

**LEADERSHIP STYLES AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN NATIONAL AGENCY FOR
FOOD, DRUGS, ADMINISTRATION AND CONTROL (NAFDAC)**

OYADIRANPHILLIP A. (PhD)
Department Of Public Administration,
Faculty Of Management Science, University Of Abuja.
+2348055247905 ; Phillyoy2000@yahoo.com

&

ADEKEYE JOSEPHADESOLA (PhD)
Department Of Public Administration,
Faculty Of Management Science, University Of Abuja.
+2348060326463; josssy2014@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The papers examines the implications of leadership styles on employee's performance in National Agency for Food and Drugs Administration and control (NAFDAC). The main objective of the study is to determine the style of leadership and its effects on employees performance in the organisation. The data for this study was obtained through the content analysis of existing secondary documents. They include; official documents, Annual reports, publications, circulars, newsletters, bulletin, policy statement and empirical studies. The findings of the study revealed that the job-centred style of leadership exhibited by leaders in National Agency for Food and Drugs Administration and control (NAFDAC has positively influenced employee's performance. This was made possible because managers were very particular about getting results and only motivated employees to give their best in order to increase performance. The paper concludes that the kind of leadership styles that encourages employee's performance in in given organisation may lead to different results in another organisation. It was recommended that a blend of job and employee centred style of leadership should be adopted by NAFDAC in order to boost the morale of employees and encourage higher performance. Lastly, there is need to encourage team work through the use of performance rating in the organisation.

Keywords: Leadership, Leadership Styles, Employee Performance, motivation

Introduction

Organisations usually combine both the material and human resources in order to achieve their goals and objectives. The availability of material resources with effective workforce could be counter-productive. This is so because the human resource is the active agent that is responsible for transforming the material resources into the desire results. However, the individuals in an organisation have different needs, attitude and personality, which tend to influence their behaviours. It is therefore necessary for managers recognize these factors and determine the types of leadership style and behaviour to employ in order to enhance employee performance (Effiong, 1998 in (Ohiri 2008).

Leaders in trying to direct the activities of the group must bear in mind that the individual making up the group have personal goals which are always at variance with the over-all objective of the organisation. It is the responsibility of the group leader to foster peace and unity rather than hindering the group's progress and

success. Leaders should be rational in their approach towards a unified goal rather than being sentimental. Groups are dynamic and so group leader should also be dynamic. Leaders must be able to forecast and predict changes before they occur. He must be able to accept and manage conflicts, communicate effectively, provide subordinates with resources and maintain a peaceful coexistence between the workers and the organization Effiong in (Ohiri 2006). When subordinates trust and respect their leader he is free to vary his behaviour. A resentful or hostile group will require a different style of leadership from the one that work with a well intended and friendly group. He emphasized further that leadership behaviour that may be successful with a self-reliant group may prove a dismal failure with a dependent apathetic one.

In most bureaucratic organisations, work schedule are task-focused and routine, with no flexibility, and yet decisions and policies are imposed on subordinates. In such organisations where the leadership perceives employees as mere hands to get job done, employees would pretend to do well due to the standards and measure being assigned to them. In a military set-up, democratic style of leadership may lead to improved performance while autocratic style of leadership may not encourage employee performance in the civil service. In view of the above, managers are in dilemma on the most appropriate style of leadership that is capable of boosting the morale of employees.

The National Agency for Food and Drugs Administration and Control (NAFDAC) as an agency of government in Nigeria is charged with the responsibilities safeguarding public health by ensuring that only the right quality food, drugs and other regulated products are manufactured, exported, imported, advertised, sold and used in Nigeria. The above objective can only be achieved through the use of effective style of leadership that is capable of encouraging employee performance. In light of the above, this paper intends seeks to determine the implication of leadership styles on employees performance in NAFDAC.

Objectives of the Paper

The objectives of this paper are to:

1. Examine the implications of leadership styles on employee performance in The National Agency for Food and Drugs Administration and Control (NAFDAC).
2. Find out the challenges confronting National Agency for Food and Drugs Administration and Control (NAFDAC) in the area of encouraging employee performance through the influence of appropriate leadership styles.

Methodology

Data for this study was generated majorly through secondary sources by analyzing existing official documents, Annual reports, publications, circulars, newsletters, bulletin, policy statement and empirical studies on issues regarding leadership style and employee performance in National Agency for Food, Drug Administration and Control (NAFDAC). This secondary method of data collection and analysis is considered suitable since adequate materials are readily available for further study on the subject matter of this paper.

Conceptual Analysis

In order to familiarize readers with the subject matter of this paper, some terms considered fundamental to the study are conceptualized below based on the opinions of notable scholars in the field:

a) Leadership

The concept of leadership has been subject of controversies among schools in the field administration and management. Some looked at it from broad perspective while others conceived from a narrow point of view. In the opinion of Adlam (2003), leadership is a complex concept. This has been proved true since several approaches have been employed to provide meaning to the term “leadership”. The traditional perspectives of leadership perceive the concept of leadership as inducing compliance, respect and cooperation. In other words, the leader exercises power over the followers to obtain their cooperation (Anderson et, al., 1998). In addition to that, the old leadership perspectives are based on leader’s role as formulating goals, and ensuring their efficient accomplishment. Mcswain (2016), also defines leadership as the capacity of a leader is to listen and observe, and to use their expertise as a starting point to encourage dialogue between all levels of decision-making, to establish processes and transparency in decision making, and to articulate their own

values and visions clearly but not to impose them. Furthermore, Schermerhorn, Hunt and Osborn (2000) define leadership as a case of interpersonal influence that get individuals, or groups of people to do what the leader wants to be done. This implies that the leader's focus is on what he/she wants from people. Therefore, followers' input is not encouraged with regard to what it is to be done. For the purpose of this paper, leadership is the ability to influence the suborning in carrying out assigned duties and responsibilities effectively under a conducive atmosphere.

Both the old and new concepts of leadership appear to agree on some characteristics of leadership. For example, both agree that leadership does not take place in isolation. Rather, it takes place in the process of two or more people interacting and the leader seeks to influence the behaviour of other people. However, to a large extent, the old concept of leadership is based on exercising power over followers to maintain the status quo, while the new perspective is based on continuous improvement and power sharing with the followers. The old concept of leadership is based on downward exercise of power and authority while the new seeks to develop respect and concern for the followers and see them as a powerful source of knowledge, creativity and energy for improving the organization.

(b) Employee Performance

Employee performance is one of the most important work outcomes and an extremely vital criterion that determines organizational success or failure. Campbell (1990) defined performance as a behaviour which consist of directly observable actions of a worker, and also mental actions or products such as answers or decisions, which result in organizational outcomes in the form of attainment of set goals. Bailey (1982) cited in Rothwell and Kazanas (2003), gave a classic definition of performance as the result of a pattern of actions carried out to satisfy an objective according to some standard. Sturo, (2007) described performance as the extent of completion of the tasks that make up an individual's job. According to Pattanayak (2005), the performance of an employee is his resultant behaviour on a task which can be observed and evaluated. It refers to the contribution made by an individual in the accomplishment of organizational objectives. Performance is a multidimensional construct (Bates and Holton, 1995) and this leads to the conclusion that when evaluating and rewarding performance of individuals and teams, a number of factors have to be considered including both inputs (behaviour) and outputs (results) (Armstrong, 2012). For the purpose of this paper, performance refers to the ability or capacity of employee to carry out assigned duties according to specification.

According to Vroom (1990:2), "the performance of employee on the job is perceived as being influenced by two distinct variables: Firstly is the ability or skills of the individual to perform the job. Secondly, there is the motivation to use his or her ability or skill in the actual performance indicates the product of the two variables (ability and motivation). McGregor (1999:3) equally demonstrates that the performance of a person at work in a business unit or organization is influenced by certain attributes of the individual among which are his knowledge, motivation, skills and certain aspects of the environment including the nature of his job, reward system and leadership that is in place". Hence, one cannot deny the fact that promotion constitutes the major attributes which have the potential of improving employee performance.

Hackman and Odman (2000:14) believe that one way to improve performance is to provide workers with enrichment, more autonomy, challenges, and responsibilities. Sultermaster (2000:4) clearly demonstrates that certain variables such as skill, knowledge, motivation, attitudes, autonomy, recognition, environmental factors have impact on employee performance. Authors agree that when conceptualizing performance, one has to differentiate between an action (i.e., behavioural) aspect and an outcome aspect of performance (Campbell, 1990; Kanfer, 1990; Roe, 1999). The behavioural aspect refers to what an individual does in the work situation. It encompasses behaviours such as assembling parts of a car engine, selling personal computers, teaching basic reading skills to elementary school children, or performing heart surgery.

Not every behaviour is subsumed under the performance concept, but only behaviour which is relevant for the organizational goals: "Performance is what the organization hires one to do, and do well" (Campbell et al., 1993:40). Thus, performance is not defined by the action itself but by judgmental and evaluative processes (Ilgen & Schneider, 1991; Motowidlo, Borman, & Schmit, 1997). Moreover, only actions which

can be scaled, i.e., measured, are considered to constitute performance (Campbell et al., 1993). The outcome aspect refers to the consequence or result of the individual's behaviour.

The above described behaviours may result in outcomes such as numbers of engines assembled, pupils' reading proficiency, sales figures, or number of successful heart operations. In many situations, the behavioural and outcome aspects are related empirically, but they do not overlap completely. Outcome aspects of performance depend also on factors other than the individual's behaviour. For example, imagine a teacher who delivers a perfect reading lesson (behavioural aspect of performance), but one or two of his pupils nevertheless do not improve their reading skills because of their intellectual deficits (outcome aspect of performance). Or imagine a sales employee in the telecommunication business who shows only mediocre performance in the direct interaction with potential clients (behavioural aspect of performance), but nevertheless achieves high sales figure for mobile phones (outcome aspect of performance) because of a general high demand for mobile phone equipment (Campbell et al., 1993).

In practice, it might be difficult to describe the action aspect of performance without any reference to the outcome aspect. Because not any action but only actions relevant for organizational goals constitute performance, one needs criteria for evaluating the degree to which an individual's performance meets the organizational goals. It is difficult to imagine how to conceptualize such criteria without simultaneously considering the outcome aspect of performance at the same time. Thus, the emphasis on performance being an action does not really solve all the problems (Borman and Motowidlo, 1993).

Performance is a multi-dimensional concept. On the most basic level, Borman and Motowidlo (1993) distinguish between task and contextual performance. Task performance refers to an individual's proficiency with which he or she performs activities which contribute to the organization's 'technical core'. This contribution can be both direct (e.g., in the case of production workers), or indirect (e.g., in the case of managers or staff personnel). Contextual performance refers to activities which do not contribute to the technical core but which support the organizational, social, and psychological environment in which organizational goals are pursued. Contextual performance includes not only behaviors such as helping coworkers or being a reliable member of the organization, but also making suggestions about how to improve work procedures (Campbell et al., 1993).

Three basic assumptions are associated with the differentiation between task and contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999): (1) Activities relevant for task performance vary between jobs whereas contextual performance activities are relatively similar across jobs; (2) task performance is related to ability, whereas contextual performance is related to personality and motivation; (3) task performance is more prescribed and constitutes in-role behavior, whereas contextual performance is more discretionary and extra-role.

Task performance in itself is multi-dimensional. For example, among the eight performance components proposed by Campbell (1990), there are five factors which refer to task performance (Campbell, Gasser, & Oswald, 1996; Motowidlo & Schmit, 1999): (1) job-specific task proficiency, (2) non-job-specific task proficiency, (3) written and oral communication proficiency, (4) supervision—in the case of a supervisory or leadership position—and partly (5) management/administration. Each of these factors comprises a number of sub-factors which may vary between different jobs. For example, the management/administration factor comprises sub-dimensions such as (1) planning and organizing, (2) guiding, directing, and motivating subordinates and providing feedback, (3) training, coaching, and developing subordinates, (4) communication effectively and keeping others informed (Borman & Brush, 1993).

In recent years, researchers paid attention to specific aspects of task performance. For example, innovation and customer-oriented behaviour become increasingly important as organizations put greater emphasis on customer service (Anderson & King, 1993; Bowen & Waldman, 1999). Contextual performance is not a single set of uniform behaviours, but is in itself a multidimensional concept (Van Dyne & LePine, 1998). Task and contextual performance can be easily distinguished at the conceptual level. There is also increasing evidence that these two concepts can also be separated empirically (e.g., Morrison & Phelps, 1999; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994; Van Scotter & Motowidlo, 1996; Williams & Anderson, 1991).

Additionally, task performance and contextual performance factors such as job dedication and interpersonal facilitation contributed uniquely to overall performance in managerial jobs (Conway, 1999).

Moreover, contextual performance is predicted by other individual variables, not only task performance. Abilities and skills tend to predict task performance while personality and related factors tend to predict contextual performance (Borman & Motowidlo, 1997; Hattrup, O'Connell, & Wingate, 1998; Motowidlo & Van Scotter, 1994). However, specific aspects of contextual performance such as personal initiative have been shown to be predicted both by ability and motivational factors (Fay & Frese, in press).

Employee performance is not stable over time. Variability in an individual's performance over time reflects (1) learning processes and other long-term changes and (2) temporary changes in performance. Individual performance changes as a result of learning. Studies showed that performance initially increases with increasing time spent in a specific job and later reaches a plateau (Avolio, Waldman, & McDaniel, 1990; McDaniel, Schmidt, & Hunter, 1988; Quiñones, Ford, & Teachout, 1995). Moreover, the processes underlying performance change over time. During early phases of skill acquisition, performance relies largely on 'controlled processing', the availability of declarative knowledge and the optimal allocation of limited additional resources, whereas later in the skill acquisition process, performance largely relies on automatic processing, procedural knowledge, and psychomotor abilities (Ackerman, 1988; Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989).

To identify the processes underlying changes of job performance, Murphy (1989) differentiated between a transition and a maintenance stage. The transition stage occurs when individuals are new in a job and when the tasks are novel. The maintenance stage occurs when the knowledge and skills needed to perform the job are learned and performance concepts and performance theory when task accomplishment becomes automatic. For performing during the transition phase, cognitive ability is highly relevant. During the maintenance stage, cognitive ability becomes less important and dispositional factors (motivation, interests, values) increase in relevance.

Performance changes over time are not invariable across individuals. There is increasing empirical evidence that individuals differ with respect to patterns of intra-individual change (Hofmann, Jacobs, & Gerras, 1992; Ployhard & Hakel, 1998; Zickar & Slaughter, 1999). These findings indicate that there is no uniform pattern of performance development over time. Additionally, there is short-term variability in performance which is due to changes in an individual's psycho-physiological state, including processing capacity across time (Kahneman, 1973). These changes may be caused by long working hours, disturbances of the circadian rhythm, or exposure to stress and may result in fatigue or in a decrease in activity.

Styles of Leadership

a. Autocratic leaders

Autocratic leaders make their own decisions without consulting employees or other team members. They hold absolute authority over the team and team members are expected to obey and comply with the decision that is made by the leader. Autocratic leaders use one way communication, which is that they will instruct team members without expecting feedback in return. The benefit of this leadership style is that decisions can be made quickly, especially if the team is in crisis, considering the views of all team members will be time consuming and impractical. However, this can lead to over dependency on the team leader as all decisions are made by him or her and it can also lead to a low team morale as the input of team members are not valued.

b. Democratic

Democratic leaders will consult with employees before proceeding to make a decision. Democratic leaders will take on a two way communication approach where team members can provide input and voice out their opinions aside from the team leader issuing instructions. Team leaders who take on this leadership style will require excellent communication skills to express to the team members what is expected of them and to respond to and understand their concerns. The benefit of this leadership style is that team members will feel more valued, leading to an overall increase in productivity in the team. However, a drawback is that since employees have a greater involvement in decision making it might slow down the decision making process.

c. Laissez-Faire

Laissez faire is a leadership style where the team leader will allow the team members to carry out their duties on their own and at their own pace. There is little to no management and authority implemented by the team leader. This style of leadership is applicable to product design or advertising teams where flexibility and freedom provides a more suitable environment to stimulate creativity and is expected to generate positive results. The benefit of this leadership style is that team members who do not like to be controlled and closely monitored can prosper and fulfil their potential as this is the environment in which they function best. The limitation of laissez faire is that team members might make poor judgements due to a lack of supervision and they might not work as hard because of the absence of a superior.

d. Transactional

This type of leadership is the most common among the styles. The relationship between the leader and team member is one of compliance, the team members do what is asked of by the manager. A transactional leader uses rewards and punishments to gain compliance this from team members and thus this leadership style produces solid but average results.

Leadership and Employee's Performance

The success of an organisation is reliant on the leader's ability to optimise human resources. A good leader understands the importance of employees in achieving the goals of the organisation, and that motivating these employees is of paramount importance in achieving these goals. To have an effective organisation the people within the organisation need to be inspired to invest themselves in the organisation's mission: the employees need to be stimulated so that they can be effective; hence effective organisations require effective leadership (Wall, Solum and Sobol, et al, 1996). Fiedler and House, (1988) indicate that organisational productivity will suffer in direct proportion to the neglect of this. Ultimately it is the individual employee who either performs, or fails to perform, a task. In order for an organisation to perform, an individual must set aside his personal goals, at least in part, to strive for the collective goals of the organisation (Cummings and Schwab, 1973).

In an organisational context, the very nature of productivity is defined by the organisation itself (Cummings and Schwab, 1973). Employees are of paramount importance to the achievement of any organisation. Thus, effective leadership enables greater participation of the entire workforce, and can also influence both individual and organisational productivity (Bass, 1997; Mullins, 1999). Effective leader behaviour facilitates the attainment of the follower's desires, which then results in effective productivity (Fiedler and House, 1988; Maritz, 1995; Ristow, et al., 1999).

Preliminary research undertaken by Booyesen and Van Wyk (1994, in Swanepoel, et al., 2000) in a South African context found that outstanding leaders, in terms of effectiveness, are perceived to show a strong and direct, but democratic and participative leadership style, and are seen as agents of change and visionaries who increase organisational productivity. Maccoby (1979), in Botha, 2001) indicates that the need of firms to flourish in the world of escalating competitiveness, of technological advances, of altering government regulations and of changing employee attitudes, requires an advanced level of leadership more than ever before. His views further demonstrate the importance of leadership in the business arena. According to Bass (1997), in the modern business environment much research has proved that leaders make a difference in their subordinates' productivity, and also make a difference as to whether their organisations succeed or fail. Kotter (1988) argues for the ever-increasing importance of leadership in organisations, because of significant shifts in the business environments, such as the change in competitive intensity and the need for more participation of the total workforce.

Leadership is perhaps the most thoroughly investigated organisational variable that has a potential impact on employee productivity (Cummings and Schwab, 1973). Winning leaders understand what motivates employees and how the employee's strengths and weaknesses influence their decisions, actions, and relationships. Cummings and Schwab (1973) mention the connection between leadership traits or leadership

styles and employee productivity. However, they stress that the literature was not based on empirical evidence and therefore has become discredited over time (Cummings and Schwab, 1973; Fiedler and House, 1988).

There is agreement in the literature (Maritz, 1995; Bass, 1997) that leadership is a critical factor in the success or failure of an organisation; excellent organisations begin with excellent leadership, and successful organisations therefore reflect their leadership. Leaders are effective when the influence they exert over their subordinates works towards achieving organisational productivity (Jones and George, 2000). Furthermore, leadership is often regarded as the single most critical success factor in the success or failure of an institution (Bass, 1990). Dimma (1989) believes that leadership is undoubtedly the critical determinant of the success of an organisation, and thus determines organisational productivity in the competitive global market.

Research into organisational behaviour in different environments found that transformational leadership has a positive influence on employee productivity, and therefore organisational productivity (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Ristow, 1998). However, through research by Pruijn and Boucher (1994) it was shown that transformational leadership is an extension of transactional leadership (Bass, 1997). The difference between these two models is that followers of transformational leadership exhibit productivity which is beyond expectations, while transactional leadership, at best, leads to expected productivity (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Ristow (1998) states that transactional leaders were effective in markets, which were continually growing, and where there was little or no competition, but this is not the case in the markets of today, where competition is fierce and resources are scarce. Research data (Brand, et al., 2000) has clearly shown that transformational leaders are more effective than transactional leaders, regardless of how “effectiveness” has been defined. Evidence gathered in South African retail and Government sectors, as well in the armed forces of the United States, Canada and Germany, points towards the marginal impact transactional leaders have on the productivity of their followers in contrast to the strong, positive effects of transformational leaders (Brand, et al., 2000, Brett Anthony Hayward, 2005).

Theoretical framework

There are several theories of leadership but this paper shall examine the following models leadership before adopting one as a theoretical framework:

a) **Traits approaches to leadership:** Traits approaches to leadership represent the earliest attempts to understand why some people emerged as leaders and others did not. This school of thought is often referred to as the “great man” approach to leadership because it suggested that leaders had particular characteristics or traits that enabled them to emerge as leaders. For decades, traits theories of leadership were criticized by scholars and left unstudied; however, recognition of the fundamental importance of traits in understanding effective leadership has reemerged, and traits have resumed an important role in the development of full range leadership theories. The skill approach to leadership is also leaders-focuses; this approach focuses on developable behaviors and skills that serve as hallmarks of effective leaders (Northouse, 2013).

b) **Situational theories of leadership:** Situational theories suggest that the situation itself serves to inform leader behaviors. They includes; contingency theory, path-goal theory and situational leadership theory. Contingency theory compels leader style; either task or relationship oriented with levels of control in situation itself serves to inform leader behaviors. This model of leadership suggests that leaders who tend to be relationship oriented are more effective in situations that are under control, and those who are task oriented are more likely to be effective when control is either low or high. Situational leadership theory of Hersey and Blanchard suggest that leader effectiveness and choice of applied style is conditioned upon the task maturity of followers (Northouse, 2013). He stated further that this maturity or development level, of the follower is based on the extent of both the competence and commitment of the follower to accomplish a particular task. Although this approach is widely used and is intuitively appealing, most validation attempts have revealed little to no support for the theory or measurement instrument for situational leadership theory. Like situation and contingency theories, Path-goal theory is concerned with the ways in which contexts influence the effectiveness of leadership. Because path-goal theory is grounded in expectancy theory,

meeting followers' motivation needs serves as the catalyst for selecting an appropriate leadership style in a given context. The task related behaviors in House's theory include directive and achievement –oriented behaviors identified through the earlier university studies. The task and subordinate characteristics are influenced by the leader's behavior.

This paper adopted the social dynamic approach as a theoretical framework since it believes that the social dynamics of interactions between leaders and followers play an important role in the enactment of leadership. The theory embraced the idea of; transformational leadership, leader-member exchange, and team leadership. Leader-member exchange originally known as vertical-dyad linkage theory emphasizes the interactions between leaders and followers, and it is the most effective when it looks specifically at the relationship between leaders and followers (Northouse, 2013). As development of theory progressed, the focus shifted to the process of leader making through interactions with followers. Transformational leadership is one of the most popular leadership theories in recent years. In general, a hallmark of transformational leadership is the extent to which the leader influences, or transforms, followers. Theories in this new paradigm of leadership center on traits and behaviors of leaders, the situational context of leadership, and the relationships, and the relationships between and among leaders and followers in the context.

Impact of leadership style on Employee performance in NAFDAC

NAFDAC was established by Decree 15 of 1993 as amended by Decree 19 of 1999 and now the National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control Act Cap N1 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 2004. This Act mandates NAFDAC to regulate and control the manufacture, importation, exportation, distribution, advertisement, sale and use of food, drugs, cosmetics, chemicals, detergents, medical devices and packaged water (Known as regulated products). Fake and counterfeit drug problem has been identified as a global problem by World Health Assembly, and this led to the adoption of a resolution in 1988 for prevention and detection of counterfeit pharmaceutical products, regarding exports, imports, smuggling, manufacture etc (NAFDAC, 2006).

The importance of food and drugs to man and animal is very obvious. They need food in order to grow and sustain life while life goes on, and because of the inherent disposition to illness, the organs of the body may not always function properly (Ogbeche, 2006). It is the duty of all government to protect the health of the citizens, and in Nigeria this is the responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Health. Within the Ministry, and until 31st December 1992, these responsibilities as regards foods and drugs devolved on the Department of Food, Drugs Administration Control (FDAC) (NAFDAC, 2006). They are also traceable to a lack of awareness by the public in practical terms of the sensitivity of relevance of matters concerning control measures on food, drugs, cosmetics, water and chemicals to both preventive and curative health care. Such control measures, when executed successfully, provide guaranteed savings of high percentage of the expenditure of the government and individuals to cure and relieve illness. These problems led to the birth of NAFDAC as a parastatal of the Federal Ministry of Health.

Leaders in NAFDAC emphasize direction of group activities through planning, communicating information, scheduling, assigning tasks, emphasize deadlines, and giving direction. Thus, leaders who adopt this style concentrate on keeping their subordinates engaged in going through specified work cycles in a prescribed way and at a satisfactory rate as determined by the standards (Likert, 1961). Therefore, the job-centred style of leadership stresses on getting the work done, group interaction towards attainment of formal goals and organise group activities, rather than the welfare and motivation of employees. This type of leadership is associated with efforts to achieve organizational goals (Mullins 2006).

According to Cribbin, (1978), the production-centred leader perceives his or her people as mere hands to get the work done. He or she is noted for not sharing concern for neither worker's welfare nor his or her considerateness of their feelings and needs. Thus, in the leader's view, technical work factors take

precedence over human work factors. The leader equates working with machines to working with people and it is not surprising that he or she is always in charge of land producing groups. The production-centred leaders maintain definite standard of productivity and ask subordinates to follow standard rules. In sum, leaders with high degree of imitating structure generally concern themselves with accomplishing tasks by giving directions and expecting them to be followed (Northouse, 1987).

The leadership practice in NAFDAC seems to march the description given by Bass and Avolio, (2000) or Mester, et al., (2003) about the transactional leader who focus their energies on task completion and compliance and rely on organisational rewards and punishments to influence employee performance, with reward being contingent on the followers carrying out the roles and assignments as defined by the leader. In fact, defining and communicating the work that must be done by their followers, how it will be done, and assisting the followers in understanding precisely what needs to be achieved in order to meet the organisation's objectives as is typical of a transactional leader can only bring in marginal returns and will not survive a competitive business environment

Challenges confronting Leadership style and employee performance in NAFDAC

The top challenges leaders face are often very similar despite the diversity of their organisations, the situations they face and their context and culture. Research carried out in NAFDAC indicated some challenges faced by most leaders from the headquarter and Abuja state office:

1. **Developing Managerial Effectiveness** — The challenge of developing the relevant skills such as time management, prioritization, strategic thinking, decision-making, and getting up to speed with the job to be more effective at work.
2. **Inspiring Others** — The challenge of inspiring or motivating others to ensure they are satisfied with their jobs; how to motivate a workforce to work smarter.
3. **Developing Employees** — The challenge of developing others, including topics around mentoring and coaching.
4. **Leading a Team** — The challenge of team-building, team development, and team management; how to instil pride in a team or support the team, how to lead a big team, and what to do when taking over a new team.
5. **Guiding Change** — The challenge of managing, mobilizing, understanding, and leading change. How to mitigate change consequences, overcome resistance to change, and deal with employees' reaction to change.
6. **Managing Internal Stakeholders and Politics** — The challenge of managing relationships, politics, and image. Gaining managerial support and managing up; getting buy-in from other departments, groups, or individuals.

Conclusion

This paper examined the implications of leadership styles on employee performance in National Agency for Food and Drugs Administration and Control (NAFDAC). The main objective of this study was to identify the specific leadership style exhibited by managers in NAFDAC and its implications on employee performance. From the supported material and results of the study it was observed that there is a significant relationship or link between leadership style and employee performance. This papers found that a job-centred style or behaviour was exhibited by leaders or managers of National Agency for food and Drug Administration and Control and that this style had positive effect on employee performance. What this means is that managers are very particular about getting results and only motivate employees to give their best in order to increase productivity. This probably suggests that management act with strict internal rules to achieve results and the fact that the practice in NAFDAC is also not democratic-centred style corroborates this. However, the kind of leadership style that encourages high productivity in a given organisation may lead to different result another organisation.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are considered fundamental to this study after thorough analysis of the research findings:

1. Those at the helm of affairs in NAFDAC should adopt a blend of job-centred, employee-centred and democratic-centred style of leadership in order to further boost the morale of its employees and encourage higher performance.
2. Leadership in NAFDAC should encourage team work by its employees through the use of performance rating. This will go a long way in encouraging employee performance. This should be done in such a way that any member of team who is able to attain the set goal will be rewarded handsomely.
3. Performance appraisal reports in NAFDAC should be used for determining training needs of employees, promotion, development programmes, deployment, pay package instead of using such information to punish erring employees.
4. Regular performance appraisal should be encouraged across all levels of the organisation since studies show that it has one of the strongest significant measures for the overall job performance.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, P. L. (1988). Determinants of individual differences during skill acquisition: Cognitive abilities and information processing. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, , 288–318.
- Anderson, T.D., Ford, R. and Hamilton, M. (1998), *Transforming Leadership: equipping yourself and coaching others to build leadership organization*, 6th edition, London: St. Lucie Press.
- Anderson, N., & King, N. (1993). Innovation in organizations. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International Review of Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1–34). Chichester: Wiley.
- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., & McDaniel, M. A. (1990). Age and work performance in non-managerial jobs: The effects of experience and occupational type. *Academy of Management Journal*, 407–422.
- Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1994), *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Botha, J. (2001), *The Relationship between Leadership, Internal Quality, and Customer Satisfaction Levels of Dealerships in a South African Motor Vehicle Organisation*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Bates, R.A. and Holton, E.F. (1995). Computerised Performance Monitoring: A Review of Human Resource Issues. *Human Resource Management Review*, Winter, 267-288.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71–98). New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, , 99–109.
- Bowen, D. E., & Waldman, D. A. (1999). Customer-driven employee performance. In D. R. Cole, G.A.(2005), *Management, Theory and Practice*; London DP. Publication Ltd.
- Campbell, J., McCloy, R., Oppler, S. and Sager, C. (1993), *The Theory of Productivity*, New York: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the Performance Prediction Problem in Industrial and Organizational Psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of*

- industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 687– 732). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Campbell, J. P., Gasser, M. B., & Oswald, F. L. (1996). The substantive nature of job performance variability. In K. R. Murphy (Ed.), *Individual differences and behavior in organizations* (pp. 258–299). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cummings, L.L. and Schwab D.P. (1973), *Productivity in Organizations: Determinants and Appraisal*, Glenview: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (2000). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, , 250–279.
- Hatrup, K., O’Connell, M. S., & Wingate, P. H. (1998). Prediction of multidimensional criteria: Distinguishing task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 305–319.
- Fiedler, F.E. and House, R.J. (1988), *Leadership Theory and Research*, A Report of Progress – International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology Ilgen, D. R., & Schneider, J. (1991). Performance measurement: A multi-discipline view. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Robertson (Eds.), *International review of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 6, pp. 71–108). Chichester: Wiley.
- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative/apptitude treatment Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (2nd edn., Vol. 1, pp. 75–170). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Kahneman, D. (1973). *Attention and effort*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, , 71–83.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Schmit, M. J. (1999). Performance assessment in unique jobs. In D. R. Ilgen & E. D. Pulakos (Eds.), *The changing nature of job performance: Implications for staffing, motivation, and development* (pp. 56–86). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Motowidlo, S. J., & Van Scotter, J. R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, **79**, 475–480.
- Murphy, K. R. (1989). Is the relationship between cognitive ability and job performance stable over time? *Human Performance*, **2**, 183–200.
- Morrison, E. W., & Phelps, C. C. (1999). Taking charge at work: Extrarole efforts to initiate workplace change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 403–419.
- Ogundiya, LS (2006), “The Challenge of Civil Service Reforms in Nigeria under Obasanjo administration.” Proceedings of Annual Conference of IRDI Management and social Science Forum vol. 1, No.4 June 28-29.
- Pattanayak, B. (2005). *Human Resource Management*, 3rd, New Delhi, PHI Learning Private Limited.
- Ployhard, R. E., & Hakel, M. D. (1998). The substantive nature of performance variability: Predicting interindividual differences in intra-individual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 859–901.
- Quiñones, M. A., Ford, J. K., & Teachout, M. S. (1995). The relationship between work experience and job performance: A conceptual and meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology*, 887–910.
- Roe, R. A. (1999). Work performance: A multiple regulation perspective. In C. L. Cooper & I. T. Ristow, A., Amos, T. and Staude, G. (1999), “*Transformational leadership and organisational effectiveness in the administration of cricket in South Africa*”, South African Journal of Business Management
- Shcermerhorn, K.R., Hunt, J.G. and Osborn, R.N. (2000), *Organizational Behaviour*, 7th edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Sutermaster R. A. (2000) *People and Productivity* New York: McGrew Hill Book Company Inc.
- Vroom V. H. (1990), *Work and Motivation*. New York: John Witory and Sons Inc.
- Zickar, M. J., & Slaughter, J. E. (1999). Examining creative performance over time using hierarchical linear modeling: An illustration using film directors. *Human Performance*, 12, 211–230.