ORGANISATIONAL PLURALISM AND LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTED PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SECTORS IN JOS, NIGERIA

Thaddeus Umoru
umoru.t@ksu.edu.ng
Department of Sociology,
Faculty of Social Sciences, Kogi State University, Anyigba, Nigeria.

Benjamin O. Omolayo
oluomolayo@gmail.com
Department of Psychology,
Faculty of Social Sciences, Federal University Oye-Ekiti, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

In a bid to potentially offer better understanding on how pluralism is manifested and managed, studies have veered off from bureaucracy, which is regarded as the conventional but ill-suited, to gaining insight on an uncertain and dynamic organisations. These studies however remain fragmented. The purpose of this study is therefore to investigate the impact of organisational pluralism on leadership effectiveness among private and public organisations in Nigeria. The study was anchored on multi-paradigm perspective also known as complexity theory. Using cross-sectional descriptive survey research design, 200 participants comprising 103 males and 97 females with a mean age of 35.27 and standard deviation of 9.87 were randomly selected from four organisations through questionnaire. Drawing from leading management and leadership literature, the study tested a hypothesis with the aid of multiple regression analysis. The result indicated a significant joint effect of age, gender, working experience, tribal identification, religious affiliation, educational qualification, marital status, and position on leadership effectiveness. It was concluded among others that the most viable way of handling diversity of interests and the increasing pluralism in organisations is by employing leadership effectiveness. The study therefore recommends that leaders should take advantage of the plurality in the organisations to grow and become effective in the art of leadership.
Keywords: Leadership effectiveness, organisational pluralism, private sector, public sector.

INTRODUCTION

The multi-rooted situational problems facing organisations of nowadays may not be far from the fact that there are varieties of actors involved in driving home organisational goals and objectives. Seeing that these problems have been persistent, it therefore falls on the onus of management to provide effective leadership to integrate the pluralistic workforce and drive home productive outcome that is required for organisational subsistence and development. Based on bureaucratic practices common among most organisations, Murphy and Yates (2009) proposed a pluralistic paradigm. In line with this proposal, International Standard Organisation (ISO) tasked with efficiently facilitating and unifying several actors in the organisations toward achieving standardized common organisational goals therefore set up a Working Group on Social Responsibility (ISO WGSR). The ISO WGSR is illustrative of a highly pluralist organization which provides a sphere for interaction and consensus-building among diverse sets of actors ((Br`es 2013).

In a pluralistic organisation, effective leadership facilitates collaboration by providing structures, mediating conflicts, enhancing the conditions of interaction between pluralistic environment and members, innovation through the blending of diverse actors and sometimes by exerting influence on them (Ahrne, Brunsson & Seidl, 2016). If pluralism is significant in solving meta-problems as well as toeing the organisation in the path of productivity as asserted by literature, the present study is an impeccable response to scholarly demand to not only revisit the understanding of the conceptual tenets but also investigate how pluralism in the organisations impacts on leadership effectiveness.

Statement Of The Research Problem
Several authors confirmed that, in the wake of globalization, contemporary organisations are becoming increasingly pluralistic and consequently, organisational theorists need to incorporate pluralism (Glynn et al., 2000). This assertion highlighted the loopholes of the traditional form of organisational practices epitomized

by the rigidity in Weberian bureaucracy and therefore rendered its features such as means-end rationality, hierarchical and centralized authority, and formal and exhaustive rules sustained by a specialized and formal division of tasks poor fit for the current pluralistic organisation (Ashcraft, 2001). Nomenclatural and typological contradictions also abound in this line of research example, Ahrne and Brunsson's (2008) "meta-organisations" and Jarzabkowski and Spee's (2009) "collective organisation" tends to connect the pluralistic dimensions that is common with present organisations. These two identically defined concepts, however failed to benefit from the academic discussion leaving a gap. Since there are divergent, insufficient, and contradictory theoretical views on how pluralism can bring out the best in organisations, we assume that leadership effectiveness would not only foster collaboration among divers actors, it would also enhance organisational effectiveness and productivity.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Concept of Organisational Pluralism
The ISO's Working Group on Social Responsibility broadly defined a pluralistic organisation as the act of coordinating diversity of actors with diffuse power and divergent agendas on substantive issues (ISO WG SR, 2011; Br`es, 2013). Management scholars have defined pluralism in a context of co-ordination that faces a multiplicity of logics (Denis, Langley, & Sergi, 2012). Pluralistic organisation is defined by Denis, Lamothe and Langeley (2001) as a structure that enables actors with divergent perspectives to cooperate on substantive organisational issues. Due to multiplicity of issues evident in today's organisations, several related concepts such as meta-organization, (Brunsson, Rasche, & Seidl, 2009), bridging organization (Lawrence & Hardy, 1999), collective organization (Battillana & Lee, 2014), boundary organization, referent organizations (Trist, 1983), and network weaving organizations (Ingram & Torfason, 2010) have been associated with pluralistic organisations. Pluralism in organisations is a challenge for collective action that will not only articulate divergent views into a formidable force but also facilitate organisational productivity.

Several authors believe that, in the wake of globalization, the environments of contemporary organisations are becoming increasingly pluralistic; as a consequence, organisational theorists need to incorporate pluralism into their theories (Glynn et al., 2000). Based on this assertion, there is a significant agreement that the traditional form of organisation epitomized by the Weberian bureaucracy is not well suited for a pluralistic world. Therefore, several authors have acknowledged the need to revisit the understanding of organisations (Br`es, 2017; Sw¨ard, 2016) and to develop new concepts for organisations in pluralistic settings.

Characteristics of Pluralistic Organisations
Scholars examining pluralistic organisations have identified three features that characterize this organization type, namely, multiple powerful stakeholders, divergent goals, and knowledge-based processes (Denis et al., 2007; Jarzabkowski, 2008). To a certain extent, all organizations are pluralistic, but some organizations appear to be more pluralistic than others (Denis et al., 2007). Typical pluralistic organizations are public sector organizations or non-profit organizations (Jarzabkowski & Fenton, 2006) such as arts organizations, professional partnerships, hospitals, public higher institutions of learning, and international organisations (Denis et al., 2007).

Multiple powerful stakeholders: This is exemplified by divergent constituencies. In the pluralistic organizations, different constituencies such as politicians, community groups, ethnic and religious groups, and professionals come together (Kraatz & Block, 2008). Their sufficient power bases and their divergent interests produce diffuse power structures, in which various constituencies can exert influence on organisational goals and strategies (Jarzabkowski & Fenton, 2006). To ascertain that all constituencies are involved and committed, participative decision-making becomes necessary (Denis et al., 2007). In particular, requests of knowledge-workers to participate in decision making become more salient and convincing as the prevalence of knowledge-intensive processes increases (Pusic, 1998). Participation may therefore lead to forced consensus, which masks the divergence of the different constituencies' interests. Yet, the consensus' unrealistic character tends to inhibit the actual realization of the decision (Denis et al., 2011).

Divergent goals and Multiplicity of Objectives: Pluralistic organizations are typically marked by the existence of divergent and sometimes contradictory goals and objectives (Jarzabkowski & Fenton, 2006). Different powerful groups advocate different sets of objectives. The multiplicity of objectives can generate confusion among organizational members so that they do not know which of the multiple objectives is most relevant. Extensive communicative exchange among the different constituencies championed by a leader about the multiple objectives becomes necessary (Jarzabkowski & Fenton, 2006). Tensions among powerful constituencies can erupt if one goal obtains priority over another (Kraatz & Block, 2008). If the fulfillment of

one goal is only possible at the expense of another, a goal conflict is unavoidable. Many public organizations, such as universities or cultural organizations, experience numerous goal conflicts. Many of those conflicts emerge from tensions between the demand for more economic, the adherence to professional roles, and the maintaining of public service quality.

Knowledge-based work: Knowledge-based work is a very vital characteristic of a Pluralistic organisation. Work is increasingly knowledge-intensive and marked by professional practice (Lowendahl & Revang, 1998; Pusic, 1998). In professional work which is opaque to non-professionals, only members of the professions possess the knowledge, skills, and orientation required to conduct the professional work. Professionals therefore strive for organizational arrangements that preserve and safeguard their autonomy and power to determine and control the conditions of their work (Levay & Waks, 2009). In managing professionals, a reliance on formal authority is therefore difficult, which is a very conducive climate for pluralism and diversity.

Concept of Leadership Effectiveness

Leadership can be defined as the process of influencing people. Leaders usually have the objectives of getting the employees motivated to ensure optimal performance. According to Yukl (1994), leadership is a group event. Leaders use different styles with subordinates to influence the situation and make impact on employees. Therefore they impact the performance. Leadership is an interpersonal skill applied by a leader in the style which is best suited to the situation and ensures the attainment of desired goals by effective and continuous communication (Tannenbaum, Weschler & Massarik, 1961). It is the process of impacting people through continuous and useful communication between leader and followers aimed at achieving a goal (Cribbin, 1981), and a challenge at influencing the behaviour of subordinates through communication process geared toward the attainment of goals (Donelly, et al., 1985). Leadership is about vision, ideas, direction, and ability to inspire others to carry out tasks without close supervision (Bennis, 1989).

An effective leader should be able to come up with a healthy strategy embodied in its prevailing pattern of moves and approaches (Thompson & Strickland, 1996) and formulate strategic intent, craft strategy to achieve the desired intent, implementing and executing the strategy efficiently and effectively. A good strategy championed by effective leadership lead to human capital development and growth and sustainable competitive advantage, thus improving organisational output performance. How a pluralistic workforce perceived a leader to have been able to effectively lead a steadily growing, productive and pluralistic organisation is paramount to this research.

Pluralistic Organisation and Leadership Effectiveness

The defining features of pluralistic organizations are intertwined and pose particular challenges to the leadership of pluralistic organizations. The potential for incoherence, goal-ambiguity, conflict, fragmentation, and organizational instability is high (Kraatz & Block, 2008; Stryker, 2000). Thus, conventional assumptions on management and strategizing do not simply apply in pluralistic organizations and ordinary management theories become problematic (Denis et al., 2007). Effective leadership in a pluralistic organisation must involve a participative decision making to ascertain that all constituencies are involved and committed (Denis et al., 2007). Effective leadership should be tactical enough to ensure that the participative decision-making which tends to lead to diluted decisions is not only acceptable but also realistic (Denis et al., 2007; Denis et al., 2011). In a pluralistic organisation, since there is a disparate goals born by divergent of interest, there is likelihood of deep-rooted and persisting tensions within the organization (Kraatz & Block, 2008). This tension requires an extensive communicative exchange among the different constituencies championed by an effective leader about the multiple objectives which should be labelled a top priority goal that is in tandem with overall organisational goal (Jarzabkowski & Fenton, 2006). The test of leadership effectiveness is also deployed in a pluralistic organisation because of its characteristic of knowledge-based work. It ensures that professional works only executed by professionals are deployed and non-professionals may be left to play the second fiddles. It takes an effective leadership to turn the barriers created by the autonomy of professionals in a pluralistic organisation into opportunity for non-professionals to acquire requisite skills needed to organization-wide goals (Denis et al., 2007).

Leadership Challenges in a Pluralistic Organisation

In pluralistic organizations, leadership has some crunching challenges and its legitimacy cannot be taken for granted (Denis et al., 2001). The re-evaluation of leadership legitimacy by the powerful constituencies and divergent workforce is a constant phenomenon. If the constituencies' expectations are not satisfied, leadership actions might encounter overt resistance (Chakravarthy & Gargiulo, 1998; Denis et al., 2001). The constant variant perception and expectation by different constituencies and divergent workforce about appropriateness leadership actions, most likely create some unintended de-legitimation (Stryker, 2000). Therefore, leadership is always on its toe to be effective in pluralistic organisations to constantly maintain legitimacy. However,

maintenance of legitimacy in pluralistic organizations is difficult because professionals tend to have high expectations with regard to their scope of influence on decision-making processes (Pusic, 1998) and because the divergent constituencies and variant workforce hold heterogeneous expectations about appropriate authority structures (Chakravarthy & Gargiulo, 1998; Kraatz & Block, 2008). So managing leadership effectiveness and legitimacy entails another hinges upon the ability to act in the interest of organizational constituencies and divergent workforce without derailing or losing touch of the overall organisational goal. Leadership has overarching likelihood of facing the risk of alienating stakeholders and losing leadership legitimacy or face the most important and yet intricate challenge of incorporating stakeholder, as well as divergent workforce through effective transformational style and maintain significance.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study used multi-paradigm perspective known as complexity theory to explain the impact of pluralism on leadership effectiveness. Multi-paradigm perspective adopts a continuing dialogue between diversity of paradigms and ideologies to advance knowledge. This theory help organisation to view issues by combining different perspective in accordance with the representation of divers actors (Gioia & Pitre, 1990) thereby leading to more comprehensive explanation and understanding of social phenomena. This study applied multi-paradigm perspective because it is expected of an effective leader to incorporate and articulate views from the entirety of the workforce in alignment to the organisational goals, thereby formulating policies for organisational wholeness and balance.

All organizations are pluralistic to certain extent, but some organizations appear to be more pluralistic than others (Denis et al., 2007). Classic examples of organizations with high pluralism are public sector organizations (Jarzabkowski & Fenton, 2006) such as hospitals, universities, and non-indigenous companies because they entail disparate goals, have the high tendency of pulling workforce from divergent races, and ethno-cultural and religious divides (Denis et al., 2001). Prior empirical research on pluralistic organisations did not only focused on hospitals (Denis et al., 2001), universities (Jarzabkowski & Seidl, 2008), public schools (Rowan, 1982), they also analysed the pluralism of rape crisis centers (Zilber, 2011) and cultural organizations (Glynn, 2000).

The features of pluralism in organisations are intertwined (the heterogeneity of multiple stakeholders and the knowledge-based work contribute to the divergence of organisational goals and reinforce the impression of ambiguity) and pose particular challenges to leadership because there is high potential for incoherence, goal-ambiguity, conflict, fragmentation, and organizational instability (Kraatz & Block, 2008), thus requires leadership in this type of organisation to be proactive and abreast with latest development because conventional assumptions on management and strategizing do not apply while ordinary management theories are chaotic at its best (Denis et al., 2007).

Drawing from Silince, Jarzabkowski, and Shaw (2010), the study which investigates the effect of pluralism on leadership effectiveness among MTN Nigeria, NASCO Nigeria Ltd., Jos University Teaching Hospital (JUTH), and University of Jos, Nigeria defined pluralism in line with community groups (religious affiliations, tribal divides, age-groups, marital status, feminism-masculinity) and professionals (positions, hierarchy, and educational qualification), but the present study examined the impact of pluralism on leadership effectiveness.

Research Questions
The research addressed the following research questions:
1. What is the perceived leadership effectiveness of the organisations?
2. Does workforce pluralism (age, gender, working experience, tribal identification, and religious affiliation, educational qualification, marital status, and position) significantly predict leadership effectiveness?

Aim And Objectives Of The Study
The aim of this study is to investigate the impact of organisational pluralism on leadership effectiveness among private and public organisations in Jos, Nigeria.
Specific objectives of the study are to:
1. determine the perceived leadership effectiveness of the organisations.
2. examine the significant joint effect of workforce pluralism (age, gender, working experience, tribal identification, religious affiliation, educational qualification, marital status, and position) on leadership effectiveness.

Significance Of The Study

The study's significance lies primarily in helping the management to gain adequate knowledge on redesigning pluralistic organizations to a goal-oriented communication perspective that considers the understanding of the key actors that represent varieties of inclinations such as age, gender, working experience, tribal identification and religious affiliation. It also helps organisational actors to accommodate divergent view in driving organisational goals and shaping leadership skills in the management of issues on pluralism. The study helps to stimulate the value of transparency among organisational actors and leaders and demystifying the ingrained inability to make quick decisions that is common in a pluralistic organisation. Study on pluralistic organizations has important impact on the study of leadership and strategies that enhance the viability of the organization, irrespective of pluralistic views.

Research Hypothesis

This hypothesis was formulated and tested:

1.   There will be a significant joint effect of workforce pluralism (age, gender, working experience, tribal identification, religious affiliation, educational qualification, marital status, and position) on leadership effectiveness.

METHODS OF RESEARCH

Research Design

The study adopted cross-sectional descriptive survey research design because the employees who participated in the study cut-across varying characteristic. The independent variable of study is organisational pluralism while the dependent variable is leadership effectiveness.

Participants

200 employees purposively selected from two private organisations namely MTN-Nigeria and NASCO Nigeria Ltd. and two public organisations namely Jos University Teaching Hospital and University of Jos, Nigeria participated in the study. 101 of the participants were drawn from private organisations while 99 were drawn from public organisations. Participants comprise of 103 male and 97 female with a mean age of 35.27 and standard deviation of 9.87.

Research Instruments

Research instrument that yielded Cronbach Alpha coefficient of 0.70 (Nunnaly, 1978) were presented in a self-report close-ended questionnaire in the following order:

i.   Organisational pluralism. This is information on age, gender, working experience, tribal identification, religious affiliation, educational qualification, marital status, and position.

ii. Leadership effectiveness was assessed by a 18-item Essential Behavioural Leadership Qualities (EBLQ) developed by Oyinlade, Gellhaus and Darboe (2003) with Cronbach Alpha of .92, and rated on a 7-point Likert scale of very unessential (1) to extremely essential (7).

Procedure

The selected participants had their confidentiality and voluntary participation assured while ethics in research were followed. Questionnaire administration and collection took four weeks.

Method of Data Analysis

Demographic information were analyzed using descriptive statistics and presented in frequency counts and percentages while multiple regression analysis was used to analyse the hypothesis to determine the magnitude of joint and singular effects of age, gender, working experience, tribal identification, religious affiliation, educational qualification, marital status, and position on leadership effectiveness.

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Table 1: Socio-demographic Attributes of Respondents

Variables	Respondents (N=200)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	103	51.5
Female	97	48.5
Age		
18 – 35 years	105	52.5
36 – 60 + years	95	47.5
Position		
Rank and file	98	49.0
Supervisors	72	36.0
Management	30	15.0
Years of working experience		
1-5years	28	14.0
6-10years	108	54.0
11years and above	64	32.0
Marital Status		
Single	81	40.5
Married	101	50.5
Divorce	18	9.0
Tribal Identification		
Birom	50	25.0
Miango	26	13.0
Angas	22	11.0
Jawara	20	10.0
Hausa	10	5.0
Vergam	15	7.5
Ankwei	16	8.0
Fulani	12	6.0
Igbo	15	7.5
Yoruba	14	7.0
Religion		
Christian	150	75.0
Muslims	40	20.0
African traditional Religion (ATR)	10	5.0
Educational Qualification		
National Diploma (ND)	39	19.5
Higher National Diploma (HND)	135	36.3
Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.)	46	23.0
Masters Of Science (M.Sc.)	46	23.0
Doctorate degree	14	7.0

Source: Field survey, 2022.

Table 1 shows that 51.5% of the participants were males, while 48.5% were females; 52.5% were aged 18 - 35years while 47.5% were aged 36-60+years. This indicates that most of the participants belong to the youthful and active age. The result also revealed that 49.0% of the participants occupies the position of rank and file, 50.5% (supervisory position), and 15.0% (management position). On years of working experience, 14.0% of the participants had 1-5years of experience, 54.0% (6-10years) and 32.0% had 11years and above); 40.5% were single, 50.5% were married, 9.0% were divorced; 75.0% were Christians, 20.0% were Muslims, 5.0% were ATR; 19.5% had the qualification of ND, 36.3% were HND holders, 23.0% had B.Sc., 23.0% had M.Sc. and 7.0% were PhD holders; and the tribe of Birom constituted the majority (25.0%) among the sampled tribes.

Table 2: Employee Perception of Leadership Effectiveness

S/N	Statements	1	2	3	4	Mean
1	Rate the perceived overall effectiveness of your leader in carrying out his or her job responsibilities (1 = *The least effective manager I have known* and 4 = *The most effective manager I have known*)	25(12.5%)	45(22.5%)	60(30.0%)	70(35.0%)	2.94
2	Rate your leader in terms of his/her overall effectiveness as leader (1 = *Ineffective* and 4 = *Very effective*)	35(17.5%)	40(20.0%)	50(25.0%)	65(32.5%)	2.91
3	Rate your leader's performance relative to past leader's performance (1 = *Much better* and 5 = *Much worse*)	68(34.0%)	58(29.0%)	46(23.0%)	28(14.0%)	2.88
4	Rate your leader's performance comparing it with similar department/unit (1 = *Much better* and 4 = *Much worse*)	66(33.0%)	54(27.0%)	46(23.0%)	34(17.0%)	2.72

Source: Field survey, 2022

Result in Table 2 shows that majority of the participants perceived their leaders to be overall effective in carrying out job responsibilities (X=2.94); leadership's overall effectiveness (X=2.91); leader's performance relative to past leader's performance (X=2.88); and finally, leader's performance comparison with similar department/unit (X =2.72). This result concludes that participants perceived their leaders to be significantly effective in carrying out responsibilities, has a significant rating of overall effectiveness as a leader, performs better than their predecessors and comparatively better than the leaders of similar units.

Table 3: Multiple Regression Analysis Showing the Effect of Pluralism on Leadership Effectiveness

Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	R2	F	P	Variables	Means	Std. dev.	ß	T	P
							Gender	1.48	.50	-.47	-6.91	.00
							Age	35.29	9.85	.19	2.63	.00
							Experience	2.18	.54	.17	2.40	.02
Regression	18503.23	5	6167.74				Religion	1.78	.90	-.40	-.76	.00
Residual	43814.13	197	223.54	.30	27.59	.00	Tribe	5.56	3.45	-.16	-2.05	.04
Total	62317.35	199					Education	2.68	2.20	.40	.99	.03
							Marital Status	2.58	1.24	-.80	-1.96	.01
							Position	1.65	.75	-.15	-2.88	.00

Source: Filed Survey, 2022

Table 3 presents the result of the hypothesis which states that age, gender, work experience, religious affiliation, tribal identification, education, marital status, and position would jointly predict leadership effectiveness. The hypothesis was significant (R2=.30; F (5, 199) =27.59; p<.05), indicating that 30% variance on leadership effectiveness jointly accounted for by the elements of pluralism, namely age, gender, work experience, religion, and tribal identification. While gender (ß=-.47; t=-6.91; p<.05), age (ß=.19; t=2.63; p<.05), Experience (ß=-.17; t=2.40; p<.05), religion (ß=-.40; t=-.76; p<.05), tribe (ß=-.16; t=-2.05; p<.05), Educational qualification (ß=.40; t=.88; p<.05), marital status (ß=-.80; t=-1.96; p<.05), position (ß=-.15; t=-2.88; p<.05), separately predicted leadership effectiveness. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study aims at investigating the impact of organisational pluralism on leadership effectiveness among private and public organisations. The hypothesis tested in the study confirmed that age, gender, work experience, religion affiliation, tribal identification, education, marital status, and position jointly predicted leadership effectiveness. The result is consistent with several empirical literature (Mitchell et al., 2015; Nishii & Mayer, 2009; Randel, Dean, Ehrhart, Chung, & Shore, 2016; Zheng, Diaz, Zheng, & Tang, 2017).

Randel, Dean, Ehrhart, Chung, and Shore (2016) compared the interactive effects of leader and psychological climate of a pluralistic workforce and found that positive psychological climate enhanced helping behaviour toward the work group and the leader by the employee in the diversely represented organisation. Nishii and Mayer (2009) operationalized inclusive leadership at a group level as involving a high group mean on leader-member exchange (LMX) and low LMX differentiation (low variability). They found that there was a negative relationship between demographic diversity and turnover. The plausible

explanation of this finding is that demographic plurality (namely, age, gender, work experience, religion affiliation, tribal identification, education, marital status, and position) is stimulating and therefore facilitate organisational commitment. In studying leadership and professional diversity, Mitchell et al., (2015) selected 75 professionally diverse health care teams working in hospitals in Australia and examined them over a 12-month period. It was discovered that the relationship between leader effectiveness in inclusive practices influence team identity and perceived status differences. This suggests that inclusive leaders enhance identification with the team which in turn improves team performance. In addition, leader effectiveness in inclusion lowers the perception of status differences, which allows for improved team performance. Zheng, Diaz, Zheng, and Tang (2017) examined leader inclusion in China and found that inclusion moderates the relationship between deep-level similarity between the supervisor and subordinate (personality, interests, and values) and taking charge (a form of OCB). Specifically, leader inclusion was especially important when deep-level similarity was low.

This study was in consonant with the suggestion made by Focus Consultancy (2011) opining that key determinant of success is the effective management of diversity. They assumed that if application of equality and diversity policies in the organisations is adequately managed by leadership that there would be reduction of the negative effects of cultural dominance that may form as a result of powerful clique among pluralistic workforce.

The finding of this study contradicts the previous findings of DiStefano and Maznevski (2000) who found that diverse teams tend to perform better or worse than homogeneous ones, in a study conducted among 73 teams selected from different companies in six different countries. According to DiSteno and Maznevski (2000), the heterogeneous working team could not outwit the homogenous group because team diversity most likely came with the unique problem of reduced cohesion, increased conflict, difficulties in communication and participation, and employment relations problems. However, the ability of a leader to turn these negatives into positive forces for productivity is what determines effectiveness.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study evaluates the effect of organisational pluralism on leadership effectiveness among private and public sectors. The hypothesis tested resulted into the conclusion that age, gender, work experience, religion affiliation, tribal identification, education, marital status, and position jointly and independently predicted leadership effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the findings of this study that organisational pluralism influence leadership effectiveness, it is therefore recommended that organisation should cultivate the culture of ensuring a pluralistic workforce and begin the early implementation of structure that facilitate mentoring and coaching the entire workforce to embrace and imbibe culture leadership at all levels of the organisation.

REFERENCES
Ahrne, G., Brunsson, N., & Seidl, D. (2016). Resurrecting organization by going beyond organizations. *European Management Journal*, 34, 93–101.
Ashcraft, K. L. (2001). Organized dissonance: feminist bureaucracy as hybrid form. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 1301- 1322.
Battilana, J., & Lee, M. (2014). Advancing research on hybrid organizing – insights from the study of social enterprises. *Academy of Management Annals*, 8, 397– 441.
Bennis, W. (1989). *On Becoming a Leader' Reading*. MA: Addison –Wesley Publishing, New York.
Br`es, L. (2013). Membership in pluralistic organization: the case of ISO26000. *American Academy of Management Best Papers Proceedings*, doi: 10.5465/AMBPP.2013.123.
Br`es, L., Raufflet, E., & Boghossian, J. (2017). Pluralism in Organizations: Learning from Unconventional Forms of Organizations. *International Journal of Management Reviews, 00, 1–23*. Doi: 10.1111/ijmr.12136.
Chakravarthy, B., & Gargiulo, M. (1998). Maintaining leadership legitimacy in the transition to new organizational forms. *Journal of Management Studies, 35*, 437–456.
Cribbin, J. J. (1981). Leadership: Strategies for organizational effectiveness. New York, USA.
Denis, J.L., Lamothe, L. and Langley, A. (2001). The dynamics of collective leadership and strategic change in pluralistic organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44, 809–837.
Denis, J. L., Langley, A., & Rouleau, L. (2007). Strategizing in pluralistic contexts: rethinking theoretical frames. *Human Relations*, *60*(1), 179–215.
Denis, J. L., Langley, A., & Sergi, V. (2012). Leadership in the plural. *Academy of Management Annals*, 6, 211– 283.
Denis, J. L., Dompierre, G., Langley, A., & Rouleau, L. (2011). Escalating Indecision: Between reification and strategic ambiguity. *Organization Science, 22*(1), 225–244.

DiStefano, J. J., & Maznevski, M. L. (2000). Creating value with diverse teams in global management. *Organizational Dynamics, 29*(1), 45-63.

Donelly JH, Ivancevich JM, Gibson JL (1985) Organizations: Behavior, structure, processes. Business Publications Inc, USA.

Focus Consultancy (2013). Diversity and innovation: A business opportunity for all. http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/progress/index_en.html

Garud, R. (2008). Conferences as venues for the configuration of emerging organizational fields: the case of cochlear implants. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45, 1061– 1088.

Gioia, D. A. & Pitre, E. (1990). Multiparadigm perspectives on theory building. *Academy of Management Review,* 15, 584-602.

Glynn, M. A. (2000). When cymbals become symbols: conflict over organizational identity within a symphony orchestra. *Organization Science*, 11, 285–298.

Ingram, P., & Torfason, M. T. (2010). Organizing the in-between: The population dynamics of network-weaving organizations in the global interstate network. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 55, 577–605.

Jarzabkowski, P. (2008). Shaping Strategy as a Structuration Process. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*(4), 621–650.

Jarzabkowski, P., & Seidl, D. (2008). The role of meetings in the social practice of strategy. *Organization Studies*, 29, 1391-1426.

Jarzabkowski, P., & Fenton, E. M. (2006). Strategizing and organizing in pluralistic contexts. *Long Range Planning, 39*(6), 631–648.

Kraatz, M. S., & Block, E. S. (2008). Organizational implications of institutional pluralism. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, and K.., Sahlin-Andersson, (Eds.): *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication, 243–275.

Lawrence, T. B., & Hardy, C. (1999). Building bridges for refugees. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 35, 48–70.

Levay, C., & Waks, C. (2009). Professions and the Pursuit of Transparency in Healthcare: Two cases of soft autonomy. *Organization Studies, 30*(5), 509–527.

Lowendahl, B., & Revang, O. (1998). Challenges to existing strategy theory in a postindustrial society. *Strategic Management Journal, 19*(8), 755–773.

Mitchell, R., Boyle, B., Parker, V., Giles, M., Chiang, V., & Joyce, P. (2015). Managing inclusiveness and diversity in teams: How leader inclusiveness affects performance through status and team identity. *Human Resource Management, 54,* 217–239.

Murphy, C., & Yates, J. (2009). *The International Organization for Standardization (ISO): Global Governance through Voluntary Consensus*. London: Routledge.

Nishii, L. H., & Mayer, D. M. (2009). Do inclusive leaders help to reduce turnover in diverse groups? The moderating role of leader–member exchange in the diversity to turnover relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 94*(6), 1412.

Pusic, E. (1998). Organization Theory and Participation. In F. Heller, E. Pusic, G. Strauss, B. Wilpert (Eds.): Organizational Participation. Myth and Reality. New York: Oxford University Press, 65–96.

Randel, A. E., Dean, M. A., Ehrhart, K. H., Chung, B. G., & Shore, L. M. (2016). Leader inclusiveness, psychological diversity climate, and helping behaviors. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(1), 216–234. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMP-04-2013-0123.

Sillince, J., Jarzabkowski, P., & Shaw, D. (2012). Shaping strategic action through the rhetorical construction and exploitation of ambiguity. *Organization Science*, 23, 630–650.

Stryker, R. (2000). Legitimacy Processes as Institutional Politics. Implications for Theory and Research in the Sociology of Organizations. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 17*, 179–223.

Sẅard, A. (2016). Trust, reciprocity, and actions: The development of trust in temporary inter-organizational relations. *Organization Studies*, 37, 1841–1860.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, T. R., & Massarik, F. (1961). *Leadership and organization: A behavioural approach.* Mc-Graw Hill Book Company, New York, USA.

Thompson, A. A., & Strickland, A. J. (1996). *Strategic management: Concepts and cases.* Chicago: Irwin, USA.

Trist, E. (1983). Referent organizations and the development of inter-organizational domains. *Human Relations*, 36, 269– 284.

Yukl, G. A. (1994). Leadership in Organizations. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Zheng, X., Diaz, I., Zheng, X., & Tang, N. (2017). From deep-level similarity to taking charge: The moderating role of face consciousness and managerial competency of inclusion. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 38*(1), 89–104.

Zilber, T. B. (2011). Institutional multiplicity in practice: a tale of two high-tech conferences in Israel. *Organization Science*, 22, 1539–1559.