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Abstract

Throughout the years, scientists have produced an overflow of work and information that includes esteem in the field of initiative examination. In spite of the fact that initiative is only an expression that is regularly utilized as a part of discussion and is every now and again depicted by different modifiers, for example, great administration, compelling authority, viable initiative, poor initiative and awful authority. Most researchers have arrived at the conclusion that the idea of administration does not credit to one particular definition. Despite the fact that an absence of amicability keeps on existing around a definite importance for administration, the vast majority of the analysts concur that initiative is an impact relationship between the pioneers and the supporter who have their mutual purposes and the pioneer accomplishes objectives through ceaseless motivation and inspiration of their adherents and there must adopt the leadership styles in to make impact on the faculty members. From the findings of the study we can assume that the respondents didn’t recognize the differences among the styles and so they have lack of knowledge about the leadership styles. The poor information about the leadership styles that for the respondents could not able to recognize the preferred style. The above two conclusions seems that the leaders themselves are not following specific style, so it’s difficult to indicate which style is adopted in management process in math departments

INTRODUCTION

Leadership style is an important aspect in the success of any organization due to its effects on employees’ performance. In a constantly changing social, economic, and technological environment, leadership is a more important attribute of management today than before. Whereas managers are concerned with bringing resources together, developing strategies, organizing and controlling activities to achieve agreed objectives, leadership performs the influencing function
of management. Leadership increases the effectiveness and proficiency of management and sustainable performance (Reed, 2005) and effective management of resources.

(Maicibi, 2005) observes that proper leadership style leads to effective performance in learning institutions. Leadership style in many organizations has been facing different challenges due to its effects on organizations’ performance, department, and teams, as well as work climate and atmosphere. Leaders who want the best results should not rely on a single leadership style (Nampa, 2007).

Clark and Clark (2002) explained that different people require different styles of leadership. For example, a newly hired person requires more supervision than an experienced employee. A person who lacks motivation requires different leadership styles and supervision than one with a high degree of motivation. A leader must have an honest understanding of who his subordinates are, what they know, and what they can do.

Holdford (2003) in his study on “Leadership Theories and Their Lessons for Pharmacists” in Malaysia noted that, autocratic leadership style uses rewards and punishments to influence behaviour. It is a style of leadership where the leader has a task orientation rather than a follower orientation in his or her way of controlling others. Democratic leadership style is one where the leader gives his or her followers a say in decisions that affect their work lives. It generates a sense of ownership by the staff in the pursuit of organizational goals, it nurtures the generation of ideas, and helps build trust and respect.

In Uganda, Nampa (2007) researched on teacher performance in Catholic founded schools in Luwero District and identified that guidance and directing was needed for good performance of teachers. Guidance and directing ensure that everything moves in the right direction and what goes wrong is put right. This can be done through direct observation of how work is being done or through reports from various departments. Therefore, for an institution to achieve better performance, a leader must constantly find out the day-to-day progress of work in order to put right what may be going wrong. The research by Kashagate (2013) on, “Influence of leadership style on teachers’ job satisfaction in Tanzania: the case of public secondary schools in Musoma municipal council” showed a positive correlation between transformational leadership dimensions and teachers’ performance. With regard to transactional leadership dimensions, the
results showed that transactional leadership affects the outcome variable, but their influence was lower as compared to the influence of transformational leadership factors.

Literature Review

Democratic leadership style

Democratic leadership style also referred to as interactive or participatory leadership is characterized by cooperation and collaboration. This leadership style refers to situations where a leader seeks for the opinion of the subordinate before making a decision. In this leadership style the leader seeks opinion of the subordinates on a tentative plan of action and then makes decisions or the leader may ask for group input in formulating plans before making a decision. The style decentralizes power and authority (Okumbe, 1998).

Cole (2005) advocates for the leadership of a head teacher to be democratic combining self-confidence, friendliness, firmness and tact and should not merely consist of issuing orders. The head teacher should be aware of the techniques that work in which situations and those that backfire. Democratic style of leadership practiced by head teachers, proper delegation of duties relieves the school administrators from their many tasks and secondly it inculcates a sense of responsibility, hardworking and commitment among the subordinates which in turn enhances teacher performance.

Lewin et al. (1939) concluded that democratic style of leadership is the most effective, but also pointed that the effectiveness of group leaders is dependent on the criterion which was being used to assess leadership”. Thus, if leadership is assessed in terms of productivity, then autocratic style is most efficient but if the role is seen as maintaining good morale and a steady level of work, democratic style is effective. Absence of leadership style brings about lack of direction from the leader resulting in low morale and lack of interest in the work.

Nzuve (2005) argued that a democratic leader is one who obtains ideas and opinions from workers. He gives them a chance to express their feelings about how things should be done. The manager considers the ideas and opinions of workers and he still makes the final decision. The head teacher allows staff to participate in decision-making within the framework of the mission and objectives of the school.
Democratic leaders show consideration and concern for others by empathetic listening and understanding. They foster open communication among all employees at all levels. Reasons and circumstances pertaining to decisions that affect the employees, department, or organization are shared in a timely fashion. The democratic or enlightened leader practices employee involvement in considering important issues and exercises influence in reaching Aung and Masare 44 consensual decisions (Northouse, 2006).

Democratic style of leadership means that leaders work together with others, including discussing matters with the teachers before taking decisions. “Leadership is distributed among the teachers. This helps to create a co-operative atmosphere in the schools. Schools become more democratic through the practice of participative decision making and actions. Leadership requires participation from everyone so that all members are engaged in creating a meaning and acting on that meaning (Harris, 2002).

**Laissez-faire leadership**

The laissez-faire leadership style is also known as the hands-off style. It is one in which the manager provides little or no direction and gives employees as much freedom as possible. Basically, this style looks simple and easy-going between leaders and subordinates. Leaders who adopt the laissez-faire leadership style exercise little control over the followers and let the followers have freedom to carry out their assigned tasks without direct supervision (Wu and Shiu, 2009).

According to Mbiti (2007), laissez-faire leadership style refers to style as a free-reign style where the leader doesn’t lead but leaves the group entirely to itself. Such a leader allows maximum freedom to subjects. They are given a free hand in deciding their own policies and methods”. The leaders who use this style of leadership believe that there should be no rules and regulations since everybody has inborn sense of responsibility.

Laissez-faire leadership style is not suited for use by head teachers because complete delegation without follow-up mechanisms creates performance problems. “Teachers and students are motivated when they are afforded opportunities to make their own decisions. The acceptance of their opinions and ideas, together with the monitoring of their performance by head teachers is a healthy way of enhancing discipline in secondary schools (Wu and Shiu, 2009).
In laissez-faire leadership, the head teacher believes that there should be no rules and regulations since everyone has a sense of responsibility (Pont et al., 2008). A laissez-faire schools environment may be more creative and fulfilling for those involved in school management system. The extent to which a head teacher succeeds in attaining the school objectives, mission, vision and philosophy depends on how he or she uses suitable management styles to a specific school contextual environment.

**Authoritarian leadership**

Wu and Shiu (2009) explained that, Authoritarian leadership is gained through punishment, threat, demands, orders, rules, and regulations. The functions of authoritarian leadership include unilateral rule-making, task-assignment, and problem solving while the roles of authoritarian followers include adhering to the leader's instructions without question or comment. Authoritarian leadership is appropriate in settings with a constant stream of new employees, limited decision-making time or resources, and the need for large-scale coordination with other groups and organizations.

Authoritarian leaders receive aggressive or apathetic behavior from their subordinates. Productivity is slightly higher under the authoritarian leader than under the democratic one. However, it is the lowest under the laissezfaire leader’s supervision” (Lunenburg and Ornstein, 2012).

In authoritarian leadership, the leaders make most or all of the decisions, without the involvement or input of the employees. Authoritarian leaders inform their subordinates on what must be done, how it should be done and when it must be completed. This kind of leader is likely to ignore suggestions made by staff members. Where quick decision making is a key factor, this particular leadership style might work well because there might not be any time to consult with staff for their involvement anyway.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

The investigation of administration has been an essential and focal piece of the writing on administration and association conduct for a very long while. In fact, no other part in associations has gotten more enthusiasm than that of the pioneer (Schwandt and Marquardt, 2000). The idea of initiative has been concentrated on since ages going back to the seasons of
Throughout the years, scientists have produced an overflow of work and information that includes esteem in the field of initiative examination. In spite of the fact that initiative is only an expression that is regularly utilized as a part of discussion and is every now and again depicted by different modifiers, for example, great administration, compelling authority, viable initiative, poor initiative and awful authority. Most researchers have arrived at the conclusion that the idea of administration does not credit to one particular definition. Despite the fact that an absence of amicability keeps on existing around a definite importance for administration, the vast majority of the analysts concur that initiative is an impact relationship between the pioneers and the supporter who have their mutual purposes and the pioneer accomplishes objectives through ceaseless motivation and inspiration of their adherents. It is imperative to have a superior comprehension of the verifiable evolvement of the idea of a pioneer and the initiative. For the reasons of this study, a dialog of these ideas will be given as they start from conventional initiative speculations of the mid-1900s to the more present day hypotheses of administration.

**Objectives of the study:**

1. To identify the impact of three styles of leadership namely Authoritarian, Democratic, and Laissez-faire on mathematical faculty members teaching activities.
2. To find the preferable styles chosen by the mathematics faculty members.
3. To find out if there is any significant differences among three styles of leadership.
4. To offer some suggestions or recommendations to the further study.

**Research Methodology**

**Research Design**

In this study, a descriptive survey design was employed to investigate the impact on teaching activities of math faculty members. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), descriptive survey helps to obtain information that describes existing phenomena by asking individuals about their perceptions, attitude behavior or values. Descriptive research gives researchers the opportunity to use both quantitative and qualitative data in order to find data and characteristics about the population or phenomenon that is being studied. The data collection for
descriptive research presents a number of advantages as it can provide a very multifaceted approach.

**Data Collection Methods and Procedure**

Questionnaire was chosen as data collection instrument. The questionnaire included variety of question on leadership styles and Teaching activities. The data was collected from math faculty members from four universities in Erbil city (Tesik, LFU, Chihan, Salahadeen) the following table illustrates the details of study’s sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teshik</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ifu</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chihan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salahdeen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before data collection, a Pilot Study was conducted this in order to reveal the weaknesses, if any, of the questionnaire.

**Data Analysis Technique**

Data was presented in frequency distribution tables. Then Pearson’s product moment correlation was used to determine the relationship between independent and dependent variables. The independent variables included Independent variables which were represented by Democratic, Laissez faire and Authoritarian. Dependent variable were Teaching activities. Validity and reliability and consistency were checked. The following scale of interpretation was used to interpret results: Strongly Disagree (SD-1), Disagree (D-2), Neutral (N-3), Agree (A-4) and Strongly Agree (SA-5).

**Findings**

I. The findings show that the mean of the impact of the overall three styles of leadership i.e. Authoritarian, Democratic, and Laissez-faire on mathematical faculty members teaching activities is (2.66) which indicates that the mean of the teaching activities is less than theoretical mean (3), which means that the leadership in general had negative impact upon teaching activates in all studied universities. The following table illustrate the findings related to the overall variables:
Table (1) Descriptive statistics on the overall Variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Authoritarian leadership</th>
<th>Democratic leadership</th>
<th>Laissez- Faire Leadership</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.9811</td>
<td>2.928</td>
<td>2.8864</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.59630</td>
<td>.70929</td>
<td>.62648</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. The findings related to the authoritarian style show that the mean of impact of this style is 2.98 which is less than theoretical mean, this result indicates that this style affects negatively on mathematics faculty members teaching activities due to its traditional norm of management which induces significant gap between the leader and faculty members. The following table illustrate the findings related to this style.

Table (2) Descriptive statistics for Authoritarians Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>question 1</th>
<th>question 4</th>
<th>question 7</th>
<th>question 10</th>
<th>question 13</th>
<th>question 16</th>
<th>Authoritarian leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.9811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>1.140</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>1.276</td>
<td>1.006</td>
<td>.59630</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. The findings related to the Democratic style of leadership show that the mean of impact is 2.928, which is also less than theoretical mean, this result as the previous one indicates that this style affects negatively on mathematics faculty members teaching activities, the result may be due to some deficits in implementation of this style such as un stability of its implementation through mixing the elements of this style with elements of other leadership styles, which as consequences induces some confusions in relationship between the leaders and the subordinates. The following table illustrate the findings related to this style.

Table (3) Descriptive statistics for Democratic Style of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>question 2</th>
<th>question 5</th>
<th>question 8</th>
<th>question 11</th>
<th>question 14</th>
<th>question 17</th>
<th>Democratic leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.9280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>1.272</td>
<td>1.169</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td>1.225</td>
<td>.70929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. The findings related to the Laissez-faire style of leadership show also that the mean of impact of this style is 2.884, which is also less than theoretical mean, this result as the previous two styles indicates that the style affects negatively on mathematics faculty members teaching activities, the result may be also due to the same factor which is mentioned in previous democratic style, the implementation of elements cross the three styles induces confusions and unstable relationships between both sides, the leader and the faculty member, which affect both side activates. The following table illustrate the findings related to this style.

**Table (4) Descriptive statistics for Laissez-faire Style of Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>question 3</th>
<th>question 6</th>
<th>question 9</th>
<th>question 12</th>
<th>question 15</th>
<th>question 18</th>
<th>Laissez-Faire Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.8864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.292</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>.62648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. The findings of ANOVA show that there are no significant differences between groups and within groups among the variables of the study, the significant values for impact of overall styles, Authoritarian, Democratic and Laissez-faire leadership are bigger than .05 respectively (.502, .290, .276, .897) which means that all universities have the same problem of nonconsistency between the leadership styles and mathematics faculty members teaching activities. The following table illustrate the findings related to ANOVA analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total resolution</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>11.373</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.284</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.054</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian leadership</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>1.293</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>13.938</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15.290</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic leadership</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.971</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>19.662</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.633</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez- Faire Leadership</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>16.628</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.876</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. All above findings show that there is no preferable leadership style is chosen by mathematics teaching staff, all three styles had relevantly the same effect on teaching activities.

Conclusions

Throughout the years, scientists have produced an overflow of work and information that includes esteem in the field of initiative examination. In spite of the fact that initiative is only an expression that is regularly utilized as a part of discussion and is every now and again depicted by different modifiers, for example, great administration, compelling authority, viable initiative, poor initiative and awful authority. Most researchers have arrived at the conclusion that the idea of administration does not credit to one particular definition. Despite the fact that an absence of amicability keeps on existing around a definite importance for administration, the vast majority of the analysts concur that initiative is an impact relationship between the pioneers and the supporter who have their mutual purposes and the pioneer accomplishes objectives through ceaseless motivation and inspiration of their adherents and there must adopt the leadership styles in to make impact on the faculty members. From the findings of the study we can assume that the respondents didn’t recognize the differences among the styles and so they have lack of knowledge about the leadership styles. The poor information about the leadership styles that for the respondents could not able to recognize the preferred style. The above two conclusions seems that the leaders themselves are not following specific style, so it’s difficult to indicate which style is adopted in management process in math departments.

Recommendations

1. The university authorities should pay attention in generalizing knowledge through symposium, seminars and conferences related to the requirement of leadership in higher education.

2. University authorities should train the leaders about the process of every specific style and its effects upon motivation of the faculty members through seminars, workshops to the faculty members in adopting the leadership styles.
3. The faculty members should be trained about the leadership styles and its affects upon the performance and motivating in job.
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