The Practice of Leadership Types in Some Selected Cities in Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia:

By: BekeleShibru (PhD)
Arsi University College of Business and Economics Department of Management, Asella, Ethiopia

Abstract

The main objective of this studywas to identify the types of leadership in Oromia Arsi and East shewa zone selected urban cities. The study followed a surveyand focus group discussion. The data were collected from four selected cities i.e. Adama, Asella, Batu, and Shashemenne. Analyses weremade based on primary data generated through structured questionnaire for leadership types. Focus group discussion was also conducted with selected informant groups. Descriptive analyses were specified to identify the current practice of leadership types. Further to explore the significant differences in leadership types among the selected cities,Kruskal-Wallis test was employed. The focus group discussion data were subject to thematic analyses and triangulated with the findings from survey analyses. The investigation revealed that the leadership types within the city administration mainly tend to ideological and pragmatic with low level of charismatic.Among others, the finding for leadership type showed that ideological leadership type dominates the city administration. A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in Charismatic, ideological and pragmatic leadership types within the city administration.

Keywords: Leadership types, Charismatic, Ideological and Pragmatic

Introduction

2.1 Leadership Types

Leadership types can be identified by the focus of leading approach that based on future orientation, past or current situation. In this regard, Mumfored, Strange, and Bedell (2006) reviewed charismatic type of leader in which leader articulate passionate vision of the future; ideological where leader appeals to the virtues of the past rather than the future and pragmatic mainly focused on an in-depth understanding of the social system at present situation. Similarly, Bass (1985) coined charismatic leadership, Strange & Mumford(2002) ideological leadership,Mumford, & Van Doorn, (2001) pragmatic leadership identified as outstanding leadership types.

Previous studies of leadership mainly focused on the identification of behavior that attribute to successful leadership. On the other side, Gronn, (2002) stated that the emerging studies contributions to leadership theory shiftedto recognizing leadership as a holistic means-making process which isdynamic and complex.

2.1.1 Charismatic leadership

Interpersonal attractiveness and communication skillsare considered as the key role to Charismatic leaders to impact their followers. First, vision appearsto provide followers, and the group as a whole, with a sense of personalmeaning that both explains events and helps establish a sense of identity(Meindl, 1990; Shamir et al., 1993). Second, visioning involves articulation ofemotionally evocative images that not only motivates followers but also allowsfollowers to create a shared experience and a shared future (Klein & House,1998). Third, vision, as a positive image of the future, suggests a path that willallow resolution of current social problems and tensions.Fourth, as followers apply a vision they will begin to make decisions in a mannerconsistent with the vision, resulting in the institutionalization of the visionthrough norms, culture, and standard operating procedures. Mumford et al. (2008) acknowledged that charismatic leaders were more likely than ideological and pragmatic leaders.

They found that visioning and expressive communicationhad a positive effect on follower performance by leading followers toevidence higher self-efficacy and set more difficult goals

2.1.2 Ideological leadership

Ideological leaders, in contrast to charismatic leaders, however, do not articulate a vision of the future. Ideological leaders instead articulate a vision, again an emotionally evocative vision that appeals to the virtues of the past rather than the future. For ideological leaders, this vision is framed in terms of the values and standards that must be maintained in order to build a just society (Strange and Mumford's, 2002).

In Strange and Mumford's (2002) view, ideological leadership, like charismaticleadership, represents a form of vision-based leadership. Ideological leaders,in contrast to charismatic leaders, however, do not articulate a vision of thefuture. Ideological leaders instead articulate a vision, again an emotionally evocativevision, which appeals to the virtues of the past rather than the future. Forideological leaders, this vision is framed in terms of the values and standardsthat must be maintained in order to build a just society.Content coding was conducted using the information presented in each chapterby applying a behavioral observation approach. In this approach, judge et al. (2009) wereasked to review the leader behaviors presented in each chapter and indicatewhether they reflected one of 30 charismatic behaviors (e.g., the leader acted accordingto a vision that specifies a better future) or 29 ideological behaviors (e.g.,the leader has a limited set of extreme, consistent, strongly held beliefs).

2.1.3 Pragmatic leadership

Pragmatic leaders influence through an in-depth understanding of the social system at present and the causal variables that shape system operations. Pragmatic leaders use problem-solving strategies that are necessary to resolve current issues (Mumford & Van Doorn,2001). Pragmatic leaders are concerned with present situation and stress neither goals nor causes in the formation of their mental modes. These leaders are much more interested in scanning their environment and gathering information than relying on vision-based or past oriented communication. Pragmatic leaders use influence tactics which are rational persuasion over inspirational appeals (Mumford et al., 2006; Yukl, 2012). Further, pragmatic leaders practice facts, evidence, and logical analysis as a means of communicating with others, rather than highlighting positive or negative elements of the past or future (Mumfordet al., 2006)

Statement of the Problem

Leadership types can be identified as charismatic, ideological and pragmatic. Within the context of outstanding leadership emerged from charismatic, ideological and pragmatic (Mumford, 2006, Mumford et al. 2008). Charismatic leaders apply influence and maintain control through compelling vision of the future permitting followers the freedom to act on causes that will bring goal attainment (Ibid). Ideological leaders apply perspective mental models that emphasize goals based on the past leaders personal experience (Ibid). Pragmatic on the other hand do not articulate a vision for their followers. Rather pragmatic leaders focus on current issues and exert their influence through an in-depth understanding and sensitivity to the social system and the causal variables operating (Momford, and Van Droon, 2001).

A study conducted in Southwest University, Texas on 247 undergraduates found mean value that Charismatic 2.67, ideological 2.44 and pragmatic 1.9 Hunter et al. (2009). The combination of outstanding leadership types that consider the past, the present and the future situation in proper balance are paramount important. To the best of the researcher knowledge, these outstanding leadership types practice didn't investigated in Ethiopian context. Therefore, this study tried to investigate the Practice of Leadership Types in Some Selected Cities in Oromia Regional State, Ethiopia.

Research Question

Which types of leadership exercised in the selected city administration?

Is there significant difference among leadership types within the city Administration?

Objectives of the study

To identify types of leadership exercised in the selected city administration?

To investigate the significant difference among leadership types within the city administration

Scope of the study

This study didn't include all types of leadership styles. It focused on the outstanding leadership types (charismatic, ideological and pragmatic) that focus on future, past and the present respectively. Geographically it was limited to some selected four cities within Oromia Regional state, Ethiopia.

Significance of the study

The identification of future oriented leader (charismatic), present oriented (pragmatic) and past oriented (ideological) will benefit urban governance and the government to take a step to

keep the proper balance. The finding of this study has contribution in disclosing the current practice of the leadership types where upcoming researchers may use it as reference to make further studies in the area. It may also serve the community from the improved leadership types.

Research Methodology

Description of research methodology contains the methods and procedures that will help to identify the research design, population and sample, instruments for data collection, and tools for data analysis. This section also addresses the validity and reliability of instruments used. Basically, the existing challenges that as perceived as critical bottlenecks to exercise good governance and the alternative mitigating strategies will be addressed.

3.1 Research Design

The research design for this study takes descriptive and explanatory approaches. Descriptive studies are primarily concerned with the actual facts reflected at present time and seek to describe both the commendable and the dysfunctional practices in the context of the pursuit of the features, indicators, qualities and attributes of good governance (i.e., accountability, transparency, participation, responsiveness, control of corruption, efficiency and effectiveness, equitable and inclusive and consensus orientation) in the selected cities.

3.2 Population and Sample

The participants for this study were employees of the four cities (i.e., Adama, Batu, Shashemenne and Asella). A total of 6601 employees are considered in the study. For the sample size selection,Krejcie, & Morgan. (1970)sample size determination table was used.

Table 3.1 Sample selection and summary of valid respondents

City	Population	Sample	Distributed	Collected	Valid
Adama	1916	125	115	101	94
Asella	1814	125	112	103	95
Batu	1063	110	106	97	91
Shashemene	1808	125	109	98	92
Sum	6601	485	442	399	372

Source; Respective city administration

Respondents were randomly selected from the stratified sub-groupsin each city administration for the survey and purposefully selected for focus group discussion based on respondents' access to the information. The performance revealed that 91 % of the questionnaire were distributed to the respondents as shown in table X. 82% of the collected questionnaire were collected. About 77% of the questionnaire were found valid for the analysis and entered to SPSS version 20

3.3 Instrument

Questionnaire and focus group discussion

The survey instruments for leadership type and good governance are questionnaires, which have been formulated, reviewed and piloted using 20 similar respondents. As a basis for this study, extant and standardized questionnaires was used and adapted as necessary. The questionnaires supported for measuring each factors of leadership types. Municipal Report Cards, and the City administration Index (UGI) were used to measure progress in achieving good city administration. The existing questionnaire were developed by previous researchers and enriched from subsequent analyses of literature review. Besides, opinion from subject matter expert was administered, analyzed and developed. Some qualitative questions were included to reflect the situational or contextual difference within the city administrations.

3.4 Data Analysis

As the primary objective of this study was to investigate the leadership types and good governance challenges facing Oromiaincity administration both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. For statistical analysis, SPSS version 20 was used. Descriptive statistics such as mean, standard deviation and frequency were used to identify the current practice of leadership types. Inferential statistics Kruskal-Wallis test was used to test the leadership types difference among the cities. Besides, mitigating strategies wererecommendedfromsurvey and qualitative analysis to generate local solutions.

3.5 Reliability and Validity

Reliability

To test the reliability of each factor of independent and dependent variable cronbachalfa test was used. Table 3.1 depicted that the reliability test for leadership types and elements of good- governance. The internal consistency test for Charismatic and pragmatic leadership

types and accountability element of good governance found ($\alpha > 0.9$) excellent while the remaining Ideological leadership type and other elements of good governance are within the range ofacceptable α value between 0.7 to 0.86 which is good to use the factors.

Table 3.2: Reliability test for leadership types

No	Leadership Types	Cronbach's Alpha	No of Items
1	Charismatic	.907	9
2	Ideological	.720	7
3	Pragmatic	.901	6

Source: Computed from survey data 2019

Validity

Thedata collection instrument was confirmed for the various types of validity. The instrumentwas pilot tested before the actual data collection using participant similar to the actual respondents. Besides, subject matter experts were involved in testing the instrument for relevance, clarity, simplicity and ambiguity of words and concepts. Based on the input received from subject matter experts and pilot test, necessary adjustments were made to the item before the actual data collection.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

Respondents were informed the purpose of the study before they had deal with the questions. Theywere informed to withdraw at any time they fill not to continue. Respondents also clarified that the ideas taken from them are considered confidential and used only for research purpose. Hence, findings from the respondents were reported at institutional level.

3.9 Limitations

The study is limited to only four capital cities in east Shewa and Arsi zone. As the research mainly focus on UNDP recognized factors, comprehensive and exhaustive factors associated with good governance were not included. These delimitations and the choice of four cities provide more feasibility but also add some limitations to this study and any unconditioned generalization to all cities in Oromia may not be possible. In addition the articles on the three outstanding leadership types are limited in number and older in duration.

4.2 Leadership types across cities

4.2.1 Charismatic Leadership

The study of leadership types may not only help to understand the nature of leadership; but also hope that the understanding of leadership leads to make interventions that enhance leader performance. Table 4.5 presents the leadership types result obtained using descriptive statistics. Charismatic leadership was measured with 9 items with cronbach's α value .907. In Adama city the reflection of 94 valid respondents were summarized in table 4.5. In this regard, 37.7% of the valid respondent believe that charismatic leadership type was not exercised or at minimal level. 44.1% showed their agreement that there is practice of charismatic leadership type within the city administration. As it can be seen on annex m, the leaders articulating a passionate vision of the future in Adama city is relatively better (55.3%) as compared with the remaining factors of charismatic leadership. The focus group discussion participants believe that there is no practice of charismatic leadership where this can be traced by absence articulating compelling vision to city.

In Asella city, majority of the respondents 50.3% (see table 4.5) showed their disagreement for implementation of charismatic leadership at city administration level. While 32.2% of the respondents believe that there is a practice of charismatic leadership type in the city administration. Analysis of each factors of charismatic leadership presented that 60% of the respondents disagree or strongly disagree that the leader articulate a passionate vision of a future (see Annex 1). The focus group discussion made with seven participants showed consistent agreement with the main survey result.

The investigation in Batu city exhibited that majority of the respondents 54% (see table 4.5) disagreed the implementation of charismatic leadership in the city administration. About 30% of the respondents believe that there is practice of charismatic leadership style in the city administration. Almost all factors of charismatic leadership were identified within disagreement category. The factor of charismatic leadership that address "leader shows inspirational communication to followers" was rated disagreement for its implementation within the city administration by 60.5% (see Annex 1) of the respondents. This survey findings was supported with FGD result that agreed absence of charismatic leadership type with in their city administration.

The survey at Shashemene city revealed that majority of the respondents 60.1% (see table 4.5) disagreed the city administration practice of charismatic leadership type. It was observed that nearly quarter of the respondents support the existence of charismatic leadership type. All factors of charismatic leadership were rated disagreement by more than 52% of the respondent. Among the factors of charismatic leadership types, the factor that rated highest disagreement is "The leader rewards high performance." (see Annex 1). The FGD result was

consistent with the main survey findings where vision is not articulated and communicated to the public.

4.2.2 Ideological Leadership

Ideological leadership that mainly focused on past orientation was measured with descriptive statistics. In Adama city majority of the respondents 52.3% perceive that ideological leadership practice observed. 29% disagree the practice of ideological leadership type within the city administration. Nearly all factors of ideological leadership were supported by majority of the respondent. Apart from the other, "The leaders leading approach is based on past situation" was supported by 55.5% (see Annex 2). The presence of ideological leadership type that main focus on restoring past practices was supported by FGD participants within the selected cities

Similarly, the descriptive analysis forAsella city showed 65.7% of the respondents agreed that there is practice of ideological leadership type within the city administration. Only 19.7% disagreed the practice of Ideological leadership type in the city. Among the items within ideological leadership, "Visions are based on restoring past glory in society" was supported by 72.2% (see Annex 2).

The descriptive analysis for the presence of ideological leadership type in Batu town presented 64% support. On the other side 22.3% of the respondents disagreed the practice of ideological leadership type within the city administration. As it can be seen in Annex 2 all items within ideological leadership type supported by majority of the respondents.

Table 4.5 presents the descriptive analysis for ideological leadership type exhibited 68.7% support for the practice within Shashemenecity administration. On the other side nearly quarter of the respondent 23.8% disagreed its exercise within their administration. All elements of ideological leadership were supported by majority of the respondents. Among the factors of ideological leadership, "Visions are based on restoring past glory in society" found highest with 76% agree and strongly agree.

4.2.3 Pragmatic Leadership

Pragmatic leadership type was analysed using descriptive statistics to see its perception level implementation within the city administration. In Adama city pragmatic leadership was supported with 44.1% and disagreed 35.1%. The element of pragmatic leadership "The leaders leading approach is based on current situation" received highest support with 54%

(See Annex 3). The triangulation of survey findings with FGD showed variation where the discussion participants agreed that there is practice of pragmatic leadership type in following the existing situation within the city administration.

The descriptive analysis for pragmatic leadership type presence level perception within Asella city supported with 59.6% whiles the disagreement about quarter of the respondent (25.8%). Among the factors of pragmatic leadership "The leader exerts influence through an in-depth understanding of the social system at present" received highest support with 62.1% (see Annex 3). The survey finding was consistent with the FGD in that pragmatic type leadership practice that focus on current situation is more common.

Likewise the assessment made with descriptive statistics in Batu city showed 40.9% agreement whereas 44.2 % disagreed with the practice of pragmatic leadership within the city administration. More than half of the respondent disagreed for the factor "The leader exerts influence through an in-depth understanding of the social system at present" 51.7% (see Annex 3). The FGD result showed that there leaders mainly focus on current situation that confirm their pragmatic leadership type presence.

The descriptive analysis for pragmatic leadership for Shashemene city revealed that 34.2% supported the practice within the city administration whereas the majority 55.1% disagreed the practice of pragmatic leadership type. Among the factor of pragmatic leadership "Leaders use creative actions that allow them to lead current situations" was the most disagreed. The focus group discussion made with eight participants agreed on the point that the city administration exercise pragmatic leadership type in focusing on existing events.

Table 3.3 Perception of leadership types across cites

Leadership types	Adama n=94			Asella n=95			Batu n=91			Shashemene n=92		
	SD+D	N	A+SA	SD+D	N	A+SA	SD+D	N	A+SA	SD+D	N	A+SA
Charismatic Leadership	37.7%	18.1%	44.1%	50.3%	17.6%	32.2%	54.0%	20.2%	25.9%	60.1%	14.4%	25.5%
Ideological leadership	29.0%	18.7%	52.3%	19.7%	14.5%	65.7%	22.3%	13.7%	64.0%	23.8%	7.5%	68.7%
Pragmatic Leadership	35.1%	20.9%	44.0%	25.8%	14.6%	59.6%	44.2%	15.0%	40.9%	55.1%	10.7%	34.2%

Source: survey result 2018

SD+D = Strongly disagree and Disagree

N = Neutral

A+ SA = Agree + Strongly agree

Is there significant difference among cities in using leadership types?

Since the data distribution do not qualify normality, to see the significant difference among cities for leadership type better tested using Kruskal-Wallis test. Kruskal-Wallis test is used to analyse the differences among group means in a sample. A Kruskal-Wallis H test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in Charismatic Leadership practice with score for the four cities, $\chi 2(3)$ = 16.52, p = 0.001, with a mean rank for Adama 222.28, for Asella 188.23 for Batu 170.59 and Shashemene 163.89. Kruskal-Wallis H test presented that there was a statistically significant difference in ideological Leadership practice with score $\chi 2(3)$ = 11.39, p = 0.010, with a mean rank for Adama 155.96, for Asella 204.78 for Batu 187.80 and Shashemene 197.54. Kruskal-Wallis H test displayed that there was a statistically significant difference in prgamatic Leadership practice with score $\chi 2(3)$ = 19.88, p <.001, with a mean rank for Adama 192.86, for Asella 221.76 for Batu 175.98 and Shashemene 154.00. The Kruskal-Wallis test result showed that the null hypothesis states that the mean leadership type values of three different styles are equal at p<.05,Since p-value = 0.001<0.05 = α, we reject the null hypothesis then, the finding reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the leadership types (pragmatic, ideological and charismatic) have different mean rank.

Table 3.4: kruskal-Wallis test for leadership types difference across cities

Variables	City	Mean	SD	Mean Rank	Ch-Square	df	P value
Charismatic leadership	Adama	2.8	.87	222.28	16.52	3	.001
	Asella			188.23			
	Batu			170.59			
	Shashemene			163.89			
Ideological leadership	Adama	3.45	.64	155.96	11.39	3	.010
	Asella			204.78			
	Batu			187.80			
	Shashemene			197.54			
Pragmatic Leadership	Adama	2.49	.98	192.86	19.88	3	.000
	Asella			221.76			
	Batu			175.98			
	Shashemene			154.00			

Chapter V: Conclusion and Recommendation

Leadership types

5.1 Summary

The survey for leadership types within the selected city administration showed that Ideological, pragmatic and charismatic leadership types are exercised respectively. The ideological leadership that mainly address based on the past situation practiced dominantly within the city administrations. As it can be seen from the KRUSKAL-WALLIS table result, there is significant difference among cities in exercising leadership types.

5.2 Conclusion

The practice of ideological, pragmatic and charismatic leadership types are not in a proper balance. Leaders mainly exercised ideological leadership where this may lack the focus of current situation and the future orientation visionary approach. The KRUSKAL-WALLIS test result showed that the null hypothesis states that the mean leadership type vale values of three different styles are equal at $p<.05$, then, the finding reject the null hypothesis and conclude that the leadership types have different means. This indicate that among the three city administrations, the practice of leadership types evidenced difference that seek the attention concerned body to address the right mix of the three leadership types.

5.3 Recommendation

The leadership that mainly based on ideological type lacks the current and the future situation. The city administrations need to have future oriented, current and in some past situation. The Kruskal-Wallis test showed that there is statistically significant difference among cities studied where this could be alike through mind set up and engagement of stakeholders. As being visionary is the key skill for a leader, the leadership types within those city administrations need to more charismatic, then pragmatic and ideological. As a result, the city administrations need to work on maintaining the right mix of the three leadership types.

Reference

Bass, B. M. (1985).Leadership beyond expectations.New York: Free Press

Bedell, K. E. (2006). The different problem-solving tactics of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders. Unpublished master's thesis,University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests.Psychometrika, 16, 297-334 (28,307

DessalegnRahmato, AkalewoldBantirgu, YosephEndeshaw (2008). A Report Prepared for the Ad Hoc CSO/NGO Task Force, Addis Ababa

Douglas, McG (1960). The Human side of enterprise, New York : McGraw-Hill, 1960

Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE).The Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. August 1995

Hunter, S.T., Bedell-Avers, K.E., & Mumford, M.D. (2009).Impact of situational framing and complexity on charismatic, ideological and pragmatic leaders: Investigationusing a computer simulation.The Leadership Quarterly,20(3), 383–404.

Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., &Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A review and theoretical extension of the leader trait thematic category.The Leadership Quarterly, 20, 855–875.

Klein, K. J., & House, R. J. (1998). On fire: Charismatic leadership and levels of analysis. In F. Dansereau& F.J. Yammarino (Eds.),Leadership: Themultiple level approach(pp. 2−33). Stamford, CT: JAI Press

Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W., (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities.Educational and Psychological Measurement.

Ligon, Hunter T. and Mumford (2008). Development of outstanding leadership: A life narrative approach: The Leadership Quarterly 19, 312–334

Meindl, J.R. (1990). On leadership: An alternative to the conventional wisdom. In B.M. Staw and L.L. Cummings (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior (Vol. 12, pp. 159-203). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Mumford, M. D., & Van Doorn, J. R. (2001). The leadership in pragmatism: Reconsidering Franklin in the age of charisma. Leadership Quarterly, 12, 279−309

Muford, (2002)….

Mumford, M. D., Bedell, K. E., Hunter, S. T., Espejo, J., Eubanks, D., Connelly, M. S. (2008). Violence in ideological and non-ideological groups:A quantitative analysis of qualitative data.Journal of Applied Social Psychology.

Mumford, M.D., Antes, A.L., Caughron, J.J., & Friedrich, T.L. (2008).Charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leadership: Multi-level influences on emergence andperformance.The Leadership Quarterly,19(2), 144−160.

Mumford and Strange, (2006).Pathways to outstanding leadership: A comparative analysis of charismatic, ideological, and pragmatic leaders.Mahwah,NJ: Erlbaum

Qin, Y., & Simon, H. A. (1990). Laboratory replication of scientific discovery processes. Cognitive Science, 14, 281−312.

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. Organization Science, 4(4), 577−594.

© **Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)**

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 34

Strange, J. M., & Mumford, M. D. (2002). The origins of vision: Charismatic versus ideological leadership. Leadership Quarterly, 13, 343−377

Yukl, G. (2012).Leadership in organizations(8th ed.). Prentice, NJ: Prentice Hall

© Association of Academic Researchers and Faculties (AARF)

A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories.

Page | 35