



Psychological Perspectives on Information and Communication Technology Integration in Leadership and Teacher Job Satisfaction

Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah
Department of Educational Psychology,
School of General Education,
Federal University of Education, Zaria.

ABSTRACT

The integration of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) has transformed educational leadership, emphasizing its role in organizational culture and teacher job satisfaction. This study examines the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership styles and job satisfaction among teachers in Kaduna State's colleges of education. Transformational leadership, characterized by vision and inspiration, leverages ICT to promote collaboration and innovation, while transactional leadership relies on structured tasks and rewards facilitated by ICT for performance monitoring. A descriptive survey design was employed, targeting 3,580 academic staff from the Federal College of Education, Zaria, and the College of Education, Gidan-Waya. Data collection instruments included a leadership style questionnaire (Zung, 2017) and a job satisfaction scale (Isa, 2016). Data analysis involved descriptive statistics and Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (PPMC) to test hypotheses at a 0.05 significance level. The findings revealed significant relationships between transformational leadership and job satisfaction, as well as between transactional leadership and job satisfaction. A correlation was also observed between transformational and transactional leadership styles. Based on these findings, the study recommends fostering effective leadership styles in colleges of education to enhance teacher satisfaction and academic performance.

ARTICLE INFO

Article History
Received: July, 2024
Received in revised form: August, 2024
Accepted: November, 2024
Published online: December, 2024

KEYWORDS

Information and communication Technology, Transformational and Transactional Style of Leadership, Jobs Satisfaction among Teacher Education.

INTRODUCTION

Organisations in the present market are always experiencing changes as a result of increasing demand from the environment to innovate in order to gain sustainable competitive advantage (Drucker, 1985). Competitive organizational environments, demographically diverse workforces, technological advances and unending wave of newness, are just a few of those changes. These changes increasingly require flexibility and excellence from workers, because availability of equipment and machines in any work setting no longer guarantees performance. And the astute efficient use of the organization should also transcend to innovation for the organization to maintain competitive relevance (Amabile, 1988; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; and West & Farr, 1989).

The notion "organizational innovation" denotes, a mechanism applied by the organizations to adapt to changing conditions of competition, technological advancement and market expansion by producing newer products, techniques and systems (Utterback, 1994; Dougherty and Hardy, 1996). In its simplest term, organizational innovation is "the tendency of the organization to develop new or improved products/services and its success in bringing those products/services to the market" (Gumusluoglu and Ilsev, 2009: 467). To define the concept more clearly, a distinction between creativity and organizational innovation is very useful. Amabile (1988) defined *creativity* as the production of creative and constructive ideas, and *innovation* as the successful realization of innovative ideas within an organization. Though the distinction has been made in many studies, several researchers have rather defined

Corresponding author: Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah

✉ ambashirbawanallah@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology, School of General Education, Federal University of Education.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



organization innovation in conjunction with the individual creativity, acknowledging individuals are the ultimate source of any new idea (Oldham and Cummings 1996; Shalley and Gilson, 2004) because creative ideas from employees could be transferred to other employees and in a large-scale lead to the development innovation at the organizational level.

Leadership as a key factor in determining organizational success has been studied extensively in the past century in the management field (Bass & Avolio, 1997). From the current leadership theories, the present study draws from the categorization of leadership behaviours transformational leadership and transactional leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1997; 2000). *Transformational leadership* integrates the elements of empathy, compassion, sensitivity, relationship building, and innovation (Jin, 2010). It fosters a climate of trust, nurtures employees' confidence, and encourages their individual development. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990) suggested that six dimensions define transformational leadership behaviour (identifying and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, setting high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and promoting intellectual stimulation), a model of transformational leadership equivalent to Bass & Avolio's (1997; 2000) four-dimension (identifying and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, and high performance expectations are combined and presented as charisma or idealized influence and inspirational motivation) model. This study would adopt Bass & Avolio's (1997; 2000) construct of leadership. *Transactional leadership* is an exchange process. It is a matter of contingent reinforcement of employees based on performances. Transactional leaders generally use organizational bureaucracy, policy, power, and authority to maintain control; this style of leadership is occasionally referred to as authoritative (Bennet, 2009). Previous leadership scholars (Bass, 1985, Podsakoff, et al., 1990) have identified *contingent reward* to include tangible (e.g., pay increases) or intangible (e.g., recognition) commodities.

A vital aspect of this study is the examination of private and public sector and their impact on the innovative behaviour. Considering the current economic situation and determining the effects the crisis is causing the governments of the countries worldwide; the importance of effectively innovative organizations (private and public) cannot be over emphasized. In the midst of economic turbulence manifesting in low employment as well as drop on standard of living, ensuring the economic viability of a nation is a task that is not only meant to be strictly handled by the government to ameliorate the suffering of her citizens but also a task to be collectively attended to by the public and private organization to ensure effectiveness and efficient use of limited resources and by so doing increase the innovation of the organization who will in return add value by reducing organizational bankruptcy and increasing secured employment of citizens. In this sense the comparative analysis of the leadership efficiency in the public and private sector is the starting point for studying the innovative performance of organizations in a country. This phenomenon has made state-controlled or centrally planned economies to be substituted with market-oriented economies with the private sector as the main engine of growth. In that regard, several developing countries have embarked on initiatives to boost the private sector. These initiatives include new investment regime, trade liberalization and privatization of state-owned enterprises. The emphasis on private sector development coupled with the growing globalization of world production and trade in recent years have made investment, particularly foreign direct investment very crucial in industrial development in particular and economic development in general.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The dynamism and high competitiveness of the global market has rendered innovation a highly sought after commodity, yet various aspects, determinants and correlates are unexplored. Due to the fast-paced erosion of fashion and fashionable product and services, plethora of research in the subject of innovation as subfield of organisational psychology is needful (Hage,

Corresponding author: Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah

✉ ambashirbawanallah@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology, School of General Education, Federal University of Education.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



1999). There is a well-known indicative of how a lack of attention to ethical issues and leadership/managerial incompetence has led to radical organizational consequences such as bankruptcy and eventual collapse (Sims & Brinkmann, 2003). Managers/supervisors tend to use top-down, command and control management techniques, which have caused failed working relationships, which in turn failed to foster trust, respect and confidence among their staff. This has also failed to build confidence among the employees to take on self-starting innovative behaviour. This leadership style instead of building confidence has built fear and the fear in turn has brought about many costly mistakes to the organizations. This leadership atmosphere is suspected to demean, disrespect and demotivate employees, thereby leading to seeming erosion of motivational tendencies for innovative behaviour (Eze, 1994; Alarape & Akinlabi, 2000). The capacity of an average Nigerian worker both at private and mostly public organization to give extra discretionary contributions that are neither required nor expected without "rubbing" his/her hands has almost become a tall dream. Individual worker chooses to withhold loyalty by engaging in sharp practices as a direct result of his/her perception of negative experiences in the workplace (Alarape & Akinlabi, 2000). Unethical climate, incompetent leadership skills have led to corruption and scandalous behaviours at all level of the organization and has extinguished the zest to contribute innovatively to the course of an organization. Based on this back drop, exploration of leadership style and ethics would provide a resounding knowledge bothering innovation among private and public organizations in Nigeria.

Objective of Study

The general objective of the study is to compare perceived ethical climate, leadership style on innovative behaviour among Academic Staff of federal Colleges of Education, Zaria and College of Education Gidan Waya. The specific objectives are:

1. To know how leadership style and ethical climate interact to successfully determine Teacher's innovation.

Research Questions

The study would answer the following questions:

1. How does leadership style and ethical climate interact to successfully determine Teacher's innovation?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be tested:

1. Transformational leadership and transactional leadership styles would have independent and joint effect on innovative work behaviour.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Exchange Relationship Theories (ERT)

Why might fair treatment cause employees to exhibit positive behaviour and result in higher levels of task performance? The type of questions are best examined through the lens of social exchange theory, which explains how different types of benefits are exchanged according to various rules and how such exchanges foster high quality relationships (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005).

Leadership Style

Transformational Leadership integrates the elements of empathy, compassion, sensitivity, relationship building, and innovation (Jin, 2010). It fosters a climate of trust, nurtures employees' confidence, and encourages their individual development. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter (1990) suggested that six dimensions define transformational leadership behaviour (identifying and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, setting high performance expectations, providing individualized support, and promoting intellectual stimulation), a model of transformational leadership equivalent to Bass & Avolio's (1997; 2000) four-dimension (identifying and articulating a vision, providing an appropriate model, fostering the acceptance of group goals, and high performance expectations are combined and presented as charisma or idealized influence and inspirational motivation) model. This study would adopt Bass and Avolio's (1997; 2000) construct of leadership.



Transactional leadership is an exchange process. It is a matter of contingent reinforcement of employees based on performances. Transactional leaders generally use organizational bureaucracy, policy, power, and authority to maintain control; this style of leadership is occasionally referred to as authoritative (Bennet, 2009), while the Laissez-faire is a permissive style of leadership (Bennet, 2009). Previous leadership scholars (Bass, 1985, Podsakoff, et al., 1990) have identified contingent reward to include tangible (e.g., pay increases) or intangible (e.g., recognition) commodities.

Transactional and transformational leadership have been widely recognized as not mutually exclusive (Bass, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1997, 2000; Werder & Holtzhausen, 2009). As pointed out by Vera and Crossan (2004), good leaders know how to switch between a transformational and transactional leadership style in accordance with the situation (e.g., the environment, strategy). Effective leaders can maximize their influence by employing both leadership styles. Furthermore, some scholars (Bass, 1998, 1999) argued that transactions lay the foundation for transformations.

Critique Of Leadership Style

Burns (1978) operationalized the theory of TL as one of two leadership styles represented as a dichotomy: transformational and transactional leadership.

Transformational leadership (TFL)

Burns (1978) defined a transformational leader as "one who raises the followers' level of consciousness about the importance and value of desired outcomes and the methods of reaching those outcomes" (p. 141). Based on empirical evidence, Bass (1985) modified the original TFL construct. Over time, four factors or components of TFL emerged. These components include idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Researchers frequently group the first two components together as charisma (Bass & Riggio, 2006). The transformational leader exhibits each of these four components to varying degrees in order to bring about desired organizational outcomes through their followers (Bass 1985; 2000; Bass & Riggio, 2006). Idealized influence

incorporates two separate aspects of the follower relationship. First, followers attribute the leader with certain qualities that followers wish to emulate. Second, leaders impress followers through their behaviours. Inspirational motivation involves behaviour to motivate and inspire followers by providing a shared meaning and a challenge to those followers while intellectual stimulation allows leaders to increase their followers' efforts at innovation by questioning assumptions, reframing known problems, and applying new frameworks and perspectives to old and established situations and challenges (Bass & Riggio, 2006). Individualized consideration involves acting as a coach or mentor in order to assist followers with reaching their full potential. Leaders provide learning opportunities and a supportive climate (Bass & Riggio, 2006).

Published studies have linked TFL to CEO success (Jung, Wu, & Chow, 2008), middle manager effectiveness (Singh & Krishnan, 2008), military leadership (Eid, Johnsen, Bartone, & Nissestad, 2008), cross-cultural leadership (Kirkman, Chen, Farh, Chen, & Lowe, 2009), virtual teams (Hambley, O'Neill, & Kline, 2007), personality (Hautala, 2006), emotional intelligence and a variety of other topics (Diaz-Saenz, 2011).

However, a number of scholars criticize TFL (Beyer, 1999; Hunt, 1999; Yukl, 1999; 2011). Yukl (1999) took TL to task and many of his criticisms retain their relevance today. He noted that the underlying mechanism of leader influence at work in TFL was unclear and that little empirical work existed examining the effect of TL on work groups, teams, or organizations. He joined other authors and noted an overlap between the constructs of idealized influence and inspirational motivation (Hunt, 1999; Yukl, 1999). Yukl suggested that the theory lacked sufficient identification of the impact of situational and context variables on leadership effectiveness (1999; 2011).

Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership focuses on the exchanges that occur between leaders and followers (Bass 1985; 2000; 2008; Burns, 1978). These exchanges allow leaders to accomplish their performance objectives, complete required tasks, maintain the current organizational situation, motivate followers

Corresponding author: Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah

✉ ambashirbawanallah@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology, School of General Education, Federal University of Education.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



through contractual agreement, direct behaviour of followers toward achievement of established goals, emphasize extrinsic rewards, avoid unnecessary risks, and focus on improve organizational efficiency. Empirical evidence supports the relationship between transactional leadership and effectiveness in some settings (Bass, 1985; 1999; 2000; Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003; Bass & Riggio, 2006; Zhu, Sosik, Riggio, & Yang, 2012). Today, researchers study transactional leadership within the continuum of the full range of leadership model (Bass & Riggio, 2006). However, Burns (1978) argued that transactional leadership practices lead followers to short-term relationships of exchange with the leader that tends toward shallow, temporary exchanges of gratification and often create resentments. Additionally, a number of scholars criticize transactional leadership theory because it utilizes a one-size-fits-all universal approach to leadership theory construction that disregards situational and contextual factors related organizational challenges (Beyer, 1999; Yukl, 1999; 2011; Yukl & Mahsud, 2010).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Two hundred teachers were randomly selected from the two Colleges (Federal College of Education, Zaria 100 and College of Education Gidan waya 100 participated in the study. From the two Colleges of Education, Participants mean age is 35.27 while standard Deviation is 9.87. As a cross-sectional survey whose participants cut across differing socio-demographics, the study adopted a 3X2 Factorial research design. The variables of study comprise two independent variables namely; ethical climate, occurring at three level (egoistic, benevolent and principal climate) and leadership style occurring at two levels (transformational and transactional leadership style) while the dependent variable is innovative work behaviour. The demographic factors are; gender, sector, work experience, organizational types and educational qualification.

Three instruments presented in a self-report close ended questionnaire assessed Demographic variable such as gender, sector, work experience, organizational types and educational qualification; innovative work behaviour, by Scott and Bruce's (1994) 9-item innovative work behaviour scale rated on a 7-

point Likert scale ranging from 'never' (1) to 'always' (7): Cronbach alpha range from .76 to .85; Leadership style, by Bass and Avolio's (1990a) 21-item Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), rated on a 5-point Likert scale of Not at all (1) to frequently (5) and Ethical climate; by Cullen, Parboteeah, and Victor's (2003) 16-item Ethical Climate Questionnaire (ECQ), rated on 6-point Likert scale of one "completely false" to six "completely true".

The researcher obtained a research request forms from the two institutions, Federal College of Education, Zaria and College of Education Gidan waya. The researcher approached the Registry and Personnel coordinators of the above institutions was assigned to help facilitate the collection of primary data from the teachers after the approval of the request. The questionnaire which assured participants of confidentiality of information as well as implore voluntary participation also thanked them for maximum cooperation. The researcher administered 300 questionnaires and frequently collected the completed one with the aid of personnel coordinator of the respective organizations. 4 weeks time interval was given between the date of first administration and the date of final collection. Out of the 310 questionnaires that returned, the researcher discarded ten that were not properly completed (non-useable data) while the 300 properly completed questionnaires (useable) were scored, coded and subjected to data analysis via SPSS.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

One hundred and three males (51.5%) and 97 (48.5%) females participated in the study with age ranges from 15 to 64; representing mean age of 35.27 and standard deviation of 9.87. One hundred and eleven (55.5%) of the participants are married, 75 (37.5%) are single, 10 (5.1%) are divorced, three (1.5%) are separated while one (.5%) is a widow. Fourteen (7.0%) participants are Bachelor degree Certificate holders, 46 (23.0%) are National Diplomas, 46 (23.0%) are Higher National Diplomas, 55 (27.5%) are Bachelors, 38 (19.0%) are Masters while one (.5%) is doctorate. One hundred and one (50.5%) participants were selected from Institutions while 99 (49.5%). Fifty-two participants (26.0%)

Corresponding author: Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah

✉ ambashirbawanallah@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology, School of General Education, Federal University of Education.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



were from Gidan Waya, 49 (24.5%) from Federal College of Education, Zaria 50 (25.0%) from College of Education Gidan Waya while 49 (24.5%) from Federal College of Education, Zaria. Sixty-four (32.0%) participants have worked in the present organisations from six months to five years, 48 (24.0%) six years to 10 years, 28 (14.0%) 11 year to 15 years, 35 (17.5%) 16 years to 20 years and 25 (12.5%) 21 years and above.

Inferential Statistics

Table 4.1: Interaction mean of perceived leadership style and ethical leadership

Leadership style	ethical climate	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Low leadership style	High	36.20	8.49	177
	Low	36.00	9.41	4
	Total	36.20	8.48	181
High leadership style	High	24.31	7.12	16
	Low	22.00	9.64	3
	Total	23.95	7.30	19
Total	High	35.22	8.99	193
	Low	30.00	11.46	7
	Total	35.04	9.11	200

Source: Field Survey (2018)

Table 4.2: Summary of simple linear regression analysis showing transformational leadership style (TFL) and transactional leadership style (TSL) as predictors of innovative work behaviour

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	means	Std. deviation	R ²	F	P	β	t	P
TFL	9981.13	2	4990.57	47.96	11.09				.46	6.15	.00
	6515.62	197	33.07			.61	150.89	.00			
TSL	16496.76	199		35.18	7.51				.36	4.77	.00

Source: Field Survey (2018)

Hypothesis two which states that transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style would have significant independent and joint effects on employee innovative work behaviour presented in Table 4.2 which is a simple linear regression summary table. It indicated a significant joint influence of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee innovative work behaviour ($R^2 = .61$; $F(2, 197) = 150.89$; $p < .05$) jointly accounting for .61% variance in employee innovative work behaviour. Independently, there was a significant effect of

At this stage of the study, the researcher deployed inferential statistics in testing the hypotheses thus stated in order to ascertain whether any difference in the variables' scores truly reflects a significant difference that can be generalized to all the population of interest. The decision rule for all this result has it that the chances of error must not be greater than .05. Depending on the hypothesis, the various inferential statistical tools used for the analysis are thus presented in tables:

transformational leadership on innovative behaviour ($\beta = .461$; $t = -6.15$; $p < .05$). Also, there is a significant independent effect of transactional leadership on innovative work behaviour on ($\beta = .357$; $t = 4.77$; $p < .05$). Therefore, hypothesis two is fully supported.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to compare perceived ethical climate, leadership style on innovative behaviour of the two institutions. Therefore, teachers were compared with respect to these three variables, research

Corresponding author: Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah

✉ ambashirbawanallah@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology, School of General Education, Federal University of Education.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



hypotheses were based a hypothesized significant influence of ethical climate and leadership style on employees innovative work behaviour.

The second Hypothesis states that transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style would have significant unique and joint effects on employee innovative work behaviour. Independently, there is a significant effect of transformational leadership on innovative behaviour. The result is consistent with previous studies who affirms that innovation in organizations is affected by a wide variety of factors; the most influential factor is leadership style in which transformational leadership has found to be significantly correlated with the innovative work behaviour in the organizations (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Janssen, 2002; Jung, Chow & Wu, 2003; Mumford, Scott, Gaddis, & Strange, 2002; Reuvers, Van Engen, Vinkenbunrg, & Wilson-Evered, 2008; Sosik, Avolio, & Kahai, 1997). Transformational leadership style is considered as an ideal style of leadership in the full range leadership theory as followers are encouraged to commence new ideas and problem solving approaches (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Also, the study found that transactional leadership style significantly promotes innovative work behaviour. This is consistent with Riaz (2009) who found that just as like transformational leadership style fosters innovation, transactional leadership style is found to be similarly effective in significantly promoting innovative behaviour among the organizations surveyed in the present study. Another reason could be that our analyses focused exclusively on individual reports of leadership style and as there are inherent limitations on relaying solely on self-reporting, it may lead to social desirable responses. Similarly, whatever the leadership style is the organization surveyed are practicing in Nigeria, Federal College of Education, Zaria and College of Education Gidan Waya, now-a-days are more innovative in nature than they were ever before. On the interaction or joint effect, the result revealed a significant influence of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee innovative work behaviour, jointly accounting for .61% variance on employee innovative work behaviour. This result is consistent with Chen and Chen (2007) who proposed and found that for the more efficient

innovation operation, transformational leadership should combine with transactional leadership. Reinforcement and reward are used by transactional leaders to enhance innovation and high performance (Gregory, 2006; Jung & Sosik, 2002). Transactional and transformational leadership have been widely recognized as not mutually exclusive (Bass, 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1997, 2000; Werder & Holtzhausen, 2009; Yukl, 2009). As pointed out by Vera and Crossan (2004), good leaders know how to switch between a transformational and transactional leadership style in accordance with the situation (e.g., the environment, strategy). Effective leaders can maximize their influence by employing both leadership styles. Furthermore, some scholars (Avolio, 1999; Bass, 1998, 1999) argued that transactions lay the foundation for transformations.

CONCLUSION

The second hypothesis which states that transformational leadership style and transactional leadership style would have significant independent and joint effects on employee innovative work behaviour revealed a significant joint influence of transformational and transactional leadership styles on employee innovative work behaviour. Independently, transformational leadership predicted innovative behaviour, while transactional leadership style predicted innovative work behaviour.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Managers at all levels should endeavour to create an ethical climate in their companies in order to put a new face on the business by discovering employees' abilities and skills and also commanding advantages of these factors.
2. This study demonstrates that organizations should consider benevolence and principle ethical climates, transformational and transactional leadership for more innovative employees. For this reason, organizations should develop specific innovative processes taking into account the processes of change and innovation.
3. Organizations should create a work environment in which rights, fairness,

Corresponding author: Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah

✉ ambashirbawanallah@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology, School of General Education, Federal University of Education.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



caring principles of rule of law and transparency are highly practiced Ethical management policies and practices of organizations can positively affect employees' perceptions of justice and this is necessary to increase the learning trends and abilities of employees to make positive changes in their intention to innovate for organization.

REFERENCES

- Abrahamson, E. (1991). Managerial fads and fashions: The diffusion and rejection of innovations. *Academy of Management Review*, 16: 586 – 612.
- Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 45(2), 357.
- Amabile, T. M. (1998). How to kill creativity. *Harvard Business Review*, 76 (5): 77–87.
- Anderson, N., Poto nik, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A stateof- the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40(5), 1297–1333. doi:10.1177/0149206314527128
- Babin, B. J., Boles, J. S., & Robin, D. P. (2000). Representing the perceived ethical work climate among marketing employees. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 28: 345-358.
- Bandura, A. (2005). The primacy of self-regulation in health promotion. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 54(2): 245-254.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership: Good, better, best. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(3), 26-40. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(85)90028-2.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Bennett, T. M. (2009). A study of the management leadership style preferred by IT subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Culture, Communications and Conflict*, 13(2), 1-26.
- Beyer, J. M. (1999). Taming and promoting charisma to change organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 307-330. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00019-3.
- Coyle-Shapiro, J. A.-M., & Neuman, J. H. (2004). The psychological contract and individual differences: The role of exchange and creditor ideologies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64: 150-164.
- Cropanzano, R., & Byrne, Z. S. (2000). Workplace justice and the dilemma of organizational citizenship. In M. Van Vugt, T. Tyler, & A. Biel (Eds.), *Collective problems in modern society: Dilemmas and solutions* (pp. 142–161). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Cropanzano, R., & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social exchange theory: An interdisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, 31, 874–900. doi: 10.1177/0149206305279602.
- De Jong, J., & den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 19(1), 23–36
- Diaz-Saenz, H. R. (2011). Transformational leadership. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of leadership* (pp. 299-310). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dienesch, R. M., & Liden, R. C. (1986). Leader-member exchange model of leadership: A critique and further development. *Academy of Management Review*, 11, 618-634.
- Eisenbeiss, S. A., van Knippenberg, D., & Boerner, S. (2008). Transformational leadership and team innovation: integrating team climate principles. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 93(6), 1438.
- Firth, R. (1967). *Themes in economic anthropology*. London: Tavistock.
- Foke, C. L.J. (2001). Leadership behaviours: Effects on job satisfaction, productivity and organizational commitment". *Journal of Nursing Management*, 9, 191-204.

Corresponding author: Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah

✉ ambashirbawanallah@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology, School of General Education, Federal University of Education.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved



<http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2834.2001.00231.x>
Hackman, J. R., and Odham, G. R. (1976).
Motivation through the design of

work: Test of theory. *Organizational behaviour and human performance*, 16, 250-279.

Corresponding author: Abdullahi Bashir Bawanallah

✉ ambashirbawanallah@gmail.com

Department of Educational Psychology, School of General Education, Federal University of Education.

© 2024. Faculty of Technology Education. ATBU Bauchi. All rights reserved