



Determinants of Leadership style and a view on Democratic style

Doctor of Business Administration

***Approaches to Research and Academic
Communication***

LCDB7000

Student ID: 1813539

Module Leader: Dr. Gladius Kulothunga

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	3
II. Literature review	4
1. Determinants of Leadership style.....	4
a. Size of an organization.....	5
b. Degree of communication	5
c. Personality of workers	6
d. Goal congruency	8
e. Level of Decision Making	8
2. History of Democratic Leadership style	10
a. Lack of conceptual precision.....	12
b. Uncertainty in Democratic leadership	13
III. Critical assessment on a chosen research.....	14
1. Research Philosophy	15
a. Epistemology.....	15
b. Ontology (Non-philosophy context).....	16
c. Axiology	17
2. Approach	18
a. Reliability	18
b. Validity	19
c. Bias.....	20
IV. Conclusion	21
V. Reference	22

I. INTRODUCTION

There is a concept that researchers in studying management in general and human resource management in particular admitted that the success of any organisations cannot deny the role and the contribution of leaders. The leadership style of an organisation helps shaping the policies on human resource, which is an indispensable resource in the organisation's operation and development as recruitment, training, rewarding, promotion and other remuneration policies that based on seniority and labour contract term. Moreover, it is stated that leadership style has certain impacts on employees, which mainly poses on the two important issues: employee's performance and loyalty. Therefore, the ultimate goal of management policy is to create an environment for employee to work effectively and help developing followers' loyalty towards the organisation.

Recently, there are numerous theories and definitions of leadership style that have been presented from elementary to intricate which drawn difficulty for readers to understand the underlined concept and terminologies. Leadership is perceived as a managerial sequence combining attitudes, characteristics, interests, reliability, behaviours and skills of individual and organisational values (Mosadeghrad, 2003). In a different context, Rad and Yarmohammadian (2006) scrutinised the capability of a leader influencing followers in accomplishing organisational goal in the role of leadership. Furthermore, adopting the suitable leadership style is necessary and understanding the factors that affect leadership style is essential. It is claimed that the preference of a leader found on understand, beliefs, standards and quality (Iqbal, Inayat, Ijaz and Zahid, 2012) as well as personal characteristics and features (Ansari and Naeem, 2010).

This paper will concentrate on factors that determined leadership style, identifying the lack of theory as well as shed light on the uncertainty of democratic leadership style. The structure of the paper as follows: I. Introduction, II. Literature review, III. Critical assessment on a chosen research, IV. Conclusion and V. Reference.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. DETERMINANTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE

The leadership style of an organization is reflected in both the nature of that organization and its relationship with the community. When the leader is sceptical and empowered, the employees would feel suspicious and greedy, jealous of their peers. In contrast, with an open and united leader, their employees will be encouraged to exchange and cooperate with each other at work or with other organizations. In many different ways, the style of the leader defines the business. The leadership style must be consistent with the organization's goals and mission. A leader would focus his or her interests in the benefits and finance in a business that built on the importance of human's values, which can undermine the goal of the job. Therefore, the sense of leadership style and the followers of the leader plays an important role in keeping the organization on track.

The concept of leadership can be understood in a broader sense, including many different ways and possibilities. A leader can be a boss, a powerful executor, a task-oriented person, a visionary developer or sometimes a spiritual leader. They suggest, appreciate or consider other people's opinions as well as recognise their ultimate responsibility for decision making.

Not to mention, it is necessary to figure which kind of leadership style is appropriate for the organization. There are various factors that the managers can use to resolve

which leadership style is effective for the business which are outlined by Ibara (2010): size of an organization, degree of communication, personality of workers, goal congruency and level of decision making.

A. SIZE OF AN ORGANIZATION

Recently, numerous corporations have growing every day with sophisticated organizational structure and behaviour. This phenomenon would arise with issues that might be challenging to clarify at the management level due to the expansion of institutions and corporations. Concurrently, as companies are enlarging and broadening on the size to be multifaceted, the administrative and managerial supervision has the tendency to be centralised (Naylor, 1999). The centralisation would constitute a lack in the cooperation in workers or leading to a serious deficiency in interaction between employee and employers. Ibara (2010) introduced solutions suggesting managers and leaders should have a clear demonstration in stating ideas and persuading perception from employee to erase the gap. Lojpur, Aleksic, Vlahovic, Bach and Pekovic (2014) tested the effect of organization's size on the leadership style; the result showed that leadership style, especially democratic model, is more sensitive to the size than other styles. It demonstrated small size businesses prefer to adopt the democratic style while larger businesses are associated with autocratic or mix type leadership style.

B. DEGREE OF COMMUNICATION

The interaction in the organization often apply to the "relational approach" among at least two parties "on the basis of social and organizational structures aimed at

achieving goals” (Ololube, 2012). Considering the ambiguity and discomposure exposes in various circumstances, leaders are compelled to focus on subordinates as the participants are the core competency of the organization. Moreover, by having the perception of this issue, it would be easier for leaders to manage the quality of the organizational learning and maintaining the focal point on key problems.

As a consequence, the standard not only in the quality but also in the quantity of synergy and communication gravitates the leadership style of a business. Given the study of Naylor (1999), the author pointed out several points that a business must obtain to be successful. The research comprised sharing information to every level of employee via accessible channels of data transmission and communication, encouraging managers address problems and discussions face-to-face with employee, increasing regular attention from leaders in different departments by carrying adequate information and the nature of information must be taken seriously as the final assumptions and decisions would be resulted from it.

In addition, the organization could consume the transparent or the opaque system. A transparent system collects data or information to connect dynamically its environment and transparency would benefit the organization by boosting the possibility of superior communication as well as the functioning and survival of the business (Ololube, 2012).

C. PERSONALITY OF WORKERS

Personal characteristic does not guarantee the success of a leader or the business, however, it plays an important role in influencing the team to achieve common goals. Personality refers to the impression and social reputation that an individual made to others, likewise, it is treated as an assessment that a person gives to others. It points to the basic and invisible structure that hidden inside each person, explaining why

each person's behaviour tends to be the same in different situations and the behaviour of an identity is identical from others. It is proved that dependent people, who rely upon others, normally disavow participating in company's projects. They feel the need of direction is necessary and prefer to have security with a prudish organizational structure. On the other hand, individuals with an independent and intelligible sense of working direction would expose themselves as career-oriented people and have the tendency to engage in the company's activities more than others. For these above reasons, leaders should create a joyful working atmosphere to increase employee's interaction and offer opportunities for subordinates to express themselves (Ibara, 2010).

Arvey (No time) and Hassan, Asad, Hoshino (2016) conducted a regression to test the relationship between personality, cognitive factors and leadership. Authors claimed that there was a positive correlation among personality and leadership as well as personality could predict the style that a leader would apply on the team.

Google Inc – a multinational technology firm – is well known for its organizational structure and its leadership style. As the company knows that satisfying employees will benefit the company the most, Google designs an incredible working environment for employees by providing freedom at work, serving free food at lunch room with variety range of cuisines, free healthcare at Google plex, establishing Friday meetings as a “get-together” at summer camp. Leaders treat subordinates as family members and workers at Google are empowered to express judgment, ideas and different opinions are appreciated at the firm (Matuzas and Kazbaras, 2015; Turekar, 2013).

D. GOAL CONGRUENCY

Goal congruency refers to the coherence of company's members sharing the identical goal and looking forward to achieving it. Amanchukwu, Stanley and Ololube (2015) stated that high goal-oriented corporations regularly recension the enterprise's activities to assure the process of achieve the goals operates smoothly. Moreover, leaders set out a concord of direction that directs employees in the company working towards the major target and divergent styles of leadership might be utilized if it is needed due to the degree of the goal congruence.

E. LEVEL OF DECISION MAKING

A good decision can save an organization and the economy from drowning. Every day, leaders must make decisions and each decision affects the organization to some extent. The visionary leader is a champion of the radical change with a natural gift for leading people through the uncertainty. This kind of leaders prefer to change, to gather relatively narrow information and have strong prejudice against actions that might be hasty to run in the wrong direction. If you are a visionary leader, it is essential to seek for broader opinions and encouraging others to express their concerns. By applying this method, the leader could enhance beneficial information and view in order to make decisions. Furthermore, leaders that are considered as guardians are a model of fairness in maintain the strength, balance and organizational values. These leaders have a well-grounded decision-making process and they attempt to fabricate choices based on reality and plans. They consistently search for information not only to develop knowledge but also to create plans. Those are treated as good characteristics, however, in some circumstances, it is recognised as unnecessary due to its cautiousness. Additionally, this style of leaders does not respond quickly to changes

and crisis. Thus, discerning between an effective leader and ineffective leader is a plural problem in management. In a research, researchers pointed that decisions are always conducted on related power of people involved. It is also declared that in a steady environment, where the availability of information is sufficient, decisions are easily made and there is also a tendency in using democratic leadership style (Hassan, Shah, Zaman, Ikramullah and Ali Shah, 2011).

Schoderbek, Cosier and Aplin (1988) pointed out that the standard and the quality of decision-making has major impact to an organization as well as the way leaders choose to present choices. Likewise, the process of implementing decision generally involves belief and perception from members (Weddle, 2013). In Weddle's paper, the author presented five levels of making decision in the business that in each level the duration and the decision-making process increases.

In level one, "leader makes the decision alone and announces the decision". The first level consumes the least amount of time as the leader is working independent with no staff involvement. This level is effective when the need of immediate action is required. In contrast, the level two eliminates the independency from leaders. Before presenting decision, leader congregates input from others with the aim to embellish and improve understanding of the issue along with fulfil the gap in doing research. Moreover, ignoring to share and soliciting others when holding important information is contemplated as irresponsibility.

Thirdly, level three has a parallel meaning with the level two and especially, the spirit of teamwork is acquired at this level. Working as a team, team leader and team members must attend several meetings to address the problems. The responsibility of the team leader is clarifying issues and assisting team members when approaching the problem. Coetaneous, listening to different opinions and views is key, members

are empowered to have a say about the situation and distinctive ideas are gathered for the use of making decision.

“Consensus building” is the level four of decision-making. The strength of leader’s authority at this level is enormous as that individual’s voice or vote is among the team members. All possible opportunities are taken in place for the decision-making and final judgement would be set until every single members in the group has the assent with it.

Last but not least, the level five is about the “consensus and delegation with criteria/constraints”. In level five, team members are the core competency of the business in decision-making process. Team members are delegated to meet the solution for the issue without the inference from the leader. The criteria must be set out clearly by the leader and failure to meet the target would lead to the re-attempted in finding the suitable decision or the obligation for the leader to adopt a default or passing the problem to a higher leader in the company.

2. HISTORY OF DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP STYLE

Dunn (2019) and Dahl (2000) interpreted that democracy has procured distinctive explanations in divergent political framework and “has been instantiated in different guises”. The democratic leader invites members to participate not only in daily decision making but also in forming an enterprise’s vision. Thus, people are enable to present ideas, initiatives, opinions about things of the organization from how it works to develop targets, thereby enriching the capabilities of the business. Several democratic leadership models can put authority in the hands of a small group – a leader or an executive – not an individual.

An American social psychologist, Kurt Lewin and his colleagues, set the foundation of the democratic leadership (Lewin and Lippitt, 1938; Lewin, et al., 1939). The researchers introduced democratic leadership as the third style of leadership style, besides autocratic and Laissez-faire style. A democratic leader awares that there is none business succeeds without the contributions of team members. In Lewin's definition, the democratic leader considers their leadership as a responsibility and takes part in the decision-making with subordinates, who are expected to have knowledge and experience in specific area. This leadership style is distinctive from the autocratic and Laissez-faire leader (Smith, 2001). However, Kariel (1956), Barlow (1981) and Gastil (1994) did not share the same school of thought with Lewin. These researchers claimed that Lewin did not develop and build the definition of democratic leadership style outlying the original sketch, which based on the hypothesis of behaviors and it could be outdated in the future that could lead to the failure in managing the business (Kavanagh, no time).

Gastil (1994) depicted in his paper that democratic leadership is the liability, authorization of membership as well as assisting team members in making decision. In the "A Definition and Illustration of Democratic Leadership", numerous researchers -Anderson (1959), Bass (1990), Gibb (1969), Hollander & Offerman (1990) - were mentioned as had been working on discovering divergent type of leadership as authoritarian, charismatic, supervisory (Gastil, 1994). Besides the researchers mentioned in Gastil's paper, in the middle of 20th century, theorists attempted to use the two-factor model with the aim to conceptualise and comparing the theory of various leadership styles. Nonetheless, these researches were claimed to be provisional, labile and disgruntled because it focused on the mislead attention and dissembled the magnitude of the contingency theory (Cotton et al. 1988; Leana et al., 1990).

In the 21st century, democratic leadership style was developed with a different vision. Wood (2003) and Wood (2004) externalised this leadership style into four inter-locking plausibility combining decisional, discursive, therapeutic and ethical. Likewise, it is claimed that democratic style expressed in four models that recapitulating not only varied ways of conceptualising but also the operationalising democracy (Woods, 2005). In particular, it includes “liberal minimalism, civic republicanism, deliberative democracy and developmental democracy”.

In democratic leadership, leaders usually communicate with followers not only about the business’s concern, goals and mission but also about their personal perception and knowledge relating to the problems. The leader set challenging objective for followers, helping subordinates to effectuate as well as eliciting a vision of future. (Ansari and Naeem, 2010). The concept of democratic leadership is intrinsically conflict. Though the idea of democracy lays on the idea of prominent sovereignty which is, self-government by an independent populace and is relied on a necessarily egalitarian spirit, the theory of leadership fundamentally involves hierarchy and hence inequality (Wren and Dulewicz, 2005; Hernandez et al., 2011). In a typical democratic society, the leader is the one of a kind. This oddity of democratic leadership is extensively perceived, both in theory and practice (Ruscio, 2008; Kane and Patapan, 2012). A few researchers have demonstrated insightful assessments that have formed our comprehensive of the leadership-democracy inter-relation (Brooker, 2005; Kane, Patapan and Wong, 2008; Ruscio, 2008). Nonetheless, almost those have not yet consolidated the diversified theoretical framework of acknowledgement of democracy and its consequences rest on leadership.

A. LACK OF CONCEPTUAL PRECISION

Commitment, trust, relationship and ethical context are components utilized to approach the democratic style (Miao, et al. 2013; Rok, 2009). Apparently, these intricacies assist browsers and readers to fully understand the effects of democratic leadership on team members and the business. Nevertheless, it is uncertainty to describe that this style has positive impacts on the organization and analysts could misconstrue the definition due to lack of concrete interpretation that could lead to misleading research questions. There is also an argument that democratic leadership sharing the assemble idea with the autocratic and Laissez-faire style (Yukl, 1999). Consequently, the inadequacy of a transparent and detailed explanation would conceive a bewilderment to the leaders when applying new kind of leadership and to the academic body.

Somech (2003), Somech (2006), Miao and et al. (2013) undertook studies to conceptualise the leadership mechanism, however, critical researches could not be produced. It is worth noticing that the conclusion was a decision tree derived from Gastil (1994)'s theory and it took a chance to generalise the concept.

In an intellectual environment, it is essential for researchers to be aware of democracy's strength and to venture out more concepts in order to enhance the leadership studies for leaders and professionals.

B. UNCERTAINTY IN DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP

Given the ambiguous and incomplete definition of democratic leadership, the approach besieging activities based on the democratic style would be precarious. This style of leadership obligates time in decision-making and it may be difficult to approach to unified decision on a number of specific issues if there are no executives with sufficient expertise, knowledge and assertiveness. Following the Gastil's theory,

democratic activities are found on the ground of fairness and flat hierarchy; likewise, the differentiation of a leader and followers is unclear which lead to a bewilderment of an exact conceptual system. Additionally, relationship and loyalty are treated as the major elements creating the democratic leadership, thus, building satisfactory behaviour and characteristic of a democratic leader is necessary as it would help the leader developing skills and self-confidence along with his/her team members. Besides, collecting opinions from followers is not always possible as it depends on whether the matter is raised within their field of knowledge and expertise. In many cases, the team members do not have the capacity to have a depth discussion on the given issue such as management, branding and foreign affairs issues. Nevertheless, there are none researches proved that there is a positive correlation between democratic behaviour of a leader with the productivity (Somech, 2006). Furthermore, if the application of this method was aimed to embolden subordinates to be innovative, the theory of democratic leadership had failed to substantiate that it was an ideal method to lead. One of the uncertainty is involving with the vagueness in identifying whether the leader's behaviour is democratic because there are numerous ways to influence followers which includes guidance, recommendations, linked concept, "emotional maturity and ethical depth" (Gastil, 1994).

III. CRITICAL ASSESSMENT ON A CHOSEN RESEARCH

In the literature review, there is a great number of researches and studies mentioned in this part. However, the study of "Examining Determinants of Leadership Style among Montenegrin Managers" attracted the most attention from the writer. The study analyses the choice of leadership style lies on the personal or organizational

characteristics, in other words, researchers studied the determinants of leadership style that mainly affected on Montenegrin leaders. The outcome of the study has contributed to the 'library' of leadership-oriented documents and it is successfully demonstrated "how some personal characteristics are considered to be less important in developing certain styles" and external factors have the most influence on the decision of leadership model (Lojpur et al., 2014).

1. RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

A. EPISTEMOLOGY

"Epistemology is about issues having to do with the creation and dissemination of knowledge in certain areas of inquiry" which was clarified in the Stanford dictionary of philosophy (2009). In the past, scientific research methods are the source where the social sciences acquired its epistemological introduction which in conjunction with the physical sciences. These methods were proved to contribute the 'factual certainties of the physical sciences and the deductive certainties of logic and pure mathematics' (Lee-Kelley, 1929:1). Based on this tradition, once external elements are monitored and controlled consistently, they might be exposed to experimental testing to identify reality not only focus on the nature of atoms, mathematical scientific and mechanics, but also in term of human behaviour. Epistemology is consistently believed in the ontological theory and such behaviour of human is critically constituted of an ordered and rule governed externally influenced by rule-governed reality. As such, there is a viewpoint that human behaviours and attitudes are greatly decided by encouragement.

Lojpur et al. (2014) answered the question “how we know the world, how do we find the perception” by interacting with the object of research to create knowledge. Based on Simon (1992), the authors are bound by their logic and sanity in the form of dainty search and satisficing behaviours. Likewise, their perception is subdued to the influence of previous studies and self-propagating conceptions as Dawkins’s opinion (2006). Due to this phenomenon, the French authors may limit readers’ perception by accidentally limiting their nervous system on addressing the problem which is mainly based on previous researches. However, their work did not make readers think the research is a separate concept from the ordinary knowledge as it is not a distinctive idea. The authors presented the theory and knowledges according to the epistemologically objective and followed the interpretivism, the underlying knowledge they proposed did not create a fray in the current status quo.

B. ONTOLOGY (NON-PHILOSOPHY CONTEXT)

As it is stated in Beck (1979)’s paper, examining ontological differences is considered as critical aspect of a research process as it empowers researchers to reveal the impact of their perceptions on the way approaching social truths (David and Sutton, 2004), if “the purpose for social science is to understand the social reality as different people see it and to demonstrate how their views shape the action which they take within that reality” (Anderson et al., 2003). Undoubtedly, there would be substantially links from the point of view of those who might take socially constructed realities and the decision which research might present regarding to methodological selections (Cohen et al., 2000).

Researchers may adopt dissimilar ontological perspectives when attempt to conduct the research. This may include the belief that the world of social interactions endures independently from the author's perception, which is rational as it is an external entity and sensible to experimental modes of inquisition.

In the selected research, five French authors perceived the study based on the non-philosophical context of ontology, which focuses on what exists specifically within the leadership field. They tested every part that exists in the leadership system of Montenegrin managers in order to identify which elements determine the leadership style. Previously, there were numerous researches mentioned in the selected paper finding the determinants of leadership style, however, those researches did not share a positive correlation in demonstrating which components are the true essence or the core determinants of the topic. Therefore, Lojur et al. (2015) enunciated assorted hypotheses according to the determinants of leadership style such as: demographic characteristics, internal organizational characteristics and decision-making characteristics with the aim to justify the description about the reality and the nature of the existing elements in leadership. It is worth noticing that the authors adopting the metaphysics as they gained 'knowledge' by combining truths and belief together. The authors were not only conducted the regression but also collating results with previous studies to actualisation their belief. However, the authors had ignored to mention the Great Man theory's implications as the theory comprises aspects stated in the research.

C. AXIOLOGY

It is essential to consider four criteria of ethical conduct – teleology, deontology, morality, fairness – before critically assessing the selected paper. These four criteria

were conducted by Mill (1969), who demonstrated that “teleology is the theory of morality” hypothesising a respectable action is a moral obligation that encouraged to be pursued by individuals.

In the teleological term, the work of Lojpur et al. (2014) results in a meaningful outcome as it gratified readers. The authors analysed the choice of leadership style is determined by personal or organizational characteristics by conducting a regression to test the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables. This methodology is not only pragmatic and commonly used, but also accentuating more benefits than harm. The underlying reason is numerous researchers have applied this method in finding and testing correlation between two or more components and it is the extraordinary way to address the problem that drive the most absolute answer.

On the deontology, every process embarked during the research has the intention to benefit authors, researchers and the public. Moreover, the authors are truthful in construing and collecting data from reliable source. This indicates the existence of morality that was maintained with the intrinsic moral values throughout the research. Nonetheless, the criterion of fairness could not be assessed in this research as it was not mentioned.

2. APPROACH

A. RELIABILITY

The literature reviews of the selected paper based on reliable studies of valid authors and researchers whose owning several journals and published books.

Moreover, the data utilised in the paper was collected from a trustful agency among business organizations in Montenegro. The data was undertaken through 105 managers from 96 organizations in 2007, however the research was published eight years later, thus the data might not be the most updated information that is utilised for the study. The sample size of Montenegrin managers in the study is small. This confined the analysis as the study could be administered more precise if the sample size was extended. Therefore, it is suggested that future studies should expand the range of sample to obtain a deep and broaden understanding.

B. VALIDITY

Being able to run the regression, the authors set the apparatus that encompasses the entire content relating to the variable. By way of explanation, this means the “Examining Determinants of Leadership Style among Montenegrin Managers” proved to have the content validity. The R-square of the regression is 0.30 which indicating the results derived from the regression is valid and the model fits the data adequately. Considering the first hypothesis of the research, “H1: The leadership style is associated with the manager’s gender – was not supported in the model”, the outcome of the model shared the same result with previous researchers (Komives, 1991; Oshabemi, 2008; Yammarino et al., 1997) which demonstrated the difference in gender does not affect democratic leadership style.

Next, in the second and the third hypothesis on the demographic characteristics (age and educational level), there was a conflict with the work of Oshagbemi (2008), which indicates “the older the manager, *ceteris paribus*, the more likely it is for consultative and participative leadership styles to be used” while Lojpur et al. (2014) displayed there was no gap between the young and the older democratic-oriented managers.

However, it shared the similar result with Ekaterini (2010), who illustrated age did not influence the democratic leadership style.

The fourth hypothesis tested “whether leadership style is associated with the decision-making process” posed a positive correlation between the democratic leadership style and manager’s decision making. The independent variable, decision-making style, involved with the frequency of how often the leader and team members participated in making decision, which was collected “as part of a larger study conducted among all business organizations in Montenegro”. (Lojpur et al., 2014).

Moreover, in order to test the last three hypotheses on the internal organizational characteristics and decision-making characteristics, Lojpur and colleague conducted a questionnaire survey consisting various aspects of manager behaviour as well as organizational and personal characteristics from a trustful and professional agency. To summarise, the validity is constructed in the selected paper as authors are able to carry conclusion correlated with the concept being studied and the interpretivism inquiry is context-specific.

C. BIAS

The authors based their research on contingency trait theory that the elements surrounding this research reflect only some aspect of leadership factors as a whole; this phenomenon resulting in unintentional bias.

Last but not least, Lojpur and partners could not merge different characteristics of leadership style to test the effects of those characteristics on the dependent variable. It would be advantageous to apply and interpret various characteristics as the outcome could be more interesting and accurate.

It would also be useful and interesting to consider and analyse how and if these differences can produce differences in the effectiveness of leaders.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the study of leadership has been introduced globally for decades and its influence has been an 'attracting' objective of many leaders and researchers. Given the illumination in literature review, factors that established by Ibara (2010) containing company's size, degree of communication, personality, goal congruency and degree of decision-making has contributed in determining the style of leadership that one would prefer. These factors might be considered to follow the Great Man theory and the contingency trait theory. From the view of democratic leadership style, writer has drawn out the flaws by highlighting the lack of understanding on theory as well as the ambiguity in behaviour of a democratic leader.

Furthermore, for the assessment on Lojpur et al. (2014), the arguments that I depicted in the paper would assist other researchers in the future. Likewise, it would propose adequate grounds to allow not only the writer but also other researchers to move forward.

V. REFERENCE

1. Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J. and Ololube, N. P. (2015) *Leadership Theories, Principles and Styles and Their Relevance to Educational Management*. Management 2015, 5(1): 6-14. DOI: 10.5923/j.mm.20150501.02 [Online] Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nwachukwu_Prince_Ololube/publication/283081945_A_Review_of_Leadership_Theories_Principles_and_Styles_and_Their_Relevance_to_Educational_Management/links/56292c3408ae04c2aeae901/A-Review-of-Leadership-Theories-Principles-and-Styles-and-Their-Relevance-to-Educational-Management.pdf (Accessed: 26th April, 2019).
2. Anderson, L. Bennett. N (2003), *Developing educational leadership: using evidence for policy and practice*. British Educational Management and Administration Society, London: Sage.
3. ANDERSON, R. C (1959) *Learning in discussions: A resume of the authoritarian-democratic studies*. Harvard Educational Review, 29, pp. 201-215.
4. Ansari, A. H., & Naeem, F. (2010). *Different leadership styles across hierarchical levels: A case study on Indian automobile industry*. Asia Pacific Business Review, VI (3), pp. 115–123.
5. Arvey, R. D. (No time) *The Determinants of Leadership: The Role of Genetic, Personality, and Cognitive Factors* [Online] <http://www.legacy-irc.csom.umn.edu/RePEc/hrr/papers/1302.pdf> (Accessed: 26th April 2019).
6. Bass, B. M. & Bass, R. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. New York: The Free Press.
7. Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge, 5th Edition.

8. Cotton, J. et al., 1988. *Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes*. Academy of Management Review, Volume 13, pp. 8 - 22.
9. David, M., and Sutton, C., (2004) *Social research: the basics*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
10. Dawkins, R. (2006). *The selfish gene*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
11. Hassan, F. S. U., Shah, B., Zaman, T., Ikramullah, M., & Ali Shah, I. (2011). *Effect of leaders' styles of decision making on perceived organizational effectiveness: An example from Pakistan*. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2(22), 297–307.
12. Hassan, H., Asad, S. and Hoshino, Y. (2016) *Determinants of Leadership Style in Big Five Personality Dimensions* [Online] Available at: <http://www.hrpub.org/download/20160331/UJM2-12105627.pdf> (Accessed: 26th April 2019).
13. Ekaterini, G. (2010). *The impact of leadership styles on four variables of executives' workforce*. International Journal of Business and Management, 5(6), pp. 3–16.
14. Hollander, L. P. and Offerman, L. R. (1990) *Power and leadership in organization*. American Psychologist, 45, pp. 179-189.
15. Gibb, C. A. Leadership. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Ede) (1969) *Handbook of social psychology*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, pp. 205-282.
16. Ibara, E. C. (2010) *Perspectives in Educational Administration*. Port Harcourt, Nigeria: Rodi Printing and Publishing.

17. Iqbal, J., Inayat, S., Ijaz, M., & Zahid, A. (2012) *Leadership styles: Identifying approaches and dimensions of leaders*. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 4(3), pp. 641–659.

18. Komives, S. R. (1991). *Gender differences in the relationship of hall directors' transformational and transactional leadership and achieving styles*. Journal of College Student Development, 32(2), pp. 155–165.

19. Leana, C., Locke, E. & Schweiger, D., (1990) *Fact and fiction in analyzing research on participative decision making: A critique of Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall, and Jennings*. Academy of Management Review, Volume 15, pp. 137 - 146.

20. Lewin, K. & Lippitt, R., (1938) *An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note*. Sociometry, Volume 1, pp. 292 - 300.

21. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. & White, R. K., (1939) *Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates."* Journal of Social Psychology, Volume 10, pp. 271- 299.

22. Lojpur, A., Aleksic, A., Vlahovic, S., Bach, M., Pekovic, S. (2014) *Examining Determinants of Leadership Style among Montenegrin Managers* [Online] Available at: <https://www.degruyter.com/downloadpdf/j/ngoe.2015.61.issue-1/ngoe-2015-0002/ngoe-2015-0002.pdf> (Accessed: 26th April, 2019).

23. Mosadeghrad, A.M. (2003a), "The role of participative management (suggestion system) in hospital effectiveness and efficiency", Research in Medical Sciences, Vol. 8 No. 3, Isfahan, pp. 85-9.
24. Mosadeghrad, A.M. (2003b), Principles of Health Care Administration, Dibagran Tehran, Tehran

25. Naylor, J. (1999) *Management*. Harlow, England: Prentice Hall.

26. Kavanagh, E. (No time) *Three Leadership Models: Kurt Lewin, Hershey and Blanchard, and Edwin Friedman*. [Online] Available at: http://www.earonkavanagh.ca/article_kavanagh-three.pdf (Accessed: 26th April 2019).
27. Gastil, J., 1994. *A Definition and Illustration of Democratic Leadership*. Human Relations, 47(8), pp. 953 - 975.
28. Ololube, N. P. (2012). *Sociology of education and society: an interactive approach*. Owerri, Nigeria: Springfield Publishers.
29. Oshagbemi, T. (2008). *The impact of personal and organisational variables on the leadership styles of managers*. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19(10), 1896–1910. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09585190802324130> (Accessed: 26th April 2019).
30. Rhodes, R. and Har, P. (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Leadership*. 1st ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
31. Schoderbek, P. P., Cosier, R. A. and Aplin, J. C. (1988) *Management*. San Diego, USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers.
32. Simon, H. A. (1992). *Rational decision-making in business organisations*. Economic
33. Sciences, 1969-1980: The Sveriges Riksbank (Bank of Sweden) Prize in Economic Sciences in Memory of Alfred Nobel, 1, 343.
34. Smith, M. K., (2001) *Kurt Lewin, groups, experiential learning and action research*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-lewin.htm> (Accessed: 26th April 2019).

35. Somech, A., 2006. *The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams*. Journal of Management, 32(1), pp. 132 - 157.

36. Weddle, J. (2013) *Levels of Decision Making in the Workplace*. [Online] Available at: http://www.jobdig.com/articles/1115/Levels_of_Decision_Making_in_the_Workplace.html (Accessed: 26th April 2019).

37. Yammarino, F. J., Dubinsky, A. J., Comer, L. B., & Jolson, M. A. (1997). *Women and transformational and contingent reward leadership: A multiple-levels-of-analysis perspective*. Academy of Management Journal, 40(1), pp. 205–222. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/257027> (Accessed: 26th April 2019).

38. Yarmohammadian, H.M. and Rad, A.M.M. (2006) *A Study of Relationship between Managers' Leadership Style and Employees' Job Satisfaction*. Leadership in Health Services, 19, pp. 11-28. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13660750610665008> (Accessed: 26th April 2019).

39. DUNN, J. (2019). *Setting the People Free: The Story of Democracy, Second Edition*. PRINCETON; OXFORD: Princeton University Press. doi:10.2307/j.ctv346rv6

40. DAHL, R. A. (2000), A Democratic Paradox?. Political Science Quarterly, 115: 35-40. doi:[10.2307/2658032](http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2658032)

41. KARIEL, H. S. (1956), POLITICAL SCIENCE IN THE UNITED STATES: REFLECTIONS ON ONE OF ITS TRENDS. Political Studies, 4: 113-127. doi:[10.1111/j.1467-9248.1956.tb00947.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.1956.tb00947.x)

42. Barlow, D. H. (1981), EDITORIAL. Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis, 14: 1-2. doi:[10.1901/jaba.1981.14-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1901/jaba.1981.14-1)

43. Cotton, J. et al., 1988. Employee participation: Diverse forms and different outcomes. *Academy of Management Review*, Volume 13, pp. 8 - 22.

44. Woods, P. A., 2004. Democratic leadership: drawing distinctions with distributed leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*, 7(1), pp. 3 - 26.

45. Woods, PA. (2003). Building on Weber to Understand Governance: Exploring the links between identity, democracy and 'inner distance'. *Sociology*, 37(1): 143–163.
46. Woods, P. A. (2005). DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION. Sage: Unknown Publisher.
47. Wren, J. & Dulewicz, V. (2005) Leader competencies, activities and successful change in the Royal Air Force, *Journal of Change Management*, 5:3, 295-309, DOI: [10.1080/14697010500226673](https://doi.org/10.1080/14697010500226673)
48. Hernandez, M., Eberly, M., Johnson, M. and Avolio, B. (2013). An Integrative Process Model of Leadership Examining Loci, Mechanisms, and Event Cycles. *The American psychologist*. 68. 10.1037/a0032244.
49. Ruscio, KP (2008) *The Leadership Dilemma in Modern Democracy*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
50. Kane, J. & Patapan, H. (2012). The Democratic Leader: How Democracy Defines, Empowers and Limits its Leaders. *The Democratic Leader: How Democracy Defines, Empowers and Limits its Leaders*. 1-230. [10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199650477.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199650477.001.0001).
51. Kane, J., Haig, P. and Benjamin, W. Eds. 2008. *Dissident Democrats: The Challenge of Democratic Leadership in Asia*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
52. Brooker P. (2005) *Pioneering Leadership as Political Entrepreneurship*. In: *Leadership in Democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan, London
53. Miao, Q., Newman, A., Schwarz, G. & Xu, L., (2013) *Participative Leadership and the Organizational Commitment of Civil Servants in China: The Mediating Effects of Trust in Supervisor*. *British Journal of Management*, Volume 24, pp. 76 - 92.
54. Rok, B., 2009. Ethical context of the participative leadership model: taking people into account. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society*, 9(4), pp. 461-472.
55. Yukl, G., 1999. An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8(1), pp. 33 - 48 .

56. Somech, A. (2003) *Relationships of participative leadership with relational demography variables: a multi-level perspective*. Journal of Organizational Behavior, Volume 24, p. 1003–1018.
57. Somech, A. (2006) *The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams*. Journal of Management, 32(1), pp. 132 - 157.
58. Matuzas, M. and Kazbaras, E. (2015). *Case Analysis 'System Infrastructure at Google', Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management* [Online]. Available at:
https://www.academia.edu/23511493/Case_Analysis_System_Infrastructure_at_Google_Organizational_Behavior_and_Human_Resource_Management (Accessed on 29th April, 2019)
59. Turekar, N. (2013). *Organisational behaviour of Google Inc* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.scribd.com/document/173702727/Organisational-behaviour-of-google-inc> (Accessed on 29th April, 2019)