

# ASSESSING THE ADOPTION OF LEADERSHIP STYLES BY PROJECT MANAGERS WITHIN CONSTRUCTION FIRMS IN KADUNA

<sup>1</sup>MAIRAMI, MARYAM B.; & <sup>2</sup>MOHAMMED, SAIDU M.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Quantity Surveying, College of Environmental Studies, Kaduna Polytechnic. <sup>2</sup>Department of Quantity Surveying, Faculty of Environmental Design, Ahmadu Bello University Zaria

Corresponding Author: [mairamim@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:mairamim@yahoo.co.uk)

DOI Link: <https://doi.org/10.70382/bejemcr.v8i4.023>

## ABSTRACT

Leadership styles should come up with tools and techniques that would not only be effective but ensure improvement and handling changes that will steer the organization towards innovation and creativity to enable the transformation agenda to succeed. This paper aimed at identifying four leadership styles adopted within the business environment that can bring about this change. The leadership styles include coaching, visionary, facilitative and team leadership styles. It assessed their frequency of adoption, and effectiveness by project managers employed within construction firms. A structured questionnaire was administered in a survey manner to project managers selected using snowballing technique within Kaduna Metropolis. 100 were administered and 71 were returned amounting to 74% response rate. Analysis conducted on a Likert Scale format showed that the most frequently adopted style as well as most effective was

## Introduction

Effective leadership is essential for the smooth functioning of organizations (Afzal & Tumpa, 2024). Several forces have come into play in ensuring the contributions of individuals and teams towards the effectiveness of organizations. This, however, is hinged upon good management that seek to encourage core values by providing performance feedback to introduce change, encourage innovation, encourage external stakeholder confidence and commitment (Boundless, 2015). This goal requires leaders that possess

coaching leadership. The study recommends that the remaining styles should be adopted more often.

**Keywords:** Construction firms, Leadership, Leadership Style, Leadership Techniques, Project Managers.

Leadership attributes to influence co-workers, team members and subordinates. Successful leaders have integrity and inspire people with shared vision, they set clear goals and motivate people towards them, they manage delivery, and they communicate well with team members (Ismail & Fathi, 2018). They also involve the team in the decision-making process, interact positively with team members, provide visibility to senior management, facilitate interactions with co-workers and live their core values (Kengera, 2023). Leaders have the responsibility to create an environment that permits the qualities attributed to them despite their underlying obligations. It is worth noting that an individual does not reach responsible leadership positions without demonstrating the ability to follow and function effectively in a group.

Project leadership is about creating a culture and working environment that will lead to project success. It revolves around decision making, judgement calls and motivating the team with consistent communication (Kengera, 2023). Effective project management is dependent upon leaders with great leadership skills because a project is unlikely to be successfully completed without good leaders. The Project Manager is the person tasked with this goal carrying a lot of weight on his/her shoulder when it comes to making the right decisions. To achieve this, the Project Manager should ideally have excellent communication and interpersonal skills, share a clear vision and inspire others, have a positive attitude and enthusiasm, have integrity, exhibit competence, have a cool and calm disposition, have excellent problem-solving skills, be a team builder, be an excellent delegator and an excellent decision maker (About Leaders, 2018).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Leadership Styles

Leadership styles involve how to approach, manage and support a team (O'Loughlin, 2019). It is the role played by leaders in helping to achieve a specific goal, what is been focused on, degree of involvement and how they respond to stimuli. Leadership styles are not set in concrete as no two projects/project teams are the same. It is

therefore essential for leaders to develop several styles to meet the differing goals of projects, thereby ensuring successful project delivery (Alexander, 2024).

Several leadership styles have been identified and these include autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire. In addition to these, other styles include transactional, strategic, transformational, cross-cultural, charismatic, coaching, visionary, facilitative and team leadership styles. This paper will concentrate on the last four styles mentioned due to their tendency to achieve improvements in productivity and innovation.

### **Coaching Leadership**

Coaching leadership involves identifying and harnessing talents of each team member. A coaching leader is highly operational in settings where results/performance require improvement. Basically, in this kind of leadership, followers are helped to improve their talents while directing everyone towards a common goal (Boogard, 2023). Coaching leaders motivate, inspire and encourage followers (Raza, 2025). In contrast to the autocratic leadership style, coaching leaders take the lead to get the best out of the team. The leader has this skill when he/she can develop and improve the performance and competencies of his employees (Janse, 2025)

### **Techniques Adopted by Coaching Leaders:**

- i. Uncover hidden talents and abilities of team members.
- ii. Motivate members to 'rise to the challenge'.
- iii. Understand the true potential of team members by building emotional intelligence.
- iv. Build trust and engage team members.

### **Advantages of Coaching Leadership**

- i. This leadership style produces a positive workplace environment as it creates trust.
- ii. Employees know what is expected of them.
- iii. It increases the skill set available to the individual worker.
- iv. It can create competitive advantages.

### **Disadvantages of Coaching leadership**

- i. It takes time for the style to be effective.
- ii. Coaching leaders must be skilled in leadership.
- iii. Mentoring is not always the right approach.

**Visionary Leadership**

This form of leadership is all about looking to the future and guiding teams towards new possibilities (Walk Me Team, 2024). It involves leaders who recognize that the procedures, moves, and processes of leadership are all obtained through people. Most great and successful leaders have visions of where they are going. However, those who are highly visionary are the ones considered to be exhibiting visionary leadership. Outstanding leaders will always transform their visions into realities.

In this fast-paced technology-age that increasingly demands change, being visionary is a must for survival and success. It is often observed that many companies come into play and become successful and profitable for a short while but then they fall badly when they face the first storm. They disappear because the main reason is that they do not have visionary leaders. Being a visionary in whatever you do, whether as a Chief Executive Officer, a manager, a team leader, a supervisor, a business owner, an employee, a professional worker, a doctor, a dentist, an engineer, a lawyer, a community volunteer is very beneficial for the organization (Raza, 2025).

**Techniques Adopted by Visionary Leaders:**

- i. They ignite passion in members
- ii. They are aware of followers' emotions
- iii. They arrive at creative solutions to problems
- iv. They encourage followers to 'dream big'
- v. They see setbacks as stopping points in realizing their visions
- vi. They create trust among team members

**Advantages of Visionary Leadership**

- i. It integrates a task-oriented and people-oriented leadership in a qualitative way:
- ii. People will perform tasks because they are happy to do them as they are inspired by the vision.
- iii. It brings out the best in people
- iv. It makes people perform beyond their imagined limitations.
- v. Mechanisms of control (rewards and bonuses) become internal and not external.
- vi. People will want to do things right not because of some external monetary reward, social commendations, or promotions.

**Disadvantages of Visionary Leadership**

- i. Visionary leaders get caught up in the future
- ii. If a leader is too focused on what is happening in the future, they may not devote themselves to solving present problems.
- iii. Vision could be unrealistic
- iv. If the vision is unclear, it can confuse team members as well as the leader himself
- v. Leaders are focused on one goal and neglect others

**Facilitative Leadership**

Facilitative leadership relies on measurements and outcomes (not a skill, although it takes much skill to master). The effectiveness of a group is causally related to the effectiveness of its process. If the group is high-functioning, the facilitative leader uses a light hand on the process. On the other hand, if the group is low-functioning, the facilitative leader will be more directive in helping the group run its process. An effective facilitative leadership involves monitoring of group dynamics, offering process suggestions and interventions to help the group stay on track (Raza, 2025).

**Techniques Adopted by Facilitative Leaders:**

- i. They manage contrasting perspectives and opinions to minimize conflict
- ii. They ensure inclusiveness of all group members by opening space for quiet ones
- iii. They ensure everyone is on the same page
- iv. Draw from strengths of all members
- v. Gather divergent views before deciding on the next plan of action
- vi. Drive creativity, innovation and brainstorming for better results

**Advantages of Facilitative Leadership**

- i. It is a style that is very people-centered.
- ii. It provides a positive work environment.
- iii. It can reduce the effects of change.
- iv. It is a way to invite feedback.
- v. It allows for a team to take ownership of a project.
- vi. It operates from a position of restraint.

**Disadvantages of Facilitative Leadership**

- i. It can be difficult to deal with conflicts.
- ii. It can create complacency in the workplace.
- iii. It takes more time to implement the fundamentals
- iv. It may create opportunities for others to take over control.
- v. It can create too many leaders, which leads to confusion.

**Team Leadership**

Team leadership involves the creation of an arresting picture of a team's future, where it is heading and what it will stand for. The vision inspires and provides a strong sense of purpose and direction. (Raza, 2025). Effective team leaders have a variety of traits such as compassion and integrity or learn leadership skills through formal training and experience. They inspire the trust and respect of the team and stimulate production within a workplace environment

**Techniques Adopted by Team leaders:**

- i. Expand the team's capabilities
- ii. Create a team identity
- iii. Anticipate and influence change
- iv. Inspire towards higher level of performance
- v. Enable and empower group members to accomplish their work
- vi. Encourage team members to eliminate low value work

**Advantages of Team Leadership**

- i. Teams become more effective units since they have a common goal.
- ii. Leaders keep a team going by choosing the right members and delegating well.
- iii. Teams can successfully grow as an organization, be effective and easily resolve conflicts
- iv. Different ideas are shared easily among team members

**Disadvantages of Team Leadership**

- i. Teams can suffer from differing conflicts.
- ii. Slow decision-making process.
- iii. Can lead to diminished productivity.

**METHODOLOGY**

The study proceeded to gather primary data through a survey of project managers within Kaduna Metropolis. A structured questionnaire was formulated and self-administered to the respondents. This was done for fast administration, achieving cost savings, considering convenience of respondents and for easy generalization of findings. Snowball sampling was adopted.

Section A of the questionnaire elicited the biodata of the respondents which included educational qualifications, years of experience and nature of projects worked upon. Section B sought to ascertain the frequency of adoption and effectiveness of leadership techniques under the four leadership styles studied. For analysis, the following rules were applied:

- Points were computed based upon the number of responses multiplied by the point allocated each response (for example number of respondents that stated strongly agree will be multiplied by 5 points)
- The mean of responses for each leadership technique were computed by dividing the total points computed by the number of responses (71).
- A grand mean was computed (mean of means) for each technique.
- Those with means above the grand mean were inferred to be accepted while those with means below the grand mean were inferred as unaccepted.
- Ranking of each leadership style was done using the grand mean in descending order.

**DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS**

Section A: Respondents' Biodata

**RESPONSE RATE**

Table 1

| RESPONSE RATE       | FREQ | %    |
|---------------------|------|------|
| NUMBER ADMINISTERED | 100  | 100% |
| NUMBER RETURNED     | 71   | 74%  |
| NUMBER NOT RETURNED | 29   | 26%  |

Table 1 shows that 100 copies of questionnaires were administered while 71 were returned amounting to a 74% response rate

**EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION OF RESPONDENTS**

Table 2

| EDUCATIONAL QUALIFICATION | FREQ | %    |
|---------------------------|------|------|
| NATIONAL DIPLOMA          | 5    | 7%   |
| HIGHER NATIONAL DIPLOMA   | 16   | 23%  |
| BACHELOR OF SCIENCE       | 20   | 28%  |
| MASTER OF SCIENCE         | 19   | 27%  |
| PhD                       | 8    | 11%  |
| OTHERS                    | 3    | 4%   |
| TOTAL                     | 71   | 100% |

Table 2 shows that most respondents have Bachelor of Science and Master of Science. Followed closely by those with Higher National Diploma.

**YEARS OF EXPERIENCE OF RESPONDENTS**

Table 3

| YEARS OF EXPERIENCE | FREQ | %    |
|---------------------|------|------|
| 0 - 5 YEARS         | 30   | 42%  |
| 6 - 10 YEARS        | 20   | 28%  |
| 11 - 15 YEARS       | 8    | 11%  |
| 16 - 20 YEARS       | 4    | 6%   |
| 21 - 25 YEARS       | 7    | 10%  |
| OVER 25 YEARS       | 2    | 3%   |
| TOTAL               | 71   | 100% |

Table 3 shows that respondents with 0 to 5 years of experience have the largest share occupying 42% of the respondents, while those with over 25 years have the least share with 3%.

**NATURE OF PROJECTS HANDLED**

Table 4

| NATURE OF PROJECTS HANDLED | FREQ | %    |
|----------------------------|------|------|
| RESIDENTIAL                | 28   | 39%  |
| CIVIL INFRASTRUCTURE       | 21   | 30%  |
| COMMERCIAL                 | 14   | 20%  |
| HEAVY ENGINEERING          | 2    | 3%   |
| MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL  | 3    | 4%   |
| ALL OF THE ABOVE           | 3    | 4%   |
| TOTAL                      | 71   | 100% |

Table 4 shows that those involved on residential projects have the highest percentage with 39%. While those involved on Mechanical and Electrical projects have the least share.

## SECTION B: RESPONSES ON LEADERSHIP STYLES

### FREQUENCY OF ADOPTION OF LEADERSHIP STYLE

Table 5

| S/NO | SUGGESTION                                                                                | VO | O  | S  | R | Nv | NR | N  | Points | Mean        | Remarks           | Ranking |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|--------|-------------|-------------------|---------|
|      |                                                                                           | 5  | 4  | 3  | 2 | 1  | -  |    |        |             |                   |         |
| A    | <b>COACHING LEADERSHIP</b>                                                                |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |        |             |                   |         |
| 1    | Motivating site operatives and/or teams to 'rise to the challenge'                        | 35 | 30 | 5  | 1 | 0  | -  | 71 | 312.00 | 4.39        | Often adopted     | 1st     |
| 2    | Uncovering hidden talents/skills of site operatives                                       | 24 | 26 | 15 | 5 | 1  | -  | 71 | 279.00 | 3.93        | Not often adopted |         |
| 3    | Building trust and engaging site operatives and/or teams                                  | 35 | 30 | 4  | 2 | 0  | -  | 71 | 311.00 | 4.38        | Often adopted     |         |
| 4    | Gauging the true potential of site operatives and/or teams                                | 23 | 32 | 12 | 1 | 3  | -  | 71 | 281.00 | 3.96        | Not often adopted |         |
|      | <b>Grand Mean</b>                                                                         |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |        | <b>4.17</b> |                   |         |
| B    | <b>TEAM LEADERSHIP</b>                                                                    |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |        |             |                   |         |
| 1    | Encouraging operatives and/or team members to expand the team's capabilities              | 19 | 37 | 12 | 2 | 0  | 1  | 71 | 283.00 | 3.99        | Not often adopted | 2nd     |
| 2    | Encourage operatives and/or team members to accomplish their work efficiently             | 30 | 29 | 11 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 71 | 299.00 | 4.21        | Often adopted     |         |
| 3    | Encouraging team members to eliminate low-value work                                      | 26 | 29 | 10 | 3 | 2  | 1  | 71 | 282.00 | 3.97        | Not often adopted |         |
| 4    | Encouraging operatives and/or team members to anticipate and influence change             | 29 | 34 | 8  | 0 | 0  | -  | 71 | 305.00 | 4.30        | Often adopted     |         |
| 5    | Inspiring operatives and/or team members to aim towards higher level of performance       | 27 | 37 | 7  | 0 | 0  | -  | 71 | 304.00 | 4.28        | Often adopted     |         |
|      | <b>Grand Mean</b>                                                                         |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |        | <b>4.15</b> |                   |         |
| C    | <b>FACILITATIVE LEADERSHIP</b>                                                            |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |        |             |                   |         |
| 1    | Encouraging operatives to critique themselves so as to improve                            | 28 | 30 | 6  | 4 | 3  | -  | 71 | 286.00 | 4.03        | Not often adopted | 3rd     |
| 2    | Understanding how group interactions impact on productivity                               | 26 | 33 | 10 | 2 | 0  | -  | 71 | 296.00 | 4.17        | Often adopted     |         |
| 3    | Involving appropriate site operatives in decision making                                  | 27 | 29 | 12 | 2 | 1  | -  | 71 | 291.00 | 4.10        | Often adopted     |         |
| 4    | Having focused, clear and proactive discussions with site operatives                      | 23 | 37 | 9  | 2 | 0  | -  | 71 | 294.00 | 4.14        | Often adopted     |         |
| 5    | Managing contrasting perspectives and opinions of site operatives to minimise conflicts   | 23 | 30 | 13 | 3 | 2  | -  | 71 | 280.00 | 3.94        | Not often adopted |         |
| 6    | Ensuring inclusiveness by opening space for quiet operatives                              | 29 | 28 | 10 | 3 | 1  | -  | 71 | 293.00 | 4.13        | Often adopted     |         |
|      | <b>Grand Mean</b>                                                                         |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |        | <b>4.08</b> |                   |         |
| D    | <b>VISIONARY LEADERSHIP</b>                                                               |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |        |             |                   |         |
| 1    | Encouraging site operatives and/or teams to arrive at creative solutions to site problems | 31 | 31 | 7  | 1 | 0  | 1  | 71 | 302.00 | 4.25        | Often adopted     | 4th     |
| 2    | Encouraging site operatives and/or teams to dream big                                     | 18 | 36 | 14 | 1 | 1  | 1  | 71 | 278.00 | 3.92        | Not often adopted |         |

| S/NO              | SUGGESTION                                                                                                                        | VO | O  | S  | R | Nv | NR | N  | Points | Mean        | Remarks           | Ranking |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|----|----|----|--------|-------------|-------------------|---------|
| 3                 | Igniting passion in site operatives and/or teams to be creative and innovative                                                    | 29 | 31 | 10 | 0 | 1  | -  | 71 | 299.00 | 4.21        | Often adopted     |         |
| 4                 | Informing site operatives and/or teams to see setbacks as stopping points in realizing the vision and mission of the organization | 18 | 32 | 11 | 5 | 4  | 1  | 71 | 261.00 | 3.68        | Not often adopted |         |
| 5                 | Being aware of site operatives' emotions                                                                                          | 20 | 29 | 16 | 4 | 1  | 1  | 71 | 272.00 | 3.83        | Not often adopted |         |
| 6                 | Creating trust among team members                                                                                                 | 28 | 32 | 9  | 1 | 0  | 1  | 71 | 297.00 | 4.18        | Often adopted     |         |
| <b>Grand Mean</b> |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |    |    |    |        | <b>4.01</b> |                   |         |

VO: Very Often, O: Often, S: Sometime, R: Rarely, Nv: Never, NR: No Response, N: Number of questionnaires returned.

Table 5 shows that with a grand mean of 4.17 'Coaching leadership' is the most often adopted style while with a grand mean of 4.01 'Visionary leadership' is the least adopted. While with a mean of 4.39 the most often adopted technique comes under coaching leadership style and that is motivating site operatives/teams to rise to challenges and the least adopted is informing site operatives/ team members to see setbacks as stopping points in realizing the vision and mission of the organisation with a mean of 3.68

## EFFECTIVENESS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE

Table 6

| S/NO | SUGGESTION                                                                    | VE | E  | N  | IE | VIE | NR | N  | Points | Mean | Remarks     | Ranking |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|--------|------|-------------|---------|
|      |                                                                               | 5  | 4  | 3  | 2  | 1   | 0  |    |        |      |             |         |
| A    | <b>TEAM LEADERSHIP</b>                                                        |    |    |    |    |     |    |    |        |      |             |         |
| 1    | Encouraging operatives and/or team members to expand the team's capabilities  | 27 | 37 | 7  | -  | -   | -  | 71 | 304.00 | 4.28 | Effective   | 1st     |
| 2    | Encourage operatives and/or team members to accomplish their work efficiently | 19 | 39 | 13 | -  | -   | -  | 71 | 290.00 | 4.08 | Ineffective |         |
| 3    | Encouraging team members to eliminate low-value work                          | 38 | 30 | 3  | -  | -   | -  | 71 | 319.00 | 4.49 | Effective   |         |
| 4    | Encouraging operatives and/or team members to anticipate and influence change | 24 | 39 | 7  | 1  | -   | -  | 71 | 299.00 | 4.21 | Ineffective |         |

|                           |                                                                                         |    |    |    |   |   |    |        |        |             |                 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|---|----|--------|--------|-------------|-----------------|
| 5                         | Inspiring operatives and/or team members to aim towards higher level of performance     | 32 | 32 | 6  | 1 | - | 71 | 308.00 | 4.34   | Effective   |                 |
| Grand Mean                |                                                                                         |    |    |    |   |   |    |        | 4.28   |             |                 |
| B COACHING LEADERSHIP     |                                                                                         |    |    |    |   |   |    |        |        |             |                 |
| 1                         | Motivating site operatives and/or teams to 'rise to the challenge'                      | 23 | 41 | 6  | 1 | - | 71 | 299.00 | 4.21   | Effective   | 2nd             |
| 2                         | Uncovering hidden talents/skills of site operatives                                     | 30 | 27 | 13 | 1 | - | 71 | 297.00 | 4.18   | Effective   |                 |
| 3                         | Building trust and engaging site operatives and/or teams                                | 28 | 34 | 7  | 2 | - | 71 | 301.00 | 4.24   | Effective   |                 |
| 4                         | Gauging the true potential of site operatives and/or teams                              | 20 | 40 | 9  | 2 | - | 71 | 291.00 | 4.10   | Ineffective |                 |
| Grand Mean                |                                                                                         |    |    |    |   |   |    |        | 4.18   |             |                 |
| C FACILITATIVE LEADERSHIP |                                                                                         |    |    |    |   |   |    |        |        |             |                 |
| 1                         | Encouraging operatives to critique themselves so as to improve                          | 31 | 26 | 10 | 2 | 2 | -  | 71     | 293.00 | 4.13        | Ineffective 3rd |
| 2                         | Understanding how group interactions impact on productivity                             | 19 | 36 | 14 | 2 | - | 71 | 285.00 | 4.01   | Ineffective |                 |
| 3                         | Involving appropriate site operatives in decision making                                | 28 | 34 | 7  | 2 | - | 71 | 301.00 | 4.24   | Effective   |                 |
| 4                         | Having focused, clear and proactive discussions with site operatives                    | 26 | 39 | 5  | 1 | - | 71 | 303.00 | 4.27   | Effective   |                 |
| 5                         | Managing contrasting perspectives and opinions of site operatives to minimise conflicts | 26 | 32 | 12 | 1 | - | 71 | 296.00 | 4.17   | Effective   |                 |

|   |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |   |   |        |      |             |     |
|---|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|---|---|---|--------|------|-------------|-----|
| 6 | Ensuring inclusiveness by opening space for quiet operatives                                                                      | 21 | 37 | 10 | 2 | 1 | - | 71     | 4.04 | Ineffective |     |
|   |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |   |   | 287.00 |      |             |     |
|   | <b>Grand Mean</b>                                                                                                                 |    |    |    |   |   |   |        | 4.14 |             |     |
| D | <b>VISIONARY LEADERSHIP</b>                                                                                                       |    |    |    |   |   |   |        |      |             |     |
| 1 | Encouraging site operatives and/or teams to arrive at creative solutions to site problems                                         | 35 | 30 | 6  | - | - | - | 71     | 4.41 | Effective   | 4th |
|   |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |   |   | 313.00 |      |             |     |
| 2 | Encouraging site operatives and/or teams to dream big                                                                             | 20 | 34 | 16 | 1 | - | - | 71     | 4.03 | Ineffective |     |
|   |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |   |   | 286.00 |      |             |     |
| 3 | Igniting passion in site operatives and/or teams to be creative and innovative                                                    | 28 | 35 | 7  | 0 | 1 | - | 71     | 4.24 | Effective   |     |
|   |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |   |   | 301.00 |      |             |     |
| 4 | Informing site operatives and/or teams to see setbacks as stopping points in realizing the vision and mission of the organization | 24 | 32 | 9  | 4 | 2 | - | 71     | 3.99 | Ineffective |     |
|   |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |   |   | 283.00 |      |             |     |
| 5 | Being aware of site operatives' emotions                                                                                          | 15 | 43 | 7  | 4 | 2 | - | 71     | 3.89 | Ineffective |     |
|   |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |   |   | 276.00 |      |             |     |
| 6 | Creating trust among team members                                                                                                 | 31 | 31 | 9  | - | - | - | 71     | 4.31 | Effective   |     |
|   |                                                                                                                                   |    |    |    |   |   |   | 306.00 |      |             |     |
|   | <b>Grand Mean</b>                                                                                                                 |    |    |    |   |   |   |        | 4.14 |             |     |

VE: Very Effective, E: Effective, N: Neither Effective nor Ineffective, IE: Ineffective, VIE: Very Ineffective, NR: No Response

N: Number of questionnaires returned.

Table 6 shows with a cumulative mean of 4.28 'Team leadership style' is the most effective while with grand means of 4.14 'Facilitative and Visionary leadership styles' are the least effective style adopted. While with a mean of 4.49 the most effective technique comes under coaching leadership style and that is Encouraging team members to eliminate low-value work and the least effective is being aware of site operatives' emotions with a mean of 3.89

### **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

This study was conducted to ascertain the frequency of adoption of leadership styles entrenched in the business environment. Several research conducted within the business environment indicates that the adoption of leadership styles is largely dependent upon the situation at hand and the number of followers. In the context of the construction industry, however, the adoption of most of the techniques under team, coaching, facilitative and visionary leadership styles can be guaranteed, some are already adopted, and the effectiveness are shown to be considerable. These findings can be used to further illustrate that the risks associated with the complexity of the project environment can be reduced through the effective use of the techniques studied. The findings can be used to further illustrate that the autocratic and democratic leadership styles are not the only styles as opined by Raza (2025) that can be adopted within the construction industry.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The Team leadership style, Coaching leadership style, Facilitative leadership style and Visionary leadership style were studied. The variables investigated included the frequency of adoption in the construction environment and effectiveness of the styles studied from the perspective of project managers. Conclusions drawn from the study include among other things:

- The most frequently adopted leadership style is the coaching leadership style while the least adopted is the visionary leadership style
- The most effective leadership style is the team leadership style and the least effective is the visionary leadership style.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The study recommends that the coaching leadership style be adopted more often, being the most effective. The best technique to be adopted under this leadership style would be to encourage members to eliminate low value work.

### **REFERENCES**

- About Leaders. (2018). *10 great leadership skills of project management*. Retrieved from Leadership skills: <https://www.aboutleaders.com>
- Afzal, F., & Tumpa, R. T. (2024). Exploring Leadership Styles to Foster Sustainability in construction projects: a systematic review. *MDPI/Sustainability*, 1-32.
- Alexander, M. (2024). *6 styles of project leadership and how to use them effectively*. Retrieved April 18, 2024, from Tech Republic: <https://www.techrepublic.com/article>

- Boogard, K. (2023). *Use the coaching leadership style to help your team achieve its full potential*. Retrieved from Worklife: <https://www.atlassian.com>
- Boundless. (2015). *Key Behaviours of Transformational leaders*. Retrieved March 20th, 2025, from Boundless Management: <https://www.boundless.com/management/text/bonus/boundless-management>
- Ismail, M., & Fathi, M. S. (2018). Leadership in Construction: Leadership Styles Practiced in construction project-a review. *Journal of Advanced Research in Business and Management Studies*, 13(1), 24-30.
- Janse, B. (2025). *Coaching Leadership Explained*. Retrieved from toolshero: <https://www.toolshero.com/coaching-leadership-explained>
- Kengera, Z. (2023). Beyond Project Management Technicalities: Uplifting the Role of leadership towards project success. *Tanzanian Journal of Population Studies and Development*, 30(1), 127-143.
- O'Loughlin, E. (2019). *5 Project Management Leadership Styles*. Retrieved from When to change yours: Capterra: [blog.capterra.com/project-management](https://blog.capterra.com/project-management)
- Raza, A. (2025). *12 different types of leadership styles*. Retrieved from wisetoast: business and lifestyle magazine: <https://www.wisetoast.com>
- Walk Me Team. (2024). *What is Visionary Leadership? Examples, traits & best practices*. Retrieved from walkme.com: <https://walkme.com/blog>