

The Effect of Participative and Directive Leadership on Team Effectiveness among Administrative Employees in a South African Tertiary Institution

Clement Bell¹, Nicole Dodd² and Themba Mjoli³

*University of Fort Hare, Department of Industrial Psychology, King William's Town Road,
P. Bag X1314, Alice 5700, South Africa*

*E-mail: ¹<clementbell86@gmail.com>, ²<ndodd@ufh.ac.za>,
³<tmjoli@ufh.ac.za>*

KEYWORDS Administration. Directing. Effectiveness. Leadership. Participation. Team

ABSTRACT The paper examined the effect of participative and directive leadership style on team effectiveness among administrative employees in a South African tertiary institution. The paper employed a quantitative design, and a self-administered questionnaire was used to collect data. The respondents were selected using a non-probability sampling method to achieve a sample size of 246 out of the population size of 676 administrative employees of the university. The paper employed descriptive and inferential statistics in the form of Pearson's correlations and multiple regression methods in analysing data. The results showed that participative and directive leadership individually have a significant effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. They also revealed that a participative and directive leadership additively has a significant impact on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. The paper recommended that South African organisations should employ these leadership strategies in their quest for team excellence.

INTRODUCTION

The value of teams and their operations in organisations have been examined since the 1920s. However, the forces exerted by the global economy have heightened the need for different organisations to optimise the use of their teams (Shuffler et al. 2011). Effective functioning of organisations is strongly contingent on the teamwork (Emmerik et al. 2011). A team is comprised of two or more people working together to enable performance and attainment of the main goals of the organisation (Sarkar and Ray 2017). Different scholars have observed a significant increase in the use of team structures in today's organisations (Hajro et al. 2017). Such developments have come because of high levels of competition in the current dynamic business environment which has forced organisations to be more adaptable than ever before (Daspit et al. 2013). The advances in uses of technology have also heightened the level of competition. Furthermore, globalisation of the business world has contributed to this challenging environment which has also increased the value of team structures (Chou et al. 2008). Organisations have, therefore, adopted a team strategy to combine different experiences and

knowledge of people to achieve a competitive advantage (Verma et al. 2016). Managers of different organisations employ teams as a strategy to establish highly responsive organisations. As such, they use teams to transform organisations and increase their capabilities. Team structures enable team members to provide unique skills which could help to develop an innovative organisation which is ready to deal with today's organisational challenges (Daspit et al. 2013). Teams are regarded as highly effective vehicles which operate effectively in contemporary organisations. Effective team members possess adequate skill resources to achieve the important goals of the organisation (Sarkar and Ray 2017). These researchers, therefore, argue that team effectiveness is the behaviour that is oriented towards the goal of performing organisation-specific responsibilities using effective communication, cohesion, collaboration and cooperation.

The mission of the University of Fort Hare is "to produce high quality education of international standards contributing to the advancement of knowledge that is socially and ethically relevant, and applying that knowledge to the scientific, technological and social-economic development of the nation, continent and glo-

bal world” (Student Guide 2018: 3). To strategically position and invent itself so that it can attain the international educational standards, the university has organised its operations around team structures because they produce higher levels of organizational effectiveness as compared to traditional and bureaucratic structures that were common at the university. This development resulted in restructuring, re-engineering and downsizing within the university. The work environment has become very complex and sophisticated. This change of the structure of the organisation has caused problems between administrative managers and their subordinates. As such, there is high turnover and poor performance among the administrative employees. It was found that high administrative employee turnover of eighteen percent at Fort Hare University was caused by job dissatisfaction and poor employee morale. This prevailing situation has led to a perpetual loss of highly qualified and experienced administrative employees within the institution of higher learning (Ngabase 2012).

The problems that the university is experiencing are caused by ineffective leadership. Poor relations between leaders and their subordinates compromise the quality of service of the university. Thus, poor leadership has destroyed the human spirit that is critical to ensuring the effectiveness of the university in delivering service excellence (Bell and Murugan 2013). It has threatened the survival of the university. The outcomes of such poor leadership include employee stress, disenchantment, lack of creativity, cynicism, high employee turnover and poor performance (Bell and Murugan 2013). The loss of many competent administrative employees has resulted in the loss of competitive advantage for the university (Nyengane 2007). The uses of team structures are highly effective in achieving organisational goals when the team members are led effectively (Polychroniou 2009). Scholars argue that there are various empirical studies on the success of different leadership styles that refer to the association between styles and different measures of performance such as the effectiveness and efficiency of organisations (Richter 2018). Other researchers argue that different leadership styles produce unique motivational forces that also affect team functioning differently (Bell et al. 2014). Furthermore, other researchers specifically argued that directive and participa-

tive leadership behaviours are conducive to team performance (Ceri-Booms et al. 2017). Therefore, based on the background given above, the paper sought to assess the effect of participative and directive leadership style on team effectiveness among administrative employees of a South African tertiary institution.

Objectives

The objectives of this research paper are to determine the effect of participative and directive leadership on team effectiveness and to determine the additive effect of participative and directive leadership on team effectiveness among administrative employees in a South African tertiary institution. In the same manner, several hypotheses were formulated in this research paper, which indicates that participative leadership has a significant effect on team effectiveness, directive leadership has a significant impact on team effectiveness, and participative and directive leadership styles combined have a significant additive effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees of a South African tertiary institution.

Literature Review

The Effect of Participative Leadership on Team Effectiveness

Participative leadership is defined as the process of jointly making decisions or having a shared influence in decision-making by a leader and his or her subordinates (Benoliel and Somech 2014). Other researchers perceive this style as entailing perceiving employees as critical knowledge resources who make up the hub of an organisation. Participative leaders focus on interpersonal interactions and socialisation. As such, it is the same as an empowering leadership paradigm (Mroz et al. 2018). It is a very significant concept in research, strategy development, and organisation management (Chen and Tjosvold 2006; Fatima et al. 2017). However, there is a deficit of empirical studies that have been entirely devoted to assessing the effect of this style on team effectiveness (Sagie et al. 2002). Researchers have argued that using a participative leadership style is effective in team situations. It has indispensable benefits (Somech and Wenderow 2006; Richter 2018). As such, using

such a leadership strategy is very crucial for managing teams effectively (Somech 2005; Newman et al. 2016). Such a leader's behaviour affects the effective reactions of team members (Somech 2010). This leadership style produces high levels of team outputs (Bell and Mjoli 2014). As such, it helps to solicit for new ideas from team members and this produces high performance levels in work teams. It also provides a basis for understanding complex leadership behaviours in team circumstances. Furthermore, it motivates team members to develop more effective work systems and processes (Bouwman et al. 2017).

The more consistent merits of participative leadership behaviour are found in decision-making processes (Sagie et al. 2002). It reduces problems among diverse team members in heterogeneous team functions by creating an environment of open exchange of ideas (Lewis et al. 2002; M'czyński and Su³kowski 2017). Participative leadership, therefore, facilitates diverse perspectives to be put forward and thereafter help to achieve a consensus among team members (Heller et al. 2007). It also promotes knowledge sharing and the development of team members' competencies (Somech 2010; Buengeler et al. 2016). This leadership style motivates team members to rethink and reflect on their ideas and consider other ideas that may not be known to them previously. This, therefore, creates a good team environment where ideas are openly given, discussed, thoroughly analysed, and reflected on (Fatima et al. 2017). Furthermore, it encourages team members to find new opportunities and challenges and, therefore, to get knowledge through acquiring, sharing, and integrating ideas (Somech 2005; Fatima et al. 2017).

Participative leadership has a strong potential for achieving team performances that organisations cannot attain using traditional bureaucratic structures (Somech 2010; Kim and Beehr 2018). As such, it is very critical today when organisations are struggling to adjust and invent their structures to respond to a growing demand for flexibility, concern for quality, and the requirement for a high level of commitment among team members to their work (Ceri-Booms et al. 2017). Scholars have also argued that the problems facing organisations today are too heavy for any leader to solve alone. As a result, allowing team members to participate in the decision-making process provides many indispens-

able benefits. It can generate the social capacity necessary for effective organisations and improving the quality of the decisions, enhancing team members' motivation, and contributing to the quality of their work-life (Bell and Mjoli 2014; Fatima et al. 2017). Participative leadership, therefore, provides the best strategy in contemporary organizational environments (Somech 2010). It increases team members' commitment and work satisfaction. And in times of organizational change, it promotes higher levels of change acceptance and effectiveness (Fatima et al. 2017). The cognitive variables of information sharing and quality of ideas, as well as motivational ones, facilitate the effect of this style of leadership on team performance (Bouwman et al. 2017; Fatima et al. 2017).

Participative leadership also stimulates thinking processes that promote quality decisions leading to task performance. These processes include clarification of problems, information seeking, knowledge sharing, quality of ideas, and synthesis of ideas (Bouwman et al. 2017). Furthermore, it promotes team goal commitment, self-efficacy, leader-subordinate mutual trust, and ownership of decisions (Sagie et al. 2002; Lee et al. 2017). It is also very effective for decision initiation and continuous development of team members (Somech 2005). Lastly, but not least, it leads to improved team innovation and team members' attitudes towards work (Bouwman et al. 2017). These extant arguments, therefore, yield to the following hypothesis:

H₁: Participative leadership has a significant effect on team effectiveness

The Effect of Directive Leadership on Team Effectiveness

Directive leadership is defined as the process of providing the subordinates with a framework for decision-making and action that is in agreement with a leader's perspective (Sagie et al. 2002; Somech 2006). It entails the leader who is taking the ultimate power and control over all decision-making processes. This type of leader does not see any value in allowing subordinates to participate in the process of making decisions and expects them to follow instructions given by the leader (Mroz et al. 2018). It is also commonly perceived as a task-oriented behaviour with a strong tendency to control discussions, dominate interactions, and personally direct task

completion (Clark and Waldron 2016; Haar et al. 2017). Researchers have also argued that using a directive leadership style has crucial and indispensable benefits in team circumstances (Somech and Wenderow 2006). As such, it produces high levels of team performances. It also helps to develop clear rules of conduct in work teams, and this helps to produce high levels of performance. Furthermore, it stimulates team members to develop effective work processes and systems (Sagie et al. 2002; Ceri-Booms et al. 2017). Directive leaders show a strong sense of inner purpose and direction (Nobile 2015; Haar et al. 2017). As such, they motivate team members to take actions that support the leader's strategy for the organisation. Their strategies are, therefore, transformational.

Directive leadership encourages team members to transcend challenging goals and achieve high levels of performances (Nobile 2015; Ceri-Booms et al. 2017). It also provides clear goals, which turn organisational objectives into short-term goals and serve as a standard guide for team members (Sagie et al. 2002; Abecassis-Moedas and Gilson 2017). Other researchers argue that it stimulates reflection processes (Burke et al. 2006). As such, this leadership style also helps to improve the exchange and processing of knowledge, which in turn, leads to performance improvement. Directive leadership behaviours further increase the work commitment and involvement of the team members (Ceri-Booms et al. 2017).

The organisational knowledge and intellectual abilities of directive leaders help to improve team performance (Burke et al. 2006; Nobile 2015). The strategies of these leaders assist in the acquisition and diffusion of knowledge among team members, which in turn, also promotes team efficiency. The motivation factors associated with this style also facilitate the influence of the directive leadership on team performance (Sagie et al. 2002; Iqbal et al. 2015). The most critical motivation factor induced by a directive leadership style is the willingness of team members to expend more effort on work. It promotes goal attainment by serving as a source of feedback for team members (Somech 2005; Gelfand et al. 2007). As such, the evaluation and control of team members' work are the behavioural qualities of this leadership style. Directive control allows the leader to adapt team resources and goals when required. These stated

qualities contribute to increasing team members' work performances. As such, highly directive leaders promote the highest level of team members' work performance (Nobile 2015).

Furthermore, directive leadership strengthens the behaviours of adherence to rules and procedure and attention to details, which also promotes team members' work performances (Nobile 2015; Mohiuddin 2017). It helps to improve team member's competences. As such, in functionally diverse teams, team members are capable of giving back the inputs their leaders have guided them to provide. Directive leadership, therefore, encourages team members to offer highly critical inputs, suggestions and solutions, which improves the processes of team reflection (Somech 2006). As such, the following hypothesis has been proposed:

H₂ Directive leadership has a significant effect on team effectiveness

The Additive Effect of Participative and Directive Leadership on Team Effectiveness

Researchers have regarded participative and directive leadership as the contrasting styles at the opposite ends of a single continuum (Greenberg 2011). But although these two leadership styles were first considered as terminal points of a leadership style continuum, which meant that an increase in the focus on directive would come at the expense of employee participation and the opposite, the notion that leaders can serve both spheres largely independent of one another took a strong stance later (Richter 2018). These styles are not regarded as mutually exclusive (Hansen and Villadsen 2010). Investigating these two leadership styles simultaneously is a crucial response to a call by researchers and practitioners to leave the traditional perspective and then adopt an inclusive strategy (Bell et al. 2014). This makes it easy to perceive leadership behaviour in genuinely new and different ways. Moreover, leaders can choose between the two seemingly opposite styles of leader behaviours (Bell et al. 2014). Both leadership styles help in increasing team effectiveness (Somech 2006). The perceived contradiction between participative and directive behaviours is not visible and both are effective in improving team performances (Sagie et al. 2002).

Each leadership style promotes motivational processes, which in turn, promote teams' work

performance and innovation (Bell et al. 2014; Ceri-Booms et al. 2017). Building on the seemingly conflicting demands of the two leadership styles, researchers argue that team members led by a directive leader cannot fully contribute to task accomplishment. And competent team members are more likely to participate in the task if their leader is participative than if the leader is directive (Sagie et al. 2002). Another scholar argues that participative and directive leadership are compatible with each other (Somech 2005). As such, transformational leaders use both practices. They show a strong sense of inner purpose and direction, and they also motivate team members to take actions that support the leader's strategy (Somech 2006). Further, they show participative orientation by giving autonomy to team members and thereby developing their capacities to achieve broad organizational goals. The two key qualities are perceived as communicating a strategy and empowering the team members to achieve the strategy (Somech 2006).

Other researchers also see a leader as someone who uses either loose or tight leadership practice according to the prevailing team circumstances (Bell et al. 2014). These scholars argue that the perception that participative and directive leadership practices can be integrated is uncommon in South African organisational team contexts. As such, there is knowledge deficiency in these areas. The Japanese managers have fully accepted the workers' innovative ideas and are willing to adopt and implement their suggestions and recommendations for the improvement of team performances. The two leadership styles complement each other. This perspective is supported by the loose-tight leadership theory, which suggests an amalgamation of directive and participative leadership practices (Sagie et al. 2002).

Researchers, however, argue that the integration of these leadership styles does not necessarily produce a coherent and stable leader's style. It produces a dynamic one in which either participative or directive leadership becomes more potent, depending on the prevailing team situational factors (Bell et al. 2014). However, participative leadership is more favoured than directive leadership (Richter 2018). Other researchers further perceive it as more warm and competent compared to directive ones (Mroz et al. 2018). Leaders tend to be participative when a high technical quality strategy is required or

when team members' commitment is needed for decisions to be accomplished. And they tend to be directive when they have enough knowledge required for making a decision. They also employ more directive practices when they suspect a conflict among team members (Sagie et al. 2002). Furthermore, researchers argue that when the organizational strategy is articulated leaders are directive, and when operational decisions are critical, they employ a more participative leadership practice (Sagie et al. 2002). These extant arguments, therefore, lead to the following hypothesis:

H₃: Participative and directive leadership has a significant additive effect on team effectiveness

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The current paper adopted a quantitative research design. The quantitative research approach strongly makes use of empirical analysis to reach conclusions, and it enables the researcher to test hypotheses (Hair et al. 2008). The research population for the present study included administrative employees working at Fort Hare University in the Eastern Cape Province in South Africa. The administrative departments that were included in the study are the Human Resources, Finance, Registrar, Student Administration, Communications and Marketing, Examinations, Payroll, Library, Information Technology, Accommodation, Maintenance, and Institutional Support. The present study employed a non-probability sampling method to select respondents from the population. As such, a convenience sampling technique was used. The sample size that was used in the present study was calculated using Raosoft Sample Size Calculator. Raosoft sample size calculator is web-based software used to calculate the sample size when the population is given. It also computes the critical value for the normal distribution (Raosoft Inc. 2004). The sample size n and margin of error E are given by the following formula:

$$x = Z \left(\frac{c}{100} \right)^2 r (100-r)$$

$$n = Nx / ((N-1)E^2 + x) \quad E = \text{Sqrt} \left[\frac{(N-n)s^2}{n(N-1)} \right]$$

Where N is the population size, r is the fraction of responses that one is interested in, and

$Z(c/100)$ is the critical value for the confidence level c . Using a population size of 676, five percent margin of error, ninety-five percent confidence level and an expected response distribution of fifty percent, the recommended minimum sample size is ($n=246$). The margin of error is the amount of error that can be tolerated. However, the researchers distributed 286 questionnaires to the respondents and 246 questionnaires were fully completed. Hence, the response rate was 66.7 percent. This paper used a structured questionnaire because of its ability to provide the most satisfactory range of reliable data.

Data Collection Method

The data collection method which was employed for this paper was only the primary data collection method. The primary data was collected using the administration of survey questionnaires to the administrative employees of Fort Hare University. Permission was obtained from the Human Resources Management Department of the University to collect data from the employees, and thereafter the questionnaires were distributed by the researchers to the respondents. The researchers continued visiting the respondents to motivate them to complete the questionnaires and to collect those questionnaires that were fully completed. Thus, such a procedure continued until a required sample size was achieved.

Research Instruments

Participative Leadership

To assess the extent to which a leader displayed participative leadership behaviour, a scale adopted from Arnold et al. (2000) was used. Participative leadership questionnaire included six items that measure the extent of involvement in various decisions. The sample items are, "my supervisor encourages team members to express their ideas or suggestions", and "my supervisor uses our team member's suggestions to make decisions that affect us". The reliability level of alpha was 0.877. The respondents used a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5).

Directive Leadership

To assess the extent to which a leader displayed directive leadership behaviour, a scale

adopted from Litwin and Stringer (1968) was used. Directive leadership questionnaire included seven items that measure the extent to which a leader provides the subordinates with a framework for decision-making and action that is in favour with the leader's vision. The sample items are, "my supervisor expects team members to follow his or her instructions precisely", "my supervisor makes most decisions for team members", and "my supervisor supervises team members very closely". The reliability level of alpha was 0.809. The respondents used bi-polar (six-point) scales, with two opposing responses on both ends ranging from extremely disagree (1) to extremely agree (6).

Team Effectiveness

To measure the extent to which teams displayed team effectiveness behaviours and processes, the researchers used the LaFasto and Larson (2001) team effectiveness scale. It has eleven items that measure team effectiveness. This scale clusters behaviours into two dimensions of team effectiveness. These dimensions are leader and team effectiveness (Mahembe 2010). Sample items are, "achieving the team goal is a higher priority than any individual objective", "team members trust each other sufficiently to accurately share information, perceptions, and feedback", and "our team leader is willing to confront and resolve issues associated with inadequate performance by team members". The reliability level of alpha was 0.929. The respondents used a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to 7 strongly agree (7).

Data Capturing and Analysis

Data was captured and coded in Microsoft Excel. To test and analyse all the proposed hypotheses, descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was, therefore, used to test alpha reliability coefficients of the research scales and to compile descriptive and inferential statistics in the form of Pearson's correlations and multiple regressions when hypotheses were tested.

RESULTS

This section will discuss the key findings of the present study. As such, the demographic profile of the sample will be presented. Thereaf-

ter, the main findings and the relationships between the relevant variables will be presented.

Demographic Profile of the Sample

A total of two hundred and forty-six administrative employees of the university participated in this research paper. Among the sample group, 59.4 percent were females and 40.7 percent were males. With regards to age, 33.3 percent were between the age group of 20-29; 26.8 percent were between the age group of 30-39; 21.9 percent were between the age group of 40-49; 15.9 percent were between the age group of 50-59, and 2.03 percent were between the age group of 60 and above. Also, with regards to education levels, 6.9 percent had a high school qualification; thirteen percent had a certificate; 15.5 percent had a diploma; 36.2 percent had a degree, and 28.5 percent had a post-graduate degree. Lastly, but not least, with regards to home languages, 70.3 percent spoke Xhosa; 6.9 percent spoke Zulu; 10.6 percent spoke Afrikaans; 6.9 percent spoke English, and 5.3 percent spoke Sepedi. The demographic profile of the sample is presented in Table 1.

Results from Tested Hypotheses

The first hypothesis proposed that participative leadership has a significant effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. The results shown in Table 2, therefore, demonstrate that participative leadership has a significant effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university (Leader team effectiveness: $r=0.57$; $p=0.000$; Team effectiveness: $r=0.45$; $p=0.000$; Total team effectiveness: $r=0.59$; $p=0.000$). The p-values (probability) were significant at both 00.5 and 0.01. The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected and the alternative one accepted. The second hypothesis proposed that directive

Table 1: Demographic characteristics of the participants (n=246)

Variable	Participant characteristics	Frequency	Percent (%)
Gender	Female	146	59.4
	Male	100	40.7
Age (in years)	20-29	82	33.3
	30-39	66	26.8
	40-49	54	21.9
	50-59	39	15.9
	>60	5	2.0
Education Level	High school	17	6.9
	Certificate	32	13.0
	Diploma	38	15.5
	Degree	89	36.2
	Postgraduate degree	70	28.5
Home Language	Xhosa	173	70.3
	Zulu	17	6.9
	Afrikaans	26	10.6
	English	17	6.9
	Sepedi	13	5.3

leadership has a significant effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. The results shown in Table 2, therefore, also demonstrate that directive leadership has a significant effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university (Leader team effectiveness: $r=0.22$; $p=0.000$; Team effectiveness: $r=0.14$; $p=0.029$; Total team effectiveness: $r=0.27$; $p=0.000$). The p-values (probability) were also significant at both 00.5 and 0.01. The null hypothesis was, therefore, rejected and the alternative one favoured. The third and last hypotheses proposed that participative and directive leadership put together have an additive effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. The results in Table 3, therefore, also demonstrate that the multiple correlation values are 0.591, 0.908 and 0.869 with the R-squared values being 0.350, 0.824 and 0.755. The results also show Beta weights of (Total team effectiveness: $\beta = 0.250$; $p<0.000$; leader team effectiveness: $\beta = 0.797$; $p<0.000$; team effectiveness: $\beta = 0.646$;

Table 2: Descriptive statistics and inter-correlation matrix of study variables (individual level) (N = 246)

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Participative leadership	23.1	4.8	0.000**				
Directive leadership	30.3	5.4	0.029*	0.000**			
Leader team effectiveness	20.7	5.10	0.000**	0.029*	0.000**		
Team effectiveness	38.10	7.10	0.000**	0.000	0.000**	0.000**	
Total team effectiveness	59.7	12.9	0.000**	0.000	0.000**	0.000**	0.000**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Table 3: Multiple regression between participative and directive leadership, on the one hand, and team leader effectiveness, team effectiveness, and total team effectiveness on the other (N = 246)

Variables	Multiple R	R ²	A R ²	Standard error	F	Sign F	Beta	t	Sig t
Total T Effectiveness (dep-)	0.591	0.350	0.344	4.679	65.312	0.000 ^b			
Participative (indep-)							0.250	6.570	0.000
Directive (indep-)							0.148	2.831	0.005
Leader T Effectiveness (dep-)	0.908	0.824	0.822	0.434	34567.442	0.000 ^b			
Participative (indep-)							0.797	567.442	0.000
Directive (indep-)							0.163	2.310	0.012
Team Effectiveness (dep-)	0.869	0.755	0.753	0.490	1374.615	0.000 ^b			
Participative (indep-)							0.646	26.400	0.000
Directive (indep-)							0.111	3.447	0.001

$p < 0.000$) for the relationship between participative leadership and team effectiveness. The same results show Beta weights of (Total team effectiveness: $\beta = 0.148$; $p < 0.005$; leader team effectiveness: $\beta = 0.163$; $p < 0.012$; team effectiveness: $\beta = 0.111$; $p < 0.001$) for the relationship between directive leadership and team effectiveness. The results, moreover, show that R-squared values are ($R^2 = 0.350, 0.824$ and 0.755) for participative and directive leadership, respectively. The p-values (probability) were significant at both 0.05 and 0.01. The null hypothesis was, therefore, also rejected and the alternative one adopted.

DISCUSSION

Hypothesis One

Having tested the first hypothesis, which states that participative leadership has a significant effect on team effectiveness, the null hypothesis was rejected in favour of the alternative one. This shows that participative leadership significantly affects team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. This finding was reinforced by Bouwmans et al. (2017) who argued that participative leadership motivates team members to develop more effective work systems and processes. They argued that it stimulates reflective processes such as the clarification of problems, information seeking, knowledge sharing, quality of ideas, and synthesis of ideas that promote quality decisions leading to the performance of tasks (Bouwmans et al. 2017). This implies that participative leadership style enhances the motivation to establish more effective work structures and

cognitive processes related to decision-making among university administrative employees. Other researchers also argued that participative leadership has a strong potential for promoting team performances that organisations cannot attain using traditional top-down structures (Kim and Beehr 2018). This, therefore, implies that it has the capacity to enhance performance among the university's administrative employee teams compared to bureaucratic structures. Participative leadership was regarded as a very critical leadership strategy when organisations are struggling to adjust and invent their structures to respond to a growing demand for adaptability, management of quality, and the requirement for a high level of commitment among team members to their work (Ceri-Booms et al. 2017; Kim and Beehr 2018). This argument, therefore, implies that this style of leadership could enable the administrative employees of the university to be highly adaptable, quality conscious and achieve high work commitment levels. Furthermore, other researchers suggested that participative leadership generates the social capacity that is critical for improving the quality of the decisions and for contributing to the quality of employees' work-life (Bell and Mjoli 2014; Fatima et al. 2017). As such, the extant argument means that this leadership style has the power to improve the quality of decisions and work-life among the administrative employees of the university.

Hypothesis Two

In testing the second hypothesis, which states that directive leadership has a significant effect of team effectiveness, the null hypothesis

was also rejected and the alternative one adopted. This implies that directive leadership has a significant impact on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. This finding was also supported by Ceri-Booms et al. (2017) who argued that directive leaders encourage team members to transcend challenging goals and achieve high levels of performances. As such, their directive control allows the leader to adapt team resources and goals when required to enhance the highest level of team members' work performances (Nobile 2015). These extant arguments, therefore, suggest that this leadership style helps to empower the administrative employees of the university to achieve difficult goals and high levels of performances. Other researchers further argued that directive leadership style strengthens the behaviours of adherence to rules and procedure as well as attention to details, which also promotes team members' work performances (Mohiuddin 2017). Reinforcing the same argument, other researchers argued that it stimulates team members to develop effective work processes and systems (Sagie et al. 2002). This implies that this style of leadership can enforce the rules and provide the work culture that promotes effective performance among the administrative employees of the university. Furthermore, it was suggested that directive leaders show a strong sense of inner purpose and direction. As such, they motivate team members to take actions that support the leader's strategy for the organisation (Haar et al. 2017). This suggests that this style of leadership has the power to foster a direction and thereby promote alignment with the leader's strategy among the university's administrative employees' behaviours.

Hypothesis Three

In the third hypothesis, the null hypothesis was rejected after some statistical testing was performed. The hypothesis stated that participative and directive leadership styles combined have a significant additive effect on team effectiveness. The results showed that the two leadership styles combined have an additive effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. However, the results also showed that participative leadership has a stronger impact than directive leadership on team effectiveness among administrative

employees of the university. Supporting this finding, a researcher argued that both leadership styles could help increase team effectiveness (Somech 2006). As such, the perceived contradiction between their behaviours is not visible and both are effective in improving team performances (Sagie et al. 2002). Each leadership style promotes motivational processes, which in turn, boost teams' work performance and innovation (Bell et al. 2014; Ceri-Booms et al. 2017). However, in support of the finding that participative leadership has a stronger effect than directive leadership on team effectiveness, a researcher argued that participative leadership is more favoured than directive leadership (Richter 2018). These extant arguments, therefore, suggest that these two leadership styles put together could help to increase team effectiveness by improving motivational processes, team performance and innovation among administrative employees of the university. But a participative style has more power than directive style in promoting team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. Furthermore, researchers argued that a leader is someone who uses either loose or tight leadership practice according to the prevailing team circumstances (Bell et al. 2014). As such, the two leadership styles could complement each other (Sagie et al. 2002). This implies that participative and directive leadership integrated could enhance team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university by supporting each other depending on their prevailing team circumstances.

CONCLUSION

Participative and directive leadership styles are a very significant concept in research, strategy development and organisation management. There is a deficit of empirical studies that have been fully devoted to examining the effect of these styles on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. Researchers argued that using these leadership styles is of utmost importance in team situations. As such, the objective of this paper was to assess the individual and additive effect of participative and directive leadership on team effectiveness among administrative employees of the university. These objectives of this paper were, therefore, achieved. It was, therefore, concluded that participative and directive leadership have a significant effect on team effectiveness among the administrative employees of a uni-

versity. Furthermore, it was also concluded that participative and directive leadership combined have a positive and significant additive effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees. However, it was also concluded that while participative leadership accounts for higher amounts of variances in team effectiveness than directive leadership, both account for highly significant proportions of variances in team effectiveness among the administrative employees of the university.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Some critical recommendations have been provided to different organisations including the institutions of higher learning in South Africa. The paper recommends that different South African organisations should employ the individual approaches of participative and directive leadership in their quest to promote team effectiveness, depending on their specific team circumstances. This paper also recommends that organisations should adopt a relatively new paradigm of leadership in South African organisations in pursuit of team effectiveness, which embraces the complementary power of both participative and directive leadership. Thus, they should perceive these leadership styles as mutually inclusive and convergent instead of divergent ones. Furthermore, the paper recommends that more research should be conducted on these variables in different organisational contexts to confirm the validity of these findings. This will then enable the generalisability of these findings in other organisational contexts.

LIMITATIONS

The major limitation of the study was the shortage of funding for transportation and other logistics of conducting research. The study was, therefore, only carried out in one institution of higher learning. Furthermore, the non-probability sampling method used in this research paper was not effective enough to produce results that could be generalised in other organisational situations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by the Govan Mbeki Research and Development Centre (University of Fort Hare, South Africa).

REFERENCES

- Abecassis-Moedas C, Gilson LL 2017. Drivers and levels of creative leadership: An examination of choreographers as directive and integrative leaders. *Innov Organisation and Management*, 20(2): 122-138.
- Arnold JA, Arad S, Rhoades JA, Drasgow F 2000. The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviours. *J Organ Beh*, 21: 249-269.
- Bell C, Mjoli T 2014. The effect of participative leadership on organisational commitment: Comparing its effects on two gender groups among bank clerks. *A Bus Man*, 8: 451-459.
- Bell C, Murugan C 2013. The relationship between conscientiousness, extraversion and leadership effectiveness among local government managers in Eastern Cape, South Africa. *A Bus Man*, 7: 4386-4397.
- Bell C, Murugan C, Nel P 2014. The impact of participative and directive leadership on organisational culture: An organisational development perspective. *M Soc Scie*, 5: 2039-2117.
- Benoliel B, Somech A 2014. The health and performance effects of participative leadership: Exploring the moderating role of the big five personality dimensions. *Europ J Work and Organisat Psychol*, 23(2): 277-294.
- Bouwman M, Runhaar P, Wesselink R, Mulder M 2017. Fostering teachers' team learning: An interplay between transformational leadership and participative decision-making? *Teac and Teache Educatio*, 65: 71-80.
- Buengeler C, Homan AC, Voelpel SC 2016. The challenge of being a young manager: The effects of contingent reward and participative leadership on team-level turnover depend on leader age. *J Organ Behav*, 37: 1224-1245.
- Burke CS, Stagl KC, Klein C, Goodwin GF, Salas E et al. 2006. What type of leadership behaviours are functional in teams? A meta-analysis. *Lead Quart*, 17: 288-307.
- Ceri-Booms M, Cur'eu PL, Oerlemans LAG 2017. Task and person-focused leadership behaviors and team performance: A meta-analysis. *H Resou Managem Rev*, 27(1): 178-192.
- Chen YF, Tjosvold D 2006. Participative leadership by American and Chinese managers in China: The role of relationships. *J Manage Stud*, 43: 1727-1752.
- Chou L, Wang A, Wang T, Huang M, Cheng B 2008. Shared work values and team member effectiveness: The mediation of trustfulness and trustworthiness. *Hum Relat*, 61: 1713-1742.
- Clark KD, Waldron T 2016. Predictors of leadership behavior in early career white-collar professionals: The roles of personal characteristics and career context. *J Lead and Organis Stud*, 23(1): 27-38.
- Daspit J, Tillman CJ, Boyd NG, Mckee V 2013. Cross-functional team effectiveness: An examination of internal team environment, shared leadership, and cohesion influences. *Tea Perform Manage*, 19: 34-56.
- Emmerik HV, Jawahar IM, Schreurs B, Cuyper ND 2011. Social capital, team efficacy and team potency. *C Develop International*, 16(1): 82-99.
- Fatima T, Safdar S, Jahanzeb S 2017. Participative leadership and employee creativity: Moderating role of need for achievement. *N Inter J Busin and Managem*, 12(1): 1-14

- Gelfand MJ, Erez M, Aycan Z 2007. Cross-cultural organizational behaviour. *Ann Rev of Psycholo*, 58: 479-514.
- Greenberg J 2011. *Behaviour in Organisations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work*. USA: Pearson Education International.
- Haar SV, Koeslag-Kreunen M, Euwe E, Segers M 2017. Team leader structuring for team effectiveness and team learning in command-and-control teams. *S Grou Resear*, 48(2): 215-248.
- Hair JF, Wolfinbarger M, Ortinau DJ, Bush RP 2008. *Essentials of Marketing Research*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.
- Hajro A, Gibson CB, Pudelko M 2017. Knowledge exchange processes in multicultural teams: Linking organizational diversity climates to teams' effectiveness. *Aca Management Journal*, 60(1): 345-372.
- Hansen JR, Villadsen AR 2010. Comparing public and private managers' leadership styles: Understanding the role of job context. *Inter Pub Management Journal*, 13(3): 247-274.
- Heller R, Bono ED, Humphrey A 2007. Creating Action Management: How to Win With Teams. *Thinking Managers Special Report*. United Kingdom: Heller Management Ltd.
- Iqbal N, Anwar S, Haider N 2015. Effect of leadership style on employee performance. *Arabian J Bus Manag Review*, 5(5): 1-6.
- Kim M, Beehr TA 2018. Empowering leadership: Leading people to be present through affective organizational commitment? *Inter J Hum Resou Management*, 1-25.
- LaFasto F, Larson C 2001. *When Teams Work Best: 6,000 Team Members and Leaders Tell What it Takes to Succeed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lee A, Willis S, Tian AW 2017. Empowering leadership: A meta-analytic examination of incremental contribution, mediation, and moderation. *J Organ Behav*, 39(3): 306-325.
- Lewis MW, Welsh MA, Dehler GE, Green SG 2002. Product development tensions: Exploring contrasting styles of product management. *The Acad Manage J*, 45: 546-564.
- Litwin GH, Stringer RA 1968. *Motivation and Organizational Climate*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- M¹czyński J, Su³kowski L 2017. A seven nation's study of leadership attributes. *Polis Psycholog Bullet*, 48(2): 307-314.
- Mahembe B 2010. *The Relationship between Servant Leadership, Team Commitment, Team Citizenship Behaviour and Team Effectiveness: An Exploratory Study*. Master's Thesis, Unpublished. South Africa: University of Stellenbosch.
- Mohiuddin ZA 2017. Influence of leadership style on employees' performance: Evidence from literatures. *J Mark and Management*, 8(1): 18-30.
- Mroz JE, Yoerger M, Allen JA 2018. Leadership in workplace meetings: The intersection of leadership styles and follower gender. *J Lead and Organis Stud*, 25(3): 1-14.
- Newman A, Rose PS, Teo ST 2016. The role of participative leadership and trust-based mechanisms in eliciting intern performance: evidence from china. *H Resou Managem*, 55(1): 53-67.
- Ngabase X 2012. *The Effect of Perceived Organisational Support and Organisational Commitment on Turn-over Intention among Academic Staff at the University of Fort Hare*. Master's Thesis, Unpublished. South Africa: Fort Hare University.
- Nobile JD 2015. The directive communication of Australian primary school principals. *Inter J Leader in Educat*, 18(2): 239-258.
- Nyengane MH 2007. *The Relationship between Leadership Style and Employee Commitment: An Exploratory Study in an Electricity Utility of South Africa*. Master's Thesis, Published. South Africa: Rhodes University.
- Polychroniou PV 2009. Relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership of supervisors: The impact on team effectiveness. *Tea Perform Manage*, 15: 343-356.
- Raosoft Inc 2004. Raosoft Sample Size Calculator. From <<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>> (Retrieved on 22 November 2013).
- Richter G 2018. Antecedents and consequences of leadership styles: Findings from empirical research in multinational headquarters. *Arm Forc and Socie*, 44(1): 72-91.
- Sagie A, Zaidman N, Amichai-Hamburger Y, Te'eni D, Schwartz S 2002. An empirical assessment of the loose-tight leadership model: Quantitative and qualitative analyses. *J Organ Behavior*, 23: 303-320.
- Sarkar M, Ray A 2017. Emotional intelligence and team effectiveness: A study among correctional officers of West Bengal. *Inter J Ind Psychol*, 4(3): 150-161.
- Shuffler ML, DiazGranados D, Salas E 2011. There's a science for that: Team development interventions in organizations. *Curr Directio in Psychol Scie*, 20(6): 365-372.
- Somech A 2005. Directive versus participative leadership: Two complementary approaches to managing school effectiveness. *Educ Admin Quart*, 41: 777-800.
- Somech A 2006. The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionally heterogeneous teams. *J Manage*, 32: 132-157.
- Somech A 2010. Participative decision making in schools: A mediating-moderating analytical framework for understanding school and teacher outcomes. *Educ Admin Quart*, 46: 174-209.
- Somech A, Wenderow M 2006. The impact of participative and directive leadership on teachers' performance: The intervening effects of job structuring, decision domain, and leader-member exchange. *Educ Admin Quart*, 42: 746-772.
- Student Guide 2018. *Your Future Begins Today*. South Africa: University of Fort Hare.
- Verma N, Rangnekar SN, Barua MK 2016. Exploring decision making style as a predictor of team effectiveness. *Inter J Organis Analys*, 24(1): 36-63.

Paper received for publication on June 2014

Paper accepted for publication on December 2016