

AIBUMA Publishing
African Journal of Business & Management (AJBUMA)
<http://www.aibuma.org/journal/index.htm>
Vol. 1 (2010), 14 pages

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF TRADE UNION LEADERSHIP AND THE FACTORS INFLUENCING THE LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS

The Case of Kenya Union of Sugar Plantation and Allied Workers (KUSPAW)

Florence Muindi, florence.muindi@uonbi.ac.ke; Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, School of Business- University of Nairobi

Christopher Sakwa Wangara, MBA Student, Department of Business Administration, School of Business- University of Nairobi

Abstract

Without effective leadership, the process of creating an environment that is positive for fostering relationships and conducive to effective production would falter and the organization would suffer loss, either monetary, personnel, or production. This study on the leadership effectiveness in the Kenya union of sugar plantation and allied workers (KUSPAW) aimed at determining the effectiveness of Trade Union leadership and determining the factors influencing the leadership effectiveness. A descriptive survey research design was used. Stratified sampling using the proportionate allocation method was used to determine the size of each stratum (national board members, branch officials and shop stewards). A structured questionnaire was used to collect primary data. The data was analyzed descriptively using the distribution (frequency), central tendency (Mean and mode) and dispersion (range, variance and standard deviation). The results revealed that the KUSPAW leadership's 'laissez-faire' and 'Management by exception: passive' had acceptable scores of 0.5 and 0.6 respectively against a benchmark of 0-1. The leadership also has an acceptable score in contingent reward (2.9) measured against a 2-3 validated benchmark. The two leadership styles that did not meet the expectations are 'Management by exception: active' and transformational leadership with scores of 2.4 and 2.9 measured against benchmarks of 1-2 and 3.0-3.75 respectively. The outcomes ratings (3.0) also failed to attain the benchmark in excess of 3.5. The study concludes that the KUSPAW leadership is relatively ineffective and recommends that the whole leadership is taken through a leadership course, albeit refresher for those with the training.

Keywords: *leadership, leadership effectiveness, trade unions*

1. Introduction

1.1 General Background

Because effective leadership is at the core of successful businesses, the understanding of what makes a successful leader is an issue that has been debated for decades. Leadership has become even more important due to the noticeable decline of enduring successful leaders in the business world today. As Kotter (1999) states: "Understanding leadership means recognizing the various definitions of leadership, examining the relationship between

leadership and management, and applying the significance of past leadership theories to today's business world. Because leadership is an essential element of a successful organization it is imperative to understand what makes a successful business leader."

1.2 Literature to Leadership Effectiveness

Ward (2010) defines leadership as the art of motivating a group of people to act towards achieving a common goal. The leader is the person in the group that possesses the combination of personality and skills that makes others want to follow his or her direction, Ward adds. Yukl (2001) argues that there is no "correct" definition; it is only a matter of how useful it is increasing our understanding of effective leadership. The Collins English Dictionary (1998) defines leadership as the position or function of a leader, the ability to lead. The web enhanced Leadership Education and Development (weLEAD) online magazine (2010) defines leadership as the active ability to articulate a vision, to embrace the values of that vision, and nurture an environment where followers can reach the organizations goals and their own personal goals.

Dessler (2004) defines leadership as one person influencing another to willingly work toward a predetermined objective. Robbins (2003) defines leadership as, coping with change. Leaders establish direction by developing a vision of the future; then they align people by communicating this vision and inspiring them to overcome hurdles. Ernsberger (2000) states that leadership involves accomplishing group objectives, taking a diverse group of people, bringing them together, and finding a common thread that enables them to work together to achieve a common goal. Kotter (1999) defines leadership as the development of vision and strategies, the alignment of relevant people behind those strategies, and the empowerment of individuals to make the vision happen, despite obstacles.

Walker (2009) states that effective leaders build a sense of community within the workplace, that they not only increase employee retention figures, but they also improve productivity because employees are more willing to follow effective leaders than non-effective individuals. Walker (2005) indicates that an Effective Leader is one who inspires others to give maximum effort to achieve a worthwhile goal. Effective leaders do not use force to get others to do what they want. They do not coerce, cajole, threaten, plead, or bargain with their followers. They inspire them to do what needs to be done! Walker further gives what he refers to as principles of Effective Leadership which he believes are common to effective leaders throughout history, and the understanding and practice of them are essential for effective leadership. These principles are; Integrity and Humility.

Bisoux (2002) argues that you can't be an effective manager these days without being an effective leader. There's too much complexity, too much turbulence to

simply 'manage'. According to Goreham, (weLEAD, 2010), the necessity of leadership in the workplace is to create an environment that is positive for fostering relationships and conducive to effective production. Without effective leadership, the process would falter and the organization would suffer loss, either monetary, personnel, or production.

Because effective leadership is at the core of successful businesses, the understanding of what makes a successful leader is an issue that has been debated for decades (Holverson, 2004). As Kotter (1999) states that understanding leadership means recognizing the various definitions of leadership, examining the relationship between leadership and management, and applying the significance of past leadership theories to today's business world. Future leaders must recognize how leadership has changed, including essential capabilities of leaders and the forces that continue to shape leadership.

If there is only one thing that we can learn from the definitions of leadership, it is that there are many components of leadership; no one definition is more correct than another. Instead, each definition presents relevant elements of leadership and helps to paint a portrait of what effective leadership involves (Holverson, 2004). The influence a leader exerts in altering moods, evoking images and expectations, and in establishing specific desires and objectives determines the direction a business takes (Zaleznik, 1998).

To understand how to effectively lead, we must also understand leadership theories of the past and apply their significance in leadership today. Fielder's Contingency Theory works to determine which type of leadership style generates the highest-producing and most efficient work group dependent on how a leader describes his/her least preferred coworker (Holverson, 2004).. Applied today, Fielder's theory creates problems; the theory deems leaders inherently either task- or relations-oriented despite the fact that specific situations call for different types of leadership (Holverson, 2004). As per Mello (2003), the model implied that as one or more of the three contingency variables of leader/member relations, task structure, or leader position power changed, the possible corresponding mandate that task- or relations-oriented leadership be substituted for the other meant that the leader would have to be replaced.

The next theory, The Leader-Participation Model created by Victor Vroom, Arthur Jago, and Philip Yetton, differentiates the levels of leadership participation needed in different circumstances

(Holverson, 2004). As per Dessler (2004: 272): “[Vroom, Jago, and Yetton] argue that being participative is not an either/or decision, since there are different degrees to participation. They developed a model that enables leaders to analyze a situation and decide how much participation is called for. Their technique consists of three components: A set of management decision styles; a set of diagnostic questions; and a decision tree for identifying how much participation the situation calls for.”

Robert J. House, the Path-goal Leadership Theory proposes that it is a leader’s responsibility to create and maintain a work environment where subordinates are able and motivated to achieve work-related goals (Holverson, 2004). Dessler (2004) goes on to say that stripped to its essentials, path-goal theory says this: If the job is ambiguous, structure it. If it is demoralizing or the employees lack confidence, be supportive and considerate. And always make it clear how an effort on the job will lead to rewards. Holverson (2004) advances the argument that this leadership theory assists leaders in choosing the correct method of leadership for specific situations by including four leadership methods from which to choose: directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented leadership. Holverson further states that the theory is very relevant to business leadership to day since it not only recognizes the need for various leadership techniques, but also acknowledges the new role of the leader. No longer are leaders inaccessible, authoritarian directors of the past; Leaders today must realize that being an effective leader is about connecting, supporting and inspiring the people they lead.

1.3 The Kenya Union of Sugar Plantation and Allied Workers

A Trade Union is an organization of workers who have joined together so as to try to improve their interests. The main object of Trade Unions is to regulate relations between employees and employers (Nzuve, 2007). Singh (1969:170) defines a Trade Union as “an association which has as its main object the regulation of relations between workers and their employers or between one group of workers and another group of workers or between employers and other employers”.

The Kenya Union of Sugar Plantation and Allied Workers (KUSPAW) was formed in the year 1960. Regulating and improving relations between employees and employers and determining conditions of conduct of any trade or other business within the scope of provisions of benefits to members is one of the aims of KUSPAW. Another aim is to organize all employees in the sugar industry, assist its members

through a collective bargaining system, to obtain fair remuneration for their labor, to establish and maintain satisfactory conditions of employment for employees in the sugar industry.

The structure of KUSPAW is such that it has an annual conference, a National Executive Board, National Officers, National Trustees, National Women’s committee, Negotiating committee, appointed Officers, and branch Officials. The Annual conference is the supreme authority of the Union and comprises of all the head office officials and delegates elected by the branches (the three principal officials of every branch). The annual conference elects National officers, trustees and members of the National Executive Board.

1.4 The Qualities of Effective Leadership

While researchers have spent years discussing traits and behavior theories, it has become clear that effective leadership is created through a combination of the two (Holverson, 2004). As Dessler (2004: 256) states, “In thinking about what it is about the leader that determines his or her effectiveness, experts usually don’t focus just on leadership traits; they talk of both traits and skills”. Some qualities of effective leadership include;

Effective leaders today cannot lead as their predecessors once did; a new type of leadership, servant leadership, is defining how leaders manage subordinates (Holverson, 2004). Mello (2003) posits that as servant first, the leader ensures that others’ greatest needs are being met and bears the self-awareness to realize that his or her own “healing” is the motivation for leadership. Leadership today is about listening and guiding subordinates, not scaring them into following direction; but serving their needs so they are willing and capable to achieve corporate goals (Holverson, 2004).

A contemporary concept very much associated with servant leadership, although not as well explored, is emotional intelligence (EI) (Holverson, 2004). EI is, “described as a set of abilities that refer in part to how effectively one deals with emotions both within oneself and others” (Palmer, Walls, Burgess, & Stough, 2001). Palmer et al. (2001) goes on to say that, today’s effective leadership skills have been described to depend, in part, on the understanding of emotions and the abilities associated with EI. Palmer further states that emotional intelligence is about understanding the differences in individuals, how you react to these differences, and the knowledge you have about yourself and the different types of personalities existing.

Credibility is another critical issue facing business leaders today (Holverson, 2004). Kotter (1998) says that, a big challenge in leadership efforts is credibility - getting people to believe the message. Due to the increasing abundance of unethical business situations, credibility is and will continue to be an important factor in effective leadership. Only individuals who are able to establish mutual trust with those around them will make successful leaders (Holverson, 2004). Ulrich (1996) posits that credible leaders have the personal habits, values, traits, and competencies to engender trust and commitment from those who take their direction. Leaders must understand the importance of following through on their promises and taking responsibility when they cannot. From this notion, leaders must also recognize that credibility is harder to gain the second time around; once credibility is lost it may never be recovered

Holverson (2004) posits that ethics and effective leadership are so closely related as to be inseparable. Ethical reasoning not only involves forming and using a business' ethical standards, but also creating and abiding by a personal ethical code as well. It is clear that strong morals and sound ethical reasoning will be essential to effective leaders of the future. We must also recognize a leader's ability to inspire others. Employee motivation is a serious challenge in businesses today; motivation begins when leaders establish realistic and inspiring corporate strategies. As such, an essential element of leadership, now and in the future, will be the ability to create and instill a vision in the people they lead.

One of the most vital skills of future leaders will be their ability to adapt to change. The business world has transformed dramatically, especially in recent years. The accessibility of information, advancements in technology, and increase in competition have created a cut-throat business environment that thrives on change and being first to capitalize on the latest craze (Holverson, 2004). Clearly, business leaders must be prepared for rapid and constant change; strategies that were working for them yesterday may end up being their downfall today. Tichy and Cohen (1997) state that In order for organizations to win, revolution, driven by leaders with ideas and the heart and guts to bring them alive must become a way of life. Future leaders must have a high tolerance to ambiguity and be capable of creating direction in times of uncertainty.

Holverson (2004) states that the future of leadership will continue to be affected by the issue of corporate social responsibility. Corporate social responsibility

is, "the extent to which companies should and do channel resources toward improving one or more segments of society other than the firm's owners or stockholders" (Dessler, 2004: 41). No longer can businesses operate without considering how their actions affect the social responsibility they have to the environment, to their consumers, and their partnerships. When strategizing, leaders need to consider more than just whether or not they are creating a profit for their company and shareholders; they must also consider the moral impact of their actions (Holverson, 2004).

1.5 Leadership Styles

In coming up with the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), Bass and Avolio (2003) developed a plan for enhancing a "full range" of leadership potential to achieve optimal outcomes with followers and associates. The MLQ measures leadership styles which may be grouped under three broad categories that differ in their outcome effects and the nature of the influencing processes involved:

Transformational leadership is a process of influencing in which leaders change their associates' awareness of what is important, and move them to see themselves and the opportunities and challenges of their environment in a new way. The four I's of Transformational Leadership as classified by Bass and Avolio (2003) include; Idealized Attributes/behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration.

Transactional leaders display behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. The constructive style is labeled Contingent Reward and the corrective style is labeled Management-by-Exception. Transactional leadership defines expectations and promotes performance to achieve these levels. Contingent Reward and Management-by-Exception are two core behaviors associated with 'management' functions in organizations. Full range leaders do this and more.

Another form of Management-by-Exception leadership is more passive and "reactive": it does not respond to situations and problems systematically. Passive leaders avoid specifying agreements, clarifying expectations, and providing goals and standards to be achieved by followers. This style has a negative effect on desired outcomes - opposite to what is intended by the leader - manager. In this regard it is similar to laissez-faire styles - or "no leadership." Both types of behavior have negative

impacts on followers and associates. Accordingly, both styles can be grouped together as 'Passive - Avoidant Leadership'.

The MLQ also measures three outcomes of leadership: Extra Effort, Individual, Unit and Organizational Effectiveness Ratings, and Satisfaction with the leadership. It has been shown in numerous independent scientific studies that these outcomes - and many others such as productivity, innovation and sales performance - are achieved at the highest levels when transformational leadership is optimally used. These influencing styles augment the usual transactional leadership often associated with 'management'. The best leaders use a full range of influencing spanning transformational and transactional styles (Bass and Avolio 2003).

2.0 Statement of the Problem

From the literature review, it is clear that Effectiveness in leadership is an important discipline which can be learned and must be earned . Leadership effectiveness in all forms of organizations, including Trade Unions, is about getting the right things done. Over the years, trade unions have been run with some stated objectives which have widened and have tended to be influenced by the economic, political and social systems within which Trade Unions operate. The trade union leadership is charged with the responsibility of championing these objectives as documented in their constitutions. The leadership effectiveness of the Trade Union is therefore of significant importance and needs to be studied.

Musandu (2007) in his study of 'the effects of fragmentation of Trade Unions on collective Bargaining in Kenya's hotel industry' found out that the causes of fragmentation of Trade Unions are; Poor management of the Trade Unions, the high court registering splinter unions without consultation or due regard for industrial relations charter or the law, poor leadership, lack of education, poor representation, leadership wrangles, large membership of Trade Unions, conflict of interests, misappropriation and lack of union funds, increase in awareness of rights, corruption, tribalism, political interference, and unfair elections. Poor management of Trade Unions was the greatest of these. Several other studies have been done on Trade Unions in Kenya. K'obonyo (1981) studied the operations of Trade Unionism in Kenya; a study of the railways African Union. Machyo (2003) studied women's participation in Trade Union leadership in Kenya. Busienei (2005) added to the body of knowledge by his study of the moderating effects of Trade Union membership on employee perception of job security

and fair treatment by management in the manufacturing industry in Kenya. Moraa (2006) surveyed the strategies used by Trade Unions in negotiating with employers in Nairobi. The response of Trade Unions to challenges posed by conditions of work at the EPZ (Mutung'a, 2006) is another addition to the body of knowledge.

Since poor management of Trade Unions and poor leadership have been cited as an area of concern, and bearing in mind that leadership effectiveness of Trade Unions has not been studied, the proposed study will add to the much needed information on Trade Union leadership. This paper sought:

- a) To determine the effectiveness of Trade Union leadership measured against their mandate.
- b) To determine the factors influencing the Trade Union leadership effectiveness in the discharge of duties.

3.0 Research Strategy

The descriptive survey research design was used . The population consists of all leaders in the KUSPAW both at the national level and at the branch level. This made the population to be 333. The selection of the national executive board members, branch officials and shop stewards is based on the fact that they constitute the leadership of the union (KUSPAW). Their account of experiences/practices will therefore provide a better picture of KUSPAW leadership and the Trade Union movement leadership in general.

The approach to used on sampling is the Stratified sampling using the proportionate allocation method since it assured that the researcher wasl be able to represent not only the overall population, but also key sub-groups of the population especially the small minority groups. A 19 percent sample of the population was chosen for the study bringing a total sample of 63.

Table 1: Stratified sampling

| Strata | Population [N] | Sampling fraction (f) [n/N] | Sample [N x f] |
|---|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| National Board Members. | 27 | 0.19 | 5 |
| Branch Officials (From the current 7 (seven) branches). | 84 | 0.19 | 16 |
| Shop stewards. | 222 | 0.19 | 42 |
| Totals | 333 | | 63 |

The researcher collected data using a questionnaire which contains both open ended and close ended questions to collect primary data. Inferential data analysis was used. The data was also analyzed descriptively using the distribution (e.g. frequency),

central tendency (Mean, median and mode) and dispersion (range, variance and standard deviation).

4.0 Data Analysis, Findings and Discussions

A total of 46 questionnaires out of the targeted 63 were administered by the researcher and were all completed, resulting in an overall response rate of 73%. The total number of National board members that was interviewed was 4, giving 80% response rate. Out of the targeted 16 branch officials, 16 branch officials were interviewed, giving a 100% response rate. The shop stewards had a 61.9% response rate since only 26 out of the targeted 42 were interviewed. The above analysis gives acceptable response rates by the respondents, the lowest being 61.9%.

The questionnaire used in the research was adopted from the Multifactor Leadership questionnaire developed by Bass and Avolio (2003). The different leadership attributes were analyzed under three leadership styles; transformational, transactional, and passive/avoidant behavior. The three outcomes of leadership; extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction with the leadership were also measured.

4.1 Transformational Leadership Ratings

Transformational leaders are proactive: they seek to optimize individual, group and organizational development and innovation, not just achieve performance "at expectations." The four I's of Transformational Leadership include; Idealized Attributes/behaviors, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, and Individualized Consideration (Bass and Avolio 2003).

Table 2: Overall transformational leadership ratings

| | Not at all | Once in awhile | Sometimes | Fairly Often | Frequently | Total | Average |
|---|------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|------------|--------|---------|
| Idealized Attributes | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| I instill pride in others for being associated with me. | | 6 | 1 2 | 1 0 | 1 8 | 4 6 | 2 .9 |
| I display a sense of power and confidence. | 1 | 3 | 9 | 1 8 | 1 4 | 4 5 | 2 .9 |
| I go beyond self-interest for the good of the group. | 4 | 4 | 8 | 1 3 | 1 7 | 4 6 | 2 .8 |
| I act in ways that build others' respect for me. | | 3 | 5 | 1 5 | 2 2 | 4 5 | 3 .2 |
| Total. | | | | | | 2 | .9 |

| Idealized Behaviors | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| I specify the importance of having a strong sense of purpose. | | 3 | 7 | 1 3 | 2 2 | 4 5 | 3 .2 |
| I consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. | 1 | 3 | 7 | 1 2 | 2 1 | 4 4 | 3 .1 |
| I emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission. | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 7 | 2 3 | 4 6 | 3 .3 |
| I talk about my most important values and beliefs. | 2 | 9 | 1 3 | 8 | 1 3 | 4 5 | 2 .5 |

Total.
3
.0

| Inspirational Motivation | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|--|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| I express confidence that goals will be achieved. | 1 | 2 | 9 | 1 0 | 2 4 | 4 6 | 3 .2 |
| I talk optimistically about the future. | 2 | 4 | 7 | 1 8 | 1 5 | 4 6 | 2 .9 |
| I talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. | 1 | 3 | 7 | 1 3 | 2 0 | 4 4 | 3 .1 |
| I articulate a compelling vision of the future. | | 4 | 9 | 1 9 | 1 3 | 4 5 | 2 .9 |

Total.
3
.0

| Intellectual Stimulation | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| I get others to look at problems from many different angles. | 2 | 2 | 1 0 | 1 5 | 1 6 | 4 5 | 2 .9 |
| I suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignments. | 1 | 2 | 1 1 | 1 7 | 1 4 | 4 5 | 2 .9 |
| I re-examine critical assumptions to question whether they are appropriate. | 2 | 4 | 1 0 | 1 5 | 1 4 | 4 5 | 2 .8 |
| I seek differing perspectives when solving problems. | 2 | 3 | 1 3 | 1 3 | 1 5 | 4 6 | 2 .8 |

Total.
2
.8

| Individual Consideration | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| I spend time teaching and coaching. | 3 | 1 0 | 1 6 | 1 1 | 5 | 4 5 | 2 .1 |
| I treat others as individuals rather than just as a member of a group. | 6 | 4 | 8 | 1 4 | 1 3 | 4 5 | 2 .5 |
| I consider an individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others. | 2 | 2 | 1 0 | 1 6 | 1 5 | 4 5 | 2 .9 |
| I help others to develop their strengths. | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 5 | 2 2 | 4 6 | 3 .1 |

Total.

2
:
9

2
:
7

Research Validated Benchmark >3.0 to <3.75 for all the attributes (Bass and Avolio 2003).

From the analysis, the overall score of the idealized attributes was 2.9 which is clearly below the >3.0 to <3.75 benchmark. In these attributes, the KUSPAW leadership demonstrated action that builds others' respect for it with a 3.2 score. The rest of the attributes, that is, instilling pride in others, displaying a sense of power and confidence, and going beyond self-interest were just below the benchmark.

The Idealized behaviors of the leadership just managed the minimum score of 3.0. The attribute of concern here is the leadership talking about its most important values and beliefs since the 2.5 score was way below the benchmark.

The inspirational motivation weighted average also just managed the minimum score of 3.0. Two attributes did not attain the benchmark, optimism and articulation of a compelling vision of the future with 2.9 each.

The intellectual stimulation of the KUSPAW leadership was below the research validated benchmark with 2.8 and all the attributes were below the benchmark, that is, getting others to look at problems from many angles (2.9), suggestion new ways of completing assignments (2.9), re-examination of critical assumptions (2.8), and seeking differing perspectives when solving problems (2.8).

Individual consideration of the KUSPAW leadership had the least score in the transformational leadership (2.7), the least of its attributes being teaching and coaching with a 2.1 score followed by treating others as individuals rather than members of a group with 2.5. One attribute, helping others develop their strengths, had an acceptable score of 3.1

In summary, it is evident that the KUSPAW's transformational leadership is below the validated research benchmark with the score of 2.9.

4.2 Transactional Leadership Ratings

Transactional leaders display behaviors associated with constructive and corrective transactions. The constructive style is labeled Contingent Reward and the corrective style is labeled Management-by-Exception.

Table 3: Transactional Leadership ratings

| | Not at all | Once in awhile | Sometimes | Fairly Often | Frequently, if not always | Total | Average |
|---|------------|----------------|-----------|--------------|---------------------------|-------|---------|
| Contingent Reward (CR) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| I express satisfaction when others meet expectations. | 1 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 20 | 45 | 3.0 |
| I discuss in specific terms who is responsible for achieving performance targets. | 1 | 6 | 15 | 12 | 11 | 45 | 2.6 |
| I make clear what one can expect to receive when performance goals are achieved. | 1 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 21 | 45 | 3.1 |
| I provide others with assistance in exchange for their efforts. | 2 | 1 | 13 | 12 | 18 | 46 | 2.9 |

Total.

2
:
9

| Management-by-Exception: Active (MBEA) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|-----|
| I keep track of all mistakes. | 4 | 8 | 14 | 9 | 10 | 45 | 2.3 |
| I direct my attention toward failures to meet standards. | 6 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 46 | 2.4 |
| I focus attention on irregularities, mistakes, exceptions, and deviations from standards. | 5 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 11 | 43 | 2.5 |
| I concentrate my full attention on dealing with mistakes, complaints, and failures. | 2 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 15 | 45 | 2.6 |

Total.

2
:
4

From the above analysis, it is clear that the KUSPAW leadership's 'contingent reward' weighted

average meets the expected performance with a 2.9 overall score though the leadership does not make clear what one can expect to receive (3.1). The leadership’s expression of satisfaction when others meet expectations just managed the maximum benchmark score (3.0).

The KUSPAW’s ‘Management-by-exception: active’ is out of the benchmark with an overall score of 2.4. None of the attributes, that is, keeping track of mistakes (2.3), directing attention toward failures (2.4), focusing attention on mistakes (2.5), and concentrating on dealing with mistakes (2.6) was within the validated benchmark of 1-2.

4.3 Passive-Avoidant Behaviors Ratings

Passive leaders avoid specifying agreements, clarifying expectations, and providing goals and standards to be achieved by followers. This style has a negative effect on desired outcomes - opposite to what is intended by the leader - manager. This style has a negative effect on desired outcomes - opposite to what is intended by the leader - manager. In this regard it is similar to laissez-faire styles - or "no leadership."

Table 4: Passive-Avoidant Behaviors ratings

| Management-by-Exception: Passive (MBEP) | Rating | Not at all | | | | | Total | Average |
|--|--------|------------|---|---|---|---|-------|------------|
| | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| I fail to interfere until problems become serious. | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0.5 |
| I wait for things to go wrong before taking action. | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0.4 |
| I show that I am a firm believer in "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 1.2 |
| I demonstrate that problems must become chronic before I take action. | 3 | 6 | 4 | | | 3 | 4 | 0.4 |
| Total. | | | | | | | | 0.6 |

| Laissez-Faire (LF) | Rating | Not at all | | | | | Total | Average |
|---|--------|------------|---|---|---|---|-------|---------|
| | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| I avoid getting involved when important issues arise. | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | | 3 | 4 | 0.5 |
| I am absent when needed. | 3 | 6 | 8 | | | | 4 | 0.2 |
| I avoid making decisions. | 2 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0.6 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------------|
| I delay responding to urgent questions. | 3 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0.4 |
| Total. | | | | | | | | 0.5 |
| Average rating for Passive-Avoidant Behaviors. | | | | | | | | 0.5 |

MBEP and LF Research Validated Benchmark 0-1(Bass and Avolio 2003)

From the above analysis, it is clear that the MBEP weighted average is within the research validated benchmark with an overall score of 0.6 though one of the attributes, belief in “If it ain’t broke, don’t fix it”, had a 1.2 score which is outside the benchmark. The laissez-faire weighted average of 0.5 falls within the research validated benchmark.

In summary, the KUSPAW leadership is satisfactorily within the expected range of passive/avoidant behavior leadership style with a 0.5 weighted average score.

4.3.1 Outcomes Ratings

The MLQ also measures three outcomes of leadership: Extra Effort, Individual, Unit and Organizational Effectiveness Ratings, and Satisfaction with the leadership.

Table 5: Outcomes ratings

| Extra Effort | Rating | Not at all | | | | | Total | Average |
|---|--------|------------|---|---|---|----|------------|---------|
| | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| I get others to do more than they are expected to do. | 9 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1.8 | |
| I heighten others’ desire to succeed. | 5 | 4 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 2.7 | |
| I increase others’ willingness to try harder. | 1 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 15 | 3.0 | |
| Total. | | | | | | | 2.5 | |

| Effectiveness | Rating | Not at all | | | | | Total | Average |
|--|--------|------------|---|---|---|---|-------|---------|
| | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | |
| I am effective in meeting organizational requirements. | | | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 24 | 3.4 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|----|----|----|------------|
| I lead a group that is effective. | | 2 | 6 | 21 | 15 | 44 | 31 |
| I am effective in meeting others' job-related needs. | | 2 | 6 | 14 | 23 | 45 | 33 |
| I am effective in representing others to higher authority. | 3 | | 2 | 12 | 29 | 46 | 34 |
| Total. | | | | | | | 33 |
| Average rating for Outcomes ratings. | | | | | | | 3.0 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|---|----|----|------------|
| Satisfaction with the leadership | R a t i n g | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| I use methods of leadership that are satisfying. | | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 23 | 32 |
| I work with others in a satisfactory way. | | | | 7 | 16 | 22 | 35 |
| Total. | | | | | | | 33 |
| Average rating for Outcomes ratings. | | | | | | | 3.0 |

Research Validated Benchmark average outcomes in excess of 3.5

The above analysis shows an underperformance in outcomes ratings overall score with 3.0 and in the three attributes (Extra Effort [2.5], Effectiveness [3.3], and satisfaction with the leadership [3.3]) by the KUSPAW leadership.

In summary, the KUSPAW leadership has not achieved the expected score in transformational leadership. In contingent reward, the leadership meets the expected performance whereas the MBEA is out of the research validated benchmark. The KUSPAW leadership is satisfactorily within the expected range of passive/avoidant behavior while the outcomes ratings are below the expected rating.

4.4 Relationship between demographics and leadership attributes

An analysis of the effectiveness of the KUSPAW leadership effectiveness as relates to demographic factors was done to establish if the factors affected the leadership effectiveness of the union. These factors include; age, position, experience, academic level, professional training and needs. Each of the questions was analyzed and summaries done for each leadership style captured in the questionnaire.

4.4.1 Age and Relative Attributes

The four different age groups were analyzed using cross tabulation, that is, each age group measured against the different leadership styles and the results were as tabulated below:

Table 6: Age and leadership styles

| Leadership Style | Transformational leadership | CR | MBEA | Passive/Avoidant Behavior | Outcomes | Frequencies and weighted averages | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|------|---------------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|----------|-----|------|-----|
| | | | | | | Score | Score | | | | |
| | [Σf] | [Σfx/Σf] | [Σf] | [Σfx/Σf] | [Σf] | [Σfx/Σf] | [Σf] | [Σfx/Σf] | | | |
| Age group | 0-20 years | 20 | 3.4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.8 | 8 | 0.0 | 9 | 3.0 |
| | 21-35 years | 207 | 2.8 | 42 | 2.5 | 41 | 2.1 | 81 | 0.6 | 93 | 2.7 |
| | 36-50 years | 598 | 2.9 | 120 | 2.9 | 119 | 2.4 | 240 | 0.6 | 265 | 3.1 |
| | Over 50 years | 80 | 3.0 | 16 | 3.4 | 15 | 3.3 | 32 | 0.4 | 36 | 3.5 |
| Research validated benchmark | | 3.0-3.75 | | 2-3 | | 1-2 | | 0-1 | | >3.5 | |

From the above analysis, it is clear that the age group that had the highest score in transformational leadership was the 0-20years group with 3.4. However, there is no sufficient evidence to justify the score since the group had the least frequency. The group's scores were thus treated as outlier in the analysis. It can therefore be concluded from the analysis that the only age group that achieved the expected rating in transformational leadership was the Over 50 years group. The other groups' performance was below expectation.

In Transactional Leadership, it is clear that the age groups 36-50 years and 21-35 years had scores that lie within the validated benchmark (2-3) for contingent reward, while the other two do not. All the groups however, did not manage an acceptable score in MBEA which is 1-2. In Passive-Avoidant Behaviors, all the age groups managed acceptable scores, that is, within the research validated benchmark. The outcomes ratings depict that only one age group managed an acceptable score (in excess of 3.5), that is, the Over 50 years group.

In summary, the age analysis depicts that the transformational leadership ratings increased with age, contingent reward's acceptable scores were

achieved by the middle-aged groups, MBEA is wanting for all groups though the 21-35 years groups was nearest to the acceptable score of 1-2, passive/avoidant behavior scores are all acceptable, and outcomes ratings increased with age just like the transformational leadership with only the Over 50 years group attaining the acceptable score.

4.4.2 Position and Relative Attributes

The three leadership position levels were analyzed using cross tabulation, that is, each level measured against the different leadership styles and the results were as tabulated below:

Table 7: Position and leadership styles

| Leadership Style | | Transformational leadership | CR | MBEA | Passive/Avoidant Behavior | Outcomes | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Frequencies and weighted averages | | $\frac{\sum f}{\sum f}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | Score $\frac{\sum f}{\sum f}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | Score $\frac{\sum f}{\sum f}$ | | | | | |
| Position | Shop Stewards | 519 | 2.8 | 104 | 2.9 | 103 | 2.4 | 197 | 0.5 | 229 | 3.0 |
| | Branch Officials | 306 | 3.1 | 61 | 2.9 | 61 | 2.7 | 123 | 0.6 | 138 | 3.0 |
| | National Board Members | 80 | 3.2 | 16 | 3.3 | 15 | 1.9 | 32 | 0.3 | 36 | 3.3 |
| Research validated benchmark | | | 3.0-3.75 | | 2-3 | | 1-2 | | 0-1 | | >3.5 |

From this analysis, it is clear that shop stewards are the only group that has not achieved the recommended score (>3.0 to <3.75) in transformational leadership. In the transactional leadership, whereas the national board members are the only group that did not attain the acceptable score in contingent reward, they were the only group that attained an acceptable score in MBEA. In the Passive-Avoidant Behaviors, it is clear that all the groups had acceptable scores in both MBEP and Laissez-faire. In the outcomes ratings, none of the groups had an acceptable score, in excess of 3.5.

In summary, the position analysis shows that; shop stewards are the only group that did not achieve the recommended score in transformational leadership, contingent reward had acceptable scores posted by shop stewards and branch officials, MBEA had an acceptable score by the National board members, Passive-avoidant behaviors had acceptable scores by all the groups, and outcomes ratings had below par performance by all the groups.

4.4.3 Experience and Relative Attributes

The three classes of experience were analyzed using cross tabulation, that is, each class measured against

the different leadership styles and the results were as tabulated below:

Table 1: Experience and leadership styles

| Leadership Style | | Transformational leadership | CR | MBEA | Passive/Avoidant Behavior | Outcomes | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Frequencies and weighted averages | | $\frac{\sum f}{\sum f}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | Score $\frac{\sum f}{\sum f}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | Score $\frac{\sum f}{\sum f}$ | | | | | |
| Experience | 0-5 years | 585 | 2.9 | 117 | 2.9 | 116 | 2.4 | 227 | 0.5 | 259 | 3.0 |
| | 6-10 years | 200 | 2.9 | 40 | 2.8 | 39 | 2.6 | 79 | 0.5 | 90 | 3.0 |
| | Over 10 years | 120 | 3.0 | 24 | 3.3 | 24 | 2.3 | 46 | 0.7 | 54 | 3.0 |
| Research validated benchmark | | | 3.0-3.75 | | 2-3 | | 1-2 | | 0-1 | | >3.5 |

It is clear from the above analysis that, measured against a research validated benchmark of >3.0 to <3.75, only the group with over 10 years experience was within the acceptable range in transformational Leadership. The analysis also reveals that the group with over 10 years experience is the only one that did not achieve the expected score in contingent reward. In MBEA however, none of the groups had an acceptable score. The analysis does show that only the group with over 10 years experience did not manage an acceptable score in MBEP (0-1) while in laissez-faire, all the scores by all the groups were acceptable.

The outcomes ratings indicate that none of the groups managed the research validated benchmark (in excess of 3.5).

In summary, only the group with over 10 years experience posted an acceptable score in transformational leadership. The group however, was the only one out of the expected range in contingent reward. MBEA had below par performance by all the groups. MBEP had acceptable scores save for the group with over 10 years experience whereas all the groups posted acceptable results in laissez-faire. None of the groups had an acceptable outcomes rating.

4.4.4 Academic Qualification and Relative Attributes

The three classes of academic qualification (primary, secondary and tertiary) were analyzed using cross tabulation, that is, each class measured against the different leadership styles. The results of the analysis were as tabulated below:

Table 92: Academic qualification and leadership styles

| Leadership Style | | Transformational leadership | | CR | | MBEA | | Passive/Avoidant Behavior | | Outcomes | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Frequencies and weighted averages | | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ |
| Academic Qualification | Primary | 40 | 2.5 | 8 | 3.3 | 8 | 3.0 | 14 | 0.5 | 18 | 3.3 |
| | O/A level | 685 | 2.8 | 137 | 2.8 | 136 | 2.5 | 279 | 0.6 | 309 | 3.0 |
| | Diploma | 180 | 3.3 | 36 | 3.1 | 35 | 2.1 | 65 | 0.3 | 76 | 3.2 |
| Research validated benchmark | | | 3.0-3.75 | | 2-3 | | 1-2 | | 0-1 | | >3.5 |

It is clear from the above analysis that only the group with tertiary education level had an acceptable score in transformational leadership. The analysis shows that only the O/A level respondents had an acceptable score in contingent reward while none of the groups had an acceptable score in MBEA.

All these groups, as can be deduced from the analysis, managed scores that are within the research validated benchmark in the passive/avoidant behavior. None of the groups managed the research validated benchmark (in excess of 3.5) in the outcomes rating.

In summary, in academic qualification analysis, only the group with tertiary education had a satisfactory score in transformational leadership. The O/A level respondents were the only group with an acceptable score in contingent reward, while MBEA posted below par performances by all the groups. The passive-avoidant behaviors group had satisfactory performance from all the groups while the outcomes ratings had no satisfactory performance.

4.4.5 Professional Qualification and Relative Attributes

The four classes of professional qualification (none, union related, leadership related, and other) were analyzed using cross tabulation, that is, each class measured against the different leadership styles.

Table 30: Professional qualification and leadership styles

| Leadership Style | | Transformational leadership | | CR | | MBEA | | Passive/Avoidant Behavior | | Outcomes | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Frequencies and weighted averages | | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ | $\frac{\sum f}{N}$ | Score $\frac{\sum fx}{\sum f}$ |
| Professional Qualification | None | 405 | 2.8 | 81 | 3.0 | 80 | 2.6 | 161 | 0.6 | 183 | 3.0 |
| | Union related | 80 | 3.3 | 16 | 3.2 | 16 | 2.8 | 32 | 0.6 | 36 | 3.4 |
| | Leadership related | 40 | 3.4 | 8 | 3.6 | 7 | 2.1 | 16 | 0.0 | 18 | 3.3 |
| | Other | 80 | 3.0 | 16 | 3.4 | 15 | 3.3 | 32 | 0.4 | 36 | 3.5 |
| Research validated benchmark | | | 3.0-3.75 | | 2-3 | | 1-2 | | 0-1 | | >3.5 |

From the above analysis, it is clear that only the respondents with union related professional training and those with leadership related training attained the research validated benchmark of 3-3.75 in transformational leadership. From the analysis, it can be deduced that the respondents who got an acceptable score in CR were those with no professional training and those with other professional training. On the other hand, none of the groups had an acceptable score in MBEA. The analysis also shows that all the respondents attained an acceptable score in passive/avoidant behavior. In the outcomes ratings, none of the groups managed an acceptable score.

In summary therefore, respondents with union and leadership related trainings had acceptable scores in transformational leadership. Contingent reward had acceptable scores posted by the groups with no professional training and those with other professional training. All the groups had acceptable scores in passive-avoidant behaviors, while none of them had acceptable scores in outcomes ratings.

In the age analysis, the group with over 50 years had the best performance with three acceptable scores out of five. The other groups had two each. In position analysis, shop stewards had the least acceptable scores with two out of five, branch officials had three satisfactory scores out of five as did the national board members. In experience analysis, the group with over 10 years had two acceptable scores out of six, the rest of the groups had three acceptable scores out of six. In academic analysis, the group with tertiary education had two acceptable scores out of five, O/A level group had two, while the other groups had one out of five.

5.0 Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Summary

The KUSPAW leadership has not achieved the expected score in transformational leadership, which is the most sought after style of leadership. In contingent reward, the leadership meets the expected performance whereas the MBEA is out of the research validated benchmark. The KUSPAW leadership is satisfactorily within the expected range of passive/avoidant behavior. In summary therefore, the KUSPAW leadership is not effective.

In position analysis, shop stewards had acceptable scores in CR (2.9) and passive/avoidant behavior (0.5). Branch officials had satisfactory scores in transformational leadership (3.1), CR (2.9) and passive/avoidant behavior (0.6). The national board members had acceptable scores in transformational leadership (3.2), MBEA (1.9) and passive/avoidant behavior (0.3).

In experience analysis, the group with over 10 years was the only group with an acceptable score in transformational leadership (3.0) and also had an acceptable score in passive/avoidant behavior (0.7). The group with 0-5 years experience had acceptable scores in CR and passive/avoidant behavior with 2.9 and 0.5 respectively. The 6-10 years group also had acceptable scores in CR and passive/avoidant behavior with 2.8 and 0.5 respectively.

In academic analysis, the only group with an acceptable score in transformational leadership was the one with tertiary education (diploma) with 3.3 and also had an acceptable score in passive/avoidant behavior (0.3). The O/A level group had acceptable scores in CR and passive/avoidant behavior with 2.8 and 0.6 respectively. The primary group had one acceptable score (0.5) in passive/avoidant behavior.

In professional training, only the group with no training underperformed in transformational leadership with a 2.8 score, but had an acceptable score in passive/avoidant behavior. The group with union related training had two acceptable scores in transformational leadership and passive/avoidant behavior with 3.3 and 0.6 respectively. The group with leadership related training also had two acceptable scores in transformational leadership and passive/avoidant behavior with 3.4 and 0.0 respectively.

The group with other training had acceptable scores in transformational leadership, passive/avoidant behavior, and outcomes with 3.0, 0.4 and 3.5 respectively.

The respondents' requirements and comments analysis show that most of the KUSPAW leadership needs more involvement in policy formulation,

governance, training, and has social-related concerns respectively.

5.2 Conclusions

The leader with an optimal profile infrequently displays laissez-faire (LF) leadership. To this end, the KUSPAW has performed well. The individual with an optimal profile also displays successively higher frequencies of the transactional leadership styles of MBEP, MBEA, CR, and the transformational components most frequently. The KUSPAW leadership is relatively ineffective since the transformational leadership score is out of the research validated benchmark.

The demographic and attributes relationship analysis suggests that performance improves with increase in age, rank, experience, education level and professional qualifications.

The notable strength of the trade union leadership is the passive/avoidant behavior in which the score was impressive, while its weakness is in transformational leadership.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Research

The KUSPAW has areas that need improvement most importantly, the transformational leadership. The other area that needs the attention of the KUSPAW leadership is MBEA. In the transformational leadership, emphasis on improvement needs to be placed on idealized attributes, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration. It is imperative that the KUSPAW leadership invests in improving on its transformational leadership so as to attain the much needed effectiveness in leadership. With reference to the age factor in leadership effectiveness, the younger age groups need more attention and training so as to improve on the transformational leadership and MBEA. With reference to positions, it is the shop stewards who should be the target for continuous improvement initiatives. The most experienced leaders need to check on their leadership styles, particularly transactional. The need for leadership related training for the KUSPAW is evident since those without the training scored dismally in transformational leadership. It is vital therefore, that the whole leadership is taken through a leadership course, albeit refresher for those with the training.

References

- Allen, V.L. (1957). *Trade Union leadership; Based on a study of Arthur Deakin*. 6 & 7 Clifford Street London: W I Longmans, Green and company Ltd.
- Aluchio, L.P.A. (1998). *Trade Unions in Kenya: development and the system of industrial*

- relations. Nairobi: Jomo Kenyatta Foundation.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (2003). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Feedback Report*. Menlo Park, CA 94025 U.S.A: Mind Garden Inc.
- Bisoux, T. (2002). The mind of a leader. *BizEd*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacsb.edu/publications/archives/Sep-Oct02/p26-31.pdf>.
- Busienei, J.R (2005). *A study of the moderating effects of Trade Union membership on employees perception of job security and fair treatment by management in the manufacturing industry in Kenya*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Business dictionary website (2010): Retrieved from <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/effectiveness.html>
- Collins English Dictionary (1998). New York, NY 10022: HarperCollins Publishers
- Dessler, G. (2004). *Management*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Ernsberger, M. (2000). 'Leadership: It is not for the faint of heart', *Vital Speeches of the day*, 66, 16, 509-512.
- Goreham, C (2004). 'Leadership: Why is it necessary?'. *We lead online magazine*. weLEAD Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.leadingtoday.org/Onmag/2004%20Archives/dec04/cg-dec04.html>
- Guest, R.H., Hersey P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1977). *Organizational change through effective leadership*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-hall.
- Holverson, M. (2004). 'Effective Leadership in the 21st Century'. *We lead online magazine*. weLEAD Inc. Retrieved from <http://www.leadingtoday.org/Onmag/2004%20Archives/sep04/mh-sep04.html> and <http://www.leadingtoday.org/Onmag/2004%20Archives/nov04/mh-nov04.html>
- K'obonyo, P.O. (1981). *The operations of trade unionism in kenya; a study of the railways African union (Kenya)*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Kotter, J.P. (1999). *John P. Kotter on what leaders really do*. USA: A Harvard Business Review Book.
- Kotter, J. P. (1998) 'What leaders really do'. *Harvard business review on leadership*, 37-60. USA: Harvard Business School of Publishing.
- Machyo ,C.M. (2003). *An analysis of women's participation in trade union leadership in Kenya*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and Personality*. New York: Harper& Row.
- Maxwell, C. J. (2007). *The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership*. Nashville, TN 37214: Thomas Nelson Inc.
- Mello, J. A. (2003). 'Profiles in leadership: Enhancing learning through model and theory building'. *Journal of Management Education*, 27, 3, 344. Retrieved June 20, 2004 from ProQuest database.
- Montesino, M. (2003). 'Leadership/followership similarities between people in a developed and a developing country: The case of Dominicans in NYC and Dominicans on the island'. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10. Retrieved December 14, 2003 from ProQuest database.
- Moraa, A. (2006). *A survey of the strategies used by trade unions in negotiating with employers in Nairobi*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Musandu, B. (2007). *Effects of fragmentation of Trade Unions on collective Bargaining in Kenya's hotel industry: a case study of KUDHEIHA AND KHAWU*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Mutung'a, J.M. (2006). *The response of Trade Unions to challenges posed by conditions of work at the Export Processing Zones (EPZs) in Kenya*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi.
- Nzuve, S.N.M. (2007). *Management of Human Resources; a Kenyan perspective (Revised Edition)*. Nairobi: Basic Modern Management Consultants.
- Palmer, B., Walls, M., Burgess, Z., & Stough, C. (2001). 'Emotional Intelligence and Effective Leadership'. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 22, 1, 5. Retrieved January 16, 2004 from ProQuest.
- Robbins, S. P. (2003). *Organizational behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Singh, M. (1969). *History of Kenya's Trade Union movement to 1952*, Nairobi: East African publishing house.
- Tichy, N. M., & Cohen, E. (1997). *The leadership engine*. USA: Harper Business.
- Ulrich, D. (1996). Credibility X Capability. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith & R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The leaders of the future*, 209-219, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher.

- Walker, C.A. (2005). *Effective Leadership 'Twelve Words To Lead By, Twelve Words To Live By'*. 536 Woodland Hills Drive La Vergne, TN 37086: Charles A Walker.
- Walker, D. (2009). 'Effective leadership in the workplace'. *The network Journal*. Available from <http://www.tnj.com/career/career-advice/effective-leadership-workplace>
- Ward, S. (2010). *Small business Canada Newsletter website*:
<http://sbinfoCanada.about.com/od/leadership/g/leadership.htm>
- Waweru, E.M. (1984). *Management of Human Resources in Kenya*. Nairobi: Kenya Literature Bureau.
- Weiss, J.W. (2003). *Business ethics (3rd edn)*, United States: Thomson South-Western.
- weLEAD online magazine (2010). Available at <http://www.leadingtoday.org/Leadership Philosophies.html#L>
- Yukl, G.A. (2001). *Leadership in Organizations (5th Edition)*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Zalezink, A. (1998). 'Managers and leaders; are they different?'. In *Harvard Business review on leadership*, 61-88. USA: Harvard Business School Publishing