

Effect of Personality of Leaders on Employee Productivity in the Local Government System in Nigeria: A Case Study of Benue State Local Government System

AMBROSE A. OKWOLI SAMUEL A. OCHOLI *RICHARD GBANDE
Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Jos, Jos, Plateau State

Abstract

The study investigated the effect of personality of leaders on employee productivity in the local government system in Nigeria which focus on the Benue State local government system using descriptive and inferential test of chi-square. The study found that personality of leaders have a positive relationship with employees' productivity in the Benue State local government system. The study therefore recommended that leaders in the local government system should be people of high personality, proven integrity and well respected.

Keywords: Personality of Leaders, Employees' Productivity and Chi-square

Introduction

Leadership is the focal point of the directing function of modern management. This involves other variables such as motivation, communication and coordination. Leadership is the process of stimulating and motivating subordinates to accomplish assigned tasks. The leader, although part of the group, is distinct from it because he is concerned with guiding, conducting and directing it (Theirauf, Klekamp, and Geeding, 1977: 490). Ocholi (2007: 17) says that the key to effectiveness is hinged on the ability to lead others successfully through creating positive impacts. It is imperative to know that effective and successful way of leading people enhance productivity. Leadership depends on the ability of the leaders to use their authority, human resources and relationship with people to achieve organizational goals.

Leadership as an influence process is natural to either formal or informal group in the society. It is a field of interest to many people. The word encompasses people who have to direct, guide and preside others to achieve group objectives. Leadership covers all aspects of human endeavours. It could be military, political, religious, cultural and societal leaders. Understanding of the subject is special and important to people as it affect their lives.

Local government system otherwise known as the third-tier of government is the closest tier of government to the grassroot people. It is often called the government at the grassroot. Uya (2003) also agrees with this when he pontificated that, local administration is "the cornerstone of a people-centered democracy everywhere in the world". The people at the helm of local government system are supposed to be in constant touch with the grassroots population and this interaction may either enhance or affect the people's aspirations.

Local government system is made up of seven departments that run the system. These are: Personnel, Health, Works, Revenue, Finance, Agriculture and Education Departments. The administration of the local government has the Director-General, Service and Administration (DGSA) as head of service while the Chairman serves as the Executive Head of the Local government.

According to the Benue State of Nigeria Gazette (2007:65), the local government performs many functions. Among them are: To formulate economic plans and development scheme for the local government area; collection of rates and issuance of radio and television licenses; Establishment, maintenance of cemeteries/burial grounds and homes for the destitute; construction and maintenance of roads, streets lights, drain parks, gardens, chiefs palaces, open spaces or such public facilities as may be prescribed by the House of Assembly of the state; Registration of all births, death and marriages; Provision and maintenance of public conveniences, sewages and refuse disposal; Naming of roads and streets and numbering of houses; Provision and maintenance of primary, adults and vocational education; The provision and maintenance of health services; Licensing, regulation and control of the sales of liquor; Other functions as may be conferred on the local government by the House of Assembly.

A casual analysis of the leadership pattern in the Nigerian public sector and its implications for productivity reveals that the local government system in Benue State has, over the years, been experiencing a noticeable level of bad leadership. This has serious consequences for productivity in the state's local government system.

Over the years, the problem of bad leadership in the local government system has been the basic obstacle that has militated against effective and efficient utilization of resources to attain goals which the system is supposed to achieve. This assertion has been encapsulated in Oloko (1997) who articulates that:

The problem of leadership is one of the basic problems which all social systems, irrespective of their size, structure and primary functions must solve in order to survive, p.33.

The importance of quality leadership in the success of every organization be it formal or informal

cannot be over-emphasized. This is manifested in the fact that for productivity to be achieved in any public sector in this regard, the local government system has to be determined by good leadership.

It is not in doubt that focus leadership enhances productivity. Leadership disposition towards certain behaviours like corruption, training and development, rewards and employee involvement affects productivity. The issue that provide impetus for this research is that of personality of leaders. Personality of leaders dictates how a leader can behave in certain situations. If a leader is perceived to be above board in all situations the subordinates will have no choice but to fall in line with his/her thoughts and if otherwise there is bound to be chaos in the organization. This may be capable of affecting productivity. The major aim of this study therefore is to ascertain if there is significant relationship between productivity and the personality of leaders in the local government system in Benue state.

Literature Review

2.1.2 Personality of leader.

Personality can be defined as a dynamic or set of characteristic possessed by a person that influence on cognition, motivation and behavior in a variety of situation. Ozer and Benet (2006) state that personality is the effective tool that predicts job performance. This is because, the way and how people solve the problems, how well people perform in the workplace and complete the task will contribute to the organization achievement. As a result this will effect on effective job performance. Personality is the combination of characteristics of individual that form a unique character for different people. Mkoji and Sikalieh (2012) state that the personality profile tools that can be used to provide an evaluation of an employee's personal attributes, values, and life skills in an effort to maximize his or her job performance and contribution to the company.

The Big Five Personality Traits

Although there is no complete agreement among researchers about the Big five model of personality (Block, 1995; Hough, 1992), one advantage of the Big five model is the opportunity it provides for integrating commonalities among diverse approaches to personality (Goodstein & Canyon, 1999; Digman, 1990; John & Srirasta, 1999). Leadership Scholars have shown increasing interest in using the model to facilitate interpretation of result on leadership traits. The five broadly defined personality traits in the taxonomy are surgency or extroversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, adjustment or neuroticism, and intelligence or openness to experience (Yukl, 2002; Hogan, Curphy & Hogan, 1994).

- (i) Surgency or Extroversion. Extraverts are described as assertive, talkative, upbeat, energetic and optimistic (Costa & McCrae, 1992). They are socially dominants and influential. They seek excitement and social attention (Ashton, Lee & Paunonen, 1999). Collins (1999) reveals that extroversion is composed of two central components, affiliation (having and valuing warm personal relationships) and agency (being socially dominant, assertive and having influence). Watson and Clark (1997) suggest that positive emotionality is at the core of extraversion. Extroverts experience and express positive emotions. Therefore, there is a tendency that extroverts will display inspirational leadership which involves having an optimistic view of the future. This is because of their influence and ambition, they are likely to gain confidence and enthusiasm among followers.
- (ii) Agreeableness. Agreeableness refers to the tendency to be cooperative, trusting, gentle, and kind (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997). People with high level of agreeableness value affiliation and avoid conflict. They are modest, altruistic, and tend to be both trusting and trustworthy (Graziano-Cambell & Hair, 1996). They stand by their words, helpful and generally sympathetic.
- (iii) Conscientiousness. Conscientiousness or dependable individuals are likely to have a strong sense of direction and also work very well to actualize goals and objectives. They value their personal integrity, high need for achievement and well organized. The people are cautious, self-disciplined and tend to be neat (Costa & McCrae, 1992).
- (iv) Neuroticism or Adjustment. Individuals high in neuroticism tend to view the world in a negative way. Costa and McCrae (1997) argue that at the core of neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative actions such as fear, sadness, quiet and anger. They experience emotional distress and are not stable and steady. Judge, Erez, Bono and Thoresen (2002) reveal a strong association between neuroticism and low self-esteem and low general self-efficiency. The degree of self-control is very low. Northouse (1997, p.17) agrees that self-confidence is a requisite to the initiation of leadership. They are not likely to attempt to lead, not role models and also not positive about the view of the future.
- (v) Openness to experience or Intellectance. The key issues of openness to experience include cultural variables such as an appreciation for the arts and sciences and a liberal and critical attitude toward societal values on one hand and intellect which is the ability to learn and reason on the other hand (McCrae & Costa, 1997). Openness to experience also represents individual's behaviour to be creative, introspective, imaginative, resourceful, and insightful (John & Srivistava, 1999). They are emotionally

responsive and intellectually curious. Divergent thinking and flexible attitudes are associated with their actions (McCrae, 1996). Judge and Bono (2000) find that openness to experience was associated with transformational leadership. This is because the individuals are creative, imaginative and insightful.

The Personality of a leader is capable of solving organizational problems. The personality of Mahammadu Buhari towards zero tolerance for corruption, lack of transparency and indiscipline has endeared him to the people who overwhelmingly voted him into power as the President of Nigeria. The change mantra is possible because of the qualities of the man Mohammadu Buhari (Wamako, 2015; Akintoye, 2015).

The Importance of Leaders to enhancing productivity

The importance of leadership is underscored by the dynamics of work organizations, including flatter structures, recognition of the efficient use of human resources and advances in social democracy. Contemporary management has steadily and progressively moved away from the emphasis on getting results through the close control of the work force to an environment of coaching support and empowerment. Thus, the practice and principles of leadership are tailored to conform to contemporary management realities for optimum results.

Leadership is inextricably linked to the three variables of motivation, interpersonal behavior and the process of communication. In this connection, managers are now seen as leaders of their groups/departments (Faisal, Mohammed, Fariq, Samina and Bashir, 2014).

What defines an effective leadership is embedded in the quality of the leadership. Good leadership, therefore, must necessarily involve the process of delegation and empowerment to the extent that the leadership relationship is not restricted to leader behavior resulting in subordinate action. Since leadership is a dynamic process, it is expected that the leader-follower relationship should be that of reciprocity, which leads to a two-way effective leadership process that influences both individual and organizational performance.

Faisal *et al.* (2014) submit that the importance of leader in the organization is just like sun in the “solar system”. Leaders can greatly influence their subordinates and have the ability to increase their productivity. The traits of leaders are visibly significant, particularly in joint effort in particular. Leaders require the abilities to employ its employees in prolific and pleasing shared pursuits. But, this is an exit from the normal means of considering leader traits as belongings, rather than interpersonal relations to others involved in common actions. The leadership skills and knowledge cannot be inherited, rather can be got and taken from others, built-up and apparent routine working (Katz, 1974).

Leaders put in place the paradigm for perfect practices, model actions and performances, then it is followed by the employees. They set the examples which may be called the initiator and originator of organization’s customs and norms. Attainment of morals plans in business is just because of enthusiastic leader (Hejika-Ekins, 2001; Lewis and Gilman, 2005). The expertise of leadership definitely enhances the efficiency of the managerial leaders, also increases the productivity of the employee working in the organization.

The most important function of the leaders is to supervise the productivity of the employees and it is one way through which the leaders can increase performance of the employees (Humphrey, 2002).

Leaders are in a position to apply an immense pressure and influence to enhance the productivity and output of the workers and employees and they are unaffected to this effect as they are immune to it. Moreover, leaders frequently put the point for making intelligence in their employees by choosing variables and methods to be observed, highlighting major features of productivity performance in cluster and personal assessments and by managing the stream to employees (Yukl, 2006; Bass and Bass, 2009; Weick, 1995). Therefore, influence and affect is a central subject inside leadership.

Technical skills of leaders include those processes, methods and techniques which help leaders in understanding a particular subject or any problem (Katz, 1974). These qualities will bring accurate information to leaders regarding organizational systems and characteristics of employees. Technical skills are added through the merger of proper tutoring, education and work practices.

These technical skills of leaders are very important as with the help of these, the leaders will be in a position to guide and instruct employees and subordinates to increase their productivity and guide the organization to success (Cook, 1998; Yukl, 2001). These abilities place the base for motivation, novelty and tactical planning.

Conceptual skills of leaders consist of critical ability, rational thinking and idea creation. In the words of Yukl (2001) these skills entails high-quality findings, judgment, care, imminent originality and the aptitude to construct choices and decisions in multifaceted conditions. Conceptual skills are required by leaders to involve in the process of development, organizing and making decision. For getting high productivity from employees, leaders need to know the working and functionality of organization and must possess or have these conceptual skills.

Interpersonal skills of leaders contain information about the behaviours of human beings and team/group processes. It includes the skills and capability of leaders to recognize the thoughts, feelings, intents of employees, capability to evidently and realistically correspond in different situations. It is compromising

talents for settling dissimilarities between employee/workers and set up jointly enjoyable associations (Mahoney, 1963; Mahoney *et al.*, 1965; Copeman, 1971; Mintzberg, 1973).

Interpersonal skills also compromise those abilities that help leaders to understand the capabilities needed to make coordination and synchronization for the actions and deeds for him/her and other people (Gillen and Carrol, 1985; Mumford *et al.*, 2000).

Interpersonal abilities and skills of leaders also power up the employees to successfully complete managerial aims and objectives (Yukl, 1989; Mintzberg, 1973) and hence increasing the productivity of the employees in the organization.

Emotional Intelligence (EI) or feelings of the leaders has also an effect on the productivity of the employees. EI is the degree to which employees are familiarized with their thoughts and feelings and concerns of the feelings of the other people (Yukl, 2001).

EI is concerned to the extent that place jointly feelings and cause in a manner so as to understand the way feelings and emotions are used to aid cognitive procedures and feelings are sensibly handled (Haq, 2011). Leaders can solve problems like management of time, disaster management to take better decision making. With the help of EI, leaders can easily understand the personalities and problems of their employees and thus are in a position to solve the problems and increasing the performance of the employees.

Social intelligence of leaders also plays an important role in understanding the employee's behavior. It includes social perceptiveness which increases the ability of the leaders to understand problems and needs of the organization as well as the employees. Behavioural elasticity is the skill and keenness to change the behaviour of employees and to fine tune for new situations (Haq, 2011).

Although, there are many types of committees, but commitments to bosses is the mainly powerful one (Becker and Billings, 1993; Gregersen, 1993; Becker and Gerhart, 1996; Meyer and Allen, 1997). In previous researches, researchers agreed that human resources may show commitment to organizations, bosses, work and working divisions (Becker and Billings, 1993; Hackett *et al.*, 2001); Wasti and Can, 2008).

In the words of Bentein *et al.* (2002) the workers who show excellent performance, they are given rewards by their leaders to increase their productivity more. Furthermore, the employees show more devotion towards their bosses or leaders as compared to organizations (Cheng *et al.*, 2003). The workers sense themselves additionally near to their bosses or leaders than their business organizations, when they observe the business organization as one unit (Wasti and Can, 2008).

Productivity

Generally speaking, productivity is defined as the relation of output to input. Productivity is therefore, on the one hand, closely connected to the use and availability of resources. This means in short that productivity is reduced if an organisation's resources are not properly used or if there is a lack of them. On the other hand, productivity is strongly linked to the creation of value. It is argued that productivity is one of the basic variables governing economic production activities, perhaps the most important one (Singh, Motwani & Kumavi, 2000). Elimination of waste give rise to improve productivity.

Productivity is a relative concept, which cannot be said to increase or decrease unless a comparison is made, either of variations from competitors or other standards at a certain point in time, or of changes over time. Misterek, Dooley and Anderson (1992) agree that improvements in productivity can be caused by five different relationships:

- (1) Output and input increases, but the increase in input is proportionally less than the increase in output.
- (2) Output increases while input stays the same.
- (3) Output increases while input is reduced.
- (4) Output stays the same while input decreases.
- (5) Output decreases while input decreases even more.

Productivity is an economic measure of efficiency that summarizes and reflects the value of the output created by an individual, organization, industry or economic system relative to the value of the inputs used to create them (Denisi and Griffin, 2005). They agree that organizations around the world have come to recognize the importance of productivity for its ability not only to compete but also to survive, furthermore, an organization that is serious about productivity will need to lead workers by given them direction and focus to create high quality products and services. Effective leadership in an organization results to enhance productivity (Ene, 2008).

Hartzell (2011) views productivity as a measured relationship between the quality and quantity of results produced and the quantity of resources required for production. Productivity is in essence a measure of the work efficiency of an individual, work unit or entire organization. He further stressed that productivity can be measured in two ways, one way relates the output of an enterprise, industry or economic sector to a single input, such as labour or capital. The other relates output to a composite of input combined so as to account for their relative importance. The choice of a particular productivity measure depends on the purpose for which it is to be

used. He further defined productivity as a war against waste. Even if the technical and economic concept of productivity is taken into consideration i.e. productivity is the ratio of output and input. This could be favourable only when planned efforts are made to utilize the scarce resources as economically as possible to achieve the best result. He concludes that among several factors affecting productivity, safety in industry, one of the most important factor to be kept in view for promoting productivity is the rate of output of a worker or machine.

Nwachukwu (2002:56) argues that productivity is the measure of how well resources are brought together in an organization and utilized for accomplishing of set result produced in reaching the highest level of performance with the least expenditure of resources. It can be seen as the amount of production in relations to labour put in.

Explaining productivity, Kerlinger (1980:208) states that public managers have worked under the uneasy assumption that a good, smoothly functioning programme was an effective one. He went further to explain how a manager used to think that if he or she spent the entire budget allocation and did not hear complaints from clients or the public, he or she was running an effective programme. From that perspective, productivity is equated to the quantity of public complaints. Nevertheless, several more precise measures of the public sector have emerged in recent years where productivity is measured in terms of cost efficiency, cost effectiveness, and programme worthiness.

Theoretical Framework

Cognitive Resources Theory

This study is anchored on the cognitive resources theory developed by Fred Fieldler and Joe Garcia in 1987. The theory focuses on the influence of the leader's intelligence and experience on his or her reaction to stress. According to cognitive resources theory, the performance or outcome of a leader's group is determined by a complex interaction among two leader traits of intelligence and experience; one type of leader behaviour which is directive leadership, and two aspects of the leadership situation involving interpersonal stress and the nature of the group's task (Fieldler & Garcia, 1987).

The theory argues the interpersonal stress for the leader moderates the relation between leader intelligence and subordinate performance. Stress may be due to a boss who creates role conflict or demands miracles without providing necessary resources and support. There are other sources of stress which include frequent work crises and serious conflicts with subordinates. Under low stress, high intelligence of a leader results in good plans and decisions. In this condition, a highly intelligent leader relies on intellectual ability to analyze the problem and find the best solution. However, on the contrary, under high stress, there is a negative relationship between leader intelligence and decision quality. The theory provides several possible explanations why highly intelligent leaders sometimes make terrible task decisions when under stress. The most plausible explanation is that stress interferes with information processing and decision-making. Under high stress, a leader is more likely to be distracted and unable to focus on the task. Intelligence provides no advantage, because it cannot be applied. The leader may withdraw and let the group drift, or to reduce anxiety, the leader may display non-productive behaviour that disrupts the group processes.

Also, interpersonal stress for the leader moderates the relationship between leader experience and subordinate performance. Experience is normally measured in terms of time on the job, and it is assumed to result in habitual behaviour patterns for effectively dealing with task problems. Experience will be positively related to the quality of leader decisions under high interpersonal stress, but it is not related to decision quality under low stress. It is possible, experienced leaders rely mostly on intelligence under low stress, and they rely mostly on experience under high stress. Leaders with little experience rely on intelligence in both situations. The essence of the theory is that stress is the enemy of rationality hindering the capacity of a leader to think and act sequentially and carefully. This theory is significant to this study in that, it justifies the essence of leaders personality to achieving organizational goals.

Research Designs

The study adopted the descriptive survey. A descriptive survey is usually employed by collecting data on and describing in a systematic manner the characteristic features or facts about a given population from a few people or items considered to be representative of the entire group (Akuezuilo & Agu, 2002). The justification for the use of the descriptive survey design for this study is based on the fact that, only a representative sample was chosen from the population and studied. It also permitted inferences and generalizations of the findings and no variable was manipulated.

The population for this study comprised 17,676 senior staff of the 23 local government areas of Benue State. The total number of staff in the 23 local Government Councils of Benue State stand at 25,353, broken down into (a) 17, 676 senior staff and (b) 7, 677 junior staff as at 2015.

In order to obtain a sample size from the population of 17,676 senior staff of the 23 local governments in Benue State, the study made use of the Cochran scientific formula expressed in equation 1 to obtain a

$$n_o = \frac{Z^2 pq}{e^2} \dots\dots\dots 1$$

representative sample for proportions of populations which gives a total of 375

respondents.

Where

n_o = Sample size,

Z^2 = value for selected alpha level of 0.025 in each tail which gives 1.96

Pq = estimate of variance = 0.25, that is (0.5 x 0.5). Where p is the estimated standard deviation of the scale which Cochran puts as 0.5 and q is $1 - p$ which equals 0.5

e = is the acceptable margin of error put at 5% which equals 0.05.

The individual sample size per local government was determined using the population allocation formula specified by Bourley (1964) and expressed in equation 2

$$nh = \frac{n \cdot Nh}{N} \dots\dots\dots 2$$

Where,

nh = Sample size per each local government

Nh = Total number of employees in each local government

N = Total population size = 17,676

n = Sample of the population used for the study = 375

Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics of mean (\bar{X}) and standard deviations were used to answer the research questions. The cut-off mark of 2.50 was used for decision making for each item on the instrument. Any item with a mean of 2.50 and above was considered as having significant effect on productivity while anyone below 2.50 was considered

as having no significant effect on productivity. The hypothesis of the study was tested using Chi-square (χ^2) test of independence at 0.05 level of significance. The Chi-square test of independence is a non parametric tool designed to analyse group differences when the variables are measured in nominal terms as it is in this study. The general formula of the Chi-square is stated as;

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

Where χ^2 is the value of the calculated chi-square is, O is the observed value and E is the expected value.

Analysis of Result

Data was generated from the following questions to test the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between productivity and personality of leaders in the Local Government System in Benue State.

<u>Effects of Personality on Productivity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Absolutely	147
To a great extent	84
To some extent	105
Not at all	<u>27</u>
	<u>363</u>
<u>Effects of leaders' action and behaviour on employees productivity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
Yes	127
No	139
Sometimes	<u>97</u>
	<u>363</u>

These data were combined to form the contingency Table (Table 1)

Table 1: Contingency Table Based on Responses of Respondents to the questions above

Effects Personality on productivity	Effects of Leaders' actions and behaviour on Productivity			
	Yes	No	Sometimes	Not at all
Absolutely	127(111.04)	20(23.40)	0(39.28)	147
To a great extent	0(29.39)	84(83.50)	0(22.45)	84
To some Extent	0(36.74)	35(0.68)	70(62.69)	105
Not at all	0(9.45)	0(10.34)	27(54.32)	27
Total	127	139	97	363

The expected frequencies are calculated using the formula:

$$E_{ij} = \frac{n_i \times n_j}{N}$$

Where E_{ij} is the expected frequency for the cell in the i th row and the j th column

n_i is the total number of subjects in the i th row

n_j is the total number of subjects in the j th column and

N is the total number subjects in the whole table

$$E(\text{Absolutely and yes}) = \frac{127 \times 147}{363} = 51.43$$

$$E(\text{Absolutely and No}) = \frac{139 \times 147}{363} = 56.29$$

$$E(\text{Absolutely and sometimes}) = \frac{97 \times 147}{363} = 39.28$$

$$E(\text{To a greater extent and yes}) = \frac{127 \times 84}{363} = 29.39$$

$$E(\text{To a greater extent and No}) = \frac{139 \times 84}{363} = 32.17$$

$$E(\text{To a greater extent and sometimes}) = \frac{97 \times 84}{363} = 22.45$$

$$E(\text{To some extent and yes}) = \frac{127 \times 105}{363} = 36.74$$

$$E(\text{To some extent and No}) = \frac{139 \times 105}{363} = 40.21$$

$$E(\text{To some extent and sometimes}) = \frac{97 \times 105}{363} = 28.06$$

$$E(\text{Not at all and yes}) = \frac{127 \times 27}{363} = 9.45$$

$$E(\text{Not at all and No}) = \frac{139 \times 27}{363} = 10.34$$

$$E(\text{Not at all and sometimes}) = \frac{97 \times 27}{363} = 7.21$$

$$\text{Thus } \chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{(o_{ij} - e_{ij})^2}{e_{ij}} =$$

$$\frac{(127-51.43)^2}{51.43} + \frac{(20-56.29)^2}{56.29} + \frac{(0-39.28)^2}{39.28} + \frac{(0-29.39)^2}{29.39} + \frac{(84-32.17)^2}{32.17} + \frac{(0-22.45)^2}{22.45}$$

$$+ \frac{(0-36.74)^2}{36.74} + \frac{(35-40.21)^2}{40.21} + \frac{(70-28.06)^2}{28.06} + \frac{(0-9.45)^2}{9.45} + \frac{(0-10.34)^2}{10.34} + \frac{(27-7.21)^2}{7.21}$$

$$= 483.3$$

Using $df = (C - 1)(R - 1)$
 $(3 - 1)(4 - 1)$
 $2 \times 3 = 6$

Or

Table 2: Chi-Square Calculation on the Effect of Personality of leaders on Productivity in the Local Government System

<i>Foi</i>	<i>Fei</i>	<i>Foi - Fei</i>	$(Foi - Fei)^2$	$\frac{(Foi - Fei)^2}{Fei}$
127	51.43	75.57	5710.825	111.040733
20	56.29	-36.29	1316.964	23.39605791
0	39.28	-39.28	1542.918	39.28
0	29.39	-29.39	863.7721	29.39
84	32.17	51.83	2686.349	83.50478396
0	22.45	-22.45	504.0025	22.45
0	36.74	-36.74	1349.828	36.74
35	40.21	-5.21	27.1441	0.675058443
70	28.06	41.94	1758.964	62.68580185
0	9.45	-9.45	89.3025	9.45
0	10.34	-10.34	106.9156	10.34
27	7.21	19.79	391.6441	54.31957004
Total				483.2720052

Source: Author's computation

χ^2 critical at 5% confidence level and degree of freedom of 6 = 12.59

(See Appendix 'A' for detailed analysis)

Decision

Since χ^2 calculated (483.3) is greater than χ^2 critical at 5% confidence level (12.59), the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis which states that 'There is significant relationship between productivity and personality of leaders in the Local Government System in Benue State' is accepted. This means that personality of leaders is a significant determinant of productivity in the Local Government System in Benue State. This is in agreement with the general saying that leaders are the image makers of their organizations. The implication is that, for productivity in the Local Government to be enhanced, the personality of leaders should be taken seriously. The finding entails that for effective productivity in the local government system in Benue State, the leaders need to have conceptual skills which will enable them to be imaginative and creative. The finding also implies that leaders should have good interpersonal skills which help them to interact well with the employees, the host community and the general public towards enhancing productivity in the system. Similarly, the social and emotional intelligence of the leaders is important in leading other employees to achieve higher productivity in the local government system.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The study investigated the effect of personality of leaders on employee productivity in the Benue State Local Government System. The study made use of the chi-square technique and found out that, personality of leaders have positive and significant relationship with employees productivity in the Benue State local government system. The study therefore recommended that leaders in the local government system should be people of high personality, proven integrity and well respected so as to encourage employees and enhance employees'

productivity.

References

- Akintola, O. (2011). Home, School Leadership and Staff. *Journal of Community and applied Social Psychology* 2, 43-49.
- Ashton, M. C., Lee, K., & Paunonen, S. V. (1999). What is the central feature of extraversion?: Social attention versus reward sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 245–251.
- Bass, B.M. & Bass, R. (2009). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Application*. 4th edition, New York: Free Press
- Becker, B. & Gerhart, B. (1996). The Impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. *Academic Manager* 39(4), 778-801
- Becker, T.E. & Billings, R.S. (1993). Profiles of Commitment: An empirical test. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 14(2), 177-190.
- Bentein, K., Stinghamber, F. & Vandenberghe, C. (2002). Organisation, Supervisor and workshop directed commitments and citizenship behaviors. *Journal work of organizational psychology* 11(3), 341-362.
- Block, J. (1995) A contrarian view of the five-factor approach to personality description. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117,187–215.
- BNSG. (2007). Benue State Government of Nigeria Gazette on Local Government
- Cheng, B.S., Jian, D. Y. & Riley, J.H. (2003). Organizational Commitment, supervising commitment and employee outcomes in Chinese context. Global hypotheses? *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*. 24(3), 334.
- Cook, M. J. (1998). Quality improvement through organizational development. *Total Quality Management* 9(4), 35-57.
- Copeman, G. H. (1971). *The Chief Executive and Business Growth: A Comparative study in the United States*. Leviathan House. Britain & Germany.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor (NEO-FFI) Inventory Professional Manual. Odessa, FL: PAR
- Costa, P.T. & McCrae, R.R. (1997). Personality in adulthood: A six-year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 853-863.
- Digman, J.M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *Journal of Personality*, 57, 195-214.
- Ene, O.C. (2008). Improving productivity in Nigerian Universities. *The Nigerian Journal of Development Studies*. 6(2),17-24.
- Fiedler, F.E and Garcia N.K.. (1967). Style of leadership and performance of coaching groups. *ZeitschriftfurExperimentelleUnAngewandte Psychologies*, 14(2), 200-217
- Gillen, D.J. & Carroll, S.J. (1985). Relationship of Managerial ability to Unit effectiveness in more organic versus more mechanistic department: *Journal of Management Studies*. 22(6), 676.
- Graziano, W. G., & Eisenberg, N. H. (1997). Agreeableness: A dimension of personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 795–824). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Graziano, W. G., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Hair, E. C. (1996). Perceiving interpersonal conflict and reacting to it: The case for agreeableness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 820–835.
- Gregersen, H.B. (1993). Multiple Commitment at work and extra role behavior during three stage of organizational tenure. *Journal of Business Resources*, 26, 31-47.
- Hackett, R. D., Lapierre, L. M. & Houaedof, P.A. (2001). Understanding the links between works commitment construct. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58 (3), 392-413.
- Haq, S. (2011). Ethics and Leadership skills in the Public Service. *Procedia social behavioural science*, 15, 2792-2796.
- Hartzell, C. (2011). Implementing legacy-C algorithms in FPGA Co-Processor for Performance accelerated smart payloads space science 59(14), 1758-1768.
- Hejka-Ekins, A. (2001). Ethics in In-Service Training Public Administration Policy 86, 79-104
- Hough, L. (1992). The “Big Five” personality variables—construct confusion: Description versus prediction. *Human Performance*, 5, 139–155.
- Humphrey, R.H. (2002). The many faces of emotional leadership. *Leadership Quarterly* 13(5), 493-504.
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In E. Pervin & O. John (Eds.), *Handbook of personality* (pp. 102–138). New York: Guilford Press.
- Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of*

Applied Psychology, 85, 751–765

- Katz, R.L. (1974). *Skills of an Effective Administrator*. Boston, Harvard Business School Press.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1980). *Foundation of Behavioral Research*. 4th edition, Belmont: Cengage learning.
- Lewis, C.W. & Gilman S.C. (2005). *A Problem Solving Guide*, San Francisco
- Mahoney, T.A., Jerdee, T.H. & Carroll, S.J. (1963). *Development of Managerial Performance: A research approach*. South-Western.
- Mahoney, T.A., Jerdee, T.H. & Carroll, S.J. (1965). The Jobs of Management. *Industrial Relations*, 4, 97-110.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). *Commitment in Workplace: Theory, Research and Application*. Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications, Inc
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). *The Nature of Managerial work*, New York, Harper and Row Publishers.
- Mkoji, D., & Sikalieh, D. (2012). The Influence of Personality Dimensions on Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2-17 184, 194.
- Mumford, M.D., Marks, M.A., Connelly, S.J & Zaccaro, S.J. (2000). Development of Leadership Skills: *Experience and timing Leadership Quarterly* 11(1), 87-114.
- Northouse, P. G. (1997). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Nwachukwu, C.C. (2002). *Management Theory and Practice*. Nigeria. African first publishing Ltd.
- Ocholi, S.A. (2007). *The Impact of Culture on Organizational Leadership in selected Companies in North Central Zone of Nigeria*. Department of Business Administration, University of Jos, Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis.
- Oloko, O. (1997). *Incentives and Rewards for Efforts*, Lagos: Mana Press.
- Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2006). Personality and the Prediction of Consequential Outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology* , 57, 401-421.
- Thierauf, R.J. Klekamp, R.C. & Geeding, D.W. (1977). *Management Principles and Practices: A Contingency and Questionnaire Approach*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Wamako, A. M. (2015). Leadership, Thursday August 20, P.38.
- Wasti, S.A. & Can, O. (2008). Affective and normative commitment to organization supervisor and coworkers: Do collectivist values matter? *Journal of vocational behavior* 73(3), 404-413.
- Weick, K.E. (1995). *Sense Making in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks SAGE Publication Inc.
- Yukl, G. (2001). *Leadership in Organisation*. 4th edition, New Jersey, Prentice Hall Inc.
- Yukl, G. (2002). *Leadership in Organisation*. 5th edition, New York, Pearson Education Publishers.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in Organisation*. 6th edition, New Jersey, Prentice Hall Inc.