

Impact of Leadership to Employees' Productivity and Engagement

Felicidad A. Dy Kam, MBA, DBA¹, Bernardo P. Delfin, MBA, FBE²

Assistant Professor, Department of International Business Administration, Kyungdong University Global Campus
Goseong-gun, Gangwon-do, South Korea¹

Assistant Professor, Department of International Hotel Management, Kyungdong University Global Campus
Goseong-gun, Gangwon-do, South Korea²

Abstract: This study dealt with the impact of leadership to employees' productivity and engagement. The research scope and limitations were the OFW (Overseas Filipino Workers) respondents working in public and private organization and residing in Manama area only. The type of research used to discover the impact of the variables in the research study was descriptive type. In order to determine the impact of the variables in the research, the statistical tool used were frequency, percentage and the two mean tests. The study showed that the leadership style has an impact in employees' productivity and engagement as it was shown by the number of frequency and percentage responses in the research. Both public and private organization showed that the employees are affected by the authoritarian, participative and laissez faire style of leadership when it comes to productivity and engagement.

Keywords: Productivity, Engagement, Performance, Private and Public Institutions, Leadership, Bahrain and Philippine Government, Overseas Filipino Workers

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant and important aspect of organizational framework is leadership. Nevertheless, the definition of leadership depends on the situation the organization has. One of the concerns of leadership is capacity. The capacity to pay attention and monitor, to promote dialogue in the levels of the organization, to be transparent and carry out processes in decision making and to express their values and objectives openly but not imposing to the workers. Leadership's concern is setting and not just accomplishing the organization's agenda and objectives. It is also concerned with pinpointing the issues and problems and commencing changes which will create improvement rather than implementing changes without clear objectives. [1]

A leader can make or break the motivation of the employees to perform well in the workplace. Hence, a leader should be a person who can ignite the interest of the workers to give their best shot in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. He should be a person who sets examples and do whatever he preaches and demonstrate his dedication to his own responsibilities. An effective leader is a motivator who is also motivated to perform his duties and endeavors to work on organization's objectives and set high quality working standards for himself. He inspires and stimulates people's eagerness and enthusiasm to perform, illustrates the techniques and leads the employees towards the accomplishments of the company's goals. [2]

Good leaders recognize the difference between hard work and productivity. By merely instructing the people to work hard is a means of leader's way to increase the output. An excellent leader would ensure that his people will have all the resources such as the tools and training to have effective productivity. The leader should evaluate all the tasks being done by his subordinates and remove the jobs with no value to achieve the organization's goal. One of the roles of the leaders is to ensure that his people are working smarter and not harder due to the physical limit of the employee's endurance in doing his job. As soon as the leaders implement this approach, it ensures motivation on the part of the employees. When the employees notice that their endeavors directly contribute to the final output, they are motivated to exert more effort to increase their productivity. In this way, the leader is able to inspire his subordinates to work as a team. Leaders must acknowledge that everyone wants to be successful in their own field of specialization and skills. When the leaders carry out this act, it will be an easy job to influence the employees to be productive and all the works will become easy. Leaders should motivate the increase productivity of the employees through recognition and praises. . [3]

Employees have to do jobs which do not necessitate a lot of mental exercise but at any rate, these jobs have to be completed. Many people declare that they do not like a busy work but they wanted to have a challenging work. In one study spearheaded by the University of California, Irvine, which was presented at South by Southwest panel on workplace distraction, the result revealed that employees are happiest when doing and completing routinely chores because they feel accomplished as compared to more challenging tasks. [4]

Kurt Lewin, a noted social scientist, identified three styles of leadership. The first is the authoritarian style which states that the leader dictates direction and leaves the members in the dark about the future plans of the company. The leader is very personal in praising and criticizing the employees. He also picks the members to work as a team collaboratively and determines the tasks provided to the team. The democratic style states that the leader accepts and appreciates the input of the team. He supports group discussion and allows the members to participate in decision making. He shares to the members the future plans of the company and he is very objective in praising and criticizing the employees. He participates in the team activities but not exceedingly involving in the activity of the employees. He also persuades the workers to perform their tasks freely and permits division of work to the team members. The laissez-faire style of leadership permits the team members the independence to decide and do not engage himself in the decision making. He will only participate in company activities upon request and will not provide comment unless asked directly and does not partake in company's activities. [5]

1.1 Statement of the Problem:

This study will determine the impact of leadership to employees' productivity and engagement in the selected private and government offices in the Kingdom of Bahrain. Specifically, this study will answer the following sub-problems:

1. What type of leadership style is prevalent in the private and public offices in the Kingdom of Bahrain?
2. What are the factors of employees' productivity as perceived by the respondents?
3. What are the factors of employees' engagement as observed by the respondents?
4. Is the leadership style has an impact on the employee productivity in the selected private and public offices in the Kingdom of Bahrain?
5. Is the leadership style has an impact on the employee engagement in the selected private and public offices in the Kingdom of Bahrain?

Objectives

This study will investigate the different leadership styles in the selected private and public offices in the Kingdom of Bahrain as well as the different factors of employees' productivity and engagement

Hypothesis

Ho: The leadership style has no impact on the employees' productivity as perceived by the respondents.

Ho: There leadership style has no impact on the employees' engagement as perceived by the respondents.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter will establish the research method to be employed in the research, the sample size, the sampling design to be utilized, the sampling technique to be applied, the research method and the statistical tool to be used for the treatment of the gathered data.

Research Design

This study will employ the descriptive method of research which will investigate the frequency distribution and the rank of the leadership style of the public and private offices/organization in the Kingdom of Bahrain. This will also reveal the rank of each factor for the employee productivity and engagement as well as their relationship to the leadership style of the public and private offices in the Kingdom of Bahrain.

The research will use the survey questionnaire to gather the primary data which will answer the problems posted and the hypothesis presented. The questionnaire will be validated by distributing it to the persons who will not be included as respondents. The purpose is to establish the clarity and validity of the questions in the survey and to determine the parts of the questionnaire which need modification.

The modified and improved questionnaire will be distributed to the Filipino Overseas Workers residing in Manama area. The researcher will go to the places where the OFW stay during their off days which fall on Fridays and Saturdays. The questionnaire will be explained to the respondents before writing the responses then, the researcher will retrieved the questionnaire for tabulation.

The process for data gathering will be as follows:

1. The validation of the questionnaire for clarity and validity by distributing to the individuals not included as respondents.
2. The modified and improved questionnaire will be distributed to the respondents for gathering the primary data.
3. Strict confidentiality to the responses will be afforded.
4. The data gathered will be tabulated for further analysis using the statistical tools presented in the research

Sample and Sampling Design

This research will use the non-probability quota sampling due to the limits and constraints for undergoing this study. This statistical tool does not have the rule as to the number of respondents to be obtained. The aim of this tool is to select respondents who have the characteristics and attributes to answer the questions that depend on their experiences as Filipino overseas workers in the public and private offices/organizations in the Kingdom of Bahrain.

Respondents of the Study

The selected Filipino overseas workers working in the public and private offices/organizations in the Manama area will be the respondents of this study. The researcher will only float the questionnaires to the professional office workers in the area of study.

Table 3.1 Frequency and percentage distribution of the public and private office/organizations respondents.

Respondents	Public Frequency	%
Public	40	50
Private	40	50
Total	80	100

The respondents will be 40 coming from the private offices/organizations and 40 coming from the public offices/organizations which constitutes 50% of each respondents.

Research Instruments and Techniques

The structured survey questionnaire is composed of part I and part II. Part one contains the profile of the respondents and Part two is composed of the factors for employees' productivity and engagement. The respondents will reply by putting a checkmark to the answer of their choice.

Statistical Treatment of Data

The data will be treated using the Frequency and Percentage distribution to determine the number of times the answer has appeared as chosen by the respondents. To determine the impact of leadership style employed by the public and private offices/organizations in the Kingdom of Bahrain to the employees' productivity and engagement, the researcher will employ the two mean test.

The formula for the two mean test is stated below.

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{s_p^2 \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

\bar{X}_1 = the mean of the first sample

\bar{X}_2 = the mean of the second sample

n_1 = the number of observations in the first sample

n_2 = the number of observations in the second sample

s_p^2 = the pooled estimate of the population variance

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 shows the age of the respondents for the public and private organization. Twenty six percent of the respondents in the public organization are between 20 to 30 years old, 15% is between 31 to 40 years old, 6.25% is between 41 to 50 years old and the 2.5% is between 51-60 years old. For the private organization, 31.25% is between 20 to 30 years old, 6.25% is between 31 to 40 years of age, 10% has the age of 41 to 50 and the 2.5% is between 51-60 years old.

Table 2 represents the number of years in service of the respondents in the public and private organization. Eighteen percent of the employees are in the public company for about 1 to 5 years and 13.75% are between 6 to 10 years. Ten percent is between 11 to 15 years of stay in the company, 5% stayed for about 16 to 20 years and 2.5% stayed for about 21 to 25 years.

Table 3 discusses the position of the respondents in the public and private companies. In the public organization, 6.25% are managers, 15% are supervisors and 28.75% are staff. For the private organization, 12.5% are managers, 18.75% are supervisors and 18.75% are staff members.

Table 4 discloses the status of employment of the respondents. Twenty two percent of the respondents in the public organization are regular employees, 22.5% are casual in status and 5% are part time workers. In the private organization, 18.75% are regular workers, 23.75% are casual employees and 7.5% are part timers.

Table 5 reveals the kinds of leadership in public and private organization. Most of the respondents stated that the kind of leadership existing in the public and private organizations is primarily participative followed by authoritarian and the last is laissez faire style. Item no. 6 under participative leadership style shows the highest frequency of responses that deals with the leader's trust to the employees competence in performing the job.

Table 6 determines the factors for employees' engagement in the job in the public and private organizations. The highest factor that will hold the employees in the employees' engagement is item no. 10 that the resources are available for performing the task and the lowest is item no. 9 which states that competitive salary with similar jobs offered by the other organizations is the least factor that will engage the employees in the job or task in the public and private company.

Table 7 illustrates the factors for employees' productivity in the public and private organization. It shows that item 10 and 11 have the highest number of replies which state that the organization has a very good relationship to its stakeholders (consumers, Suppliers) and the organization measure its performance beyond financial accomplishments but also other range of key performances. The lowest factor that affects the employees' productivity is the company devotes on research and development for new products and services as well as item no. 1 which states that the organization promotes leadership at every level of organization.

Table 8 determines the significant difference between public and private organizations in terms of authoritarian leadership and employee productivity. The computed T value is lower than the tabular T value means that the hypothesis is rejected. There is an impact of the authoritarian leadership style in the employee productivity of the public and private companies.

Table 9 determines the significant difference between public and private organizations in terms of authoritarian leadership and employee productivity. The computed T value is lower than the tabular T value means that the hypothesis is rejected. There is an impact of the participative leadership style in the employee productivity of the public and private companies.

Table 10 determines the significant difference between public and private organizations in terms of authoritarian leadership and employee productivity. The computed T value is lower than the tabular T value means that the hypothesis is rejected. There is an impact of the laissez faire leadership style in the employee productivity of the public and private companies.

Table 11 determines the significant difference between public and private organizations in terms of authoritarian leadership and employee productivity. The computed T value is lower than the tabular T value means that the hypothesis is rejected. There is an impact of the authoritarian leadership style in the employee productivity of the public and private companies.

Table 11 determines the significant difference between public and private organizations in terms of authoritarian leadership and employee engagement. The computed T value is lower than the tabular T value means that the hypothesis is rejected. There is an impact of the participative leadership style in the employee productivity of the public and private companies.

IV. CONCLUSION

This chapter illustrates the findings, conclusion and recommendations to the gathered data as well as the solution to the problem presented in a way of recommendation.

The following findings were obtained in the interpretation of the data.

1. The public and private companies in the Kingdom of Bahrain have different types of leadership.
2. The public and private companies' respondents have different criteria on the factors that contribute to the employees' productivity.
3. The public and private companies' respondents have different criteria on the factors that contribute to the employees' engagement
4. The various leadership styles have impact on the employees' productivity and engagement.

The conclusions below were retrieved from the findings of the study.

1. In the Kingdom of Bahrain, the private and public organizations have different types of leadership which are existent in all the types of organization may it be a small, medium or large enterprise and the employees are aware of this situation.

2. The respondents have various perceptions as to the factors of employees' productivity that will motivate them for a better productivity performance.

3. The respondents showed different observations regarding the factors that will inspire them to have an improved employee engagement in the public or private organization.

4. The respondents have illustrated that they are affected by the kind of leadership that they have in the public or private organization in terms of employee productivity and engagement.

The recommendations below were obtained from the conclusion of the study.

1. The company owners may ensure that the employees should be aware of the leadership style existing in the public or private organization.

2. The company owners should guarantee that the different factor for employees productivity are being implemented in the company to motivate a better productivity among the employees which will result to improved production of goods and services.

3. The company should learn that there are many factors for employee engagement, in which case, will result to a better productivity as well as an improved professional and personal development of the employees.

4. The company owners should have knowledge that the leadership style has an impact on the employee productivity and engagement. In doing so, the owners as leaders, will be able to be aware on the treatment of their employees so as to improve the productivity and engagement and will result to good relationship and higher production of goods and services.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We would like to extend our gratitude to the Overseas Filipino respondents, to our friends who introduced us to this publication journal and to International Advanced Research Journal in Science and Engineering and Technology for giving us the opportunity to publish this research study.

REFERENCES

[1] Ann Marie E. McSwain, Assistant Professor at Lincoln University) (McSwain, 2000). <http://www.cosmolearning.com/topics/leadership-418/>
 [2]<http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/management/Int-Loc/Leadership-Styles-and-Bases-of-Power.html> Reference for Business Encyclopedia Leadership Styles and Bases of Power
 [3]<https://www.td.org/Publications/Blogs/Management-Blog/2013/11/Leaderships-Impact-on-Productivity-and-Engagement>
 [4]<http://www.forbes.com/sites/ilyapozin/2014/04/17/4-surprising-truths-about-workplace-productivity/#5d926ac8e46e>
 [5]<http://www.referenceforbusiness.com/management/Int-Loc/Leadership-Theories-and-Studies.html> 2nd ed
 [6]<http://www.leadership-central.com/leadership-theories.html#axzz442XRLUmm>
 Management Theories & Concepts at the Workplace
 [7] <http://smallbusiness.chron.com/management-theories-concepts-workplace-17693.html>
 Systems Theory
 [8]https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Employee_engagement
 [9]http://managementstudyguide.com/leader_versus_manager.htm (2013)
 [10]<http://engageforsuccess.org/case-study-harvard-business-review-the-impact-of-employee-engagement-on-performance>
 [11] <https://www.liveplan.com/blog/2015/10/the-research-backed-guide-to-increasing-office-productivity/>
 [12]http://workplaceflexibility.bc.edu/need/need_employers_performance (2013)
 [13] <http://employment.govt.nz/er/bestpractice/productivity/7drivers.asp>
 [14]<https://www.cornerstoneondemand.com/news/press-releases/new-research-reveals-biggest-productivity-killers-america%E2%80%99s-workforce>
 [15]<http://smallbusiness.chron.com/motivation-productivity-workplace-10692.html>
 [16]http://d27n20517rookf.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/DR16_becoming_irresistible.pdf
 [17]http://www.ddiworld.com/ddi/media/monographs/employeeengagement_mg_ddi.pdf?ext=.pdf

Table 1 Age of the Respondents

Form of Organization	20-30		31-40		41-50		51-60		Total	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Public Organization	21	26.25	12	15	5	6.25	2	2.5	40	50
Private Organization	25	31.25	5	6.25	8	10	2	2.5	40	50
Total	46	57.5	17	21.25	13	16.25	4	5	80	100

Table 2 Number of Years in Service

Form of Organization	1-5		6-10		11-15		16-20		21-25		Total	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Public Organization	15	18.75	11	13.75	8	10	4	5	2	2.5	40	50
Private Organization	18	22.5	14	17.5	7	8.75	1	1.25	0	0	40	50
Total	33	41.25	25	31.25	15	18.75	5	6.25	2	2.5	80	100

Table 3 Position in the Company

Form of Organization	Manager		Supervisor		Staff		Total	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Public Organization	5	6.25	12	15	23	28.75	40	50
Private Organization	10	12.5	15	18.75	15	18.75	40	50
Total	15	18.75	27	33.75	38	47.5	80	100

Table 4 Status of Employment

Form of Organization	Regular		Casual		Part time		Total	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Public Organization	18	22.5	18	22.5	4	5	40	50
Private Organization	15	18.75	19	23.75	6	7.5	40	50
Total	33	41.25	37	46.25	10	12.5	80	100

Table 5 Kinds of Leadership in Public and Private Organization

AUTHORITARIAN	√		PARTICIPATIVE	√		LAISSEZ-FAIRE	√		TOTAL
	PUB	PRIV		PUB	PRIV		PUB	PRIV	
The leader supervises the employees thoroughly	15	16	The leader permits the employees as part in the decision making process	25	18	The leader provides a little supervision in solving the employees' problems in the workplace.	0	6	80
The leader's perception is that employees are generally lazy.	20	15	The good leader guides the employees without pressure.	16	19	The leader does not meddle with the employees in doing their jobs.	4	6	80
To reach the organizational goal, the leader motivates the employees through providing rewards.	12	20	The leader communicates to his employees as regularly as possible.	20	15	The leader permits the employees to assess their own tasks.	8	5	80
The leader directs the employees to attain the organizational goals.	12	15	The leader helps in completion of employees' tasks.	25	25	The leader gives a full independence to employees in solving their own problems.	3	0	80
The leader is the only evaluator in the organization in terms of employees' accomplishments.	14	12	The leader supports the employees to become passionate to his job.	22	21	The leader gives a little input in instructing the employees.	4	7	80
The leader provides the clearer procedures and policies to be followed by the employees in performing the job.	10	8	The leader trusts the employees for competence in performing their job	25	27	The leader leaves the employees on their own to do their tasks.	5	5	80
TOTAL	83	86		133	125		24	29	480

Table 6 Factor for Employee Engagement

FACTORS FOR EMPLOYEES ENGAGEMENT	√		TOTAL	FACTORS FOR EMPLOYEES ENGAGEMENT	√		TOTAL
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE			PUBLIC	PRIVATE	
The organization gives beneficial and positive comments.	30	32	62	Respect of everyone from the highest to the lowest in rank	25	29	54
Employees are given the chance to obtain sufficient opportunities for professional growth	28	34	62	Competitive salary with similar jobs offered by other organizations	25	24	49
There is a strong feeling of teamwork and support in the organization	32	29	61	Resources are available for performing the task	34	36	70
The employees have a balance of work and personal life.	35	28	63	Poor performance is successfully addressed in the organization	31	38	69
The primary concern is the importance of the quality of products and services	32	35	67	Information are shared openly in the organization	20	35	55
There is a fair treatment of employees	24	32	56	Employees can give comments that do not support the suggestions of the manager but does not result to getting into trouble	21	32	53
There is a good understanding of organization's mission and vision among the employees	32	28	60	Employees' talents and contribution are valued by the organization.	31	36	67
TOTAL	213	218	431		187	230	417

Table 7 Factors for Employee Productivity

FACTORS FOR EMPLOYEES PRODUCTIVITY	√		TOTAL	FACTORS FOR EMPLOYEES PRODUCTIVITY	√		TOTAL
	PUBLIC	PRIVATE			PUBLIC	PRIVATE	
The organization promotes leadership at every level of organization	28	30	58	The employees are allowed to analyze the work processes and the work flows	30	35	65
The organization performs succession planning for a clearer career path for the employees	29	32	61	The employees are allowed to share information to teams and work areas	32	35	67
The employees share the same values and goals	31	34	65	The organization is linked with other businessmen and organizations in the industry	28	36	64
The management gives rewards for employees' participation and sharing of good ideas for the improvement of the organization.	32	31	63	The organization has a very good relationship to its stakeholders (consumers. Suppliers)	30	36	66
The company devotes on research and development for new products and services	28	29	57	The organization measures its performance beyond financial accomplishments but also other range of key performances	31	35	66
The employees receive training to adopt in the new technology	32	30	62	The organization benchmarks its operation against the best practices of other industry for	28	32	60

				improvement and enhancement of services.			
The new employees are effectively trained by the senior and experienced employees	34	35	65	The manager of the organization leads and creates a very good and productive working environment.	27	32	59
TOTAL	214	221	431		206	241	447

Table 8 Impact of Public and Private Organizations in Terms of Authoritarian Leadership and Employee Productivity

Form of Organization	Std. Dev.	Computed T Value	Tabular T Value	Decision
Private	11.94	-1.15	1.994	Reject Ho
Public	1337	-28.57	1.994	Reject Ho

Table 9 Impact of Public and Private Organizations in Terms of Participative Leadership and Employee Productivity

Form of Organization	Std. Dev.	Computed Value	Tabular Value	Decision
Private	11.99	-0.64	1.994	Reject Ho
Public	13.49	-0.47	1.994	Reject Ho

Table 10 Impact of Public and Private Organizations in Terms of Laissez Faire Leadership and Employee Productivity

Form of Organization	Std. Dev.	Computed Value	Tabular Value	Decision
Private	10.22	-1.933	1.994	Reject Ho
Public	12.86	-1.91	1.994	Reject Ho

Table 11 Impact of Public and Private Organizations in Terms of Authoritarian Leadership and Employee Engagement

Form of Organization	Std. Dev.	Computed Value	Tabular Value	Decision
Private	8.86	-2.10	1.994	Reject Ho
Public	7.65	-2.11	1.994	Reject Ho

Table 12 Impact of Public and Private Organizations in Terms of Participative Leadership and Employee Engagement

Form of Organization	Std. Dev.	Computed Value	Tabular Value	Decision
Private	8.93	-1.52	1.994	Reject Ho
Public	7.84	-1	1.994	Reject Ho

Table 13 Impact of Public and Private Organizations in Terms of Laissez Faire Leadership and Employee Engagement

Form of Organization	Std. Dev.	Computed Value	Tabular Value	Decision
Private	53.4	-0.53	1.994	Reject Ho
Public	6.70	-3.88	1.994	Reject Ho

BIOGRAPHY



Dr. Felicidad A. Dy Kam completed her degree in Liberal Arts and Commerce major in Economics and Management from Ateneo de Naga University. She took her Master in Business Administration and Doctor in Business Administration from Polytechnic University of the Philippines. She has taught in various universities in the Philippines. She has also an international exposure abroad as visiting professor for 3 months in one of the universities in China and for two years as visiting professor in South Korea. She worked as an Assistant professor at AMA International University-Bahrain where she handles Management and Economics subjects. Currently, she is teaching in Kyungdong University Global Campus, South Korea.



Prof. Bernardo Pedrosa Delfin finished his bachelor's degree in Hotel & Restaurant Management from the Philippine Women's University. He completed a double-degree in Bachelor of Business Management and Master in Business Administration from the University of the City of Manila (PLM). Prof. Delfin was a former college dean at Arellano University and Emilio Aguinaldo College-Cavite. He became a consultant in hotel and schools offering hotel and restaurant management. He was a member of the Regional Quality Assessment Team of the Commission on Higher Education in the Philippines from 2003 to 2014. Prior to his career in the academe, he worked in hotel and restaurants occupying rank & file and supervisory positions respectively. He has taught in several colleges and universities handling business, hotel management and tourism courses. At present, he is connected at Kyungdong University-Global, South Korea.