

## Examining the relationship between organisational effectiveness and leadership styles

**Peyman Rahiminejad**, Department of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, School of Psychology, Islamic Azad University of Isfahan, 1584743311, Tehran, Iran

**Ghazal Golshani\***, Department of General Psychology, School of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Science and Research of Tehran, 1584743311, Tehran, Iran

### Suggested Citation:

Rahiminejad, P. & Golshani, G. (2018). Examining the relationship between organisational effectiveness and leadership styles. *Contemporary Educational Researches Journal*. 8(3), 115-122.

Received from September 20, 2017; revised from January 15, 2018; accepted from August, 11, 2018.

Selection and peer review under responsibility of Assoc. Prof. Dr. Deniz Ozcan, Near East University, Cyprus.

©2018 SciencePark Research, Organization & Counseling. All rights reserved.

---

### Abstract

This study aims to investigate the relationship between organisational effectiveness, supportive leadership and oppressive styles. The current research is correlative and descriptive due to its nature. For this study, 400 samples were considered. After distributing and collecting questionnaires, 20 valid questionnaires were diagnosed for analysis, so research sample group was reduced to 380 persons. The sample was randomly taken based on a list of employees. To collect log data, organisational effectiveness questionnaire, leadership oppressive questionnaire, a questionnaire ethical leadership and supportive leadership questionnaire were used. Data analysis in two levels of descriptive statistics and inferential statistics was performed using SPSS software. According to the result of the relationship between leadership styles (moral, oppressive and support) with dimensions of organisational effectiveness (effectiveness of individual results, effectiveness and efficiency of the overall structure and system), there is a significant relationship.

**Keywords:** Leadership styles, oppressive leadership, organisational effectiveness, supportive leadership.

---

\* ADDRESS FOR CORRESPONDENCE: **Ghazal Golshani**, Department of General Psychology, School of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Science and Research of Tehran, 1584743311, Tehran, Iran.

**E-mail address:** [ghazalgolshan@gmail.com](mailto:ghazalgolshan@gmail.com) / Tel.: + (98-21) 88830826-30

## 1. Introduction

Nowadays, due to increasing competition among organisations, every organisation seems to be more effective. Organisational effectiveness, access to priorities and multiple goals within the organisational culture are a shared value system. Functions in a way that is optimal in terms of cost and time, and fulfils that are interested in trying to reach the goals (Szumal, 2001).

Rapid changes and development of communication and knowledge management have changed, the existence of effective performance evaluation system for the organisation is inevitable. Organisational effectiveness and organisational performance are intimately related such that management-related research papers and magazines during the past 35 years have shown that two concepts are intertwined (Zaki, Adibi & Yazd khasti, 2006).

Achieving effectiveness and organisational health require the development and organisation development. Development and organisational development are the processes of increasing organisational effectiveness and facilitating the change through individual and organisational interventions using behavioural and social science knowledge. Organisational effectiveness and organisational development are one of the outputs of progress (Anderson, 2012).

Given the pivotal role of leadership in promoting the organisation's objectives has been determined and sustained survival, the need for coordination, collaboration and direct interaction with the leaders of all organisational levels in order to realise this is inevitable. Therefore, leaders are trying to adopt different leadership styles appropriate to the culture, maturity and organisational development, growth and development of individual, group and organisational condition. The research has a direct relationship between personal and leadership effectiveness that are observed (Kwanz & Boglarsky, 2007).

Leadership styles include ethical leadership style, supportive and oppressive. Effort of leaders is to build consensus and to understand the organisation and their leadership in the growth and development of the concept of 'ethical leadership'.

## 2. Moral leadership

Appropriate normative behaviour by individual actions and behaviours in interpersonal relationships and increase followers by such decisions. Two-way communication is encouraged (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005).

Servant leadership will have to defend something that is good and right. Even when this does not materially benefit the organisation. At any time may have to fight injustice and social inequality. Even against the weak and powerless of society should have the common courtesy. Servant leadership should instead use the power to dominate subordinates, in order to empower them to carry through. Trust through honesty and transparency, coordinate actions with the values and showing trust in subordinates caused 'Greenleaf' to believe that subordinates of such leaders themselves have an incentive to become servant leaders. People should prepare themselves for guidance. As a result of this situation, people are more prepared to serve as moral agents in society (Yukl, 2006).

## 3. Supportive leadership

Supportive leadership behaviour gives importance for the subordinates' satisfaction and meets the needs and preferences of them. Supportive leadership is concerned with the well-being of their employees (House & Mitchell, 1974). This behaviour is especially needed in situations in which tasks are physically or mentally abusive (House, 1996). So in supportive leadership the concern of leaders is to meet the needs of subordinates, and this issue is very important for leaders towards subordinates

(Sharma, 2011). Supportive leaders are also nice to know their subordinates human needs and behaviours are just trying to meet them.

#### 4. Oppressive leadership

Oppressive leadership is based on personal self-interest and abuse of others as described by Howell and Avolio (1993). These leaders use their power for their own benefit and to the needs of its sub-indifferent and least constructive behaviour in society. Oppressive leadership is based on personal domination and despotism defined behaviour (De Hoog & Den Hartog, 2008).

The relationship between leadership styles and organisational effectiveness reviewed and concluded that the lack of satisfaction of managers and leadership, coupled with a lack of gratitude and reward among the predictors of organisational effectiveness (Mishra, 2008). Also believes that leadership, success and health of employees during the three-step plan organisational effectiveness through the creation of trust, respect, clear relations, balance of work and home, competence and skills development, clear vision, appreciated and rewarded, ability to compromise, commitment and teamwork provides (Fisher, 2009).

During the research the role of leadership styles has on organisational effectiveness, the findings of the researchers suggest, which tends to provide more support and attention to the moral and human values in the form of an exchange transformational leadership and organisational effectiveness and leadership are related (Rukmani, Ramesh & Jayakrishnan, 2010).

In view of the above, this study aimed to determine the relationship between a combination of moral leadership, supportive leadership and oppressive leadership with organisational effectiveness has been done.

#### 5. Methodology

##### 5.1. The method used in this research was descriptive.

##### 5.1.1. Sample size

The research is based on the proportion of population size and sample size, in order to increase the statistical power was considered 400 results. Therefore, for this study, 400 samples were considered. After distributing and collecting questionnaires, 20 questionnaires for invalid analysis were diagnosed, so research sample group was reduced to 380 persons. The sample was randomly taken based on a list of employees. The sample from cycle to undergraduate education domain members, their ages range from 21 to 46 years; range from 3 months to 19 years of general work experience and job tenure in the company's future range from 3 months to 11 years ranged Sepahan pipe. Table 1 shows the frequency and percentage rate of the sample by age.

**Table 1. Frequency and frequency per cent grope, a sample based on age**

Row	Ages grope	Frequency	Frequency per cent	Cumulative frequency per cent
1	21–30 years	333	87.6	87/6
2	31 years and older	44	11/6	99/2
3	Not Declared	3	0/8	100
4	Total	380	100	–

#### 6. Research tools

Organisational Effectiveness Inventory: Inventory assessment to measure the organisational effectiveness presented with 52 questions was used. This log has a seven-point 'Likert' response scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree) and 52 questions based on what (Szumal, 2001)

introduces three areas of effectiveness in the individual results with 14 questions, the effectiveness of structures and systems five questions and with 33 questions the overall effectiveness of the measure (Szumal, 2001). The list and its reliability by 'Cronbach's alpha' ranged from 0/6 to 0/86 reported on the swing. To investigate the correlation validity of the questionnaire, a list of organisational culture (including organisational culture builder, corporate culture defensive/passive and aggressive defensive organisational culture) was studied. It also shows that the dimensions of organisational effectiveness manufacturer often has a positive relationship with organisational culture and organisational culture in front of the defense (passive or aggressive) has a negative and significant relationship.

#### **6.1.1. Oppressive leadership inventory**

To measure the oppressive leadership of the six questions presented by De Hoog and Den Hartog (2008), the seven-point scale (never = 1 to always = 7) answered, was used the question of a despotic behaviour, destructive and staff morale buster supervisor for the measure (De Hoog & Den Hartog, 2008). The six questions the validity and Cronbach's alpha equal to the 0/82 have been reported [16]. This Inventory has been translated and introduced in Iran. The construct validity of the questionnaire in this study (Golparvar & Vaseghi, 2010). Examined through exploratory factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha equal to 0/87 it has been reported (Golparvar & Vaseghi, 2010).

#### **6.1.2. Moral leadership inventory**

To measure the moral leadership of 17 question introduced by De Hoog and Den Hartog (2008), the seven-point scale (never = 1 to always = 7) answers were used. The questionnaire with three morality and fairness (six questions), to clarify the roles (five questions) and the division of power (six questions) for ethical leadership is measured (De Hoog & Den Hartog, 2008). Examined the construct validity of the questionnaire, the 'Cronbach alpha', three of morality and fairness, clarity of roles and the division of powers above 0/8 have reported (De Hoog & Den Hartog, 2008).

#### **6.1.3. Supportive leadership inventory**

To measure the supportive leadership of nine questions introduced by Banai and Reisel, (2007), the seven-point 'Likert' scale (1 = strongly disagree to strongly agree = 7) answered was used (Banai & Reisel, 2007). The validity and reliability of the questionnaire sample Cuban, German, Polish, Russian and American, reviewed and approved, and 'Cronbach's alpha' of 0/8 for this inventory of development have been reported (Banai & Reisel, 2007).

### **7. Method of data analysis**

Finally, to test the assumptions of the study collected data from questionnaires using SPSS software and appropriate statistical methods in two descriptive and inferential statistics were analysed. In the description of the frequency table, frequency percentage with descriptive indicators (mean, standard deviation and standard error) were used. Pearson test and test inferential level of significance, for the simple relationships between leadership styles (moral, oppressive and support), the dimensions of organisational effectiveness (effectiveness of individual results, effectiveness and overall effectiveness of the organisational structure and systems) were used. Pearson's correlation coefficient and significant inferential statistics to test investigate the simple relationship between leadership styles (moral, oppressive and supportive), the dimensions of organisational effectiveness (effectiveness of individual results, effectiveness and overall effectiveness of the organisational structure and systems) used.

### **8. Finding**

In examining the relationship between leadership styles (moral, oppressive and support) with dimensions of organisational effectiveness (effectiveness of individual results, effectiveness and efficiency of the overall structure and system) according to the results listed in Table 2, it can be

concluded that the being fair and ethical (moral leadership), clarity of roles, division of powers, oppressive leadership and supportive leadership with individual effectiveness, structure and system effectiveness and overall effectiveness there is a significant relationship ( $p < 0/01$ ).

**Table 2. Correlation between leadership styles and dimensions of organisational effectiveness**

Row	Research variables	Individual effectiveness		Effectiveness of the structures and systems		Overall effectiveness	
		R	P	r	P	r	P
1	Being fair and ethical (moral leadership)	0/38	0/000	0/47	0/000	0/21	0/000
2	Clarity of roles (moral leadership)	0/43	0/000	0/52	0/000	0/27	0/000
3	Division of power (moral leadership)	0/38	0/000	0/5	0/000	0/27	0/000
4	Oppressive leadership	-0/26	0/000	-0/35	0/000	-0/2	0/000
5	Supportive leadership	0/66	0/000	0/78	0/000	0/6	0/000

According to Table 3, in reviewing the relationship between leadership styles (moral and fairness, clarity of roles, division of powers, oppressive leadership and supportive leadership) with the effectiveness of individual results can be seen after regression analysis, in the between of the leadership styles, clarity of roles and supportive leadership with respect to standardised beta coefficient is equal to 0/17, 0/57, 47/2, the percentage of the variance in effectiveness of individual results.

According to this hypothesis is thus confirmed, the clarity of roles and supportive leadership effectiveness on the individual results are combined in linear relationship. The equation to predict the effectiveness of the structures and systems through significant aspects of leadership styles are as follows: (Supportive leadership) + 0/44 (obviously part of) 0/14 + 2/29 = effectiveness of individual results.

**Table 3. Results of regression analysis simultaneous to predict the effectiveness of individual results through leadership styles**

Row	Constant and predicted values	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	b	SE	β	T	P
1	Fixed value	0/687	0/472	66/95**	2/29	0/18	-	12/39	0/000
2	Being fair and moral (moral leadership)				0/07	0/04	0/09	1/55	0/12
3	Clarity of role (moral leadership)				0/14	0/04	0/17	3/43	0/001
4	The division of power (moral leadership)				0/003	0/05	0/004	0/07	0/94
5	Oppressive leadership				-0/03	0/04	-0/05	-0/98	0/33
6	Supportive leadership				0/44	0/03	0/57	13/36	0/000

\* $P < 0/05$ , \*\*  $P < 0/01$

In reviewing the relationship between leadership styles (moral and fairness, clarity of role, division of powers, oppressive leadership and supportive leadership) with the effectiveness of the structures and systems of linear combination. According to the results presented in Table 4 can be said that the style of leadership, clarity of roles and supportive leadership with respect to standardised beta coefficient equal to 0/18, 0/65, 66/4 per cent of the variance in effectiveness of the structures and systems. Clarity of role and supportive leadership with the effectiveness of structures and systems, linear combination relationship is established. The equation to predict the effectiveness of structures and systems through significant aspects of leadership styles are: (Supportive leadership) 0/4 + (Clarity of role) 0/12 + 1/8 = effectiveness of the structures and systems.

**Table 4. Results of regression analysis simultaneous to predict the effectiveness of structures and systems through leadership style**

Row	Constant and predicted values	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	b	SE	β	T	P
1	Fixed value	0/815	0/664	148/14**	1/8	0/12	–	15/3	0/000
2	Being fair and moral (moral leadership)				0/05	0/03	0/07	1/6	0/11
3	Clarity of role (moral leadership)				0/12	0/02	0/18	4/65	0/000
4	The division of power (moral leadership)				0/05	0/03	0/07	1/55	0/12
5	Oppressive leadership				–0/004	0/02	–0/008	–0/19	0/85
6	Supportive leadership				0/4	0/02	0/65	19/04	0/000

\*P < 0/05, \*\*P < 0/01

To investigate the relationship between leadership styles (ethics and fairness, clarity of role, division of powers, oppressive leadership and supportive leadership) overall effectiveness of regression analysis can be seen in Table 5, between the leadership styles, supportive leadership with standard beta coefficient equal to 0/59, 36% of the variance in overall effectiveness of the organisation. Thus the sixth hypothesis of study confirmed that supportive leadership is the overall organisational effectiveness in the combination of the linear regression. The equation predicts overall organisational effectiveness through significant aspects of leadership styles, which are presented as follows: (Supportive leadership) 0/59 + 3/06 = overall organisational effectiveness.

**Table 5. Results of regression analysis simultaneous to predict the overall effectiveness of organisational through leadership styles**

Row	Constant and predicted values	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	b	SE	β	T	P
1	Fixed value	0/6	0/36	42/13**	3/06	0/25	–	12/09	0/000
2	Being fair and Moral (moral leadership)				–0/08	0/06	–0/08	–1/37	0/17
3	Clarity of role (moral leadership)				0/06	0/05	0/07	1/23	0/22
4	The division of power (moral leadership)				0/003	0/06	0/003	0/04	0/96
5	Oppressive				–0/04	0/05	–0/05	–0/84	0/4

	leadership					
6	Supportive leadership	0/56	0/04	0/59	12/5	0/000

\* $P < 0/05$ , \*\* $P < 0/01$

## 9. Conclusion

According to the result of the relationship between leadership styles (moral, oppressive and support) with dimensions of organisational effectiveness (effectiveness of individual results, efficiency of the overall structure and system and overall effectiveness) thus confirmed the hypothesis place. Between moral leadership and fairness, clarity of roles, division of powers, oppressive leadership and supportive leadership with effectiveness of individual, structure and system effectiveness and overall effectiveness there is a significant relationship. The findings from the results of Kwantz and Boglarsky (2007) are consistent.

They found that the direct link between organisational culture, leadership and individual effectiveness exists. Also (Golparvar, Padash & Atashpour, 2010), in a study entitled reinforcing model of feeling of energy, empowerment and employees' creativity through ethical leadership found that ethical leadership directly reinforces empowerment and energy at work is felt.

In determining the findings related to moral leadership and support of this hypothesis can be said as the two styles are the emphasis on support staff.

There by the effectiveness of the individual, structure and system effectiveness and overall effectiveness of the organisation. These leaders create a supportive environment, and respecting the requests, issues, concerns and needs of their employees in order to encourage the effectiveness of individual and, subsequently, the effectiveness of the structure and strengthen their overall effectiveness. But because of the behaviour of despotic and tyrannical leadership authoritarianism, abuse of others and individual domination reduce the effectiveness of individual, intrinsic motivation and the overall effectiveness.

In determining the outcome of the relationship between leadership styles (ethics and fairness, clarity of roles, division of powers, oppressive leadership and supportive leadership) with the definition of the role and leadership effectiveness of individual results support the effectiveness of individual results of the combined linear relationship on the track.

It can be said then that between the Study of leadership styles (moral leadership, supportive leadership and oppressive leadership), Clarity of roles and supportive leadership the efficacy Individual results are linear combination relationship.

These findings suggest that theoretically clarify (or reduce ambiguity and conflict in work) roles, along with being the supervisor of the necessary support to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the individual are perceived.

Because of predictability to clarify the roles and supportive leadership can be traced to the fact that each employee to perform assigned tasks, required as roles and duties explicitly, the job demands that are raised are.

That is why when considering the moral leader or supervisor, tried to clarify the roles of the staff, at the same time the positive support they feel able to perform the roles provide. As a result of their own to help increase the effectiveness of individual employees. It is natural that the orbital support staff supervisor or leader, when placed next to the resolution, the more individual provides to improve effectiveness.

Between leadership styles (moral and fairness, clarity of roles, division of powers, oppressive leadership and supportive leadership) with the effectiveness of combination there is a significant linear relationship between structure and systems.

This hypothesis was confirmed that resolution of role and supportive leadership with efficacy of the combined linear relationship structures and systems are in place. Stepwise regression analysis in this research suggests that the study of leadership styles (moral leadership, supportive leadership and oppressive leadership) only resolution of role and supportive leadership with effectiveness of the structures and systems of linear combination relationship. The findings are the result (Anderson, 2012) consonants.

They noted that effective organisations, encouraging environment, rewarding and satisfying.

These findings suggest that theoretically clarify (or reduce ambiguity and conflict at work) roles, along with the support of leaders and managers of the fundamental principles of efficiency and effectiveness of organisational structures and systems. It is also important to point out that there are as clear roles and responsibilities for both the perceived effectiveness of individual employees contribute. Moreover, it makes the effectiveness of systems and organisational structures. That is why satisfying the organisation's environment, the space provides a kind of protectionist and growth. That feature is supportive leadership more important role because of organisational structures.

In explaining the relationship between leadership styles (ethics and fairness, clarity of role, power-sharing, supportive leadership) overall effectiveness can be concluded that supportive leadership with overall organisational effectiveness in the regression at the same time to be a linear combination. Stepwise regression analysis in this study suggests that between of the study of leadership styles (moral leadership, supportive leadership and oppressive leadership) are only supportive leadership and overall organisational effectiveness as the composition linear relationship. This finding is consistent with findings (Zaki et al., 2006).

The researchers found that the organisational effectiveness with organisation's overall performance has a close relationship. Also (Newton & Maierhofer, 2005) pointed out that supportive leadership positively associated with the move to employee well-being of employees, and make the commitment and job satisfaction.

These findings suggest that there is theoretically supportive leader, a friendly atmosphere and combined with psychological support and facilitate the work creates, is to improve organisational performance.

Followed by the organisation's overall effectiveness is achieved. So it must be pointed out, if an organisation is to achieve its goals, supportive leaders can more quickly reach these objectives and create greater organisational effectiveness.

## References

- Anderson, D. A. (2012). *Organization development the process of leading organizational change* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Banai, M. & Reisel, W. D. (2007). The influence of supportive leadership and job characteristics on work alienation: A six country investigation. *Journal of World Business*, 42, 463–476.
- Brown, M. E, Trevino, L. K. & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117–134.



- Rahiminejad, P. & Golshani, G. (2018). Examining the relationship between organisational effectiveness and leadership styles. *Contemporary Educational Researches Journal*, 8(3), 115-122.
- De Hoog, A. H. B. & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationship with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19, 297-311.
- Fisher, A. (2009). *Psychological sense of community*. New York: Plenum Publisher.
- House, R. J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 7(3), 323-352.
- House, R. J. & Mitchell, T. R. (1974). Path-goal theory of leadership. *Contemporary Business*, 3, 81-98.
- Howell, J. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors of consolidated-business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(6), 891-902.
- Golparvar, M., Padash, F. & Atashpour, H. (2010). The model enhances the sense of energy, empowerment and creativity of employees through moral leadership. *Health of Iran*, 7(3), 11-14.
- Golparvar, M. & Vaseghi, Z. (2010). *A new point in attachment styles in organizational and work environments: A case study of the link between moral and oppressive leadership with mental capital*. 2nd congress of biennial of industrial and organizational psychology of Iran. Isfahan: Islamic Azad University of Khorasgan.
- Kwartz, C. & Boglarsky, C. A. (2007). Perception of organizational culture: Leadership effectiveness and personal effectiveness across six countries. *Journal of International Management*, 13, 204-230.
- Mishra, S. (2008). On measuring group-differentials displayed by socio-economic indicators: An extension. *Applied Economics Letters*, 15(12), 935-938.
- Newton, C. J. & Maierhofer, N. I. (2005). Supportive leadership and well-being: The role of team value congruence. In M. Katsikitis (Ed.), *Proceedings 40th Australian Psychological Society Annual Conference*, pp. 208-212, Melbourne.
- Rukmani, K., Ramesh, M. & Jayakrishnan, J. (2010). Effect of Leadership Styles on Organizational Effectiveness. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 15, 3.
- Sharma, P. N. (2011). *Intervening and moderating mechanisms in the supportive leadership cascading process*. Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.
- Szumal, J. L. (2001). *Reliability and validity of the organizational effectiveness inventory (OEI)*. Arlington Heights, IL: Human Synergistics/Center for Applied Research, Inc.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organization*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Zaki, M. A., Adibi, M. & Yazd khasti, B. (2006). *Investigating the Organizational Effectiveness of the Schools of Education in Isfahan* (Special Issue for Population and Development), pp. 27-43. (AGIL Parsons Model Test).