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Abstract
The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between the leadership strategy aspects and the manpower productivity among the Sports and Youth Organization’s employers of Hamedan Province. In this research, all of the managers and employers of the Sports and Youth Organization’s employers of Hamedan Province are considered as the statistical population among which 29 of managers and 103 of managers and employers were selected as the statistical sample. For sample selection the random sampling was used. The research methodology is descriptive-survey. The instrument of the study was a researcher-made questionnaire which its first part composed of 16 questions relevant to the leadership strategy and was answered only by managers and the second part composed of 29 questions of five-choice-Likert scale for manpower productivity and answered by managers and employers. Data analysis was done using SPSS 19.00 software. For data description the descriptive statistics, frequency tables, percentages and bar diagrams, and for deductive statistics at end Spearman’s correlational coefficient and Kolmogorov-Smirnov’ test were used. Regarding the results of the study, it is concluded that there is a relationship between the absolute leadership strategy and manpower efficiency, and there is an inverse relationship between benevolent absolute leadership and manpower efficiency. There is a relationship between the absolute leadership strategy and manpower efficiency, and also between the democratic leadership strategy and manpower efficiency.
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Introduction
Leadership strategies are strongly affected by the cultural environment of the communities, and it can be said that leadership and management strategies in any civilization are instances of that civilization’s structure. It is evident that the cultural structure of any society is also affected by the social, economic, and the belief environments. Thus, managers’ behavior is based on the cultural environment structure to some extent. It should be noted that these theories are proposed for what kind of environment and their application requires what requirements (Rezaeian, 2001, 423).

Leadership: leadership is the capability of influencing on a group and directing it to the intended goals. The source of this influence or power is formal. Since the management position is formal and the authority is given to formally and it is possible that someone accepts the leader’s position in an organization as a result of getting a position, the discussion is that all of the leaders are not managers, and all of the managers are not leaders, too. Because organization gives specific rights to any manager, it does not mean or guaranty that the manager can lead the organization effectively. The non-organizational or non-administrative leadership (i.e. the influencing power which is acquired by individual and is one of the organization’s external sources) can have more importance than the formal influencing power. In other words, leadership can be established inside the group, like a leader who is appointed (Robins, 2004, 218).
Successful vs. effective leadership: when someone tries to influence others’ behavior, this motive is called the leadership effort. Responding this leadership effort could be successful and unsuccessful, because the administrative responsibility of any manager in any organization is to do the jobs with contribution of others. In another definition for leadership, it is said that the general criteria in any approach for identifying leaders is the effect made by an individual on colleagues. Thus, is the discussion of leadership, leaders are defined as members of the group who affect others’ activities. Three conclusions are possible:

First, leading a group the problem is not the existence of inexistence of the leader, but all of the group members who affect others to some extent are considered as leaders. In fact, in this definition the discussion should not be about the leaders against the disciples, but the amount of the leadership of anybody in the group should be discussed which will be a quantitative variable.

Second, the leader’s behavior is the interaction with people which like other interactions is mutual (reciprocal). That is, as the leader affects the disciples (followers) and disciples affect the leader, too. So, leaders are obedient to the position and demands of the group members greatly by two different absolute leadership and liberal leadership strategies and have similar thought, but their strategy is based on the disciples’ demands and affected by them.

Third, there should be a differentiation between the leaders who affect the servitors and their organizations’ managers. In other words, the formal leaders are not the real ones (Jasbi, 1994, 29). Any reality has three stages: firstly it is derided. Secondly, it is objected extremely. Thirdly, it is accepted as a belief.

Leaders are those who dare to work and ready to be objected. Leaders are responsible for their beliefs and are ready to be mocked, objected, and finally accepted by their ideas (Karosley, 2003, 9).

Leaders who deceive their colleagues and humiliate them are going to be dismissed as soon as their power is going to be faded away (E. O’Conner, 2000, 7 & 8).

To be informed of the leadership power, the best way is that the leader should be told that a positive change is needed. Managers are able to keep the movement direction but they are unable to change. To direct people to the new direction the influence is needed.

Leadership theories:
A lot of theories have been proposed about leadership. They can be summarized into three groups:

Leader’s personal traits theories
Leader’s behavior theories
Leader’s situational and appropriateness theories (Alvani, 2006, 143).

a) Leader’s personal traits theories
The innate traits are mentioned in this group of theories. Based on these theories, leaders are supermen who deserve leadership because of some traits that are Godsend. Thus, these traits can play the leadership role in the organization that has the traits like smartness, extrovert, self-mastery, self-confidence, eloquence and charisma, face beauty and attraction, and etc. one of the authors has mentioned four main traits for leaders:

Intelligence: research on successful organizational leaders has shown that their intelligence is more than disciples and subordinates.

Social maturity and insight: leaders are stable emotionally. They have self-confidence and an extensive insight and vision towards the issues and events around.

Seeking success motivation and tendency toward the goal: leaders have strong motivation for success, and they seek success.

Humanism: humanism and emphasis on human values are other distinctive traits of the successful leaders.
Another author has mentioned six traits for leaders:
1. Appearance and physical characteristics like height, mien, and hand gestures,
2. Cultural background like education and experience,
3. Intelligence,
4. Personality like extrovert
5. Occupational traits like perseverance and effort, innovation and invention,
6. Social traits like political and social communication.

What has been proved about traits theories; however, is the degree of intelligence and sagacity of the leaders as a main trait. There is no agreement about other traits and since there have been very successful leaders in organizations without having the above-mentioned traits, traits theories are not considered to be a comprehensive and complete set for leadership explanation.

For leadership justification though, these traits are not enough. The first weakness of the mentioned traits is that the situational factors have been ignored. Having only the relevant traits cannot turn an individual into a successful or effective leader. Leader should take appropriate actions and “appropriate actions” in a situation cannot be considered appropriate in another situation (Robins, 2004. pp. 219 & 220).

Research completed during 1900 to 1957 shows that leaders are people with more power of regulation and coordination, dominancy, extroverted, and delicacy towards the environment, but in these studies, there are two problems for leaders before starting their leadership:
One is that, having these traits does not necessarily mean the leadership, but it requires other conditions. Accordingly, there are other people without having the leadership responsibilities that have these traits (Jasbi, 1995, 238).
Some of the studies have concluded that the effective managers are taller than ineffective managers, while other studies have concluded inversely. Even some of the authors considered the leadership traits relevant to the physical and appearance characteristics or line characteristics. Traits attitude has been encountered with a big problem in which the way of communication with assumed leader and the leader itself have not been proven or cleared.

b) Behavioral approach
Researchers who have not been successful in case of traits’ theories (noticing personal traits), had to notice the leaders special behaviors. They wanted to know if successful leaders had something unique from the perspective of behavior or not. For example, they wanted to know if this group of leaders would take democracy or absolute leadership. They hoped to find an appropriate response to their questions in case of being successful in this way regarding the behavioral approach, and can suggest scientific guidelines (a thing which was not possible in theories). If the research on the personal traits was successful, it would be possible to appoint appropriate people as leaders and place them in an organizational position and finally turn them into competent leaders. Contrary to this fact, in research on the leaders’ behaviors determining behaviors of leaders were found. That is, the behavioral and personal traits’ theories (approach) are theoretical assumptions which the mentioned theories are based upon. If the reliability of the traits’ theories had been proved, it would have been said that some people are born as leaders. In that case, they could have those traits or not.
On the other hand, if the specific behaviors could be the representative of successful leaders, teaching leadership would be possible. That is, it was possible to plan schedules and teach people the leadership patterns and make them successful leaders. There is no doubt that this subject could be exciting enough, because this meant that it is possible to add to successful leaders. If training is possible, more successful or effective leaders will be trained and delivered (Robins, 2004, 220 & 221).
Generally, two kinds of leadership behaviors in this study were investigated. Imperative behavior based on duty, and behavior based on human communication. I these studies, the assumption were that choosing any strategies by leader depend on the leader’s attitude and assumptions towards the leadership origin and human nature, in a way that, if leader considers his/her power originated from his own position and imagine the human as a natural lazy and unreliable creature, he/she will have an imperative
and task-oriented behavior. However, if the leader considers his/her power originated from the disciples’ support and imagine the human as a responsible and reliable creature, he/she will have a partnership and humanism behavior (Rezaeian, 1380, 426).
In 1950 the European Organization for Economic Cooperation (OECD) has officially defined the productivity as: the result of a deduction which is obtained from dividing the amount or value of the product into the amount or the value of one of the production factors. In this way the productivity, capital, ingredients, and labor force can be discussed.
Productivity is the proportion of output to one of the production factors (land, capital, labor force, and management). In this definition management is considered as one of the factors specifically. The proportion of production to each of these factors is a criterion for measuring the productivity.
In 1985, the European Productivity Agency defined productivity as the degree and extreme of effective use of each of the production factors. Also, this organization declared that productivity is a kind of attitude and view on the basis that anybody can do their work and duties better than the previous day. Believing in productivity improvement means to have firm belief in humans progressing.
In the announcement of formation of Productivity Center of Japan in 1995 related to the goals resulted from productivity improvement it is stated that: “the utmost use of physical sources, manpower, and other production factors scientifically in a way that productivity improving leads to production expenses decreasing, extending the markets, increasing employment, and increasing the living standards for the people of the nation.”
From the viewpoint of Productivity Center of Japan, productivity is a priority and a national choice which leads to the social prosperity increasing and decreasing poverty. Since its establishment in 1955, the Productivity Center of Japan has directed the national movement of productivity increasing in this country under three bases which are: employment increasing, cooperation between labor force and management and fair and equal distribution.
The results of productivity improvement in a number of countries in recent decades have led to the national productivity level promotion as a priority in important countries.
From the beginning of the 1970s productivity has been one of the most important issues that getting a lot of attention at the level of organizations and countries. The amount and rate of the productivity development in any country have a crucial effect on the life standards, inflation, unemployment, health, and economy and competitiveness world widely. In a survey completed among the U.S. industries’ managers, more than 9 percent of the managers believe that productivity improvement is one of the two or three important issues the country faces.
Calculating the productivity in organizations is one of the important indices in studying and evaluation of their performance. Doctor John Kendick, one of the contemporary and well-known authors on the issue of productivity has stated the importance of productivity in this way that: companies and organizations which their productivity is higher than the average productivity of industry usually have a higher profit boundary. Furthermore, if the productivity of a company increases faster than its competitors the profit boundary of that company will also be increased. Inversely, those organizations whose productivity is lower than the average index of productivity in industry and their productivity rate is less than the competitors will eventually fail.
Mandel: productivity is the proportion of the production turnover to the consumed source which is compared with the base year.
Davis: the obtained change in the amount of yield in exchange for the consumed sources.
Fabricant: a continuous proportion between output and input.

Types of productivity
**Partial productivity:** is the proportion of a product value and amount to a category of input. For example, product in exchange for everyone per hour (labor force productivity criterion) or the value and
amount of the produced product in exchange for each ton of consumed raw materials (productivity) or the interest of produced income in exchange for each Rial of capital (capital productivity) and so on. 

**Total factor productivity:** is the proportion of the product’s net proportion to sum of the labor force and capital inputs. Usually instead of net production value of sales and in the denominator the labor force and capital summation are placed. This criterion is not an appropriate one for some of the criterion commodities like television and computer which most of their producing expenses consist of consumables.

**Total productivity:** is the whole value of the produced product to the whole consuming inputs value summation. This index measures the common and simultaneous effect of all of the inputs and sources (including manpower, materials and components, machineries, capital, and energy) related to the obtained product value.

**Research conceptual model:**

\[
\text{Absolute reactionary-exploitation leadership} \quad \uparrow \quad \text{Benevolent reactionary leadership} \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{Likert model} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{participatory leadership} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{productivity} \quad \downarrow \quad \text{Counseling leadership}
\]

**Research methodology**

The current research is an applied one based on the purpose and is a descriptive-survey based on the nature and method. The statistical population of this research includes the managers of the Organization of Sports and Youth among which 29 managers of the affiliated organizations of Hamedan Provinces and is 140. Estimating the sample content by Morgan and Takman are respectively 29 and 103.

Required data and information were sorted through library and questionnaire which are the most common field methods based on the five-choice-Likert, and scooting each question was done from very much to very little. The used questionnaire in this research is as following. 

Leadership strategy questionnaire:
- Questions 1 to 14 are relevant to reactionary-absolute exploitation leadership.
- Questions 5 to 8 are relevant to the benevolent reactionary leadership strategy.
- Questions 9 to 12 are relevant to the counseling leadership strategy.

Questionnaire of productivity evaluation (Hersey, Blanchard, and Goldsmith):
- The scoring and interpretation of the results procedure: data related to the productivity indices includes 29 questions as following:
  - a) If the calculated point is between 160 and 128, the employer has a very high productivity.
  - b) If the calculated point is between 96 and 127, the employer has a high productivity.
  - c) If the calculated point is between 64 and 95, the employer has a normal productivity.
  - d) If the calculated point is between 32 and 63, it indicates that the employer has a low productivity.
Questionnaire validity and reliability:
The questionnaire was delivered to the field relevant instructors and experts and the validity of this questionnaire was investigated based on their views. For determining the reliability of the questionnaire in this research the Cronbach’s Alpha method was used which is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Cornbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute reactionary-exploitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent reactionary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productivity</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leadership</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole aloha</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.913</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis and hypotheses testing was done using the SPSS software.

Spearman test:
**Hypothesis 1:** there is not a positive relationship between the absolute reactionary leadership and manpower productivity. H0: $p=0$
There is a positive relationship between the absolute reactionary leadership and manpower productivity. H1: $P \neq 0$ (claim).

Table 2. Spearman correlational coefficient between absolute reactionary leadership and manpower productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>Spearman correlation coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute reactionary leadership and manpower productivity</td>
<td>$r^2=0.225$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the above table and since the calculated sig is more than 0.05, H0 is rejected then the above claim stating that there is a relationship between the absolute reactionary leadership and manpower productivity is confirmed. The correlational coefficient for 29 data sets of leadership strategy and 103 data sets for productivity is 0.475.
About the intensity of the relationship regarding the calculated determining coefficient the intensity is so low because the amount of the coefficient is 0.225 and it is smaller than 0.07.

**Hypothesis 2:** there is not an inverse relationship between the benevolent-reactionary leadership strategy and the manpower productivity. H0: $p=0$
There is an inverse relationship between the benevolent-reactionary leadership strategy and the manpower productivity. H1: $P \neq 0$ (claim).
Table 3. Spearman correlational coefficient between the benevolent-reactionary leadership strategy and the manpower productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Spearman correlational coefficient (Significance level (sig))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolent reactionary leadership and manpower productivity</td>
<td>-0.591 0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Existence of significant and inverse relationship

According to the above table there is an inverse relationship benevolent-reactionary leadership strategy and the manpower productivity, because the correlational coefficient is calculated as ($r = -0.591$). Accordingly, with the certainty level of 95% there is an inverse relationship between two above-mentioned variables. According to the determining coefficient of 34 percent there is unity between these two variables. Thus, H1 with the certainty of 95% is confirmed and H0 is rejected.

Hypothesis 3: there is not a positive relationship between the counseling leadership strategy and manpower productivity. H0: $p=0$

There is a positive relationship between the counseling leadership strategy and manpower productivity. H1: $P \neq 0$ (claim).

Table 4. Spearman correlational coefficient between the counseling leadership strategy and manpower productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Spearman correlation coefficient (Significance level (sig))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactionary leadership and manpower productivity</td>
<td>0.670 0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\rho = 0.225$

Determining coefficient

Regarding the above table and since the sig calculated amount is less than 0.05 H0 is rejected. So, the above claim stating that there is a relationship between the absolute reactionary leadership and manpower productivity is confirmed in this research. The correlational coefficient for 29 data sets of leadership strategy and 103 data sets for productivity is 0.670.

About the intensity of the relationship regarding the calculated determining coefficient the intensity is so low because the amount of the coefficient is 0.225 and it is smaller than 0.07.

Hypothesis 4: there is not a positive relationship between the democratic leadership strategy (group participation) and manpower productivity. H0: $p=0$

There is a positive relationship between the democratic leadership strategy (group participation) and manpower productivity. H1: $P \neq 0$ (claim).

Table 5. Correlational coefficient between the democratic leadership and manpower productivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Spearman correlation coefficient (Significance level (sig))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reactionary leadership and manpower productivity</td>
<td>0.860 0.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\rho = 0.739$

Determining coefficient

According the above table because the calculated sig is less than 0.05 there is a relationship between the democratic leadership strategy (group participation) and manpower productivity. Correlational coefficient for 103 data sets of productivity and 29 data sets of management strategy is 0.860.

About the intensity of the relationship regarding the calculated determining coefficient because its amount is 0.739 and it is more than the determining coefficient 0.07 the intensity is so high.
Conclusions

**Hypothesis 1** - there is a positive relationship between the reactionary leadership strategy and manpower productivity.

Regarding the obtained result from the research questionnaire’s test, since the calculated sig is less than 0.05 H0 is rejected, and the above claim stating that there is a relationship between the reactionary leadership strategy and manpower productivity is confirmed in this research. The correlational coefficient for 29 data sets of leadership strategy and 103 data sets for productivity is 0.475.

About the intensity of the relationship regarding the calculated determining coefficient the intensity is so low because the amount of the coefficient is 0.225 and it is smaller than 0.07.

**Hypothesis 2** - There is an inverse relationship between the benevolent-reactionary leadership strategy and the manpower productivity. For investigating the above hypothesis which is provided in table (4-10) Spearman correlational coefficient was used. Because the correlational coefficient is $\gamma_h = -0.591$ and the significance level is less than 0.01, with the certainty of 99% there is an inverse relationship between these two variables. There is 34 percent unity between these two variables, accordingly, H1 is confirmed and H0 is rejected.

**Peripheral hypothesis3** - There is a positive relationship between the counseling leadership strategy and manpower productivity.

Regarding the obtained results since the sig calculated amount is less than 0.05 H0 is rejected. So, the above claim stating that there is a relationship between the absolute reactionary leadership and manpower productivity is confirmed in this research. The correlational coefficient for 29 data sets of leadership strategy and 103 data sets for productivity is 0.670.

About the intensity of the relationship regarding the calculated determining coefficient the intensity is so low because the amount of the coefficient is 0.225 and it is smaller than 0.07. Accordingly, the weak relationship between the counseling leadership strategy and manpower productivity is confirmed.

**Hypothesis 4** - There is a positive relationship between the democratic leadership strategy (group participation) and manpower productivity.

Regarding the results of the test, since the calculated sig is less than 0.05 there is a relationship between the democratic leadership strategy (group participation) and manpower productivity. Correlational coefficient for 103 data sets of productivity and 29 data sets of management strategy is 0.860.

About the intensity of the relationship regarding the calculated determining coefficient because its amount is 0.739 and it is more than the determining coefficient 0.07 the intensity is so high.

Regarding the findings in this research, the leadership strategy can have a positive effect on the productivity when the democratic leadership strategy is used more. Based on the theoretical arguments increasing the education can change the management strategies from imperative to participatory and direct the employers’ needs to more humanism strategies. Furthermore, with respect to the Maslow’s needs hierarchy it could be analyzed that the primary needs of the employers leave their place for the middle needs and respect and self-actualization.
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