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Abstract: The aim of this research is to investigate the effect of the leadership styles on employee performance in a non-profit making organization. This was a quantitative research that used a survey method. Data was collected from a sample of 168 employees in a non-profit making organization in Amman, Jordan. Simple random sampling was used. The SPSS and SMART-PLS statistical tools were used to generate descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. The findings revealed that participative leadership is the most effective leadership style. However, the results revealed that autocratic and laissez faire leadership styles were not preferred. The findings supported the results from some earlier studies and bring out several new ideas such as the importance of participative leadership style. Based on the findings of this study, leaders should adopt more participative leadership style in non-profit organizations. The findings have also significantly contributed to the advancement of knowledge in employee performance. The paper's primary contribution is that it provides an understanding that most effective leadership style in a non-profit organization.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This study is based on the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees (UNRWA) in Jordan. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) that was created in 1949 is a relief and human development agency which supports more than 5 million registered Palestinian refugees, and their patrilineal descendants (UNRWA, 2018). UNRWA Headquarters are located in Amman and in Gaza. The UNRWA operate one of the largest school systems in the Middle East, teaching nearly half a million children in over 700 schools. The UNRWA is one of the largest United Nations programmes, with over 30,000 personnel working across five areas of operations, and is unique in that it delivers services directly to beneficiaries. In addition, UNRWA deliver basic health services through a network of primary health care facilities and mobile clinics. The UNRWA also provide social protection services, basic food supplies and cash subsidies, as well as emergency cash grants and adequate shelter and income-generating opportunities to refugees (UNRWA, 2018).In today’s globalized environment, managing employee performance effectively has become important (McGirk, 2011).

As stated by Jacobsen and Andersen (2015), managing performance is becoming difficult due to workplace pressures, growing bureaucracy and low levels of motivation. Managing employee performance effectively requires leaders who possess and practice the right leadership style (Liu et al., 2013). Several researchers and scholars asserted that a good leadership style matters in an organization (e.g.; Vandenabeele et al., 2014). Different leadership styles such as transactional leadership and transformational leadership have been identified in the literature (House et al., 2004). Lewin et al. (1939) identified three leadership styles. The leadership styles identified by Lewin (1939) were autocratic (authoritarian), democratic (participative) and laissez-faire (delegative) styles. There are inconsistencies in the results of past studies on which style is the most effective. A study by Iqbal et al. (2015) concluded that the autocratic leadership is useful in the short term, democratic leadership style is useful in all time horizon and participative leadership style is most useful in long term and effect on employees is positive. Other past research has shown that participative leadership is highly effective and increases employees’ motivation, and job performance (Huang, Iun, Liu, and Gong, 2010). However, Adyemeyi (2010) found that job performance was found to be better in schools having principals using autocratic leadership style than in schools having principals using democratic or laissez-faire leadership styles. Somech (2006) found that participative leadership style was positively associated with team reflection, which in turn fostered team innovation; however, this leadership style decreased team in-role performance. Furthermore, a study by Li, Liu and Luo (2018) found that team leaders high in locomotion orientation prefer directive leadership while team leaders high in assessment orientation prefer participative leadership to ‘get the best’.

In view of the inconsistent results from past studies, it is worth undertaking this study in a non-profit making organization. Although the influence of leadership style on job performance has been well established but there is a paucity of research that has empirically tested the relationship between autocratic, participative and laissez faire style of leadership towards employee performance in a nonprofit making organization such as UNRWA. Most of the past studies on the relationship between leadership styles and employees’ performance has been done in profit making organizations.
Therefore, a study of these styles of leadership styles is important for leaders in non-profit organizations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Employee Performance

Many authors have defined employees’ job performance and the related parameters (Campbell, 1990; Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). Motowidlo et al. (1997) stated that job performance is the aggregated value to the organization of the discrete behavioural episodes that an individual performs over a standard interval of time. According to Rivai (2004), employee’s performance refers to the success or the overall outcomes of an employee during a particular period that is compared with work standards, criteria and target. Researchers have further asserted that employee performance refers to an employees work achievement after exerting required effort on the job (Karacas, 2010). Scholars have conceptualized performance as a multidimensional construct that is difficult to define (Pahos and Galanaki, 2018). Several other scholars stated that performance is a multidimensional and a multicomponent concept and the behavioural engagements can be distinguished from the expected outcomes (e.g.: Borman, & Motowidlo, 1993). Campbell (1990) coming from the psychological perspective stated that the outcome aspect is the consequence of an employee’s behaviour and behaviour is the action employees exhibit. Researchers have paid attention to the predictors of performance and indicated that employee performance encompasses financial or non-financial outcome of the employees (e.g. (Campbell, 1990; Lee and Donohue, 2012). Pradhan and Jena (2017) developed a heuristic framework of job performance and placed relative importance on three performance components namely task, adaptive, and contextual performance. Therefore, the dimensions of job performance can differ among jobs and there are a high number of measures as indicators of employees’ job performance. Several researchers have focussed on the relationship between leadership style and job performance of employees but the results were not consistent. Vigoda-Gadot (2007) found a direct relationship between leadership and performance. The results a study by Yeh and Hong (2012) showed that leadership type had a positive influence on organizational commitment and organizational commitment positively and significantly affected job performance. Similarly, a study by Ojokuku, et al., (2012) also found that leadership style dimensions jointly predicted organizational performance, which counted for 23% variance of performance. However, a study by Lok, and Crawford (2004) found that leadership style had a negative effect on job satisfaction and past studies have shown that job satisfaction is related to job performance. Scholars have also looked at the different leadership styles such as transactional, transformational and authentic leadership styles. Several studies found a significant relationship between transformational leadership and job performance (e.g.: Obiwuru et al., 2011). The study by Obiwuru et al. (2011) concluded that transactional leadership style was more appropriate in improving job performance.

B. Participative Leadership

Participative leadership refers to leadership styles where the leader or supervisor invites and encourages employees to take a certain amount of responsibility in the workplace (Sauer 2011). Through influence and encouragement, the leader using participative leadership style facilitate employees’ involvement in the decision-making process (Amabile et al., 2004). As explained by Yukl (2010), participative leadership involves the use of various decision procedures that allow other people some influence over the leader’s decisions. The aspects of participative leadership include consultation, joint decision making, power sharing, decentralization, empowerment, and democratic management. There are several studies done on participative leadership but the various researchers and reviewers did not agree in their conclusions, but they all noted the lack of consistent strong results in the research (Yukl, 2010). Results from past studies suggest that participation can be effective in some situations. Yukl (2010) stated that studies that used questionnaire data usually found positive effects for participation, whereas studies with independent measures of outcome variables had results that were weaker and less consistent. Huang et al. (2010) found a positive relationship between participative leadership behaviors and employees’ task performance and organizational citizenship behavior toward organization. Results of a study by Yukongdi (2010) showed that the most preferred style of leadership for employees was the consultative manager, followed by participative manager. Another study by Iqbal, Anwar, and Haider (2015) found that participative leadership style is most useful in long term and effect on employees was positive. A study by Somech, and Wenderow (2006) revealed that that although the impact of directive leadership on teachers’ performance was contingent in nature, the positive effect of participative leadership on their performance was above and beyond the specific conditions studied. From team leadership perspective, Somech (2006) found that participative leadership style was positively associated with team reflection, which in turn fostered team innovation; however, this leadership style decreased team in-role performance. Huang et al., (2006) also found that participative leadership behavior tended to make short-tenure employees feel competent and more committed to an organization. However, participative leadership behavior was not significantly related to organizational commitment for long-tenure employees (Huang et al., 2006). Therefore, as concluded by Yukl (2010), participative leadership sometimes results in higher satisfaction, effort, and performance, and at other times it does not. The following hypothesis was formulated: 

H1. Participative leadership is positively related to employee performance.

C. Autocratic Leadership

The autocratic leaders make decisions without consulting or participation of employees and such leaders normally establish regulations and maintain a formal relationship with the employees (Maloş 2012).
In autocratic leadership, the employees are willing to follow and learn how to do the job more efficiently from the leader (Northouse, 2012). These autocratic leaders are the controllers and followers have to execute the tasks in the manner specified by their leader (Northouse, 2012). As explained by Northouse (2012), the leaders formal position and authority authorizes them to use reward or legitimate power to influence the employees. The autocratic leadership style does not support employees’ development in terms of creativity and decision making (Sauer 2011). From the positive viewpoint, the autocratic leaders give clear and short instructions to their subordinates to help them perform their tasks efficiently (Cunningham, et al., 2015). Several studies were done on the relationship between autocratic leadership employee performances but the results were not consistent. Adeyemi (2010) found that job performance better in organizations with leaders using autocratic leadership style than in organizations with leaders using democratic or laissez-faire leadership styles. Autocratic leadership can foster team psychological safety when team members accept the hierarchy within the team. De Hoogh et al. (2015) looked at the team members’ acceptance of the hierarchy within the team. De Hoogh et al. (2015) found that when team power struggles were low, autocratic leadership was positively related to team performance but when team power struggles were high, autocratic leadership was negatively related to team performance. A study by Puni et al. (2014) found that autocratic leadership style had a very low impact on job performance and this is an indication that autocratic style of leadership is inappropriate because it results in dissatisfaction and low motivation. A study by Akor (2014) found that an autocratic leadership style does not significantly influence the job performance of academic librarians and the level of performance of the academic librarians was low. Geothals et al. (2004) asserted that autocratic leadership decreases job performance on complex tasks and may affect the creativity. The following hypothesis was formulated for testing:  

**H2. Autocratic leadership style is positively related to employee performance.**  
Laissez Faire Leadership  
Laissez-faire leadership has been defined as the absence of leadership (Bass and Avolio, 1990). According to Hartog et al., (1997), leaders using the passive laissez-faire leadership style avoid decision making and supervisory responsibilities. As stated by Hartog (1997), there is a negative relationship between leaders’ scores on laissez-faire leadership and their scores on collaborating with others. The laissez-faire leadership style has been linked to negative outcomes such as low motivation (e.g. Judge and Piccolo, 2004; Skogstad et al., 2007). Researchers have argued that the laissez-faire leadership style could be a destructive form of leadership and result in negative outcomes such as workplace stress (Skogstad et al., 2007). Scholars and past researchers have viewed laissez-faire leadership style as ineffective whereas most research found that transformational leadership is more effective (e.g. Judge and Piccolo, 2004). However, some studies found positive outcomes of laissez-faire leadership in employees’ innovation propensity (e.g. Ryan and Tipu, 2013). As stated by Yukl (2010), leaders will have a greater effect on skilled employees who need low supervision.

Sandling (2015) stated that this style of leadership can be effective when the followers are highly motivated, knowledgeable and skilled and whom the leader trust. Past studies also argued that laissez-faire leadership may support an environment that facilitates innovation (e.g. Ryan and Tipu, 2013). In addition, Theodosiou and Katsikea (2007) stated that a laissez-faire leadership improves the confidence of subordinates and this may encourage innovation, independence and entrepreneurial inclination. Therefore, the possible outcomes of laissez-faire leadership, could be positive or negative.

There were several studies done on the relationship between laissez-faire leadership and employee performance but the results were not consistent. Yukl (2010) stated that teams which are not led may encounter difficulties and they may have to compensate for the missing leadership in order to reach goals. Rowold (2015) looked at team heterogeneity and found that culturally heterogeneous work teams can perform well, even if the leader is practicing laissez-faire style of leadership. According to Rowold (2015), the heterogeneous teams compensate for missing leadership when leadership and guidance is not available from the leader. Another study by Sadeghi and Pihie (2012), showed that a combination of transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles were predictors of leadership effectiveness. Laissez-faire leadership was one of the significant predictors of leadership effectiveness. A study by Adeyemi (2010) found that laissez faire leadership style cannot improve job performance and the use of the laissez-faire leadership style should be discouraged among school principals. Koech and Namusonge (2012) investigated the effects of leadership styles on performance and found that laissez-faire leadership style was not significantly correlated to performance. Similarly, a study by Pradeep and Prabhu (2011) also revealed that laissez-faire leadership had a negative relationship with the employee performance. Based on the past research findings discussed above, the following hypothesis was formulated for testing in the present study.

**H3: Laissez Faire leadership style is positively related to employee performance**

### III. MATERIALS AND METHOD

**A. Research Design**

This was a causal research to study cause-and-effect relationships of the variables of this study. The positivism research philosophy of this research depends on quantifiable observations that lead to statistical analyses (Saunders et al., 2012). This positivist study adopted a deductive approach and hypothesis were tested. The quantitative study was a cross sectional survey. The data was collected by using questionnaires that were distributed personally by hand. The study population were employees of UNRWA and simple random sampling was used. The sample consisted of 168 employees of UNRWA in Jordan. The data collected was edited and coded before being entered in Excel and SPSS.
Data analysis was based on descriptive and inferential statistics that were generated using SPSS and SmartPLS 2.

B. Sampling Technique and Sample Size

Simple random sampling was used and a sampling frame was created. The sampling frame of this research focused on the employees of UNRWA in Jordan. The researcher set the sample size of 200 respondents and distributed the questionnaire by hand among the UNRWA staff in Jordan. For models containing five or fewer constructs, Hair et al. (2010) suggested that the minimum sample size should be 100. To calculate the sample size, Tabachnick and Fidell (2013) proposed a formula “50 + 8m” where “m” is the number of variables. In this study, a total of 168 staff completed and returned the questionnaires.

C. Instrumentation

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The demographic questions were included in section A (Gender, Age, Work experience and Education Level). In section B, the questions covered the dependent variable and the independent variables. The fixed alternative questions required the respondents to choose the best answer based on a five-point Likert-type scale. The questions were adopted from past studies but translated into the Arabic language because the employees of UNRWA were more conversant in the Arabic language. The questionnaires were printed on standard A4 size paper and distributed by hand. A pilot test was done to check the understanding of the questions by the respondents and some questions that were ambiguous or misleading were amended (Saunders et al., 2012). A pre-testing of the questionnaire with a sample of twenty respondents detected some weaknesses in the wording, layout and design of the questionnaire. Ambiguous, unclear and confusing questions were reviewed and rectified accordingly.

D. Data Collection

For this research, self-administered questionnaires were used with a covering letter attached. The questionnaire was delivered direct to the respondents because they can be reached personally. The target respondents were given one week to respond. After one week, the questionnaires were collected. The response rate was very good and 168 questionnaires were collected at the end of the first month. Analysis of the primary data collected in numerical form include the calculation of descriptive statistics such as calculation of frequencies and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics was used to acquire a feel for the data by checking the central tendency and the dispersion (Sekaran and Bougie 2010). The Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 22 and Smart Partial Least Square (PLS) Version 2.0 were used. A two-way approach was adopted and in the first stage, the measurement model was tested to assess the validity and reliability of items using convergent validity, discriminant validity and reliability analysis. Subsequently, the hypothesized relationship was tested. Bootstrapping method (500 resamples) was used to determine the significance levels for loadings, weights and path coefficients. Various statistical methods and techniques were used to present the descriptive and other statistics.

IV. FINDINGS

A. Demographic profiles of the respondents

The respondents included 57% (n=95) female and 43% (n=73) male. The respondents age included 66% (n=111) between the age range of 20 to 45 years, and 34% (n=57) above the age range of 45 years. In terms of qualification, there 41 postgraduates, 96 were degree holders and 31 people had either a Diploma/Certificate or lower qualification. In terms of working experience, 13 respondents worked for less than 5 years, 37 worked between 5 to 10 years and 118 respondents worked more than 10 years.

B. Descriptive Statistics and Normality

Kurtosis and skewness methods are used to assess the normality of data distribution. (Hair et al., 2010). The values for skewness is between the ranges of -2.26 to .935 and the values for kurtosis are between the ranges of -0.68 to -.801. Therefore, the values of skewness and kurtosis values are within +2 and -2 standard deviations from its mean (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). The mean of all the variables was above 2.3 and the standard deviation is low.

C. Reliability

Reliability was measured based on Cronbach’s Alpha which is a reliability coefficient that indicates how well the items in a set are positively correlated to one another (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010). The reliability value should be 0.6 and above and as stated by Sekaran and Bougie (2010), the closer Cronbach’s Alpha is to 1.0, the higher the reliability. Based on Table 2, the result showed that the rho values for each construct are above 0.75 and below 0.93. For a good reliability, the reliability coefficient or Cronbach’s alpha should be .7 or higher (Hair et al., 2010). The reliability result of 0.909, 0.914, 0.835 and 0.738 are acceptable and this indicates that the questionnaire designed for this study was reliable, and the collected data were reliable.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democratic Style</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Style</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.6935</td>
<td>.96307</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>-.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez Faire Style</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>.72985</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>-.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.2620</td>
<td>.52087</td>
<td>-.935</td>
<td>-.674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2: Construct Validity Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>rho_A</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average Variance Extracted (AVE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.934</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>0.914</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>0.835</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez Faire</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Convergent Validity

As stated by Hair et al. (2010), the convergent validity is used to measure and examine the extent that a construct converges the specific construct’s indicators by explaining the items’ variance. The convergent validities are obtained by the computation of the AVE. Based on the criteria by Fornell and Larcker (1981), the values of the AVEs should be greater than 0.50. In Table 2, all the AVE values for the constructs exceeded 0.5. Therefore, the convergent validity was accepted. To get the values of AVEs that is greater than 0.5, the factor loadings of all the constructs was checked. Figure 1 shows the factor loading of each construct and three constructs with low loadings were deleted. As shown in Figure 1, the loadings for all the items ranged between 0.74 and 0.87, exceeding the threshold value of 0.6 (Hair et al., 2010).

Table 3: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Autocratic</th>
<th>Democratic</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Laissez Faire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>0.827</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>-0.582</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>-0.356</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez Faire</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>-0.253</td>
<td>-0.356</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. Discriminant Validity

Hair, et al. (2010) explained that discriminant validity is an indicator that shows whether the constructs are independent from one another. Observation of the cross loading indicators was based on Chin (1998). As stated by Chin (1998), discriminant validity is established when the indicators have higher factorial loads in their respective latent variables than in others. This criterion by Fornell and Larcker (1981) compares the square roots of the AVE values of each construct with the correlations between the latent variables. Based on the Table 3, the results show the discriminant validity was established because all the indicator’s loadings were consistently the highest on each of the constructs. Therefore, the results showed that the discriminant validity was valid and represented that the measurement model has been successfully validated.

F. Significance and Relevance of Path Coefficients

The R square of 0.226 is an indication of the quality of the model and explains the portion of the variance of the independent variables, which is explained by the structural model. Bootstrapping technique with sample size of 500 was done to test the significance of the relations. Figure 1 and Table 4 shows the Smart-PLS screen with the correlation coefficient values and the t-statistics. As stated in Table 4, the figure shows that only two values of the relations are above the referenced value of 1.96. In Table 4, the path coefficient shows the strength of relationship between the exogenous and endogenous variables (Hair et al., 2010). The standardized regression value of -0.094 shows an inverse relationship between autocratic leadership and job performance and the effect is insignificant (p>0.05). Thus, the hypothesis H1 is not supported. The standardized regression value of 0.267 shows a positive and significant relationship between democratic leadership and job performance (p<0.05). Thus, the hypothesis H2 is supported. The standardized regression value of -0.255 shows an inverse relationship between Laissez Faire leadership style and job performance and the effect is significant (p<0.05). Thus, the hypothesis H3 is not supported. Thus, only democratic leadership gave a significant and positive impact to the job performance of employees.
The perceived effective leadership style and employee performance in a non-profit making organization. A quantitative study in Amman, Jordan

Figure 1: Path Coefficients diagram

Table 4: Path Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Path Coef</th>
<th>T Statistics</th>
<th>P Values</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic -&gt; Performance</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic -&gt; Performance</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez Faire -&gt; Performance</td>
<td>-0.255</td>
<td>3.238</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The results of this study showed there is positive and significant relationship between democratic leadership style and employee's performance of employees of UNRWA in Amman. The results of this study are consistent with several prior studies (Iqbal, Anwar, and Haider, 2015; Somech, and Wenderow, 2006). The study by Iqbal, Anwar, and Haider (2015) also found that participative leadership style was the most useful in long term and effect on employees was positive. These results are important because like most previous studies, this study showed that participative leadership is the most prevalent leadership style in improving job performance. As stated by Yukl (2010), participative leadership can be regarded as a distinct type of behavior. For example, when designing a flextime system, participation of employees creates better work schedules and showing concern for employee needs (Yukl, 2010). Therefore, organizations should encourage participation of employees and consulting will not be effective unless people are actively involved in generating ideas, making suggestions, stating their preferences, and expressing their concerns (Yukl, 2010).

It was hypothesized that autocratic leadership would be positively related to job performance. The results from this study are consistent with results from previous studies. Past research had also indicated that autocratic leadership was not related to job performance (Puni et al., 2014; Akor, 2014). A study by Puni et al. (2014) found that autocratic leadership style had a very low impact on job performance. As stated by Geothals et al. (2004), autocratic leadership decreases employee performance on complex tasks and may affect creativity of followers.
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