THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Leadership Style and Team Effectiveness: A Theoretical and Extant Literature Review

Orishede Emefuvwoma Evans
Teacher, Department of Business Administration,
Delta State University, Abraka, Delta State, Nigeria

Abstract:
The paper examined the effect of leadership style on team effectiveness of administrative employees in tertiary institution using an extant literature review, The paper examined team effectiveness using two specific objectives ,which are to examine the effect of participative leadership on team effectiveness and to ascertain the effect of directive leadership on team effectiveness, The results showed that participative leadership and directive leadership have positive influence on team effectiveness administrative employees of tertiary institutions. The paper concludes that participative and directive leadership styles are very significant concepts in leadership research, strategy development and organisation management, using these leadership Styles is of utmost importance in team situations and team success. The paper recommends that organisations should adopt a relatively new paradigm of leadership in organizations in pursuit of team effectiveness, which embraces the complementary power of both participative and directive leadership, they should perceive these leadership styles as mutually inclusive and convergent instead of divergent ones.

Keywords: Participative leadership, directive leadership and team effectiveness

1. Introduction

The value of teams and their operations inorganisations have been examined since the1920s. However, the forces exerted by the globaleconomy have heightened the need for differentorganizations to optimize 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 togetherto enable performance and attainment of the main goals of the organisation (Sarkar andRay 2017). Different scholars have observed a significant increase in the use of team structures in today's organizations (Hajro et al. 2017). Such developments have come because of high levels of competition in the current dynamic business environment which has forced organizations 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, globalization of thebusiness 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 andKnowledge of people to achieve a competitive advantage (Verma et al. 2016).

Managers of differentorganisations employ teams as a strategyto establish highly responsive organisations. Assuch, they use teams to transform organizations and increase their capabilities. Team structures enable team members to provide unique skills which could help to develop an innovative organization which is ready to deal with today's organizational 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 Ray2017). These researchers, therefore, argue thatteam 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 most Universities 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 global world" (Student Guide 2018: 3). To strategically position and invent itself so that it can attain the international educational standards, the university has organized 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 Universities 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 (BellandMurugan 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 organizational 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 (Richter2018).

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 participative 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 directive leadership style on target settings among administrative employees of Nigeria tertiary institution.

1.1. Objectives

The objectives of the paper are to examine the effect of participative leadership on team effectiveness and to ascertain the effect of directive leadership on team effectiveness among administrative employees in tertiary institution using extant literature.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Effect of Participative Leadership on Team Effectiveness

Participative leadership is defined as the process of jointly making decisions or having ashared influence in decision-making by a leader and his or her subordinates (Benoliel and Somech2014). Other researchers perceive this styleas entailing perceiving employees as critical knowledge resources who make up the hub ofan organisation. Participative leaders focus oninter personal interactions and socialization. Assuch, it is the same as an empowering leadershipparadigm (Mroz et al. 2018). It is a very significant concept in research, strategy development, and organisation management (ChenandTjosvold 2006; Fatima et al. 2017). However, there is a deficit of empirical studies that havebeen 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; Newmanet 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 abasis for understanding complex leadership behaviours in team circumstances. Furthermore, it motivates team members to develop more effective work systems and processes (Bouwmans etal. 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^1czyñski and Su^3kowski 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 etal. 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 agood team environment where ideas are openly given, discussed, thoroughly analysed, and reflected on (Fatima et al. 2017). Furthermore, itencourages 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 potentialfor achieving team performances that organizations cannot attain using traditional bureaucratic structures (Somech 2010; Kim and Beehr2018). As such, it is very critical today when organisations are struggling to adjust and invent their structures to respond to a growing dem and for flexibility, concern for quality, andthe requirement for a high level of commitment among team members to their work (Ceri-Boomset 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 indispensable 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. Andin times of organizational change, it promotes higher levels of change acceptance and effectiveness (Fatimaet 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 (Bouwmans etal. 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 (Bouwmans 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 notleast, it leads to improved team innovation and team members' attitudes towards work (Bouwmanset al. 2017). These extant arguments, therefore, yield to the following hypothesis:

2.2. 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 (Sagieetal. 2002; Somech 2006). It entails the leader whois taking the ultimate power and control over alldecision-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 givenby the leader (Mroz et al. 2018). It is also commonly perceived as a task-oriented behavior with a strong tendency to control discussions, dominate interactions, and personally direct task completion (Clark and Waldron 2016; Haaret al.2017). Researchers have also argued that usinga 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 helpsto 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; Haaret 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 membersto transcend challenging goals and achieve high levels of performances (Nobile 2015; Ceri-Booms et al. 2017). It also provides clear goals,which turn organizational objectives into short-term goals and serve as a standard guide forteam members (Sagie et al. 2002; Abecassis-Moedas and Gilson 2017). Other researchers argue that it stimulates reflection processes (Burkeet al. 2006). As such, this leadership style alsohelps 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-Boomset 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 promote steam 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 sourceof feedback for team members (Somech 2005;Gelfand et al. 2007). As such, the evaluation and control of team members' work are the behaviouralqualities 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 behaviour's 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).

2.3. The Participative and the Directive Styles of Leadership

Researchers have regarded participative and directive leadership as the contrasting styles atthe opposite ends of a single continuum (Greenberg2011). 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 canserve 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 adirective 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). Assuch, transformational leaders use both practices.

They show a strong sense of inner purpose and direction, and they also motivate team membersto 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 communicatinga 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 organizational team contexts. As such, there is knowledge deficiency in these areas. The Japanese managers hatefully 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 etal. 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 (Mrozetal. 2018). Leaders tend to be participative whena high technical quality strategy is required or when team members' commitment is needed for decisions to be accomplished. And they tend tobe directive when they have enough knowledge required for making a decision. They also employ more directive practices when they suspecta conflict among team members (Sagieet 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 at al. 2002). These extant arguments, therefore, lead to the following hypothesis:

4. Discussion

The extant literature reviewed showed that participative leadership has positive effects on team effectiveness; this shows that participative leadership is highly related to team effectiveness, this finding was reinforced by Bouwmanset 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. This implies that participative leadership style enhances the motivation to establish more effective work structures andcognitive 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 (KimandBeehr 2018). This, therefore, implies that ithas the capacity to enhance performance among the employee teamscompared to bureaucratic structures. Participative

Leadership was regarded as a very critical leadership strategy when organisations are struggling to adjust and invent their structuresto 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; KimandBeehr 2018). This argument, therefore, implies that this style of leadership could enable employees 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; Fatimaet 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 employees of the university.

The extant literature also revealed that directive leadership has a positive effect on team effectiveness, this implies that directive leadership has an important effect on team effectiveness of employees. Thisfinding 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 employees to achieve difficult goals and high levels of performances. 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 of employees

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 organization (Haaret 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.

From the review of extant literature, it was observed that participative and directive leadership styles combined have positive influence on team effectiveness. The two leadership styles combined have an additive effect on team effectiveness among employees, 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)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 of employees. Furthermore, researchers argued that a leader is someone whouses either loose or tight leadership practice according to the prevailing team circumstances (Bellet 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 of employees by supporting each other depending on their prevailing team circumstances.

5. Conclusion

Participative and directive leadership styles are a very significant concepts in leadership research, strategy development and organisation management, using these leadership Styles is of utmost importance in team situations. It was, therefore, concluded that participative and directive leadership have a positive effect on team effectiveness among the administrative employees of Tertiary institutions.

Furthermore, the also concludes that participative and directive leadership combined have a positive additive effect on team effectiveness among administrative employees, participative leadership accounts for higher amounts of variances in team effectiveness than directive leadership, both account for high proportions of variances in team effectiveness among the administrative employees.

6. Recommendations

The paper recommends that different approaches of participative and directive leadership should be considered in the quest to promote team effectiveness, depending on team specific circumstances.

The paper also recommends that organisations should adopt a relatively new paradigm of leadership in organizations in pursuit of team effectiveness, which embraces the complementary power of both participative and directive leadership, they should perceive these leadership styles as mutually inclusive and convergent instead of divergent tones.

7. References

i. Abecassis-Moedas C, Gilson LL (2017). Drivers and levelsof creative leadership: An examination of choreographersas directive and integrative leaders. *Innov Organizationand Management,* 20(2): 122-138.

ii. Arnold JA, Arad S, Rhoades JA, Drasgow F (2000). Theempowering leadership questionnaire: The constructionand validation of a new scale for measuring leaderbehaviours. *J Organ Beh,* 21: 249-269.

iii. Bell C, Mjoli T (2014). The effect of participative leadershipon organisational commitment: Comparing itseffects on two gender groups among bank clerks. *ABus Man,* 8: 451-459.

iv. Bell C, Murugan C (2013). The relationship between conscientiousness, extraversion and leadership effectivenessamong local government managers in Eastern Cape, South Africa. *A Bus Man,* 7: 4386-4397.

v. Bell C, Murugan C, Nel P (2014). The impact of participative and directive leadership on organisational culture:An organisational development perspective. *MSocScie,* 5: 2039-2117.

vi. Benoliel B, Somech A (2014). The health and performanceeffects of participative leadership: Exploringthe moderating role of the big five personality dimensions.*Europ J Work and Organisat Psychol,* 23(2):277-294.

vii. Bouwmans M, Runhaar P, Wesselink R, Mulder M (2017).Fostering teachers' team learning: An interplay between transformational leadership and participativedecision-making? *Teac and Teach Education,* 65: 71-80.

viii. Buengeler C, Homan AC, Voelpel SC (2016). The challenge of being a young manager: The effects of contingent reward and participative leadership on teamlevelturnover depend on leader age. *J Organ Behav,*37: 1224-1245.

ix. Burke CS, Stagl KC, Klein C, Goodwin GF, Salas E et al.2006. What type of leadership behaviours are functionalin teams? A meta-analysis. *Lead Quart,* 17:288-307.

x. Ceri-Booms M, Curºeu PL, Oerlemans LAG (2017). Taskand person-focused leadership behaviors and team performance: A meta-analysis. *H ResouManagemRev,* 27(1): 178-192.

xi. Chen YF, Tjosvold D (2006). Participative leadership byAmerican and Chinese managers in hina: The roleof relationships. *J. Manage Stud,* 43: 1727-1752.

xii. 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.

xiii. Clark KD, Waldron T (2016). Predictors of leadershipbehavior in early career white-collar professionals: The roles of personal characteristics and career context.*J Lead and Organis Stud,* 23(1): 27-38.

xiv. Daspit J, Tillman CJ, Boyd NG, Mckee V (2013). Cross-functionalteam effectiveness: An examination of internal team environment, shared leadership, andcohesion influences. *Tea Perform Manage,* 19: 34-56.

xv. Emmerik HV, Jawahar IM, Schreurs B, Cuyper N.D (2011).Social capital, team efficacy and team potency. *CDevelop International,* 16(1): 82-99.

xvi. Fatima T, Safdar S, Jahanzeb S (2017). Participative leadership and employee creativity: oderating role ofneed for achievement. *N Inter J Busin and Managem,*12(1): 1-14

xvii. Gelfand MJ, Erez M, Aycan Z (2007). Cross-cultural organizational behaviour*. Ann Rev of Psycholo,* 58: 479-514.

xviii. Greenberg J 2011. *Behaviour in Organisations: Understanding and Managing the Human Side of Work.*USA: Pearson Education International.

xix. Haar SV, Koeslag-Kreunen M, Euwe E, Segers M (2017).Team leader structuring for team effectiveness andteam learning in command-and-control teams. *S GrouResear,* 48(2): 215-248.

xx. Hair JF, Wolfinbarger M, Ortinau DJ, Bush RP (2008)*.Essentials of Marketing Research.* New York: McGraw-Hill Companies Inc.

xxi. Hajro A, Gibson CB, Pudelko M 2017. Knowledge exchangeprocesses in multicultural teams: Linking organizationaldiversity climates to teams' effectiveness.*Aca Management Journal,* 60(1): 345-372.

xxii. Hansen J.R., Villadsen A.R (2010). Comparing public andprivate managers' leadership styles: Understanding the role of job context. *Inter Pub Management Journal,*13(3): 247-274.

xxiii. Heller R, Bono ED, Humphrey A (2007). Creating ActionManagement: How to Win With Teams. *ThinkingManagers Special Report*. United Kingdom: HellerManagement Ltd.

xxiv. Iqbal N, Anwar S, Haider N (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. *Arabian J Bus ManagReview,* 5(5): 1-6.

xxv. Kim M, Beehr TA 2018. Empowering leadership: Leadingpeople to be present through affective organizational commitment? *Inter J Hum Resou Management,*1-25.

xxvi. LaFasto F, Larson C.(2001). *When Teams Work Best: 6,000Team Members and Leaders Tell What it Takes toSucceed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

xxvii. 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.

xxviii. Lewis, M.W, Welsh, M.A, Dehler, G,E, Green S.G.(2002).Product development tensions: Exploring contrasting styles of product management. *The AcadManageJ,* 45: 546-564.

xxix. Litwin GH, Stringer RA 1968. *Motivation and OrganizationalClimate.* Boston: Harvard University Press.M[1]czyñski J, Su[3]kowski L (2017). A seven nation's studyof leadership attributes. *Polis Psycholog Bullet,* 48(2):307-314.

xxx. Mahembe B (2010). *The Relationship between ServantLeadership, Team Commitment, Team CitizenshipBehaviour and Team Effectiveness: An ExploratoryStudy.* Master's Thesis, Unpublished. South Africa:University of Stellenbosch.

xxxi. Mohiuddin ZA (2017). Influence of leadership style onemployees' performance: Evidence from literatures.*J Mark and Management,* 8(1): 18-30.

xxxii. Mroz JE, Yoerger M, Allen JA (2018). Leadership in workplacemeetings: The intersection of leadership stylesand follower gender. *J Lead and Organis Stud,* 25(3):1-14.

xxxiii. Newman A., Rose P.S, Teo S.T.(2016). The role of participative leadership and trust-based mechanisms in elicitingintern performance: evidence from china. *HResouManagem,* 55(1): 53-67.

xxxiv. Ngabase X (2012). *The Effect of Perceived OrganisationalSupport and Organisational Commitment on TurnoverIntention among Academic Staff at the Universityof Fort Hare.* Master's Thesis, Unpublished. SouthAfrica: Fort Hare University.

xxxv. Nobile, J.D (2015). The directive communication of Australianprimary school principals. *Inter J Leader inEducat,* 18(2): 239-258.

xxxvi. Nyengane, M.H.(2007). *The Relationship between LeadershipStyle and Employee Commitment: An ExploratoryStudy in an Electricity Utility of South Africa*.Master's Thesis, Published. South Africa: Rhodes University.

xxxvii. Polychroniou, P.V.(2009). Relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership of supervisors:The impact on team effectiveness. *TeaPerform Manage,* 15: 343-356.

xxxviii. RaosoftInc (2004). Raosoft Sample Size Calculator. From<http://www. raosoft.com/samplesize.html> (Retrievedon 22 November 2013).

xxxix. Richter G (2018). Antecedents and consequences of leadership styles: Findings from empirical research inmultinational headquarters. *Arm Forc and Socie,*44(1): 72-91.

xl. Sagie A, Zaidman N, Amichai-Hamburger Y, Te'eniD,Schwartz S (2002). An empirical assessment of the loose-tight leadership model: Quantitative and qualitative analyses. *J Organ Behavior,* 23: 303-320.

xli. Sarkar M, Ray A (2017). Emotional intelligence and team effectiveness: A study among correctional officers ofWest Bengal. *Inter J IndPsychol,* 4(3): 150-161.

xlii. Shuffler ML, DiazGranados D, Salas E (2011). There's a science for that: Team development interventions inorganizations. *CurrDirectio in PsycholScie,* 20(6):365-372.

xliii. Somech A (2005). Directive versus participative leadership:Two complementary approaches to managingschool effectiveness*. Educ Admin Quart,* 41: 777-800.

xliv. Somech A (2006). The effects of leadership style and team process on performance and innovation in functionallyheterogeneous teams. *J Manage,* 32: 132-157.

xlv. Somech, A,(2010). Participative decision making in schools:A mediating-moderating analytical framework for understanding school and teacher outcomes. *EducAdmin Quart,* 46: 174-209.

xlvi. 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. *EducAdmin Quart,* 42: 746-772.

xlvii. Student Guide (2018). *Your Future Begins Today*. SouthAfrica: University of Fort Hare.

xlviii. Verma, N, Rangnekar, S.N, Barua, M.K (2016). Exploringdecision making style as a predictor of team effectiveness.*Inter J OrganisAnalys,* 24(1): 36-63.