جامعة الأمير عبد القادر للعلوم الإسلامية قسنطينة – الجزائر
ISSN: 1112-4377, EISSN: 2588-2384
المجلد: 30. العدد. 04. السنة. 2026.
مجلة المعيار
EL MIEYAR

Administrative Leadership Styles and Their Sociological Implications for Industrial Productivity

أنماط القيادة الإدارية وانعكاساتها على الإنتاجية في المؤسسة الصناعية

Zineb Chennouf[1]

zineb.chennouf@univ-ouargla.dz

Received: 31/03/2026 ***published: 15/09/2026***

تاريخ الاستلام: 2026/03/31 تاريخ النشر: 2026/09/15

Article abstract:

This article examines how democratic, authoritarian, and laissez-faire leadership styles generate social dynamics affecting productivity in Algerian industrial enterprises. Drawing on Weber, Lewin, and social capital theory, the study combines a questionnaire, observation, and interviews covering all 70 workers at PLASTUB Company, Ghardaïa. Findings show that the democratic style predominates, enhancing productivity through participatory decision-making, social bond consolidation, and organizational trust, while authoritarian and laissez-faire styles are structurally absent.

Key words: *Administrative leadership styles; Intra-organizational social dynamics; Participatory decision-making; Social capital; Algerian industrial enterprise.*

ملخص المقال:

يطرح هذا المقال تساؤلاً حول كيفية توليد أنماط القيادة الديمقراطية والاستبدادية والفوضوية لديناميكيات اجتماعية تؤثر على الإنتاجية في المؤسسة الصناعية الجزائرية. استناداً إلى أعمال فيبر ولوين ونظرية الرأسمال الاجتماعي، جمعت الدراسة بين الاستمارة والملاحظة والمقابلة على 70 عاملاً في مؤسسة *PLASTUB* بغرداية. أثبتت النتائج هيمنة النمط الديمقراطي الذي يُعزّز الإنتاجية عبر المشاركة في القرار وتوطيد الروابط الاجتماعية والثقة التنظيمية، فيما غاب النمطان الاستبدادي والفوضوي بنيوياً.

كلمات مفتاحية: أنماط القيادة الإدارية؛ الديناميكيات الاجتماعية التنظيمية؛ المشاركة في صنع القرار؛ الرأسمال الاجتماعي؛ المؤسسة الصناعية الجزائرية.

1. **University of Ouargla (Algeria)**

Introduction

The question of administrative leadership and its relationship to productivity occupies a central position within the field of the sociology of organizations and work, given the sociological dimensions it encompasses, notably patterns of authority, mechanisms of social control, and the structure of intra-organizational relationships. The industrial enterprise is not merely an economic unit oriented toward the maximization of output; rather, it constitutes a distinctly social space in which relations of power, subordination, negotiation, and resistance are forged, and through which individuals reproduce their professional identities and collective affiliations. At the heart of this space stands the leader as the pivotal institutional actor who organizes interactions and directs collective energies toward—or diverts them from—organizational objectives.

Since the classic studies conducted by George Elton Mayo and his associates at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company between 1924 and 1932, the social sciences have come to recognize that productivity is not a mechanical outcome of physical variables such as illumination, temperature, and working hours, but is fundamentally a product of the social structure within which labor is performed. When the Hawthorne experiments demonstrated that productivity increased even as lighting levels declined, it became evident that group belonging, feelings of recognition, and status within the work group constitute the true drivers of productive performance, surpassing technical and material factors (Mayo, 1933). This paradoxical discovery opened the way for a sustained trajectory of sociological research aimed at elucidating the hidden social dynamics that propel productive behavior, among the most notable outcomes of which has been the growing scholarly interest in administrative leadership as the organizational variable most decisive in shaping the social climate of the enterprise.

However, research attention to this problematic in the Algerian context has remained modest relative to the strategic importance of the Algerian industrial enterprise, particularly in the period following the 1990s reforms that redrew the contours of the industrial sector in the transition from a socialist management model to a market economy. This research gap deepens when it concerns industrial enterprises in the Saharan and southern regions, which operate within distinctive social and cultural contexts characterized by particular values pertaining to work, authority, and collective solidarity. In a related context, (Boufelja, 2006) documented that mechanisms of social control in Algerian enterprises interact with the local organizational culture in ways that ultimately determine the nature of workers' occupational commitment.

Furthermore, most available studies on this subject tend toward psychological framing that focuses on individual variables such as motivation, satisfaction, and personality, at the expense of a sociological framing that foregrounds social structures, relational patterns, status, and collective identity as deeper explanatory factors for productive behavior. From this methodological critique springs the justification for the present article: to re-read the relationship between administrative leadership and productivity from an explicitly sociological perspective that transcends the psychological stimulus-response model toward an understanding of how different leadership styles generate social dynamics that reproduce and reshape organizational reality.

The central research question guiding this article is: How do administrative leadership styles—democratic, authoritarian, and laissez-faire—generate social dynamics within the industrial enterprise that bear upon productivity levels? Three subsidiary questions emerge: What social dynamics does the authoritarian style produce, and what are their implications for the production process? What are the socio-organizational consequences of the laissez-faire style for the productive process? And how does democratic leadership consolidate an intra-organizational relational structure that contributes to elevated productivity levels?

In light of this problematic, the study proceeds from three guiding hypotheses, which are tested against the field data in the concluding section of the empirical analysis: (H1) The authoritarian leadership style generates a relational structure of rigid subordination that erodes workers social capital and self-engagement, thereby constraining productivity. (H2) The laissez-faire leadership style produces a state of organizational anomie and role ambiguity that obstructs the coordination necessary for production. (H3) The democratic

leadership style consolidates participatory decision-making, organizational trust, and social capital, thereby elevating productivity levels.

PLASTUB Plastic Pipes Company in Ghardaia was selected as the field site for clear substantive reasons. It represents a model of a private industrial enterprise with an extended organizational history dating back to 1982, situated within a geographic and cultural context distinguished by the specificities of Ibadi values related to collective work, consultation as embodied in the institution of the Halqa council, and social solidarity. This complex context endows the research with additional dimensions that enrich the sociological analysis and render it more intricate than analyses conducted in standard urban settings in northern Algeria.

1. Theoretical Framework & Methodological Approach

1.1 Theoretical Framework: Administrative Leadership and Productivity in Sociological Perspective:

1.1.1 The Weberian Legacy: Organizational Authority and Its Typologies

Max Weber laid the foundational pillars of sociological thinking on organizational authority in his seminal work *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, wherein he distinguished three ideal types of legitimate authority: traditional, charismatic, and legal-rational. The last of these constitutes the ideological basis of the modern enterprise, grounded in codified rules, functional specialization, impersonality in dealings, and a defined hierarchical order. (Weber, 1968) Robert King Merton (1940), however, identified the phenomenon of "bureaucratic dysfunction" in his classic essay "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality," whereby rules are transformed from means into ends in themselves. (Merton, 1940) From an alternative vantage point, Michel Crozier (1963) revealed in *Le phénomène bureaucratique* that organizational members deploy individual and collective strategies to control "zones of uncertainty" and maximize their margins of freedom, thereby recasting the image of the leader as a strategic player rather than a mere bearer of formal authority. (Crozier, 1963)

1.1.2 Lewin's Experimental Typology of Leadership: A Sociological Reading

The experiment conducted by Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph White (1939) (Lewin, Lippitt, & White, 1939) at the Iowa Child Welfare Research Station constitutes one of the foundational works in understanding the relationship between leadership style and the social dynamics of the group. The researchers distinguished three styles, which may be read sociologically as follows:

a. The Democratic Style:

This style gives rise to a work group characterized by cohesion, exchange, and belonging, since participation in decision-making transforms workers from objects of management into actors within the organizational process. This is reflected in productivity through the generation of what is termed "internal commitment," which sustains performance even in the absence of external surveillance (Etzioni, 1975).

b. The Authoritarian Style:

This style produces a relational structure founded on rigid hierarchy and subordination, reproducing within the organization what Pierre Bourdieu (1980) termed "symbolic domination." (Bourdieu, 1980). Workers comply with directives not because these are rational but because refusal carries consequences. Over the long term, this structure leads to a decline in self-engagement and an erosion of the enterprise's social capital (Bass, 1990).

c. The Laissez-faire Style:

This style produces what resembles a condition of Durkheimian anomie, which diffuses ambiguity in role distribution and weakens workers' collective identity, thereby obstructing the coordination necessary for production (Northouse, 2021).

1.1.3 Productivity from the Perspective of the Sociology of Work

The sociology of work broadens the concept of productivity to encompass non-visible dimensions. Jean-Pierre Durand (2012) argues in *La chaîne invisible* that productivity in post-Fordist society has become linked to cognitive mobilization and the degree to which workers are prepared to deploy their knowledge and relational skills (Durand, 2012). The concepts of social capital acquire considerable explanatory importance here, as James Samuel Coleman (1988) demonstrates that trust, cooperative networks, and norms of exchange constitute social capital that generates added value not directly quantifiable (Coleman, 1988). Studies reveal that democratic leadership is most conducive to building and preserving this capital (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). The theory of organizational justice (Greenberg, 1987); (Colquitt, Greenberg, & Zapata-Phelan, 2005) further highlights that workers' perceptions of distributive and procedural justice determine the extent of their engagement in the productive process—a perception closely linked to leadership style.

1.1.4 Proposed Analytical Model

This article proposes an analytical model positing that leadership styles do not affect productivity directly, but rather through the mediation of three social dynamics: (1) the structure of internal social relations, (2) the degree of participation in decision-making, and (3) the level of accumulated social capital, manifested in networks of trust, cooperation, and shared norms.

1.1.5 Literature Review in Arab and Algerian Contexts

A study by (Bouattit, 2015), published in the journal *Al-Tawasol* at the University of Annaba, concluded that participatory leadership approaches in Algerian enterprises generate more open communication patterns that reinforce collective cohesion. (Boumanqar & Aissawi, 2015) demonstrated that employee empowerment strategies enhance administrative efficiency and effectiveness. Internationally, the meta-analytic study by (Judge & Bono, 2000), which reviewed 87 independent studies, found a statistically significant positive correlation between transformational leadership and organizational performance. (Yukl, 2020) and Peter Guy Northouse (2021) (Northouse, 2021) documented that leadership competence is fundamentally relational in nature, produced within the context of interaction. (Boltanski & Chiapello, 1999) caution, however, that participatory management has at times been deployed as a soft technique for extracting full worker commitment without any genuine redistribution of power—a warning that necessitates a critical reading of the field findings.

1.2 Methodological Approach:

1.2.1 The Field Site in Its Socioeconomic Context

The study was conducted at PLASTUB Plastic Pipes Company, located in the industrial zone of Beni Isguen, Ghardaïa Province, situated approximately 600 kilometers south of the capital Algiers. Established in 1982, the company specializes in the production of PVC and PE pipes of varying diameters up to 630 mm and distributes its products across more than ten Algerian provinces.

The geographic location lends the study an additional socio-cultural dimension, as the Ghardaïa region is distinguished by its Ibadi culture and the values it inculcates pertaining to collective work, consultation (the Halqa), integrity, and social solidarity—values that are likely to modulate leadership styles and shape workers' responses to them.

1.2.2 Study Population and Census Survey

The research population comprised 70 workers representing the total workforce of the enterprise, distributed across the following departments: administration (10 workers), production (33 workers), transport and distribution (11 workers), warehouse (9 workers), and maintenance staff (7 workers). A census survey approach was adopted given the limited size of the population, thereby ensuring comprehensive coverage of the phenomenon and circumventing representativeness problems inherent to sampling.

1.2.3 Mixed-Methods Design and Data Collection Instruments

This study adopted a mixed-methods research design integrating quantitative and qualitative approaches within a coherent methodological framework, drawing upon the work of (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017), who established that mixed-methods designs afford a deeper understanding of social phenomena when a single instrument cannot fully address the research problem. The mixed-methods approach in the present study is manifested across three complementary levels:

The Quantitative Level — Questionnaire: Designed in accordance with the three hypotheses, the questionnaire comprised 32 items distributed across four thematic axes (personal data, followed by the three leadership styles), employing a binary scale (yes/no) alongside open-ended questions. Data were analyzed using percentages and descriptive statistical analysis.

The Qualitative Level — Systematic Field Observation: Regular visits were conducted across the enterprise's departments (administration, factory floor, transport and distribution section, warehouse) to observe daily interactions between the leader and workers in their natural context, free from the artificial responses elicited by survey instruments.

The Qualitative Level — Semi-Structured Interviews: Three in-depth interviews were conducted with the Human Resources Director, the Production Manager, and the Distribution Supervisor, yielding rich qualitative data on leadership dynamics within the institutional context.

The integration of these three levels permits mutual validation and deepened interpretation of the data: quantitative figures derived from the questionnaire intersect with qualitative findings from observation and interviews, constructing a composite sociological understanding that neither reduces the phenomenon to abstract numbers nor relies on impressionistic descriptions resistant to verification.

1.2.4 Analytical Framework

Analysis was conducted on two complementary levels within the mixed-methods framework. The first is quantitative, based on the computation of percentages interpreted structurally rather than descriptively. The second is qualitative, deploying sociological concepts as interpretive tools for the field data, particularly the concepts of social capital, organizational control, symbolic domination, and professional habitus. The integration of both levels ensures higher internal validity and broader reliability compared to single-method studies.

2. Field Results and Sociological Analysis & Discussion of Results and Theoretical Framing

2.1 Field Results and Sociological Analysis:

2.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of the Study Population

Table 1: Distribution of PLASTUB Workers by Age Group (N=70)

Age Group (years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
20–30	32	45.72
31–40	25	35.71
41–50	8	11.43
51–60	5	7.14
Total	70	100.00

Sociological reading: The demographic data in Table 1 reveal a series of age-related characteristics of considerable significance for understanding leadership and productivity dynamics in the enterprise under study.

The 20–30 age group predominates at 45.72%, indicating that nearly half the workforce is in the process of constructing their professional identity and forming organizational loyalty—a phase characterized by openness to authority, receptivity to guidance, and readiness to internalize organizational norms, thereby providing fertile ground for the success of the democratic style in securing the allegiance of young workers.

The 31–40 age group ranks second at 35.71%, representing a cohort of accumulated competence and growing expertise, wherein workers have already established their professional identity and seek recognition from the leader for the value of their experience. This explains this group's preference for the democratic style, which permits participation in decision-making and accords workers a position within the organization commensurate with their professional capital.

The 41–50 age group constitutes 11.43% and carries qualitative rather than quantitative sociological significance, as its members possess institutional memory and accumulated expertise that renders them informal reference points for younger workers. They typically constitute the cultural bridge between enterprise management and the work group—a role consistent with the democratic style's reliance on horizontal relational networks.

The 51–60 age group represents only 7.14%, reflecting proximity to retirement. While this may diminish the dynamism of their engagement in organizational change, these workers remain carriers of values of institutional loyalty and acquired discipline, enriching the general organizational climate with implicit, informal norms of control.

Overall, the age structure reveals that 81.43% of workers fall within the two younger cohorts (20–40 years), signaling an enterprise in a phase of vitality and construction rather than depletion—an environment conducive to consolidating a participatory leadership style that converts youthful energy into productive social capital.

Table 2: Distribution of Workers by Gender (N=70)

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	66	94.29
Female	4	5.71
Total	70	100.00

Sociological reading: Table 2 reveals a stark gender imbalance within the enterprise, a disparity that calls not merely for statistical notation but for sociological interpretation in light of its cultural and economic context.

Males predominate at 94.29% (66 of 70 workers), a proportion reflecting primarily the nature of industrial labor predicated on physical exertion, which reproduces the social division of labor by gender in the Algerian context. This male dominance does not necessarily indicate formal discrimination but rather constitutes a manifestation of deeper social structures that define "congruent roles" for each gender within the productive space. Within the framework of the prevailing democratic style, this distribution acquires dual

significance: on the one hand, the homogeneity of the work group's social structure facilitates its cohesion; on the other, it constrains the diversity of values and experiences within the organization.

Conversely, females represent only 5.71% (four workers), concentrated exclusively in administration and maintenance work, as field observation confirmed. This concentration in non-directly-productive tasks reproduces the gendered division of institutional space, rendering women's presence in the industrial work group limited in both role and status. This low proportion opens an essential question for future research: How do leadership dynamics take shape in female-dominated industrial enterprises, and does the democratic style remain equally suitable in such contexts?

Table 3: Distribution of Workers by Educational Level (N=70)

Educational Level	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Illiterate	4	5.72
Primary	6	8.57
Middle School	20	28.57
Secondary	26	37.14
University	14	20.00
Total	70	100.00

Sociological reading: Table 3 presents a precise portrait of the educational structure of the study population—a heterogeneous structure that warrants a stratified sociological reading distinguishing educational levels as determinants of organizational status and capacity for engagement in participatory dynamics.

Illiterate workers constitute 5.72% (four individuals), representing a margin of the workforce lacking the communicative and symbolic tools necessary for effective participation in decision-making. Nevertheless, the absence of formal education does not necessarily entail the absence of practical experience or tacit accumulated wisdom—a point to which Bourdieu draws attention when distinguishing between school-based cultural capital and practical capital acquired through experience.

Those with primary education represent 8.57% (six workers), generally occupying operational or service positions requiring manual skill more than formal communication. Field observation indicates that this group constitutes the workers most amenable to direct guidance from the leader, contributing to the consolidation of organizational self-regulation when the prevailing democratic norms are reflected upon them.

Middle school graduates rank third at 28.57% (twenty workers), forming the broad base of skilled workers in production and distribution. These workers possess sufficient communicative ability and procedural competence to participate in discussions about work matters, although their participation in strategic decision-making remains more limited.

Secondary school graduates represent the majority at 37.14% (twenty-six workers), a finding that carries composite sociological significance: this group possesses cognitive tools enabling full engagement in the participatory dynamics established by the democratic style.

University graduates represent 20% (fourteen workers) and occupy, according to the interviews, administrative positions and certain technical functions. Their presence carries dual organizational significance: as professional staff, they reinforce the enterprise's formal competence; as social actors, they contribute to producing and disseminating participatory values among other groups.

The overall reading indicates that 85.71% of workers possess an educational level enabling effective communication, comprehension of enterprise objectives, and participation in its participatory dynamics—thereby meeting the educational precondition necessary for the success of the democratic style in this institutional context.

Table 4: Distribution of Workers by Professional Seniority (N=70)

Seniority (years)	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 5 years	30	42.86
5–10 years	25	35.71
More than 10 years	15	21.43
Total	70	100.00

Sociological reading: Table 4 reveals a seniority structure expressing different stages in the trajectory of organizational belonging—a pivotal dimension in the sociology of the enterprise given its implications for professional identity, accumulated social capital, and the degree of cultural internalization of prevailing leadership norms.

The cohort with less than five years' tenure represents 42.86% (thirty workers), the highest proportion. This reveals a relative fragility in the institutional identity of nearly half the workforce, as their internalization of the enterprise's values and organizational norms remains incomplete. However, these recently hired workers are the most open to leadership development and participatory management styles, and least resistant to change, representing malleable human capital in the hands of a competent democratic leader.

The 5–10 years cohort represents 35.71% (twenty-five workers), combining sufficient experience to understand the enterprise's logic with sufficient ambition to engage in its productive and participatory trajectories. They form the solid foundation upon which the democratic style relies to produce dynamics of cooperation and trust within the organization.

The cohort with more than ten years' tenure represents 21.43% (fifteen workers)—the lowest proportion quantitatively but the highest in qualitative value. These workers carry established institutional memory and serve as lateral leaders (informal leaders) who reinforce the formal authority of the leader or constrain it when decisions conflict with established institutional norms.

Overall, 78.57% of workers have been with the enterprise for ten years or less, indicating an enterprise in the process of building its collective institutional memory—a phase that necessitates a leadership style that consolidates values and generates belonging, which is precisely what the prevailing democratic style affords.

2.1.2 Hypothesis One: Absence of the Authoritarian Style and Its Implications for the Relational Structure

Table 5: Indicators of the Authoritarian Style (N=70)

Indicator / Question	Yes — n (%)	No — n (%)
Does the manager exercise authoritarian control over work?	3 (4.29%)	67 (95.71%)
Does the manager impose his opinion on subordinates?	7 (10.0%)	63 (90.0%)
Is the manager strict and harsh with workers?	14 (20.0%)	56 (80.0%)
Does the manager accept discussion of work matters?	62 (88.57%)	8 (11.43%)
Does the manager use authority for personal purposes?	14 (20.0%)	56 (80.0%)

Sociological reading: The data in Table 5 present a consistent statistical portrait indicating a near-total absence of the authoritarian style in the studied enterprise. Only 4.29% (3 workers) agree that the manager exercises authoritarian control, while 95.71% deny this. The 10% who affirm that the manager imposes his opinion suggest that a direct directive approach is occasionally exercised in specific situations such as emergencies or production crises. The 20% who agree that the manager is sometimes strict perceive this not as personal harshness but as professional discipline related to quality standards—a fundamental sociological distinction between personalistic authoritarianism and rational institutional control. The 88.57% affirming that the manager accepts discussion of work matters indicates that a dialogic space is effectively open within the organization. In sum, the authoritarian style is structurally absent from PLASTUB, entirely refuting the first hypothesis.

2.1.3 Hypothesis Two: Absence of the Laissez-faire Style and the Self-Regulation Thesis

Table 6 : Indicators of the Laissez-faire Style (N=70)

Indicator / Question	Yes — n (%)	No — n (%)
Does the manager adopt a laissez-faire approach to work?	0 (0.0%)	70 (100%)
Does the manager leave work decisions to workers without guidance?	7 (10.0%)	63 (90.0%)
Does the manager avoid discussing work matters?	6 (8.57%)	64 (91.43%)
Does the manager personally guide workers in performing their tasks?	59 (84.29%)	11 (15.71%)
Does collective decision-making enhance the production process?	51 (72.86%)	19 (27.14%)

Sociological reading: Table 6 presents the clearest statistical picture of the absence of the laissez-faire style. The 0% recorded for the adoption of a laissez-faire approach is an exceptional result rarely encountered in empirical social research, attesting to an absolute consensus regarding the organized character of leadership. The 84.29% who affirm that the manager personally guides workers confirm active direct field supervision. The most sociologically rich indicator is the finding that 72.86% affirm that collective decision-making enhances the production process, revealing a notable socio-organizational awareness: workers recognize that production is contingent upon organized collective coordination. Rejection of the laissez-faire style is not merely a reaction to the manager's approach but a position arising from a functional understanding of the productive process.

2.1.4 Hypothesis Three: The Democratic Style and the Production of Productivity-Enhancing Social Dynamics

Table 7: Indicators of the Democratic Style (N=70)

Indicator / Question	Yes — n (%)	No — n (%)
Is the manager democratic in dealings?	38 (54.29%)	32 (45.71%)
Does the manager involve workers in decision-making?	40 (57.14%)	30 (42.86%)
Does the manager distribute responsibilities to all members?	70 (100%)	0 (0.0%)
Does the manager encourage friendly relations among members?	58 (82.86%)	12 (17.14%)
Does the manager participate in resolving workers' concerns?	65 (92.86%)	5 (7.14%)

Does the manager make workers feel the importance of their efforts?	65 (92.86%)	5 (7.14%)
Does the manager take workers' suggestions into account?	61 (87.14%)	9 (12.86%)
Is the manager's relationship with workers akin to friendship?	52 (74.29%)	18 (25.71%)
Do workers continue working even in the manager's absence?	62 (88.57%)	8 (11.43%)
Does the manager take the necessary measures to guide workers?	70 (100%)	0 (0.0%)

Sociological reading: Table 7 constitutes the analytical fulcrum and foundational pillar of the field study. The general democracy-in-dealings indicator registers 54.29% in the affirmative, revealing a relative cleavage within the work group in evaluating the democratic character of the leader. The participation-in-decision-making indicator at 57.14% reveals a selective rather than comprehensive democracy. The distribution-of-responsibilities indicator records 100%—the most significant from the perspective of organizational justice theory: when all workers affirm comprehensive distribution, they express their perception of distributive justice. The indicators of resolving workers' concerns and making them feel the importance of their efforts both register 92.86%Table 7 constitutes the analytical fulcrum and foundational pillar of the field study. The general democracy-in-dealings indicator registers 54.29% in the affirmative, revealing a relative cleavage within the work group in evaluating the democratic character of the leader. The participation-in-decision-making indicator at 57.14% reveals a selective rather than comprehensive democracy. The distribution-of-responsibilities indicator records 100%—the most significant from the, revealing the functional unity of these two indicators in constructing social capital. A proportion of 87.14% report that the manager considers their suggestions, reinforcing what Amitai Etzioni terms "moral commitment."

The indicator of workers continuing to perform in the manager's absence (88.57%) represents the most sociologically dense indicator: when workers continue working without external surveillance, they have internalized the norms of performance and belonging into their own value system. This corresponds to what Pierre Bourdieu termed "professional habitus" (*habitus professionnel*): the transformation of the objective structures of the organization into internalized subjective dispositions that transcend external coercion (Bourdieu, 1980). The indicator of the manager taking necessary guidance measures registers 100%—the second unanimity in the table—indicating that the democratic leader combines equity in distribution with efficacy in guidance.

Table 8: Comparative Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

H	Leadership Style	Field Presence	Test Result	Social Implication
H1	Authoritarian	Absent (95.71% denial)	Not confirmed	Absence of social capital; implicit resistance
H2	Laissez-faire	Absent (100% denial)	Not confirmed	Anomie and dissolution of collective identity
H3	Democratic	Predominant (88.57%)	Confirmed ★	Social capital, trust, self-regulation, belonging

Sociological reading: The comparative reading of Table 8 establishes that PLASTUB rests upon three concomitant sociological realities: the absence of personalistic domination (Hypothesis One), the absence of debilitating anomie (Hypothesis Two), and the presence of democratic leadership that produces social capital and consolidates self-regulation (Hypothesis Three). It is precisely this triad that renders this enterprise a model worthy of study and of cautious generalization.

2.2 Discussion of Results and Theoretical Framing:

2.2.1 Democratic Leadership as Dialogic Practice

The field findings intersect with what (Habermas, 1984) terms in *The Theory of Communicative Action* "communicative rationality": democratic leadership is in essence a dialogic practice aimed at achieving organizational consensus through legitimate argumentation rather than coercion. When the manager involves workers in decision-making, the organizational space is transformed from a context of domination into a space of dialogue. However, as (Boltanski & Chiapello, 1999) remind us, participatory management in contemporary capitalism has come to be deployed as a soft technique for extracting full worker commitment without any genuine redistribution of power. In our field context, 42.86% still report non-participation in decision-making, prompting the question: Is the organizational democracy here substantive, or is it selective consultation?

2.2.2 Social Capital and Organizational Trust

The data reveal that the relationship between the manager and workers at PLASTUB transcends the formal functional framework toward a pattern of quasi-familial relations. From the perspective of (Hofstede, 2001) in *Culture's Consequences*, Algeria is characterized by a high "power distance" dimension; however, what the field reveals is a cultural paradox: workers tend to accept firm leadership on the condition that it is coupled with human warmth and recognition of personal dignity. This explains the success of the democratic style in this particular Ibadi cultural context.

2.2.3 Limitations of the Study and Directions for Future Research

Methodological limitations include: the concentration of the study in a single enterprise, which constrains generalizability; the reliance on a binary measurement scale, which limits the detection of fine-grained attitudinal gradations; and the insufficiency of the descriptive approach for rigorous causal inference. Future research is recommended to pursue multi-site comparative studies, employ ethnographic methods to uncover latent dynamics, and incorporate gender as a central analytical variable.

Conclusion:

This sociological field study, grounded in a mixed-methods design, concludes that productivity at PLASTUB is not a mechanical outcome of material production processes but rather the product of complex social dynamics generated by administrative leadership styles and reproduced daily within the fabric of relations between leader and workers. The democratic style—established as the dominant pattern through dual quantitative and qualitative analysis—is not merely a successful management technique but a social practice that reproduces the enterprise's social capital and consolidates norms of cooperation, trust, and organizational belonging.

The study further demonstrates that the Ibadi cultural context of Ghardaïa constitutes fertile ground for the success of democratic leadership, raising a broader question about the dialectical relationship between local culture and organizational leadership styles.

Returning to the questions that framed this study, the field evidence yields unambiguous answers: the authoritarian style is not merely rare but structurally absent (H1 not confirmed), refuting any expectation that rigid hierarchy sustains this enterprise's productivity; the laissez-faire style is likewise absent, with workers'

own accounts ruling out anomic drift or role ambiguity (H2 not confirmed); and the democratic style is confirmed as the dominant and productivity-enhancing pattern (H3 confirmed), operating through participatory decision-making, distributive justice, and the internalization of organizational norms into a genuine professional habitus. The central research question is thus answered: administrative leadership shapes productivity not directly but through the social dynamics of participation, trust, and social capital that a given style either builds or destroys.

Study Recommendations :

- **Human Resources Management:** Adopt training programs that consolidate participatory leadership among managers while taking into account the cultural specificities of each region.
- **Industrial Policy:** Establish formal mechanisms for participation in decision-making, such as workers' committees, consultative councils, and continuous improvement groups.
- **Sociological Research:** Conduct multi-site comparative studies covering Algeria's geographic and cultural diversity while employing mixed methods and in-depth ethnographic approaches.

Academic Training: Incorporate the sociology of the enterprise and the sociology of organizations and work into management science curricula to produce managers

Sources and references

Bass, Bernard. Morris. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3 ed.). New York: Free Press.

Boltanski, Luc., & Chiapello, Ève. (1999). *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme (NRF Essais).* Paris: Gallimard.

Bouattit, Jalal.al-Din. (2015). al-Qiyāda al-idāriyya wa-asālīb al-taʾthīr fī al-mawārid al-bashariyya. *Majallat al-Tawāṣul fī al-ʿUlūm al-Insāniyya wa-al-Ijtimāʿiyya*(44), 139–154.

Boufelja, Ghiath. (2006). *Muqaddima fi Ilm al-Nafs al-Tanzimi [Introduction to organizational psychology]*. Ben Aknoun, Algeria: Office of University Publications.

Boumanqar, Murad., & Aissawi, Fella. (2015). Istrātījiyyat tamkīn al-ʿāmilīn wa-ahammiyyatuhā fī taḥqīq al-kafāʾa wa-al-faʿāliyyah al-idāriyya. *Majallat al-Tawāṣul fī al-ʿUlūm al-Insāniyya wa-al-Ijtimāʿiyya*(44), 125–138.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1980). *Le sens pratique (Collection Le sens commun).* Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Coleman, James. Samuel. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. *The American Journal of Sociology, 94(Supplement: Organizations and Institutions)*, S95–S120. doi:https://doi.org/10.1086/228943

Colquitt, Jason Andrew., Greenberg, Jerald., & Zapata-Phelan, Cindy. (2005). What is organizational justice? A historical overview. In J. Greenberg, & J. A. Colquitt (Eds.), Handbook of organizational justice (pp. 3–55). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Creswell, John William; & Plano Clark, Vicki Lynn. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3 ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Crozier, Michel. (1963). *Le phénomène bureaucratique: Essai sur les tendances bureaucratiques des systèmes d'organisation modernes et sur leurs relations en France avec le système social et culturel.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Dirks, Kurt Thomas., & Ferrin, Donald Lee. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(4), 611–628. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.611

Durand, Jean-Pierre. (2012). *La chaîne invisible: Travailler aujourd'hui, flux tendu et servitude volontaire.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Etzioni, Amitai. Werner. (1975). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations: On power, involvement, and their correlates (Revised and enlarged ed.).* New York: Free Press.

Greenberg, Jerald. (1987). A taxonomy of organizational justice theories. *Academy of Management Review, 12*(1), 9–22. doi:10.5465/amr.1987.4306437

Habermas, Jürgen. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Vol. 1. Reason and the rationalization of society.* (T. McCarthy, Trans.) Boston: Beacon Press.

Hofstede, Geert. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Judge, Timothy Alan., & Bono, Joyce Elizabeth. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(5), 751–765. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.85.5.751

Lewin, Kurt., Lippitt, Ronald., & White, Ralph Kirby. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates." . *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *10*(2), 269–299. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366

Mayo, George Elton. (1933). *The human problems of an industrial civilization.* New York: Macmillan.

Merton, Robert. King. (1940). Bureaucratic structure and personality. *Social Forces, 18*(4), 560–568. doi:https://doi.org/10.2307/2570634

Northouse, Peter Guy. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (9 ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications.

Weber, Max. (1968). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology.* (R. Guenther, W. Claus , Éds., F. Ephraim, & e. al, Trads.) New York: Bedminster Press.

Yukl, Gary Alan. (2020). *Leadership in organizations* (9 ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education.