

The Impact of Management Aggressiveness on Employee Performance in Mogadishu-Somalia

ABDIMAHAD ABSHIR ARALE

HORMUUD UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

This study will examine the attitude of the respondents toward Management Aggressiveness and Employee Performance in Mogadishu. The researcher will use a questionnaire survey to collect the data from 80 respondents from the different segments of the Community of Somalia. The researcher will distribute 80 set of questionnaire papers to business owners, CEOs, Managers, Supervisors, Consultants, and Employees, in Mogadishu, the capital city of Somalia. The data collected will be analyzed using qualitative techniques. Data will be analyzing using descriptive statistics and presented as frequency distribution. Percentages in tables and the quantitative data will be organized into themes that came out of the research questions and analyze using descriptive form. The findings will indicate that the Management Aggressiveness is the engine that drives Low employee performance and organizational failure. The unhidden fact is that since the collapse of Said Barra's regime the private business sector was and still is the major working opportunity available in this country. So, the researcher recommends:

The entrepreneurship has a great consequence and influence on the mounting of the private business sectors in Somalia so government should focus it. The government has to emphasize and bring into being new business regulations, policies and laws. The government is needed to encourage private business sectors, through preparing available trainings and capacity building programs to the business staff. This may prop up to achieve poverty and hunger reduction in Somalia.

Keywords: *Aggressiveness, performance, satisfaction, productivity, motivation and loyalty.*

Date of Submission: 28-12-2022

Date of Acceptance: 08-01-2023

I. INTRODUCTION

Every organization whether business, social, religious or political is basically a group of people formed to accomplish some common goals. Historically, management is a popular subject among business students as well as management scholars and researchers. University courses, text books and academic journals on management bound. Management is the art of getting things done, effectively and efficiency, through and with other people. (Burrow & Kliendl, 2013), management has been needed since civilizations first began organizing work. Individuals and groups had to make decisions about how work would be completed. Today, the smallest part time businesses, the newest entrepreneurial business ventures, and the largest global corporations require management.

The concept of management is not new field it exists until human life. Edward Lhwyd, the Welsh antiquary and scholar, first wrote about the discovery of the entrance to the tomb at New grange during his tour of Ireland in 1699 (Bru na Boinne, 2002). His letters give an account of the entrance passage, the finds in the chamber, and the presence of a standing stone on the top of the mound. He also produced the first detailed drawings of the passage and chamber. His discoveries-initiated investigations of the area by a succession of well-known antiquaries and travelers (Thomas Molyneux, 1726; Thomas Wright, 1748; Thomas Pownall, 1773; Gabriel Beranger, 1775). It was Henry R. Towne who initiated the management movement in 1886. His classic paper. 'the Engineer as Economist'. Management existed for thousands of years. The Egyptian pyramids and great wall of china is a prove that management existed and undertaken well before modern times. These examples led us that management has been since before industrial revolution. however, in the 20th century, that management has undergone systematic investigation, acquired a common body of knowledge and become formal discipline (Robbins & Decenzo, 2004).

In the early of 20th century the concept of scientific management, in fact triggered the management movement by creating a proper environment. For the first time in history, entrepreneurs and professional managers were provided with a conceptual framework based upon logic for solving problems and fulfilling the goals of business firms (Saleemi, 2014).

The two major theories of classical approach are: scientific management and general administrative theory. The most important contributors to scientific management theory were Fidrck Winslow Tylor and Frank

and Lillian Gilbreth. The most important contributors to general administrative theory were Henri Fayol and Max Weber. In behavioral approach, since managers get things done through people, writers and researchers focus on organization's people. The field of study that focuses on the behaviors of people at work is called organizational behaviors (OB). Most of the managers in today's organizations do when managing people: leading, motivating, building trust, team building, managing conflict that has come out of OB field. The most important contributors to OB approach were Robert Owen, Hugo Munsterberg, and Mary Parker.

In quantitative approach, the use of quantitative techniques to improve decision making also known as management science. This approach evolved from mathematical and statistical solutions developed for military problems during World War II, and later applied to business. Contemporary approach differs from earlier approach since earlier focus on to influence how managers manage. Most of the earlier approaches concern was inside the organization. From 1960 researchers focus external environment. Outside boundaries of the organization. The two-contemporary management perspectives are systems and contingency.

Previous studies examining the validity of measures of trait aggressiveness either have been retrospective studies or have used laboratory aggression as the criterion behavior. Bushman & Wells (1998). Informal observation suggests that some people are especially likely to become involved in aggressive interactions. Individual differences are critical to understanding human aggression. The personality trait of aggression is referred to as trait aggressiveness. Trait aggressiveness can be measured using self-report personality scale, aggression nominations by others (e.g. peers, teachers, counselors), and violent histories (Bushman & Wells, 1998).

Authors conducted a comprehensive review to understand the relation between personality and aggressive behavior, under provoking and non-provoking conditions. The qualitative review revealed that some personality variables influenced aggressive behavior under both neutral and provocation conditions, whereas others influenced aggressive behavior only under provocation (Bettencourt, Talley, Benjamin, & Valentine, 2006). Among adult employees, interpersonal injustice and abusive supervision predict aggression toward supervisors at work. Also, similar relationships exist among teenage employees. This can possibly cause future and long-term consequences of teenager's use of aggression at work (Dupre, Inness, Connelly, Barling, & Hopton, 2006).

Aggression management has been used in many institutions including educational, healthcare, colleges, and universities. Byrnes proposes two types of aggression, primal and cognitive. Primal is defined by adrenaline driven physical changes, while cognitive aggression is defined by intent driven strategic and tactical planning (Byrnes, 2002).

Aggression has substantial intellectual heritage (Bandura, 1997). For instance, aggression has been studied, documented, and debated in the fields of child development, political science, sociology, criminal justice, anthropology, psychology, and several other disciplines. However, its relevance and application to organizational work settings is relatively new (Griffin & Lopez, 2005).

There are two different but not incompatible definitions of aggression that have emerged as commonly used perspectives in the organizational literature. The Neuman & Baron perspective. Neuman & Baron (1998) used the term workplace aggression to encompass all forms of behavior by which individuals attempt to harm others at work or their organizations. These authors later extended their thinking by describing five forms of aggression. Covert aggression, overt aggression, verbal aggression, obstructionism and workplace violence (Baron & Neuman, 1998). This approach to aggression has also been used by Glomb and Lio'O (2003); Dietz, Robinson, Folger, Baron, and Schultz (2003); Jawahar (2002); and Kennedy, and Homent (2004).

(O'leary-kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996) perspective. A somewhat different approach to workplace aggression has been developed by (O'leary-kelly, Griffin, & Glew, 1996). Using the work of Bandura (1973) as context, these authors introduced the term organization motivated aggression. Defined as an attempted injurious or destructive behavior initiated by either an organizational insider or outsider that is instigated by some factor in the organizational context.

Aggression is seen as a specific behavior or set of behaviors by an individual in an organization this aggression is also seen as resulting from a stimulus in the organization, such as perceived injustice or some extreme stressor such as being terminated or demoted (Griffin & Lopez, 2005). Hence this aggression is seen as a behavior, violence is seen as a consequence of that behavior. A terminated employee may feel justified in attempting to assault the manager responsible for the termination (aggression); the effects of attempted assault may be physical injury (violence). Some researchers like Tobin (2001) and Aquino and Bradfield (2000) use this perspective in their own work.

Workplace aggression has become a problem that is too costly to ignore. Although several studies (Einarsen, Hoef, Zapf & Cooper, 2003; NAMIE & Namie, 2003), have vividly illustrated the pain, mental distress, physical illness, emotional harm, and career damage suffered by victims of aggression or bullying (Fisher-Blando, 2008). This study workplace aggression or aggressive management behavior and its impact on job performance provides an opportunity to understand the behaviors that underlie aggression, conflict, and violence toward subordinates or workers. Robert L. & James L. suggest that aggression is weak when it erodes

interpersonal relationships. In today's competitive business climate where the ability of work with people is critical, overly aggressive behavior derails individual careers and undermines organizational effectiveness. An overly aggressive leader is harsh, belligerent, bullying, autocratic and generally insensitive to the needs and feelings of others.

II. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Most economists today agree that human capital (employee) is the most important asset in whole organization. Human resource managers and other management executives in modern world today believe that organizations can survive or exist only in two reasons; human capital and customers. Since organizations can't exist without customers. Customers can't exist without legal employee (human capital) in the organization. As mentioned above employee are the greatest asset in organizations it depends on; organizations productivity, performance, reputation, and goodwill, innovation and creativity, satisfaction of the customers, retaining and attracting potential customers. In order to do that amazing job, they need fair and humble management.

In Somalia roughly 95% of the labor force work for private sector while 4% have small businesses and only 1% or less than that work for public sector. Managers and public-sector owners deal with their employees as slaves and manage aggressively, that results employees become only machine that will never satisfy their self and customers.

Every private sector employee in Somalia have no satisfaction with his/her job. Employees thought either of these four ways; exit, voice, loyal or neglect, which means totally lack of satisfaction. So, in that situation of aggressive behavior and lack of satisfaction creates; low productivity, lack of innovation, low performance and zero loyalty to the organization. Therefore, there is a problem with less knowledge about management and business sector, lack of training and courage for innovation and lack of awareness of the importance with employee's satisfaction in the organizational development and existence in Somalia. Thus, this study tries to investigate the impact of management aggressiveness on employees' performance.

The purpose of this study is to determine the impact of management aggressiveness on employee performance in Mogadishu, Somalia using survey design. Management aggressiveness is operational by workplace bullying and performance is characterized by productivity, innovation and loyalty to the organization.

The objectives of this study are;

1. To determine the effect of aggressive management on employee performance in Mogadishu.
2. To find out the role of aggressive management on employee satisfaction in Mogadishu.
3. To examine the importance of employee satisfaction and performance in organizations in Mogadishu.

III. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study is important because it contributes some evidence of aggressive management and employee performance in Mogadishu, this study will be benefited by;

Businessmen, this research is useful by the private sector especially those who investing private sectors because they get full information about aggressive management, employee performance, productivity, and satisfaction. Government, this research is benefited by the government when concluded by the researcher the government will get information about the growth of the economy, labor force productivity and employee satisfaction both private and public sector. Academia, this research is also benefited by academia because it is a new field of that needs research and more information and its important. This study will help when concluded by the teachers, students and researchers in academia of business and management field. It will be cited as reference and also facilitate more research about the fields of employee productivity and satisfaction.

The researcher investigates the significance of this study which have greater importance for the Somali society so if the study is concluded it will be favorable to apply all sectors both private and public in Somalia. The researcher hopes that the study provides up-to-date information about aggressive, contemporary managers, employee productivity, performance, and satisfaction. To those interested in this information such as government, businesses, and academia.

This study is concluded in Somalia especially in Mogadishu, where most of the labor force work for private sectors and private sector, and small business owners mostly have no idea or policy about employee productivity, performance, satisfaction and retaining talented employee in their organizations. This research is conducted in February 2018 through survey design.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

Aggression is a noun that is generally defined as an act of aggressive behavior (concise oxford dictionary). The term aggression and aggressive behavior are used interchangeably. Aggressive forms of behavior can be characterized by verbal or physical attack. Aggression may be either appropriate (self-protective) or alternatively, it may destructive to the self and others (Ferris and Gurriso, 1996).

Some fields the term aggression refers to a range of behaviors that can result in both physical and psychological harm to one self, others, or objects in the environment. Aggression can take a variety of forms, including: physical, verbal, mental, and emotional. While we often think of aggression as purely in physical forms such as hitting or pushing, mental aggression can also be very damaging (Cherry, 2017). Aggression has also been viewed as a heterogeneous concept encompassing a wide variety of behaviors (Conner, 2004). Researchers have attempted to create more homogeneous categories in this behavioral domain by identifying subtypes of aggression based on statistical techniques such as factor analysis (Conner, 2004).

Aggression is overt, often harmful, social interaction with the intention of inflicting damage or other unpleasantness upon another individual. It may occur either in retaliation or without provocation in humans, frustration due to blocked goals can cause aggression. Human aggression can be classified into direct and indirect aggression, whilst the first is characterized by physical or verbal behavior intended to cause harm to someone, the second one is characterized by a behavior intended to harm social relations of an individual or group (Veiga, et al., 2011).

Aggression can have adaptive benefits or negative effects. Aggressive behavior is an individual or collective social interaction that is a hostile behavior with the intention of inflicting damage or harm. Two broad categories of aggression are commonly distinguished, one includes effective and hostile, reactive, or retaliatory aggression that is a response to provocation, and the other includes instrumental, goal oriented or predatory, in which aggression is used as a mean to achieve a goal (Veiga, et al., 2011).

Despite recent increased scientific interest in aggression (Feshback et al, 1958, 1964, 1965, 1966), it remains an area of conceptual uncertainty. There is no generally agreed upon definition and consequently considerable confusion of concepts and terms exists. Behaviors considered to be aggressive by the different approaches vary widely. These range from war and physical assault to angry words, non-acted upon wishes, fantasies and dreams (Kahn & Kirk, 1968). From the point of view of the victim of aggression, how or it aggression is perceived has also been offered as a criterion. The problem is one determining whether what is perceived as aggression on the part of the victim was intended, or even that which was perceived by the victim actually happen (Kahn & Kirk, 1968). Workplace aggression is a employee behavior in which intended to harm current or previous coworkers or organization to which they are presently or previously been employed (Hepworth & Towler, 2004).

AGGRESSIVENESS AND MANAGEMENT

The concept of management is rather clear according to scholars' view, most of them view with the same meaning. There is no universal definition of management theory. Most of the scholars define management doing the job through others through lead and guidelines. The concept of management is not new and exists until human life (Edward, 1699). It was Henry R. Towne who initiated the management movement in 1886. Although management exists thousands of years, in 20th century, management undergone systematic investigation acquired a common body of knowledge and become formal discipline (Robbins & Decenzo, 2004). It was early 20th century when concept of scientific management was discovered that created management movement by creating proper environment.

For the first time in history, entrepreneurs and professional managers were provided with conceptual framework based upon logic for problem solving and fulfilling business and financial goals of the firms (Saleemi, 2014). The heroes of management concept were: Fedrick Winslow Tylor, Henri Fayol, Max Weber, Frank and Lillian Gilbreth, who were discovered the management theories as classical approach theory, behavioral approach theory, quantitative approach theory, and contemporary approach, and later on Peter Drucker become legend of management expertise. There is no unique concept defining management aggressiveness. It is new field and have no much reference. Oxford dictionary define "behaving or doing in a determined and forceful way. Feeling of anger or antipathy resulting in hostile or violent behavior, readiness to attack or confronting. Or the action of attacking without provocation." Webster dictionary define "forceful action or procedure such as unprovoked attack especially when intended to dominate or master. Or unprovoked violation and destructive behavior." Macmillan dictionary define "an angry feeling that makes you want to attack or defeat someone else." Collins dictionary define "is a quality of anger and determination that makes you ready to attack other people." The researchers concept of management aggressiveness is behaving as dominant hostile and forceful action that lead to sub-ordinates unsatisfied, low productivity, low performance and lack of innovation. The working definition of this study will be; forceful action or behavior that dominate others and create hostile, unsatisfied, destructive behavior or environment. Authors conducted studies that define aggressive behaviors and management; through mangers, employee, companies case studies and scientific researches that related to employee performance, productivity, satisfaction, loyalty, entrepreneurship, innovation, and organizational citizenship behavior that related to managers actions and behaviors and how they behave employee, lead, motivate, retain, develop skills and how they inspire to reach the highest productivity, performance, and satisfaction. Other authors conducted a comprehensive review to understand the relation

between personality and aggressive behavior, under-provoking and non-provoking conditions. The qualitative review revealed that some personality variables influenced aggressive behavior under both neutral and provocation conditions, whereas others influenced aggressive behavior only under provocation. Studies that assessed personality variables and that directly measured aggressive behavior were included in the quantitative review (Bettencourt, Talley, Benjamin, & Valentine, 2006).

Among adult employees, interpersonal injustice and abusive supervision predict aggression toward supervisors at work Dupre, et al, (2006). Aggressiveness creates to employees in mental distress, physical illness, emotional harm, and career damage suffered by victims of aggressive behavior. Workplace aggressiveness is a pattern of persistent, malicious, insulting or exclusionary intentional or non-intentional behavior that a target perceives as intentional efforts to harm, control, or drive a sub-ordinate from workplace (Fisher-Blando, 2008). Aggression management system was first developed by John Byrnes in his book *Beyond Conflict* (Byrnes, 2002). Aggression management first used in U.S arm, NASA, and U.S postal service. Byrnes proposes that there are two types of aggression, primal and cognitive. Primal cognition is defined by adrenaline driven physical changes, while cognitive aggression is defined by intent driven strategic and tactical planning. In today's competitive business climate where the ability to work with people is critical, overly aggressive behavior derails individual careers and undermines organizational effectiveness (Robert and James). In recent years, organizational scholars have increasingly focused on various forms of bad behaviors in the workplace. Notable of these bad behaviors include deviance, aggression, anti-social behavior, and violence (Griffin & Lopez, 2005).

Sharp and Washington state department of labor and industries define workplace aggression involves an abuse or misuse of power. Aggression behavior creates feeling of defenselessness and injustice in the target and undermines an individual's right to dignity at work. Bullying is different from aggression. Whereas aggression may involve a single act, bullying is a repeated attack against the target. According to WHO violence is one of the leading public health problems worldwide. Therefore, aggression have a deep impact on society. Aggressive behavior has deliberate intent to harm or injure another person (García-Forero, Gallardo-Pujol, Maydeu-Olivares, & Andrés-Pueyo, 2009). Studies suggested that aggression is defined as the unwanted behavior of the individual for others. Person shows aggressive behavior to force others to do something. There are different types of aggression, one of the most sensitive type is workplace aggression. Workplace aggression is defined as the health harm and repeated mistreatment of one person against others (Krzyzanowska, 2016).

Manifestations of behavior problems can range from hitting and yelling, to destroying things, and even self-injury (Eileen P. Ahearn). Workplace violence such as homicide is just the "tip of the ice berg"; the larger problem effecting organizations is workplace aggression in its broader sense (Olson, Nelson, & Parayitam, 2006). Many managers around the world often have the mistaken assumption that aggression, bullying, shouting, threatening, or getting angry at employees will somehow lead to organizational efficiency and improved performance (Tony Buon, 2002).

WHAT MAKES SOMEONE AGGRESSIVE

Informal observation suggests that some people are especially likely to become involved in aggressive interactions. Individual differences are critical to understanding human aggression. The personality trait of aggression is referred to as trait aggressiveness. Trait aggressiveness can be measured using self-report personality scales, aggression, nominations by others (e.g. peers, teachers, counselors) and violent histories (Bushman & Wells, 1998). A common method of pencil & paper measure of trait aggressiveness can predict aggressive behavior outside lab. If a measure of trait aggressiveness can predict later aggressive behaviors, such a measure might prove useful for identifying, from larger population; a subset of individuals who could most benefit from intervention or focused treatments (e.g. anger control, workshops) prior to their being placed in certain settings, alternatively, scores on a such a measure might be useful for deciding which individuals might best suited for particular jobs in which anger control needs to be especially high (Bushman & Wells, 1998).

Personality is defined as a dynamic organization, inside the person, of psychological systems that create the person's characteristic patterns of behavior, thoughts, and feelings. The personality variable adhered to this inclusion and available for the meta-analysis were dissipation rumination, emotional susceptibility, impulsivity, irritability, narcissism, trait aggressiveness, sensation seeking and trait anger (Bettencourt, Talley, Benjamin, & Valentine, 2006). A variety of contemporary theories are relevant for understanding associations between personality and aggressive behavior, developmental models of anti-social and aggressive behavior (Bettencourt, Talley, Benjamin, & Valentine, 2006). The five-factor model (Costa & McCrae, 2000), a prominent theory of personality dimensions, is useful for understanding the link between personality and aggressive behavior. The major personality dimensions in the five-factor model are neuroticism, extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness and openness to experience; each dimension is represented by six facets. Research on aggressive behavior has examined the influences of a variety of specific personality variables without reference to these major dimensions. However, few researchers (Gleason, et al, 1996, and David et al, 1998)

have sought to understand the relation between aggression and dimensions of personality using the five-factor model. The neuroticism and agreeableness dimensions appear to be particularly associated with aggression (Costa & McCrae, 2000). Agreeableness dimensions describes people who are directed toward interpersonal relationships and the needs of others. The facets of agreeableness include trust, straightforwardness, altruism, compliance, modesty and tender-mindedness. The opposite pole of agreeableness is antagonism. According to Costa et al (2000), antagonistic people tend to be hostile and irritable, they need to oppose, to attack, or to punish others, moreover, those high in antagonism tend to mistrust and have a low regard for others, and, in turn they act in ways designed to exclude those who are perceived as disliked or inferior. Finally, antagonistic people may lack emotional expression and be attached interpersonally, they are cool or cold, contemptuous, callous, and unfeeling. The neuroticism dimension is characterized by those who have a tendency to experience negative effectivity and psychological distress. The facets of neuroticism include anxiety, angry, hostility, depression, self-consciousness and impulsiveness. Neurotic individuals are ineffective in their attempts to cope with stress and are prone to engage in irrational thought. By contrast, those who are low in neuroticism are more emotionally stable and calm and adapt well to stressful situations. Theorizing and research suggest that these two personality dimensions may predict different propensities for hostility and aggression (Costa & McCrae, 2000).

(Bushman, DeWall, & Anderson, 2011), defined trait aggressiveness as propensity to engage in physical and verbal aggression, to hold hostile cognitions and to express anger. Tiedens theorized that the tendency for those high in trait aggressiveness to make hostile attributions may increase anger and create a vacuous cycle of hostility and negative effect (Bettencourt, Talley, Benjamin, & Valentine, 2006).

AGGRESSIVENESS AND EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION

Business leaders are expected to make decisions that quickly and positively impact bottom line results. Whether intentional or un-intentional, these decisions also impact employee satisfaction (Topolosky, 2000). Some authors believe that managing effectively human resources and good HR policies will properly, directly, economically significant contribute to organizations' high performance. More effective HR systems and policies simultaneously exploit the potential complementarities of such practices and to help to implement organizations' competitive strategy and big source of firm's competitive advantage (Topolosky, 2000).

Authors said our relationship to work with activity is a fundamental determinant of the way we live. They also believe that our relation to work has determined and influenced our status. Our food preference, our ability to buy goods, our use of time and leisure, and the nature of our family and sexual relations, the state of our mental health, which closely relate the problem that we are going to analyze "aggressiveness" and an endless host of other conditions (Best, 1973). Levering, peter Drucker and some other authors said work is central to our lives, it defines our role in a society. It also determines our level of income and our standard of living. So, to make a living is not a longer enough, work has also to make a life better, perform and satisfied. There are many other studies and researches that contribute the relationship between work and employee satisfaction using correlation and studies of 100 best fortune companies. Hawthorne and many other studies suggest that paying attention to employees' satisfaction will increase organizations productivity.

Earliest studies focused on identifying the elements that contribute job satisfaction. Some studies stated that the term job satisfaction is multidimensional. They also stated that there can be satisfaction with specific activities of the job; with the place and working conditions under which the job is performed or with specific factors such as economic rewards, security, or social prestige. Hackman and others conducted a research and identified the dominant dimensions of a job as task variety, autonomy, feedback, identity and significance as they said each dimension has its potential impact to employee job satisfaction. They also support that work or job redesign had positive effect on employee levels of motivation and satisfaction of the job and management (Topolosky, 2000).

Instead to be aggressive to your employee and their satisfaction, production and performance fall, use directive, appreciation, respective, and supportive method that will increase productivity, satisfaction and performance of the individual and whole organization.

AGGRESSIVENESS AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE

It makes big sense recognizing and rewarding employees for their superior performance which leads to superior organizational performance. Most employers believe that their optimal performance is what they expect to achieve with their rewards programs (Deeprise, 2006). When times are tough the only driving policy is rewarding programs and the good reasons to invest more creative efforts and money in your rewarding programs. Recognizing and rewarding employees does more than make people happy. It directly contributes to the bottom line results. Over the past decades, work life programs that benefit the entire workforce have risen high on employees' list of most valued rewards. The measurable results from the organizations are powerful evidence that effective rewards programs have significant bottom line impact (Deeprise, 2006).

There is a contradictory confronting most organizations today of how to maintain a lean workforce by downsizing when costs rise or sales decline. While at the same time retain key employees and crucial skills without any promise of long-term job security. Most companies rate retaining and recruiting as their number one personnel issue. All organizations acknowledge the need to establish an equitable balance between each employee's contribution to the organization and that of the organization to the employee. Meeting that need is basic to recruiting and retaining talent employees. Employees are looking for a number of other returns to justify the time, energy, and mental and emotional effort they devote to the organization. That is why many organizations now think in terms of a total rewards package. This type of package includes not just salary and benefits but also work environment, learning and development, and work life balance. Equity requires that total rewards meet the needs of employees to the same degree that employees contribute to meeting the objectives of the organization (Deepröse, 2006).

Most managers want to write good, fair, and professional performance appraisals, but it is not always that easy to find this perfectly. Managers can use on performance appraisal forms, to describe the performance of any employee in areas, from "accuracy" to "initiative" to "productivity" to "time management skills". Managers can choose phrases from five performance levels that are used on many performance appraisal forms; outstanding, exceeds expectations, meets expectations, need improvement, and unacceptable (Max & Bacal, 2003).

Undertaking formal performance appraisal is not usually an activity most managers relish, but it is important part of the job of the manager. And it gives a manager an opportunity, well done correctly, to positively affect the future of your employees (Max & Bacal, 2003). In order to evaluate performance appraisal, the manager needs to improve his skills of interpersonal and communication and not become aggressive. Aggressive managers never evaluate performance appraisal and never improve the skills and satisfaction of their employees and that is why they are always less productive than humble and democratic manager. Performance appraisal is not just filling a form you have to prepare, conduct, and read. Effective performance appraisal is a process where manager and employees have a meeting and the manager explains the process and criteria for judging performance (Max & Bacal, 2003). Recording incidents and behaviors that are out of extraordinary is very important to performance appraisal. Feedback to employees, both positive and critical, from significant behaviors can enhance employee motivation to improve (Max & Bacal, 2003).

You want the employees to actively participate in the entire appraisal process. This can happen if the employees understand that it will be two-way discussion of performance which means the manager is not aggressive.

AGGRESSIVENESS AND EMPLOYEE PRODUCTIVITY

It was economic theory in nineteenth century "only the investment of capital assets can increase the productivity of labor". In 20th century, management has come to accept that people, not cash, buildings, or equipment, are the critical differentiators of a business enterprise as we move into the new millennium and find ourselves in a knowledge economy, it is undeniable that people are the profit lever. All the assets of an organization, other than people, are inert. Organizations' resources other than human are positive and require human application to generate value. The key to sustaining a profitable company or a healthy economy is the productivity of the workforce, our human capital (Fitz-enz, 2000).

Most traditional people management systems have typically concentrated only on an annual review that lead up to setting of objectives and results for the coming 12 months. These events have a place in the overall system of managing the performance and productivity of our people. This system is designed to be the most useful at the middle and operational levels, especially to all the line managers within the organization. It is also for all the people who work with these managers employees need to know what is expected of them and how their future development will occur (Carter & McMahon, 2005).

Key result areas are determined at the strategic level of the organization. They are then translated into strategic objectives and flow down into a set of actions to be undertaken. These actions ultimately affect the performance and productivity of the shop floor (Carter & McMahon, 2005). In employee product it is straight forward and natural in that it becomes part of the everyday life and existence of the individual and teams. Just like serving a customer, making a product, or taking part, it is a part of what we do around here every day. Good employee productivity management becomes a habit of successful workplaces (Carter & McMahon, 2005).

Today's companies need people who are at least meet their goals and when given opportunity, exceed those goals, demonstrating initiative and creativity. If you have strong people skills. You can build a high productive team that can be relied on to make major contributions to your organization's strategic plan (Stone, 2007). When organizations care about employee productivity, it is to have competency in three key people skills; coaching, counselling, and mentoring. Because it means better bottom line results, organizations look for managers with these abilities (Stone, 2007). Another method for improving employee productivity is continuity management. Knowledge continuity management is defined as the efficient and effective transfer of critical

operational knowledge, both explicit and tacit, both individual and institutional from transferring, resigning, terminating, or retiring, employees to their successors. Continuity management is an effective means of countering the acute and chronic threats of knowledge loss. It speeds up new employees, increases productivity, reduces stress of job changes for new hires and incumbent employees, protects the organizations' knowledge base, improves customer satisfaction, and creates other competitive advantages. Authors also highlight four of the most important management concepts of the new century require effective knowledge continuity to fulfill their potential, continuous improvement, quality maximization, recurrent innovation, and organizational learning (Beazley, Boenisch, & Harden, 2002).

The corporate goal of every organization is to survive if it can make a profit or create a surplus at the same time, even better. But corporate entity by itself does not make profits. People do. The sum total of all employees' efforts and the efforts of distributors creates the wealth which allows the company to invest in new systems, products, and services for its future survival. So, doing business in the long term is the process of people improvement their productivity at work (Fisher, 2005). Last few years, organizations have adopted the phrase "employee engagement" to capture the kind of motivation required in today's workplace. Unfortunately, "employee engagement has been used in a quite different way by different writers, often without specific definition. A more specific and useful definition of engagement is the degree to which people actively self-manage in the work (Thomas, 2009).

The knowledge workplace is the vast array of work and service inside companies that can make or break an organization but that are not related to manufacturing or sales. In those areas, output, productivity, and success can be expressed in a very specific metrics such as sales, or low defect ratios, or gross production numbers (Dibachi & Dibachi, 2002). Some authors think that management's most important contribution for this century will be to raise the productivity of knowledge workers by a similar, staggering amount. The knowledge workers are often very smart, very motivated and hardworking people. Knowledge managers are desperate for help in making their knowledge workplaces more productive and their people more accountable (Dibachi & Dibachi, 2002). Knowledge depletion is the chronic threat to corporate productivity, profitability, and competitiveness posed by the loss of critical knowledge from the millions of annual transfers, resignations, and terminations, that characterize the transient workforce of the information age. When these employees leave their organizations, for whatever reason, their operational knowledge is lost to the organization. In some low positions of the hierarchy, the lost knowledge is merely inconvenient for the organization. In higher, knowledge-based positions, however, it can be devastating (Beazley, Boenisch, & Harden, 2002).

AGGRESSIVENESS AND EMPLOYEE ACHIEVEMENT

Self-efficacy is hypothesized to have effects on task choice, effort, persistence, and achievement. Those who feel efficacious for performing tasks, work harder, persist longer when they encounter difficulties, and achieve at a higher level. Although self-efficacy is an important determinant of achievement, it is not its only influence (Wigfield & Eccles, 2002).

Employees achievement in life is determined to a large extent, by your ability to think, plan, decide, and take action. The stronger your skills are in each of these areas, the faster you will achieve your goals and the happier you will be with your life and career (Tracy & Fraser, 2005). Everyone has special gifts and abilities, if you develop them properly, you can use them to achieve all your goals in life. If you are committed to mastering the circumstances of your life, to realizing your dreams, to creating a thriving career or business and leading a fulfilling and creating life, you must uncover these special gifts and abilities and dedicate yourself to developing and sharpening them (Tracy & Fraser, 2005).

Today's employee expect authenticity in their leaders. If you require a high standard, whether in ethics, production, or quality, then you must demonstrate your commitment to that standard as well. Now more than ever, employees want models of performance. Take care that you model the behaviors and demonstrate a commitment to the goals that you expect from others (Hawley, 2004). Some organizations make a point of calling their employees to "associates" because along with the fact that they value them so much, we don't like the sometimes-demeaning connotations of employee and worker and for sure, help. Studies show that success of organizations are living proof that when associates are extremely satisfied. Some organizations get it that people are their most important asset. While some others focus on product. studies are not saying you shouldn't focus on building a better product, but positive people power is fundamental to the overall success of any business (Mitchell, 2004).

AGGRESSIVENESS AND EMPLOYEE LOYALTY

Over the past decades, employees immersed in bad workplace relationships that have ended terribly, sometimes with the litigation. In addition to our painful experiences as employees, manager, administrator, and business owner, we had a ringside seat for innumerable workplace battles, witnessing the behavior patterns that have almost led employees and employers down a path of frustrated desires and expectations, broken trust,

bleak futures and perhaps most regrettably, lost opportunities for relationships that could have been mutually rewarding (Janove, 2008).

From studies experience authors developed management tool that gives employers the opportunity to avoid pitfalls and instead, tap into their employees' spirit and collective intelligence. This tool provides a basis for mutual understanding between direct reports and their supervisors, promoting collaboration and helping organizations move away from the old command and control model to one in which employees' managers, and executives all feel more invested (Janove, 2008). This tool is called star profile and helped many clients to deal with employee problems, diffusing volatile situations by replacing them with common understanding. Managers who are confronted with serious employee performance, attendance, or conduct problems now have new methods to solve these issues by identifying the employee behaviors most closely connected to the organizations big picture (Janove, 2008).

Some organizations do employee assessment that help employees assess their capabilities and attitudes. The instrument addresses skills, knowledge, attitudes toward the company and toward one's job, basic career goals, and perceived need for additional education, training and experience. These ways organizations earn employees' loyalty and citizenship (Kalamas & Kalamas, 2004). The true causes of employee turnover are hiding plain sight. If we really think about it, we already know what they are; lack of recognition including low pay, unfulfilling jobs, limited career advancement, poor management practices, untrustworthy leadership, and dysfunctional work cultures. These are not hidden factors but survey tells us that they are hidden from the very people who need to be most aware of them, the line managers who are charged with engaging and keeping valued employees in every organization. The vast majority of line managers, in fact, believe that most employees leave because they are "pulled" away by better offers. Of course, most do leave for better offers, but it is simplistic and superficial to accept "pull factors" as root causes (Branham, 2005).

What these managers fail to perceive is that "push factors" mostly within their own power, are the initial stimuli; the first causes that open the door to the "pull" of outside opportunities (Branham, 2005).

AGGRESSIVENESS AND EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION

Motivation is about cultivating your human capital. The challenge lies not in the work itself, but in you, the person who creates and manages the work environment. Managers need to know what drives their employees. Managers have to make workplace where employees feel good about themselves and where the work people do helps them to feel good inside as well (Bruce, 2003).

The only way to get people to like working hard is to motivate them. Every individual in an organization is motivated by something different (rick Pitino). Most people in business would agree that the best employees are motivated ones. Motivated employees are the individuals who take the initiative, who want to do good work, who move up the ranks, and who are generally the most likely to succeed (Silverstein). Employees who are motivated are loyal and dedicated and become ambassadors of good will for their companies. In fact, it's widely accepted that companies with motivated have lower turnover and tend to outpace their competitors in sales and profits. The more motivated your workforce is, the higher your organizations' productivity will be (Silverstein). Part of s boss's job is to be a role model for employees. If you are asking your staff to improve performance or behavior, you have to let them know that the same expectations apply to everyone, even you, (Belding, 2004).

AGGRESSIVENESS AND EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT

Employee development and skydiving are very much the same, both require enormous trust and taking a leap of faith. As managers, we teach what we know, and we often use the tools we feel comfortable with and have relied on time and again. It is only human to want to ensure the success of our efforts and the efforts of the people we are training and developing. Organizations' employees' ultimate success is a reflection on how well we have developed their potential and talent up to that point (Bruce, 2010).

The ultimate objective of employee development is to provide each and every employee with the best tools and resources available to help ensure a successful journey and safe landing. Once you have provided the map and compass, it's time for both you and your employee to take the ultimate leap of faith and implement the plan (Bruce, 2010). Development plays an essential role in succeeding as a leader. People often get promoted for demonstrating their technical expertise. The scarcity of praise and inadequate responses to poor performance are difficult to understand. All leaders are accountable for the performance of the teams they lead. If someone on your team is performing poorly, you have no choice but to intervene and to do so quickly. You are accountable for the performance of each and every person who reports to you (Wall, 2007).

Despite what we fear, bullying, hostility, and blame are not human nature. People's reactions are determined to a great extent by their settings, the norms of the group to which they belong, and the magnitude of perceived threat. When people feel threatened or lack of skills, they react reflexively (Maravelas, 2005).

V. RESEARCH METHEDODOLOGY

This study will follow descriptive design. It is cross-sectional qualitative design in nature. In this analytical research, the researcher will use facts or information already available and will analyze them to make a critical evaluation of the material. It is cross-sectional survey because the researcher will exam many people at the same time.

The researcher will conduct this study in Somalia, particularly, the capital of Mogadishu. The population of this study will 100 subjects selected from business owners, CEOs, managers, supervisors, and employees in Mogadishu, Somalia. From the target population of 100 respondents of the study, the researcher will select 80 respondents as sample size. The key respondents will comprise of 10 CEOs, 20 managers, 15 supervisors, 5 Business Consultants and 30 employees.

In this study, the researcher will use purposive sampling technique. Purposive sampling technique is a type of sampling where the researcher uses his judgement or common-sense regarding participant from whom the information was collected. The researcher will use purposive sampling in order to choose the respondents that the researcher believe to have the information concerning his study by using his judgment and the researcher will distribute the questionnaire to them. An adopted questionnaire will be designed, distributed and administered to business owners, CEOs, managers, supervisors, consultants, and employees in Mogadishu, Somalia.

FINDINGS

This study investigated management aggressiveness and how they impact employees’ performance. The purpose of the study was to examine the impact of management aggressiveness on employees’ performance in Mogadishu-Somalia. This study was distributed questionnaire and analyzed in statistical package in social sciences.

According to the study topic of management aggressiveness and employees’ performance, economist and business managers believe that management is a crucial engine that runs business performance, experts also believe if the management become aggressive, unfair, cruel, incompetent, and unskillful that cannot satisfy, manage, motivate, and inspire employees’ talent, skills, knowledge, and innovation, the whole organizations productivity, performance, achievement, and innovations will go down and simply organization will shut down as well.

The key business stakeholders are employees, managers, customers, and shareholders. If one of these stakeholders do not satisfy with the organizations mission, strategies, objectives, vision, culture, and profit, their contribution to the organization automatically turn into organizations threat. Before this study the researcher finds a problem of that business management in Somalia was not encouraging innovation, organizational citizenship behavior, and satisfaction of the employees. Most managers focus only profit but they do not see the way they can reach.

Economic development analysts suggest that if the organization wants to succeed financially and strategically, they need to behave their employees like boss, in order to feel and behave citizenship. Employees work hard, keep secrets of the organization, and maximize the profit of the organization.

Thus, in this study the researcher tried to investigate the impact of management aggressiveness on employees; performance in Mogadishu-Somalia. Data collected was analyzed using SPSS statistical computer software. The researcher also found out that there is relationship between other sub variables of the study. The respondents were asked to answer the questions based on the relationship between management aggressiveness and Employees’ performance and other sub variables of the subject and object of the study and that most of them confirmed that there is relationship between them, data collected was analyzed under research questions and the results and findings are presented in sub sections.

Table 4.1: In order to get any goal, it is necessary to press ahead without looking outside

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	33	41.2	41.2	41.2
	Strongly Agree	15	18.8	18.8	60.0
	Neutral	11	13.8	13.8	73.8
	Disagree	20	25.0	25.0	98.8
	Strongly Disagree	1	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the above table 4.1, **41.2%** of the respondents agreed that in order to get any goal, it is necessary to press ahead without looking outside, **18.8%** strongly agreed that in order to get any goal, it is necessary to press ahead without looking outside, **13.8%** were neutral, while **25%** disagree that in order to get any goal, it is necessary to press ahead without looking outside, and **1.2%** strongly disagree that in order to get any goal, it is necessary to press ahead without looking outside.

Table 4.3: Usually I achieve success because I inflexibly press ahead

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	20	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Strongly Agree	24	30.0	30.0	55.0
	Neutral	13	16.2	16.2	71.2
	Disagree	19	23.8	23.8	95.0
	Strongly Disagree	4	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.2: Matters only victory, non-important the way to reach it

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	13	16.2	16.2	16.2
	Strongly Agree	24	30.0	30.0	46.2
	Neutral	24	30.0	30.0	76.2
	Disagree	10	12.5	12.5	88.8
	Strongly Disagree	9	11.2	11.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the above table 4.2, **16.2%** of the respondents agreed that victory only matters but it is not important the way to reach it, **30%** strongly agreed that victory only matters but the way is not important, **30%** were neutral, while **12.5%** disagree that victory only matters but the way to reach it, is not important, **11.2%** strongly disagreed that victory only matters but the way is not important.

From the 4.3 above, 25% of the respondents agree that they achieve because of their inflexibility, 30% strongly agree which makes total agree of more than 50% also, 16.2% of the respondents become neutral, 23.8% of the respondents disagree, while 5% of the respondents strongly disagree that achieving success needs inflexibility of the person.

Table 4.4: I am not afraid to stand up for defend my own right, even in the face of persons standing higher than me

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	28	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Strongly Agree	34	42.5	42.5	77.5
	Neutral	12	15.0	15.0	92.5
	Disagree	5	6.2	6.2	98.8
	Strongly Disagree	1	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.4 above, 35% of the respondents agree that people stand and defend their rights even if they can cause to face their bosses or any other person that higher than, 42.5% of the respondents strongly agree that they do too with strongly which makes the question that more than 70% of the respondents agree that

they stand up for their rights if they feel management injustice, also 15% of the respondents become neutral for this, while 6.2% disagree and 1.2% of the respondents strongly disagree that employee can defend their rights from their management and bosses.

Table 4.5: I use every opportunity to win

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	26	32.5	32.5	32.5
	Strongly Agree	33	41.2	41.2	73.8
	Neutral	10	12.5	12.5	86.2
	Disagree	8	10.0	10.0	96.2
	Strongly Disagree	3	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.5 above, 32.5% of the respondents agree that employee and managers both use every opportunity to win, 41.2% of the respondents strongly agree that is approximately 74% and according to study which makes perfectly clear that majority of the labor seeking every opportunity to win, 12.5% of the respondents become neutral to this, while 10% of the respondents disagree and 3.8% strongly disagree.

Table 4.6: I feel satisfaction if I succeed in cause damage to my rival

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	19	23.8	23.8	23.8
	Strongly Agree	11	13.8	13.8	37.5
	Neutral	27	33.8	33.8	71.2
	Disagree	12	15.0	15.0	86.2
	Strongly Disagree	11	13.8	13.8	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.6 above, 23.8% of the respondents agree they would like success and feel satisfaction to their succeed even if they cause damage to their rival part, 13.8% strongly agree also, 33.8% of the respondents become neutral, it is the largest number of all, meanwhile 15% of the respondents disagree and 13.8% of the respondents strongly disagree, so according to the respondents less than 50% agree, so according to the respondents people like satisfaction and success but don't like to cause damage to others.

Table 4.7: Employees only work when they feel excessive monitoring pressure

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	16	20.0	20.0	20.0
	Strongly Agree	22	27.5	27.5	47.5
	Neutral	15	18.8	18.8	66.2
	Disagree	13	16.2	16.2	82.5
	Strongly Disagree	14	17.5	17.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.7 above, 20% of the respondents agree that employees work better only when they feel excessive monitoring pressure of the management, 27.5% of the respondents strongly agree that employees only work hard when they feel excessive monitoring pressure, 18.8% of the respondents become neutral, 16.2% of the respondents disagree and 17.5% of the respondents strongly disagree. So, it is nearly 50/50 that employees work hard when they feel excessive monitoring pressure according to this study, but to my opinion it is also related to culture, because this study directly applied to where I researched Somalia and maybe it is our culture most people work only pressure and don't feel organizational citizenship behavior.

Table 4.8: The ultimate driving force for employees' performance is punishment

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	13	16.2	16.2	16.2
	Strongly Agree	13	16.2	16.2	32.5
	Neutral	11	13.8	13.8	46.2
	Disagree	22	27.5	27.5	73.8
	Strongly Disagree	21	26.2	26.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.8 above, 16.2% of the respondents believe that employees' ultimate driving force for their performance is punishment, 16.2% others strongly agree, 13.8% become neutral, while 27.5% of the respondents disagree which nearly two times of percentage agreed, 26.2% of the respondents strongly disagree which is total disagree of more than 50%, although this also closely relate to culture of citizenship behavior, this study finally show that ultimate driving force of employees' performance is not punishment.

From the table 4.9 above, 40% of the respondents agree that employees know how their performance impact the whole organization, 31.2% of the respondents strongly agree, 17.5% of the respondents become neutral, 5% of the respondents disagree and 6.2% of the respondents strongly disagree. The whole concept of the study towards this question is that people especially employees exactly know how their performance impacts the whole organization that is why they become hard workers and satisfied and become lazy when they are dissatisfied.

Table 4.9: Employees know how their performance impacts the organization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	32	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Strongly Agree	25	31.2	31.2	71.2
	Neutral	14	17.5	17.5	88.8
	Disagree	4	5.0	5.0	93.8
	Strongly Disagree	5	6.2	6.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.10: High levels of performance are recognized and rewarded

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	24	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Strongly Agree	40	50.0	50.0	80.0
	Neutral	9	11.2	11.2	91.2
	Disagree	6	7.5	7.5	98.8

Table 4.11: The employees believe the system is fair

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	24	30.0	30.0
	Strongly Agree	16	20.0	50.0
	Neutral	25	31.2	81.2
	Disagree	11	13.8	95.0
	Strongly Disagree	4	5.0	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0
Strongly Disagree	1	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.10 above, 30% of the respondents agree that high level performance employees are to be recognized and rewarded, 50% of the respondents strongly agree that high level performance deserve to be recognized and rewarded, 11.2% of the respondents become neutral 7.5% of the respondents disagree and 1.2% of the respondents that high level performance employee deserve to be recognized for their effort and rewarded. 80% of the respondents totally agree that high level performance employee deserve to be rewarded, but in Africa it is hard and complicated to be recognized and rewarded, so it may be cultural barrier, in Somalia organizational citizenship behavior is under zero because of management aggressiveness.

From the table 4.11 above, 30% of the respondents agree that the system is fair, 20% of the respondents strongly agree which is half of the respondents in total and other half is 31.2% of the respondents which is highest number of all five criteria become neutral that is why some people believe that the system is unfair, they believe that the system full of nepotism, bias and corruption that is common sense also. 13.8% of the respondents disagree that the system is fair and 5% of the respondents strongly disagree which is total disagree of nearly 20% of the respondents.

Table 4.12: Employees who need improvement are given developmental opportunities

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	35	43.8	43.8
	Strongly Agree	25	31.2	75.0
	Neutral	10	12.5	87.5
	Disagree	9	11.2	98.8
	Strongly Disagree	1	1.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0

From the table 4.12 above, 43.8% of the respondents agree that the employees who need improvement are given developmental opportunities, 31.2% of the respondents strongly agree, 12.5% of the respondents neutral, 11.2% of the respondents disagree and 1.2% strongly disagree. In the context of Somalia, it is less more than you thought.

Table 4.13: Ratings are accurate and reflect actual performance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	22	27.5	27.5	27.5
	Strongly Agree	19	23.8	23.8	51.2
	Neutral	20	25.0	25.0	76.2
	Disagree	9	11.2	11.2	87.5
	Strongly Disagree	10	12.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.13 above, 27.5% of the respondents agree that the ratings are accurate and reflect actual performance, 23.8% of the respondents strongly agree that the ratings are accurate and reflect actual performance, 25% of the respondents become neutral, 11.2% of the respondents disagree and 12.5% of the respondents strongly disagree that the ratings are accurate and reflect actual performance.

Table 4.14: The system measures both the results and how they are achieved

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	38	47.5	47.5	47.5
	Strongly Agree	19	23.8	23.8	71.2
	Neutral	11	13.8	13.8	85.0
	Disagree	7	8.8	8.8	93.8
	Strongly Disagree	5	6.2	6.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.14 above, 47.5% of the respondents agree that the system measures both the results and how they are achieved, 23.8% of the respondents strongly agree, 13.8% of the respondents become neutral, 8.8% of the respondents disagree and 6.2% of the respondents strongly disagree, although this and other two above questions in real life Somalia is fiction because mostly have no system if they have, have no accurate and sometimes have no measurement.

Table 4.15: I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work i do

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	22	27.5	27.5	27.5
	Strongly Agree	21	26.2	26.2	53.8
	Neutral	18	22.5	22.5	76.2
	Disagree	13	16.2	16.2	92.5
	Strongly Disagree	6	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.15 above, 27.5% of the respondents agree that the employee being paid fair amount for the work they do, 26.2% strongly agree while 22.5% of the respondents become neutral, 16.2% of the respondents disagree and 7.5% of the respondents strongly disagree that the employee paid fairly for the work they do.

Table 4.16: I like the people I work with

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	27	33.8	33.8	33.8
	Strongly Agree	34	42.5	42.5	76.2
	Neutral	14	17.5	17.5	93.8
	Disagree	1	1.2	1.2	95.0
	Strongly Disagree	4	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.16 above, 33.8% of the respondents agree that they like the people they work with, 42.5% of the respondents strongly agree 17.5% of the respondents become neutral, 1.2% of the respondents disagree 5% of the respondents strongly disagree that employee like the people they work with.

Table 4.17: When I do good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	29	36.2	36.2	36.2
	Strongly Agree	27	33.8	33.8	70.0
	Neutral	10	12.5	12.5	82.5
	Disagree	11	13.8	13.8	96.2
	Strongly Disagree	3	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.17 above, 36.2% of the respondents agree when they do good, they receive recognition for it, 33.8% of the respondents strongly agree, 12.5% of the respondents become neutral, 13.8% of the respondents disagree and 3.8% of the respondents strongly disagree that they should receive recognition of what they do.

Table 4.18: There is really too little chance for promotion on my job

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	25	31.2	31.2	31.2
	Strongly Agree	12	15.0	15.0	46.2
	Neutral	18	22.5	22.5	68.8
	Disagree	19	23.8	23.8	92.5
	Strongly Disagree	6	7.5	7.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.18 above, 31.2% of the respondents agree that employee have little chance of promotion for their jobs which can cause immoral of the employee, 15% of the respondents strongly agree, 22.5% of the respondents become neutral, while 23.8% of the respondents disagree and 7.5% of the respondents strongly disagree that employee have little chance for promotion on their jobs. Anyway, nearly half of the respondents already agree that the employee have little chance of promotion.

Table 4.19: I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	21	26.2	26.2	26.2
Strongly Agree	11	13.8	13.8	40.0
Neutral	16	20.0	20.0	60.0
Disagree	19	23.8	23.8	83.8
Strongly Disagree	13	16.2	16.2	100.0
Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.19 above, 26.2% of the respondents agree that they are not satisfied with the benefits they receive, 13.8% of the respondents strongly agree too, but 20% of the respondents become neutral, while 23.8% of the respondents disagree and 16.2% strongly disagree that the employees are not satisfied with the benefits they receive.

Table 4.20: I sometimes feel my job is meaningless

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	13	16.2	16.2	16.2
Strongly Agree	8	10.0	10.0	26.2
Neutral	17	21.2	21.2	47.5
Disagree	14	17.5	17.5	65.0
Strongly Disagree	28	35.0	35.0	100.0
Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.20 above, 16.2% of the respondents agree that they feel their job is meaningless, 10% of the respondents strongly agree that, 21.2% of the respondents become neutral, 17.5% of the respondents disagree and 35% of the respondents strongly disagree.

Table 4.21: My supervisor is unfair to me

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Agree	9	11.2	11.2	11.2
Strongly Agree	8	10.0	10.0	21.2
Neutral	19	23.8	23.8	45.0
Disagree	18	22.5	22.5	67.5
Strongly Disagree	26	32.5	32.5	100.0
Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.21 above, 11.2% of the respondents agree that their supervisor is unfair to them, 10% of the respondents strongly agree, while 23.8% of the respondents become neutral, 22.5% of the respondents disagree and 32.5% of the respondents strongly disagree. So, more than 50% of the respondents disagree that their supervisor is unfair to them.

Table 4.22: I am increasingly being overloaded with work making it difficult to achieve my targets

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	18	22.5	22.5	22.5
	Strongly Agree	17	21.2	21.2	43.8
	Neutral	18	22.5	22.5	66.2
	Disagree	13	16.2	16.2	82.5
	Strongly Disagree	14	17.5	17.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.22 above, 22.5% of the respondents agree that their jobs are overloaded that make it difficult by achieving their targets, 21.2% of the respondents strongly agree, while 22.5% of the respondents become neutral, 16.2% of the respondents disagree and 17.5% of the respondents strongly disagree. This clear show that more than 40% of the respondents are being overloaded with their jobs that cause them to be difficult to achieve their goals and targets.

Table 4.23: My work is being plagiarized intentionally/ the credit of my work is being stolen

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	12	15.0	15.0	15.0
	Strongly Agree	13	16.2	16.2	31.2
	Neutral	24	30.0	30.0	61.2
	Disagree	18	22.5	22.5	83.8
	Strongly Disagree	13	16.2	16.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.23 above, 15% of the respondents agree that their work is being plagiarized intentionally and the credit of their work is being stolen, 16.2% of the respondents strongly agree, while 30% of the respondents become neutral, 22.5% of the respondents disagree and 16.2% of the respondents strongly disagree. In Somalia plagiarizing work and stealing work credit become sensitive case that mostly occur.

Table 4.24: I am undermined and humiliated in front of others

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	13	16.2	16.2	16.2
	Strongly Agree	8	10.0	10.0	26.2
	Neutral	19	23.8	23.8	50.0
	Disagree	22	27.5	27.5	77.5
	Strongly Disagree	18	22.5	22.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.24 above, 16.2% of the respondents agree that they are undermined and humiliated in front of others, 10% of the respondents strongly agree, 23.8% of the respondents become neutral, 27.5% of the respondents disagree and 22.5% of the respondents strongly disagree.

Table 4.25: I am unfairly blamed and accused

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	11	13.8	13.8	13.8
	Strongly Agree	7	8.8	8.8	22.5
	Neutral	22	27.5	27.5	50.0
	Disagree	19	23.8	23.8	73.8
	Strongly Disagree	21	26.2	26.2	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.25 above, 13.8% of the respondents agree that they are unfairly blamed and accused, 8.8% of the respondents strongly agree, 27.5% of the respondents become neutral, 23.8% of the respondents disagree and 26.2% of the respondents strongly disagree. So, according to the study nearly 50% of the respondents disagree that they are blamed and accused unfairly.

Table 4.26: I am denied the resources necessary for completing my work and achieving my goals

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	18	22.5	22.5	22.5
	Strongly Agree	12	15.0	15.0	37.5
	Neutral	14	17.5	17.5	55.0
	Disagree	16	20.0	20.0	75.0
	Strongly Disagree	20	25.0	25.0	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.26 above, 22.5% of the respondents agree that they are denied with the necessary resources for completing their work and achieving their goals, 15% of the respondents strongly agree, 17.5% of the respondents become neutral, 20% of the respondents disagree and 25% of the respondents strongly disagree. It is a much number that agreed but disagreed number is larger than so, mostly employee get some resources to complete and achieve their goals and work targets.

Table 4.27: When you feel your boss is fair, your performance will high and achieve more

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	22	27.5	27.5	27.5
	Strongly Agree	45	56.2	56.2	83.8
	Neutral	3	3.8	3.8	87.5
	Disagree	6	7.5	7.5	95.0
	Strongly Disagree	4	5.0	5.0	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.27 above, 27.5% of the respondents agree when their boss is fair their performance will high and achieve more, 56.2% of the respondents which more than half strongly agree when their boss is fair their performance will high and achieve more, the total respondents agreed are 83.7% which makes perfectly clear according to this study when the boss, supervisor, manager is fair to the employees their performance will high and achieve more, 3.8% of the respondents become neutral, 7.5% of the respondents disagree and 5% of the respondents disagree.

Table 4.28: Management aggressiveness effect employee satisfaction at work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	32	40.0	40.0	40.0
	Strongly Agree	35	43.8	43.8	83.8
	Neutral	5	6.2	6.2	90.0
	Disagree	6	7.5	7.5	97.5
	Strongly Disagree	2	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.28 above, shows 40% of the respondents agree that management aggressiveness affect employee satisfaction at work, 43.8% of the respondents strongly agree, 6.2% of the respondents become neutral, 7.5% of the respondents disagree and 2.5% of the respondents strongly disagree. In addition of the two highest numbers become 83.8% of the respondents agreed that management aggressiveness affect employee satisfaction at work.

Table 4.29: Management aggressiveness effect employee achievement at work

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	29	36.2	36.2	36.2
	Strongly Agree	38	47.5	47.5	83.8
	Neutral	7	8.8	8.8	92.5
	Disagree	3	3.8	3.8	96.2
	Strongly Disagree	3	3.8	3.8	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

From the table 4.29 above, shows that 36.2% of the respondents agree that management aggressiveness affect employees achievement at work, 47.5% of the respondents strongly agree, the respondents of this study dominantly agreed 83.7% that management aggressiveness have affect on employees achievement at work, so, management has always big role about employees achievement at work, 8.8% of the respondents become neutral, 3.8% of the respondents disagree and another 3.8% of the respondents strongly disagree.

Table 4.30: Management aggressiveness effect employee performance at work and at organization

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	24	30.0	30.4	30.4
	Strongly Agree	41	51.2	51.9	82.3
	Neutral	5	6.2	6.3	88.6
	Disagree	4	5.0	5.1	93.7
	Strongly Disagree	5	6.2	6.3	100.0
	Total	79	98.8	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.2		
Total		80	100.0		

From the table 4.30 above, shows that 30% of the respondents agree that management aggressiveness affect employee performance at work and at organization, 51.2% of the respondents which more than half of the respondents strongly agree that management aggressiveness affect employee performance at and at organization, as earlier before mentioned above tables and analysis management is the center of the whole organizations performance activities and productivity, if the management become dysfunctional the whole system will like that. So, if the management become aggressive to the employees the whole organization become dysfunctional, employees become dissatisfied and the performance and productivity of the organization will be downward. 6.2% of the respondents stays neutral, while 5% of the respondents disagree, another 6.2% of the respondents strongly disagree and 1.2% is an error missing.

VI. DISCUSSION

This study examined the perception of the respondents towards the relationship between management aggressiveness and employee performance at work in Mogadishu. The researcher used questionnaire survey to collect data from 80 respondents of different segments of the business market. the researcher distributed 80 set of questionnaire papers to the above-mentioned category of respondents. The questionnaire was distributed some of the biggest business companies' employees, supervisors, managers and consultants and also other business owners, small business managers and even some academia.

The research did not consider the respondents gender, their age, but were distributed those on available at the time of distribution. All the respondents were given time of 30 up to 35 minutes to complete each questionnaire paper and then collected back. The data collected were analyzed using qualitative techniques. Data was analyzed using descriptive statistics and presented as frequency distribution. Percentages in tables and the quantitative data were organized into themes that came out of the research questions and analyzed using descriptive form. The analysis of data enabled the researcher to come up with the following findings.

✓ In respondents' gender 96.2% of the respondents were male while other 3.8% of the respondents were female, although the researcher was not considering gender and age, but the reality is that women are less than men in Somalia's job sector especially Mogadishu. There is no exact study that the researcher can cite but the common sense is that there is class ceiling Mogadishu jobs especially high level and managerial positions.

✓ The highest number of the respondents were 21-30 young age group that become 58.8% of the total respondents. The ministry of youth and sports in Somalia said earlier this year that statistically 75% of the Somalis population are young age group less than 30 years old. So, even in job sector the highest number is still youth, and it also the highest number of the study's respondents.

✓ Most of the respondents even the young group 81.2% were married. Economic development analysts said that under-developing countries have more marriage, more baby boomers than those developing and developed countries and Somalia is one of the under-developing countries. This may be logic because even Somalia, some of the poorest region have more population and baby booming than the others.

✓ The level of education by the respondents were different 53.8% of the respondents were postgraduate, the reason of course is that the study respondents were high level, since the study respondents were managers, consultants, supervisors and even high-level employees.

✓ Generally, the study confirmed that management aggressiveness impacts employees' performance at work, and that proves that most of the questions that relate management aggressiveness and employee performance were agree and strongly agree, and in sum greater than those of disagree and strongly disagree. 83.7% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that if their boss is fair they can perform better and achieve more, so, the researchers definition aggressiveness comes from perception of employees that is unfairly behavior of their supervisors. 83.8% of the respondents in sum agree and strongly agree they said that management aggressiveness affect employee satisfaction at work. Another 83.7% of the respondents in sum of agree and strongly agree said that management aggressiveness affect employee achievement at work. 81.2% of the respondents also believe that management aggressiveness affects employees' performance at work and at whole organization. Which in total means if the management is aggressive, cruel, and unfair to their employees, the whole organizations productivity, performance and achievement will go down as moral of employees goes down. These are the best measurable questions of the study and study confirmed the researcher's hypothesis of that the management aggressiveness impacts employees' performance.

VII. CONCLUSIONS & SUGGESTIONS

The study looked of the various levels of the relationship between Management and employees' performance. Data was collected then analyzed. SPSS software was used to enhance the data processing by providing rational relevant tables for analysis. The researcher applied all the elements of a descriptive research.

In chapter four the data was analyzed in SPSS and the result presented in tables to make it easier for the last users to take note when studying or reading.

1- To improve the employee performance, managers must be inspiring, motivators, supporters and leaders that can be role model, and create the whole organizations culture that is intended to perform properly. Every organization has its own culture, but the managers and senior administrators are the founders of that culture, so, if that culture become a supporting culture of the employee then performance will go high and employee feel citizenship. In order to make the whole performance high, Organizations stakeholders especially shareholders and boards must make sure that the managers are the right persons that capable of employee and the whole organizations.

2- To improve organizations performance, it must first build by the right persons and the right strategy. in order to do that, people must be organizations first asset and their development must be part of the strategy. 500 fortune companies in the world focus human resource planning. So, employees know their performance impact in the organization.

3- Managers can be part of the development and also can be part of the organizations loss. When the manager has knowledge, skill and ability, and also can lead and manage employees' performance and reward that manager wins huge impact of the organization. Employees always perform how their management treat.

4- To decrease bias, nepotism, and favoritism government must make rules and regulations of the labor. When the employees know that the government will control the system and even they can get where to complain about their problems they feel confidence and innovation.

5- To improve loyalty, to avoid favoritism and bias, to encourage innovation, business owners must focus what is best for their business. It means to hire the right person, then train, develop, and innovate always.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The finding indicates that the management sector is the engine that drives the performance of both the employees and the whole organization and keeping the organizations stakeholders. Many of the respondent said that were if not for the management business will not succeed and produce profit, management are the drivers of the performance and profit of the organization. The unhidden fact is that since the collapse of Said Barra's regime the private business sector was and still is the major working opportunity available in this country. So, the researcher recommends:

- 1- The government has to emphasize and bring into new business regulations, policies and laws.
- 2- The government has to emphasize and bring into new labor regulations, policies and laws.
- 3- Governments and private business must support, encourage and build capacity of the human resource, trainings, education, and development of the staff, and managers.
- 4- Since Somalia's major functioning sector after institutional collapse in Somalia 1991 is private sector, small business owners and corporations must encourage innovation and employee capacity building programs and trainings.
- 5- Finally, Somalia's educational institutions must know what they produce, it means what kind of person, what kind of employee they are producing to the market of labor. and organizational institutions must what criteria they are looking for the employees.

References

- [1]. Bandura, A. (1997). social learning theory. new jersey: prentice - hall.
- [2]. Beazley, H., Boenisch, J., & Harden, D. (2002). Continuity Management; Preserving Corporate Knowledge and Productivity When Employees Leave. Canada: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, N.J.
- [3]. Belding, S. (2004). WINNING WITH THE EMPLOYEE FROM HELL; A GUIDE TO COACHING AND MOTIVATION. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: ECW PRESS.
- [4]. Bettencourt, B. A., Talley, A., Benjamin, A. J., & Valentine, J. (2006). Personality and Aggressive Behavior Under Provoking and Neutral conditions. psychological Bulletin, 132.
- [5]. Branham, L. (2005). The 7 Hidden Reasons Employees Leave; How to Recognize the Subtle Signs and Act Before It's Too Late. New york: AMACOM.
- [6]. Bru na Boinne. (2002). Management Plan.
- [7]. Bruce, A. (2003). How to Motivate Every Employee; 24 Proven Tactics to Spark Productivity in the Workplace. New york: MCGRAW-HILL.
- [8]. Bruce, A. (2010). PERFECT PHRASES for EMPLOYEE DEVELOPMENT PLANS; Hundreds of Ready-to-Use Phrases for Motivating and Growing Employees for Success. New york: McGraw-Hill.
- [9]. Burrow, J. L., & Kliendl, B. A. (2013). Business management. Mason: South-Western.
- [10]. Bushman, B. J., & Wells, G. L. (1998). Trait Aggressiveness and Hockey Penalties. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83.
- [11]. Bushman, B. J., DeWall, C. N., & Anderson, C. A. (2011). The General Aggression Model: Theoretical Extensions to Violence. Psychology of Violence, 245-258.
- [12]. Byrnes, J. (2002). Preventing Aggressive Behavior. New york: Pearson.
- [13]. Carter, E. M., & McMahan, F. A. (2005). IMPROVING EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE through workplace coaching. london, UK: London and Sterling.
- [14]. Cherry, K. (2017). What factors lead to aggression. website.
- [15]. Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (2000). personality inventory. florida: psychological assessment resources, Inc.

- [16]. Deeprose, D. (2006). HOW TO RECOGNIZE & REWARD EMPLOYEES. New York: AMACOM.
- [17]. Dibachi, F., & Dibachi, R. L. (2002). Just Add Management; Seven Steps to Creating a Productive Workplace and Motivating Your Employees in Challenging Times. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [18]. Dupre, K. E., Inness, M., Connelly, C. E., Barling, J., & Hopton, C. (2006). Workplace Aggression in Teenage Part-Time Employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91.
- [19]. Eileen P. Ahearn. (n.d.). Management of Anxiety and Aggression. Cdl's Foundation.
- [20]. Fisher-Blando, J. L. (2008). AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR AND ITS EFFECT ON JOB SATISFACTION AND PRODUCTIVITY. Dissertation UNIVERSITY OF PHOENIX, 156.
- [21]. Fitz-enz, J. (2000). The ROI of Human Capital. New York: AMACOM.
- [22]. García-Forero, C., Gallardo-Pujol, D., Maydeu-Olivares, A., & Andrés-Pueyo, A. (2009). Disentangling impulsiveness, aggressiveness and impulsive aggression: An empirical approach using self-report measures. *Psychiatry Research*, 40-49.
- [23]. Griffin, R. W., & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). "Bad Behavior" in Organizations. *Journal of Management*, 31.
- [24]. Hawley, C. F. (2004). 201 ways to turn any employee into a star performer. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [25]. Hepworth, W., & Towler, A. (2004). The Effects of Individual Differences and Charismatic Leadership on Workplace Aggression. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 176-185.
- [26]. Janove, J. (2008). STAR PROFILE; A MANAGEMENT TOOL TO UNLEASH EMPLOYEE POTENTIAL. California: Davies-Black Publishing Mountain View.
- [27]. Kahn, M. W., & Kirk, W. E. (1968). THE CONCEPTS OF AGGRESSION: A REVIEW AND REFORMULATION. *The Psychological Record*, 559-573.
- [28]. Kalamas, D., & Kalamas, J. B. (2004). Developing Employee Capital. Amherst, Massachusetts: HRD Press, Inc.
- [29]. Krzyzanowska, K. (2016). AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOR AND THE IMPACT ON JOB SATISFACTION AND PRODUCTIVITY OF EMPLOYEES IN IRELAND. Dissertation Master in Human Resources Management, National College of Ireland, 113.
- [30]. Maravelas, A. (2005). How to Reduce Workplace Conflict and Stress. Canada: Franklin Lakes, NJ.
- [31]. Max, D., & Bacal, R. (2003). Perfect Phrases for Performance Reviews. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [32]. Mitchell, J. (2004). Hug Your People; The Proven Way to Hire, Inspire, and Recognize Your Employees and Achieve Remarkable Results. New York: Hyperion.
- [33]. O'leary-kelly, A. M., Griffin, R. W., & Glew, D. J. (1996). Organization-motivated aggression. *The Academy of Management Review*, 225-253.
- [34]. Olson, B. J., Nelson, D. L., & Parayitam, S. (2006). Managing aggression in organizations: what leaders must know. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 384-398.
- [35]. Robbins, S. P., & Decenzo, D. A. (2004). Fundamentals of Management. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- [36]. Saleemi, N. A. (2014). Principles and Practice of Management Simplified. Nairobi: Saleemi Publications LYD.
- [37]. Silverstein, B. (n.d.). Motivating Employees; BRINGING OUT THE BEST IN YOUR PEOPLE. New York: Harper Collins.
- [38]. Stone, F. M. (2007). Coaching, Counseling & Mentoring. New York: AMACOM.
- [39]. Thomas, K. W. (2009). Intrinsic Motivation at Work; What Really Drives Employee Engagement. San Francisco, California: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- [40]. Tony Buon. (2002). Workplace Bullying and the Impact on Organisational Efficiency.
- [41]. Topolosky, P. S. (2000). Linking Employee Satisfaction to Business Result. New York: Routledge.
- [42]. Tracy, B., & Fraser, C. (2005). TurboCoach; A Powerful System for Achieving Breakthrough Career Success. New York: AMACOM.
- [43]. Veiga, C. P., Aranda, B. C., Stein, D., Franci, C. R., Miczek, K. A., Lucion, A. B., & Almeida, R. M. (2011). Effect of social instigation and aggressive behavior on hormone levels of lactating dams and adult male Wistar rats. *Psychology & Neuroscience*, 103-113.
- [44]. Wall, B. (2007). COACHING FOR EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE; The Secret to Developing the Star Potential in Your Employees. Broadway, New York: AMACOM.
- [45]. Wigfield, A., & Eccles, J. S. (2002). Development of Achievement Motivation. Orlando, Florida: Academic Press.

ABDIMAHAD ABSHIR ARALE. "The Impact of Management Aggressiveness on Employee Performance in Mogadishu-Somalia." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, 25(1), 2023, pp. 20-42.