



**THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES AND KEY
PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AMONG MANAGERS OF SAPCO SUPPLY CHAIN
STORES**

**AHMAD BEIRANVAND¹, FERESHTEH MOSTAFAVI RAD^{2*}, MAHBOOBEH
CHINAVEH³**

1. Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Arsanjan Branch, Arsanjan Iran

2. Department of Educational & Psychological Science, Sepidan Branch, Islamic Azad University,
Sepidan, Iran

3. Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, Islamic Azad University, Arsanjan Branch,
Arsanjan Iran

*Corresponding Author: Fereshteh Mostafavi Rad; E Mail: f.mostafavvee@iausepidan.ac.ir

ABSTRACT

The present study aimed to explore the relationship between leadership styles and key performance indicators among managers of SAPCO supply chain stores. The research population consists of all 131 managers of five part manufacturing companies, of whom 97 managers were selected by simple random sampling as the respondents in the study. The instruments were Leadership Style Scale and components of key performance indicators. The collected through the questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics (Pearson correlation coefficient and regression analysis). The results showed that task-oriented, human-oriented, and integrative leadership styles are significantly correlated with key performance indicators. Besides, of leadership styles, task-oriented leadership style was able to predict qualitative, financial, and engineering power. Human-oriented leadership style was also able to predict competitiveness and self-sufficiency. It was also noted that integrative leadership style was able to predict supply and export power.

Keywords: Leadership Styles, Task-Oriented Leadership Style, Human-Oriented Leadership Style, Integrative Leadership Style, Supply Chain, Key Performance Indicators

INTRODUCTION

Organizational performance is one the important constructs in organizations which has captured the attention of many executives and organizational and industrial psychologists. A criterion that is able to measure the success of an organization's performance and determine to what extent it has achieved its desired goals is related to statistics and indicators of the organization and since these statistics and indicators actually reflect the degree efficiency and effectiveness of the organizational units, they represent solutions to the existing problems and provide an environment to control and evaluate those activities that are of high significance (Saghaeian Nezhad, 2001).

Given the importance of all of the selected indicators (qualitative power, self-sufficiency power, supply power, financial power, engineering power, competitiveness, and the export power) in the manufacturers' total performance evaluation indicators, each indicator play a significant role in the supply chain of the car part manufactures and thus any possible weakness in each indicator interferes with the supply chain performance. In addition, considering the dramatic and unprecedented changes made in the economy, politics, science and technology, especially in recent decades, management

tasks and functions have grown much broader, complex, and more difficult than before. Good behavior and proper orientation of the manager can lead to improved performance and effectiveness of the organization and facilitate the achievement of optimal performance. Besides, the attainment of organizational goals depends on effective leadership styles (Irtwange, 2002).

Over the past few years, an awareness of the required leadership competencies at the global level has become a necessity so that the leaders who are equipped with these competencies take charge of directing the organization. Today, a majority of organizations need rapid changes to maintain their competitive competition and these rapid changes require that organizations have leaders and employees who are adaptable and work effectively. Effective leaders are those that gain the required results in a given time framework so that they be considered as effective in their role (Barling et al., 2000).

The automotive industry in recent years has gained a significant among different industries, so given the importance of this industry and the lack of literature on the leadership between leadership styles and performance indicators, there is a need for

more studies in this regard. As such, the present study is going to explore performance indicators based on the indicators approved for by SAPCO to assess the performance of manufacturers. The performance indicators will be assessed in terms of seven categories: qualitative performance indicator (return on the production line, the return of the after sales services, the results of the qualitative warning, and the audit score), domestic manufacturing depth indicator or self-sufficiency power (measured as the ratio of currency share to the total value of the produced part), supply power indicator (the financial resources needed to continue financing the current needs [for a 120 day time period]), technical-engineering power indicator (the ability for designing and development, process engineering, technology and the ability to design and validate molds), competitiveness power indicator (the ability to supply parts and assemblies in accordance with the principle of competitiveness), and export power indicator (the ability to operate in foreign markets). Based on what was mentioned the main question addressed in this study is whether leadership styles are able to predict some of the variance in organizational performance key indicators or not.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Lee (2007), studied the relationship between human resource management practices, leadership styles, competitive strategies, and performance indicators used in the steel industry in Taiwan. The results showed that transformational leadership style had a significant effect on the performance. Besides, human resource management practices were correlated with leadership styles. It was also noted that of 6 human resource management practices, only training and development, pay and compensation, and planning had an impact on organizational performance.

Rejas et al., (2006), explored the relationship between leadership styles and organizational effectiveness in small industries and found that certain leadership styles (participatory, supportive, and transformational) affected the effectiveness of the industries under study.

Al-Mailam (2001), studied impact of leadership styles on the performance of public and private hospitals in Kuwait. The results showed that managers and employees at both private and public hospitals believed that transformational leadership style is the best way to achieve high levels of organizational performance.

Mosadegh Rad (2006), conducted a study to assess the relationship between leadership

styles and efficiency of hospital managers at training hospitals in Isfahan. The results showed that participatory management style is the most dominant leadership style used by managers at university hospitals in Isfahan. It was also showed that there is a relationship between management styles and the efficiency of hospitals.

In another study, Arab (2001), examined the influence of organizational structure and management practices on hospital performance indicators to determine appropriate models for improving performance at public hospitals in Iran. The results indicated that the benevolent-autocratic leadership style is the most frequently used style (47.45%) while the participatory leadership style was the least commonly used leadership style (5.86%).

METHODOLOGY

The present study is a descriptive-correlational research. The population under study consisted of all 131 managers at five part manufacturing companies, of whom 97 managers were selected by simple random sampling as the respondents in the study. Then, the questionnaires were distributed among the respondents and of the returned questionnaires, only 85 ones were included in the final analysis and the rest were excluded

because they were not carefully answered or completed.

3.1. Instruments

3.1.1. Likert Leadership Styles Questionnaire

In this study, Renesis Likert (1967), Leadership Styles Questionnaire containing closed items was used. The questionnaire contains some items about age, gender, marital status, education, employment status, job level, organizational position, and 35 closed items related to managers' management styles. The responses to the items were scored using a Likert scale (always, often, sometimes, rarely or never). The scoring was performed in three categories: (1) human-oriented leadership style, (2) integrative leadership style, and (3) task-oriented leadership style. Salzman and Ander Colk (1982) distributed the questionnaire among managers of an organization and reported an acceptable level of validity. Besides, the reliability value of the questionnaire was reported to be 0.86.

3.1.2. Determining key indicators and performance evaluation

An index refers to the use of criteria and principles that express quality characteristics in terms of quantity and make them assessable. To determine the manufacturers'

total performance evaluation indicators, the supply chain management's experiences from the past few years were used as well as comprehensive studies were conducted by experts in the field of key indicators affecting SAPCO and supply chain interactions. In addition, the evaluation systems of the efficiency of supply chain of successful automakers in the world were analyzed. To this end, after extracting indicators, 7 major indicators needed for manufacturers with different weights were measured. To assess each indicator, capacities of each of 7 indicators in terms of abilities, planning, identification of and filling the potential gaps

were assessed using checklists and estimated equations for each applicable indicator for manufacturers of automobile parts. In addition, the weighted average method was employed to rate indicators and their components.

3.1.3. Reliability of the instruments

Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the reliability value of the Likert Leadership Styles Questionnaire and its subscales as shown in Table 1. Besides, the latest results of manufacturers' performance evaluation used by SAPCO in March of 2014 were employed to rate indicators.

Table 1: Reliability of the instruments using Cronbach's alpha

Leadership Styles	Cronbach's alpha coefficients
Human-oriented leadership style	0.74
Task-oriented leadership style	0.68
Integrative leadership style	0.82

RESULTS

Descriptive and inferential statistical methods were used in this study to analyze the collected data. The descriptive statistics included frequency, mean, weighted average, and standard deviation. The inferential statistics used to test the research hypotheses were Pearson correlation and simple and multivariate regression analysis.

4.1. Descriptive statistics

4.1.1. Descriptive characteristics used to measure research variables

Two main variables were used in this study:

- a) Leadership styles (task-oriented style, human-oriented style, and integrative style)
- b) Key performance indicators (qualitative power, self-sufficiency power, supply power, financial power, engineering power, competitiveness, and the export power)

Tables 2 and 3 show means and standard deviations for leadership styles (task-oriented style; human-oriented style and integrative style) and key performance indicators:

Table 2: Means and standard deviations for leadership styles

Leadership styles	Mean	Standard deviation
Task-oriented	60	2.2
Human-oriented	45	3.5
Integrative	52.5	2.7

Table 3: Means and standard deviations for key performance indicators

Key performance indicators	Mean	Standard deviation
Qualitative power	89.8	3.2
self-sufficiency power	56.4	3.1
Supply power	78.2	1.6
Financial power	71	4.3
Engineering power	62.4	3.2
Competitiveness power	89	3
Export power	0.2	2.7

4.2. Inferential statistics

4.2.1. Inferential statistics used to test hypothesis

To test research hypotheses, the zero correlation matrix was first used to rate the research variables as shown in Table 4:

Table 4: correlation matrix (Pearson coefficient) between key performance indicators and leadership styles

Leadership Styles Key Performance Indicators	Task-oriented style	Human-oriented style	Integrative style
Qualitative power	0.74*	0.46	0.58**
self-sufficiency power	0.29	0.80	0.30
Supply power	0.29	0.42	0.70*
Financial power	0.68*	0.34	0.46
Engineering power	0.79**	0.48	0.53
Competitiveness power	0.25	0.84**	0.41
Export power	0.37	0.36	0.69*
Total	0.37	0.34	0.67

* = Significance level of 0.05, ** = Significance level of 0.01

As it can be seen, in the above table, there is a positive significant relationship between the task-oriented leadership style and performance indicators (qualitative power, financial power, and engineering power). In addition, there is a positive significant relationship between human-oriented leadership style and performance indicators (self-sufficiency power and competitiveness power). Finally, there is a positive significant correlation between

integrative leadership style and performance indicators (qualitative power, supply power, export power, and total performance indicator).

Hypothesis 1: Leadership styles (task-oriented style, human-oriented style, and integrative style) are able to predict qualitative power as a performance indicator. To test the above hypothesis, multivariate regression analysis was run so that all variables were entered into the model

altogether. In this model, leadership styles were used as predictors while the qualitative power was used as the predicted variable.

Table 5: Result of multivariate regression analysis

Component	Sum of squares	df	F	Sig.
Regression	12536.11	2	1.15	0.05
Residual	24610.15	83		
Total	37146.26	85		
F = 1.5, P < 0.05, R ² = 0.21				

The above table shows the total significance level of leadership styles in predicting the qualitative power as a performance indicator. As can be seen, leadership styles are able to predict the qualitative power as a

performance indicator. In addition, as the value of the coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.21, it can be suggested that leadership styles can predict only 21% of the qualitative power as a key performance indicator.

Table 6: Regression coefficients

Component	Standard coefficient (Beta)	t-statistic	Sig.
Constant	2.01	22.1	0.01
Task-oriented style	0.28	0.72	0.02
Human-oriented style	0.02	0.43	0.11
Integrative style	0.21	2.1	0.01

As it is shown, of leadership styles, task-oriented leadership style ($\beta = 0.28$) and integrative leadership style ($\beta = 0.21$) are able to predict the qualitative power while human-oriented leadership style has no predictive power to explain the qualitative power as a performance indicator.

integrative style) are able to predict financial power as a performance indicator.

Hypothesis 2: Leadership styles (task-oriented style, human-oriented style, and

To test the above hypothesis, multivariate regression analysis was run so that all variables were entered into the model altogether. In this model, leadership styles were used as predictors while the financial power was used as the predicted variable.

Table 7: Result of multivariate regression analysis

Component	Sum of squares	df	F	Sig.
Regression	11956.26	2	1.08	0.05
Residual	20769.07	83		
Total	32725.31	85		
F = 1.08, P < 0.05, R ² = 0.18				

The above table shows the total significance level of leadership styles in predicting the financial power as a performance indicator.

As it can be seen, leadership styles are able to predict the financial power as a performance indicator. Furthermore, since

the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.18, it can be suggested that leadership styles can predict only 18% of the

financial power as a key performance indicator.

Table 8: Regression coefficients

Component	Standard coefficient (β)	t-statistic	Sig.
Constant	1.98	1.43	0.05
Task-oriented style	0.17	0.86	0.01
Human-oriented style	0.04	0.43	0.056
Integrative style	0.08	0.54	0.060

As it is shown in the above table, of leadership styles, task-oriented leadership style ($\beta = 0.17$) is able to predict the financial power while the other two leadership styles have no power to predict the financial power as a performance indicator.

Hypothesis 3: Leadership styles (task-oriented style, human-oriented style, and integrative style) are able to predict

engineering power as a performance indicator.

To test the above hypothesis, multivariate regression analysis was run so that all variables were entered into the model altogether. In this model, leadership styles were used as predictors while the engineering power was used as the predicted variable.

Table 9: Result of multivariate regression analysis

Component	Sum of squares	df	F	Sig.
Regression	11743.15	2	1.74	0.01
Residual	18963.24	83		
Total	30706.39	85		

$F = 1.74, P < 0.01, R^2 = 0.22$

The above table shows the total significance level of leadership styles in predicting the engineering power as a performance indicator. As it can be seen, leadership styles are able to predict the engineering power as a performance indicator. Furthermore, since

the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.22, it can be suggested that leadership styles can predict only 22% of the engineering power as a key performance indicator.

Table 10: Regression coefficients

Component	Standard coefficient (β)	t-statistic	Sig.
Constant	2.40	1.79	0.05
Task-oriented style	0.20	1.50	0.01
Human-oriented style	0.07	0.38	0.12
Integrative style	0.98	0.68	0.07

As it is shown in the above table, of leadership styles, task-oriented leadership style ($\beta = 0.20$) is able to predict the engineering power while the other two leadership styles have no power in predicting the engineering power as a performance indicator.

Hypothesis 4: Leadership styles (task-oriented style, human-oriented style, and integrative style) are able to predict self-

sufficiency power as a performance indicator.

To test the above hypothesis, multivariate regression analysis was run so that all variables were entered into the model altogether. In this model, leadership styles were used as predictors while the self-sufficiency power was used as the predicted variable.

Table 11: Result of multivariate regression analysis

Component	Sum of squares	df	F	Sig.
Regression	14698.04	2	2.34	0.05
Residual	32034.47	83		
Total	35930.75	85		

$F = 2.34, P < 0.05, R^2 = 0.36$

The above table shows the total significance level of leadership styles in predicting the self-sufficiency power as a performance indicator. As it can be seen, leadership styles are able to predict the engineering power as a performance indicator. Furthermore, since

the value of the coefficient of determination (R^2) is 0.36, it can be suggested that leadership styles can predict only 36% of the self-sufficiency power as a key performance indicator.

Table 12: Regression coefficients

Component	Standard coefficient (β)	t-statistic	Sig.
Constant	5.34	3.11	0.00
Task-oriented style	0.24	0.72	0.02
Human-oriented style	0.32	0.43	0.05
Integrative style	0.61	1.2	0.01

As it is shown in the above table, of leadership styles, integrative leadership style ($\beta = 0.61$) have more power to predict the self-sufficiency power than human-oriented

leadership style and task-oriented leadership style.

Hypothesis 5: Leadership styles (task-oriented style, human-oriented style, and integrative style) are able to predict

competitiveness power as a performance indicator.

To test the above hypothesis, multivariate regression analysis was run so that all variables were entered into the model

altogether. In this model, leadership styles were used as predictors while the competitiveness power was used as the predicted variable.

Table 13: Result of multivariate regression analysis

Component	Sum of squares	df	F	Sig.
Regression	17536.24	2	1.08	0.01
Residual	19847.11	83		
Total	37410.35	85		
F = 1.08, P < 0.05, R ² = 0.18				

The above table presents the total significance level of leadership styles in predicting the competitiveness power as a performance indicator. As it can be seen, leadership styles are able to predict the competitiveness power as a performance

indicator. Furthermore, since the value of the coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.18, it can be suggested that leadership styles can predict only 18% of the competitiveness as a key performance indicator.

Table 14: Regression coefficients

Component	Standard coefficient (β)	t-statistic	Sig.
Constant	1.70	1.18	0.01
Task-oriented style	0.02	0.8	0.054
Human-oriented style	0.15	1.01	0.01
Integrative style	0.05	0.63	0.13

As it is shown in the above table, of leadership styles, human-oriented leadership style (β = 0.20) is able to predict the engineering power while the other two leadership styles have no power in predicting the competitiveness power as a performance indicator.

Hypothesis 6: Leadership styles (task-oriented style, human-oriented style, and

integrative style) are able to predict supply power as a performance indicator.

To test the above hypothesis, multivariate regression analysis was run so that all variables were entered into the model altogether. In this model, leadership styles were used as predictors while the supply power was used as the predicted variable.

Table 15: Result of multivariate regression analysis

Component	Sum of squares	df	F	Sig.
-----------	----------------	----	---	------

Regression	15603.08	2	1.74	0.05
Residual	14540.09	83		
Total	30143.17	85		
F = 1.74, P < 0.05, R ² = 0.11				

The above table presents the total significance level of leadership styles in predicting the supply power as a performance indicator. As it can be seen, leadership styles are able to predict the supply power as a

performance indicator. Furthermore, since the value of the coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.11, it can be suggested that leadership styles can predict only 11% of the supply power as a key performance indicator.

Table 16: Regression coefficients

Component	Standard coefficient (β)	t-statistic	Sig.
Constant	1.41	1.87	0.05
Task-oriented style	0.09	0.41	0.12
Human-oriented style	0.07	0.37	0.054
Integrative style	0.13	1.18	0.01

As it is shown in the above table, of leadership styles, only integrative leadership style (β = 0.13) is able to predict the supply power.

Hypothesis 7: Leadership styles (task-oriented style, human-oriented style, and integrative style) are able to predict export power as a performance indicator.

To test the above hypothesis, multivariate regression analysis was run so that all variables were entered into the model altogether. In this model, leadership styles were used as predictors while the export power was used as the predicted variable.

Table 17: Result of multivariate regression analysis

Component	Sum of squares	df	F	Sig.
Regression	3896.27	2	2.34	0.05
Residual	320347.47	83		
Total	35930.75	85		
F = 1.37, P < 0.01, R ² = 0.17				

The above table shows the total significance level of leadership styles in predicting the export power as a performance indicator. As it can be seen, leadership styles are able to predict the supply power as a performance

indicator. Furthermore, since the value of the coefficient of determination (R²) is 0.17, it can be suggested that leadership styles can predict only 17% of the export power as a key performance indicator.

Table 18: Regression coefficients

Component	Standard coefficient (β)	t-statistic	Sig.
Constant	1.37	1.07	0.05
Task-oriented style	0.24	0.29	0.1
Human-oriented style	0.32	0.11	0.054
Integrative style	0.21	1.5	0.05

As it is shown in the above table, of leadership styles, only integrative leadership style ($\beta = 0.21$) is able to predict the export power.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to determine the relationship between leadership styles (task-oriented, human-oriented, and integrative leadership styles) and key performance indicators (qualitative power, self-sufficiency power, supply power, financial power, engineering power, competitiveness, and the export power). This section presents a discussion of the main findings of the study. The results from the correlation matrix in Table 4 indicated that there is a positive significant relationship between the task-oriented leadership style and performance indicators (qualitative power, financial power, and engineering power). In addition, there is a positive significant relationship between human-oriented leadership style and performance indicators (self-sufficiency power and competitiveness power). Finally, there is a positive significant correlation between integrative leadership style and performance indicators (qualitative power,

supply power, export power, and total performance indicator). These findings are in line with the results of studies conducted by Salehi Sadaghiani (2009), Arab (2006), Seyed Javadi (1384), Oregon et al., (2005), and Al. Mailam (2001) but are contrary to the research conducted by Mosadegh Rad (2006) and Arab (2001). The main research hypothesis indicated that leadership styles (human-oriented, task-oriented, and integrative leadership styles) to be able to predict the performance indicators. It was found that of leadership styles, task-oriented leadership style was able to predict the qualitative power ($\beta = 0.28$), the financial power ($\beta = 0.17$), and engineering power ($\beta = 0.20$). Accordingly, it can be suggested that the task-based leadership style is applied to affairs that are associated with issues such as technological coordination, control, and engineering as supported by Rezaian (2008) is aligned. In SAPCO, the qualitative power of manufacturers is measured using two approaches, i.e. measuring the engineering quality and qualitative performance. Besides, the qualitative power score is obtained by calculating the mean

scores of these two factors. The financial power is also measured based on specific criteria set by the SAPCO Financial Deputy and experiences from the previous years. As it is shown in tables 14 and 18, of leadership styles, only human-oriented leadership style was able to predict self-sufficiency power ($\beta = 0.32$) and competitiveness power ($\beta = 0.15$). At present, the manufacturers' competitive power is measured by price competitiveness. A comparison of manufacturers' ceiling price with the target price by SAPCO shows the competitive power of the company. Iran Khodro as the biggest carmaker in the Middle East is facing competitive conditions. Therefore, SAPCO and the manufacturers' supply change management are trying to enhance their performance and gain competitive advantage. In SAPCO, self-sufficiency is defined as a situation where if foreign governments were not willing to export their products to Iran, the company could meet the domestic demand through the domestic products. Prior to this, the self-sufficiency power was estimated based on the ratio of the currency share to the total price of the produced part. However, given the limitations and considerations related this approach and in order to take into account all attempts made by manufacturers concerning gaining self-

sufficiency in producing care parts, other parameters such as the assembly process, the design and manufacture of molds and tools, the supply of raw materials and semi-manufactured parts have also been considered in the calculations. In addition, given the limitations in Iran, manufacturers' self-sufficiency will be determined based on the level of technology used to produce parts. As it is shown in tables 12, 16, and 18, of leadership styles, only the integrative leadership style was able to predict the supply power ($\beta = 0.13$), the export power ($\beta = 0.21$), and the self-sufficiency power ($\beta = 0.61$). The results of multivariate regression analysis also indicated that the integrative leadership style had stronger predictive power in accounting for the performance indicators. This finding is in line with the studies conducted by Lee (2007) and Rejas et al., (2006). Based on what was mentioned, it can be said that the managers' leadership style is related to their assumptions about the human nature and the people who work with them in the organization. Each manager holds a set of assumptions about the nature of people around him such as subordinates, peers, and bosses and his behaviors, decisions, and generally his leadership style is affected consciously and unconsciously by such assumptions. Accordingly, a number of

suggestions will be provided to improve the quality and the usefulness of the subject matter of this study.

SUGGESTIONS

- Corporate key indicators must be aligned with the requirements set by SAPCO in assessing key performance indicators.
- SAPCO's cooperation with manufacturers should be guaranteed according to the results of assessment of the seven performance indicators in the future.
- An authoritative and convincing leadership style focusing on strong task-orientation and relationship-orientation prevents innovation. Therefore, the use of participatory and empowering styles depending on different conditions and the employee maturity would be useful.
- As it was shown by the results of this study, human-oriented and integrative leadership styles are efficient under different circumstances. However, given the inefficiency of the mere task-based leadership style and the efficiency of the human orientated leadership style, teamwork and the employees' participation in leadership

play a significant role in the effective leadership.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arab, M. (2001). The impact of organizational structure and management practices on hospital indicators and developing a model to promote these indicators in public hospitals in Iran. PhD Dissertation, School of Health, Tehran University of Medical Sciences.
- [2] Arab, M.; Tajvar, M.; Akbari, F. (2006). The relationship between leadership styles of directors and managers of hospitals and hospital performance indicators. Qazvin University of Medical Sciences, 4, 75-70.
- [3] Al. Mailam, FF (2001). The effects of leadership on hospital performance in public and private hospitals in Kuwait. Doctoral Dissertation . University of La Verne, California, United States.
- [4] Irtwange, SD (). Impact of management style performance on academic staff. Makurdi, An Unpublished MBA project . Department of Business Management, Benue State University, Markurdi-Nigeria.

- [5] Kritner, R.; Kiniki, A. (2007). Managing organizational behavior. Translated in A. A. Farhangi and H. Safarzadeh. Tehran: Tehran: Puyesh Institute for Book Publication and Distribution
- [6] Lee, F. (2007). The relationship between HRM practices, leadership styles, human resources management practices, and organizational trust. University of Pretoria, South Africa.
- [7] Mosadegh Rad, A. (2006). The role of participative management in the efficiency of Shahid Fayazbakhsh Hospital in Tehran. Master Thesis, Iran University of Medical Sciences.
- [8] Nekuei Moghadam, M. (2007). The relationship between the management styles and management tasks in Kerman University of Medical Sciences. *Medical Journal*, 29, 44-37
- [9] O'reagan, N., Ghobadian, A., Sims, M. (2005). The link between leadership, strategy and performance in manufacturing SMEs. *J. Small Bus Strategy*, 15 (2): 45-57.
- [10] Perra, BM (2000). Leadership: The key to quality outcomes. *Nurs Andm Q*, 24 (2): 56-61.
- [11] Rejas. L, P., Ponce, ER, Ponce, JR (2006). Leadership styles and effectiveness: A study of small Firms in Chile. *J. Interiencia*, 31 (7); 499-504.
- [12] Rezaeian, A. (2008). Fundamentals of organization and management. Tehran: SAMT Publishers.
- [13] Seyed Javadi, M. (2005). The relationship between leadership styles and organizational maturity in the training hospitals of Ardabil University of Medical Sciences. Master Thesis, School of Management and Information Sciences, Iran's University of Medical Sciences and Health Services.
- [14] Salehi Sadaghiani, J.; Mahmudi Moghaddam, Y.; & Beibzadeh, A. (2009). Organizational factors affecting human resources productivity among police staffs in Lorestan Province. *Quarterly Social Order*, No. 1, 47-56.