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ABSTRACT

Human attributes that constitute a good leader in terms of leadership qualities and thinking styles are somewhat limited. The latter situation makes it difficult to employ the right person with the right leadership qualities in the continuously changing world of work (Lussier & Achua, 2000).

The researcher investigated the relationship between cognitive styles and leadership styles of individuals who are employed in the automotive industry and in a supervisory position. A quantitative research methodology was employed for the study of (n= 115) using the Cognitive-Style Indicator (COSI) developed by Cools and van den Broeck (2007) and the Leadership-style questionnaire developed by Clark (2007).

Leadership styles have been researched throughout the world, but a dearth of research specifically pertaining to cognitive styles was rather limiting in the context of the research that was undertaken. On the one hand, leadership focuses on three main dimensions, namely: Authoritarian, Participative and Delegative Leadership Styles. According to Clark (2007), the above three dimensions are the core styles that are used within the workplace. On the other hand, a three-dimensional cognitive style model, as proposed by Cools and Van den Broeck (2007) incorporates three dimensions with specific characteristics pertaining to each style. These three dimensions were labelled as: Knowing (K), Planning (P), and Creating (C) styles, which were utilised to find a significant relationship between the various leadership styles.

Significant relationships were found between the Cognitive-Planning style and the Participative Leadership style, the Delegative Leadership style and the Knowing-Cognitive style, the Creative-Cognitive style and the Delegative Leadership style, and the Knowing-and-Planning Cognitive style. Similarities were also found between the Coloured and African groups, as the Delegative style is relevant to both the Coloured and African groups, while the participative style is more prominent in the White racial group. No significant correlations were produced for the Asian group, however.
Organisations are rapidly changing and adapting to various types of change; and it is essential for all employees – and not only those within a leadership position – but it is imperative that leaders should not only understand and know their cognitive and leadership style, but also of those individuals who are reporting to them.
Chapter 1

Research Orientation

1.1 Introduction

This study is a conceptualisation of cognitive and leadership styles and an investigation into the relationship between these styles amongst various supervisory staff members in the automotive industry. The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of the theoretical background, the problem statement and the objectives of the study. The research design and methodology will also be explained in further detail.

1.2 Background of and motivation for the study

All individuals are diverse, whether it be by race, gender, religious stance or culture; therefore, an individual who leads a team is different from any other leader, inclusive of his cognitive disposition (Cools & van den Broeck, 2006). An individual's leadership style, which is adopted within the workplace, would depend on various factors, like personality, personal preference, type of work performed by employees, knowledge skills, type of organisation, as well as the culture thereof (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

With this in mind, one should take cognisance of the fact that every individual is different; thus, a leader’s behaviour and manner in the work situation would ordinarily operate in terms of one or another leadership style.

Leadership style may be defined as “the combination of traits, skills, and behaviours leaders use as they interact with [their] followers” (Lussier & Achua, 2000, p. 69). An individual’s leadership style is believed to be based on specific traits and skills; but the most important component is the individual’s behaviour, as it is seen as the most consistent pattern of behaviour that clearly characterises a leader within any organisation (Lussier & Achua, 2007).
According to Clark (2007), the three main dimensions of leadership include the authoritarian style (autocratic), the participative (democratic), and the delegative style (free reign). According to the Clark (2007), the said three dimensions are the core styles that are used within the workplace. People think differently and practise different leadership styles; therefore, the way people are thinking can have an effect on the leadership style in an organisation (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Researchers (Cools & van den Broeck, 2006) are of the opinion that there is a relationship between managers' leadership styles and cognitive styles. Therefore, the way a person manages people in the workplace would be determined by the interaction between his/her leadership and his/her cognitive styles. According to Hayes and Allinson (1994), as well as Kirton, (2003) (cited in Cools & Van den Broeck, 2007) researchers have found that individual differences in cognitive styles influence perception, learning, problem-solving, decision-making, communication, and creativity in important ways.

Cools and Van den Broeck’s (2007) three-dimensional cognitive style model, incorporates three dimensions with specific characteristics pertaining to each style. These three dimensions were labelled as: the Knowing (K), Planning (P) and Creating (C) styles. People with a knowing style look for facts and data. They want to know exactly the way things are; and they tend to retain many facts and details. They like complex problems if they can find a clear, rational solution.

People with a planning style are characterized by a need for structure. Planners like to organise and control; and they prefer a well-structured work environment. They attach importance to preparation and planning, in order to reach their objectives. People with a creative style tend to be creative, and they like experimentation. They see problems as opportunities and challenges, and they like uncertainty and freedom (Cools & Van den Broeck, 2007).

Organisations are rapidly changing and adapting to various types of change; and it is essential for all employees – not only those within a leadership position – but it is
also imperative that leaders should not only understand and know their own cognitive and leadership style, but also of those individuals who are reporting to them. They would, subsequently, have a better understanding of who they are working with on a daily basis, as well as assisting employees to find the correct organisational fit. This would not only benefit the employees, but also the organisation.

In addition to the above background it can be mentioned that in work organisations managers and supervisors must take leadership of decision making in order to adapt to economical or other changes demanded out of the business environment. This includes decisions on the utilisation of the human component within the organisation (Gallén, 2006; Miles & Snow, 1978). In order to develop/retain competitive edge, strategic thinkers need to view the organisation as a complex system that is influenced by internal and external factors (Senge, 1990).

Managers have been criticized because of their inability or unwillingness to consider the variety of strategic options open to the company (Johnson & Scholes, 1993) during the process of change. One reason for this limited way of thinking is alleged to be the personal style of the manager (Gallén, 1997; Nutt, 1986). As Hambrick, Geletkanycz and Fredrickson (1993, p. 402) put it, some executives are only interested in “what is” while others are more able to accept new untested ideas about “what might be”. Cools and Van der Broeck (2007, p. 1) refer to such unique decision making styles as “cognitive styles.” There are many examples of where the difference between success and failure of a business organisation has been directly attributed to the leadership style of its chief executive officer (Wheatley, Amin, Armstrong & VanderLinde, 1991).

When considering that when a manager is not taking leadership of strategic decision making, or who continues to make incorrect decisions, such manager can be replaced. Even when new managers or supervisors are recruited the selection of the right person who does the favourable decisions should be done via the recruitment and selection process (Gallén, 2006). The same counts for individuals in leadership
positions whose personal (cognitive) style is in conflict with the subordinates under his/her supervision. Researchers (Allinson, Armstrong & Hayes, 2001; Riding & Sadler-Smith, 1997) is of the opinion that a cognitive style is a consistent individual difference and the leader with the right cognitive style must fit a specific group of subordinates otherwise a leader might be in conflict which is in detriment with organisational growth. It seems that unlike cognitive styles, leadership cannot be regarded as a consistent process especially when considering the contingency theory of leadership (Warrick, 1981).

For the researcher it seems that it is imperative that organisations should select the right leaders who take the right decisions in order to steer the organisation in the desired direction. Furthermore, the individuals with the less favourable leadership qualities and cognitive styles should be avoided via the succession planning or recruitment and selection process (Gallén, 2006). The question that stays unanswered is whether it is the leader with wrong leadership style that causes an organisation to fail or is it a leader with a specific cognitive style that takes the wrong decisions, or is it both. This unanswered question should be researched in order to improve prediction of future executive appointments.

1.3 Problem statement

All organisations are primarily made up of groups of people who are important, not only for the organisation to develop into a well-established and recognised organisation, but to thrive under conditions of economic and social turmoil, the rapid increase in technology, and that of change. With this in mind, leaders within the organisation who lead this change amongst their staff need to be equipped with the relevant and adequate skills, not only to ensure that employees are retained within the organisation, but also to the extent that they are fulfilled within their day-to-day activities (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

Leadership is seen as a two-way process between leaders and followers. Therefore, good leaders have the ability to not only gain the trust of fellow employees, but also
their commitment and enthusiasm to move the organisation forward, and to attain the key objectives. However, the human attributes that constitute a good leader in terms of leadership qualities and thinking styles are limited. This makes it difficult to employ the right person with the right leadership qualities in the continuously changing world of work (Lussier & Achua, 2000).

Researchers (Du Plessis, 2010; Fjeldstad, 2006) are of the opinion that public and corporate organisations are facing changes since the new political dispensation came into effect. Furthermore, such organisations' performance is deteriorating as a result of poor leadership, poor decision-making and lack of economic growth. Tatum, Eberlen, Kottraba and Bradberry (2003) echoed the afore-mentioned researchers and add that organisations deteriorate as a result of the fact that leaders do not adapt to different leadership and decision making styles when situations are changing or become challenging. It seems that the interplay between leadership and cognitive styles is not considered significant in organisational survival and therefore not well researched (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1997; Yang, Wang & Wu (2010). Authors (Brevis, 2005; Luthans, Van Wyk & Walumbwa, 2004) assert that organisations can be saved by a paradigm shift (cognitive rethinking process) and leaders who nurture their leadership styles. Sosik and Dinger (2007) are of the opinion that organisations and society want leaders with vision and a creating style that is conducive to environmental change adjustments in order to save society or organisations from decline. Such ideal leadership qualities can be operationalized in terms of the dimensions of cognitive and leadership styles. If these two constructs can be linked the possibility exist that cognitive and leadership styles would provide more selection criteria when managers and supervisors apply for executive positions within organisations.

The importance of conducting this research is imperative, as organisations evolve and key employees are lost, as a result of leaders who are unable to lead followers, or who continuously make incorrect decisions. It is important that the appropriate steps be put in place – in terms of succession and progression planning within specific departments and in the organisation. Talent management, which is seen as
a fairly new concept within organisations, is an important part of the whole, as an organisation evolves and embraces change (Stockley, 2005).

Talent management involves individual and organisational development in response to a changing and complex operating environment. Thus, providing the appropriate talent is of vital importance. It includes the creation and maintenance of a supportive, people-oriented organisational culture. Once again, the appropriate individuals with suitable leadership and cognitive styles must be found for further development, and a proper culture should drive through the change process (Stockley, 2005).

It is, therefore, imperative to ensure that suitable employees in management positions are recruited during the recruitment and selection process – to determine their leadership and cognitive styles that are still to be defined. Furthermore, identifying and understanding an individual’s cognitive style and leadership style should assist management in the organisation in various ways. It may enhance an individual’s team performance, productivity and the appropriate person-organisation fit (Cools & Van den Broeck, 2007). This would, therefore, assist in specific progression and succession plans, as well as career development for individuals within the organisation.

A library search with the key word combination of “leadership style”, “cognitive style and “South Africa” delivered more than 16000 hits. Although sufficient information was provided relevant to the independently concepts, a thematic analysis of the abstracts could not provide a single research case in which the relationship between leadership styles and cognitive styles were determined or correlated in a correlation study. However, Cools and van Den Broeck (2008) found a relationship between cognitive styles and managerial behaviour in the European context. A wide variety of people were involved in the study, but differences with regard to management level and function could not be taken into account in the analyses. The above research information therefore did not provide any differentiation between supervisory levels. In the same breath leadership styles vary across situations and it is therefore difficult to assess an applicant’s leadership style for a supervisory position’s (Bryman, 2004). Amongst others, leadership styles are one of the drivers or moderators of
organisational decline. Furthermore, vision and intuition are identified by leaders as important but have not been subjects of serious study in business (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). Minzberg (1976), a prophet of the left brain right brain theory, is also of the opinion that envisioning and intuiting are not seriously studied. Given that if leadership styles that are adjustable and cognitive styles that are consistent are related, the latter could be a predictor of leadership styles that is important for leadership succession or selection.

No African study could be found to determine the interplay between leadership styles on the one hand, and cognitive styles, on the other hand. A study relating to the relationship between leadership and cognitive styles was conducted in Belgium by Cools and Van den Broeck (2007). The results of this study cannot be compared with those found in South Africa, due to various factors, such as culture, race, ethnicity and religious differences. Further research is, therefore, required to conceptualise cognitive and leadership styles, and also to investigate the relationship of these two variables.

Consequently, the following research question(s) emanate from the problem stated above:

- How can cognitive styles and leadership styles be conceptualised, and what is the relationship between these two kinds of styles?

- How do leadership and cognitive styles, as constructs, relate to each other in a sample of employees within the automotive industry?

### 1.4 The paradigmatic perspective

A paradigm is a framework in which research can be conducted and evaluated (Mouton & Marais, 1992). In this research, Industrial and Organisational Psychology serves as the disciplinary framework through which the study is conducted, with the emphasis on a psychometric perspective. This research relies on psychometric evidence and scientific results to determine the relationship between leadership and
cognitive styles. Textbooks and accredited journals were consulted in terms of cognitive and leadership style assessments, to assist in the conceptualisation and integration of both cognitive and leadership styles.

Consequently, the conceptualisation of the said constructs forms the basis of the literature review of the research.

The methodological justification of the research is derived from the philosophy of empirical science. The empirical investigation is conducted in terms of an overarching functional model (Morgan, 1980, p. 608, p. 619). The model postulates that:

- The human being is functioning in a society, which is characterised by order and regulation;
- The human being is functioning as a system, based on the observable truth;
- The human being plays a role in society, and behaviour must be judged in accordance with the reality and tangible social relationships; and
- The human research results are always subject to objectivity, and all research principles and techniques are dependent thereon.

During the generation of valuable research knowledge, the functional model is characterised by regulation and pragmatism in its basic orientation to the understanding of society. Its existence is founded in scientific, objective and uncontaminated inquiry, interpretation, and eventually, a true understanding of the human's social behaviour. Functionalism is one of the theoretical frameworks of empirical investigations in psychology, and eventually Industrial and Organisational Psychology. This requires that the researcher tries to understand and explain the observable functions of behaviour in terms of the empirical research conducted in the work context. For example, honesty or dishonesty may have a function in the sense that they prepares the individual for gain or loss of financial or material benefits. Furthermore, some individuals may survive the onslaught of the economic
pressures, as a result of their honest or dishonest behaviour when applying for job openings, while others might not survive such an onslaught (Morgan, 1980).

1.5 Research aims and hypothesis

In this research, general and specific aims are formulated that are outlined in the next section.

1.5.1 General aim

The general aim of the research is to establish the relationship between an individual’s leadership and cognitive styles among the middle managers in the automotive industry.

1.5.2 Specific aim

The following specific aims were formulated for this research:

- To conceptualise leadership styles and cognitive styles and the integration of these two constructs in a literature review.

- A further aim of the empirical study is to determine the relationship of these two constructs, namely: leadership styles and cognitive styles, in a sample of employees, specifically supervisors within the automotive industry who were utilised for this purpose.

1.6 Hypothesis

In order to reply to the research questions and to achieve the above research aims, the following hypothesis is formulated:

There is a significant relationship between leadership and cognitive styles among supervisory employees in the automotive industry.
1.7 Research design

This research follows the positivistic tradition with a non-experimental design.

The group is the unit of analysis, and is selected from a group of individuals who are currently employed within an automotive organisation within the Eastern Cape. Individuals who are currently in a supervisory or management position, who have two or more individuals reporting to them, are regarded as supervisors or as managers.

The research design will be discussed fully in Chapter Three.

1.8 Research method

The survey method was employed with a paper-and-pencil instrument. Questionnaires were used to collect the data. The population sample, measuring instruments, data collection, procedure and processing are discussed in Chapter Three.

1.9 Research terminology

This section briefly explains some terminology, in order to orientate the reader with regard to constructs that were used in the research, commencing with the Authoritarian Leadership Style.

1.9.1 The Authoritarian leadership style

The authoritarian leadership style is defined as “a style used by managers that want or need to have full power in decision-making” (Bushman, 2007, p.1). This style is often expressed by the manager telling employees specifically what to do and how to do it; and it is often most necessary when time is of the essence.
1.9.2 The Participative leadership style

Managers use the participative leadership style when they want or need to include employees when making decisions. The manager encourages or expects employees to provide input that would help the manager make the final decision. “This style is most often used, when the manager has some of the information, and employees have some other information that is needed to make a decision” (Clark, 2007, cited in Bushman, 2007, p. 1).

1.9.3 The Delegative leadership style

The delegative leadership style is used by managers who want – or need to allow – employees to make the final decision. The manager is still responsible for the decisions that are made, however. “The effective manager will use this style when the situation is right, but will not use this style excessively” (Bushman, 2007, p.1).

1.9.4 Cognitive style

An individual's cognitive style is defined as: “The way a person perceives, thinks, learns, solves problems, and relates to others” (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1995); whereas Hunt, Krzystofik, Meindl, and Yousry (1989) further define it as: “The way people process and organize information and arrive at judgements or conclusions on the basis of their observations.” Therefore, the manner in which people perceive stimuli within their environment, as well as how the information is received would influence the manner in which they behave in specific situations.

1.10 The reliability and the validity of the study

A study of scholarly literature describing leadership and cognitive styles is part of the present project. This is also true for the measuring instruments used in the empirical study.
Validity and reliability of the literature study were improved by:

- Choosing models that support the literature study;
- Giving conceptual descriptions of concepts that are relevant to the research;
- Consulting literature that is mostly of recent and an scholarly nature;
- Collecting literature through a standardized and systematic procedure; and,
- A verbal cross-checking of literature findings with experts in the particular research field.

Validity and reliability in terms of the empirical study were further improved by:

- Applying measuring instruments that were used for similar purposes, and which predict high levels of internal, external and face reliability and validity, as well as consistency;
- Valid and reliable interpretations of statistical analysis supported by statistical experts and standardized techniques; and
- Obtaining data from a representative sample size with a magnitude that supports statistical and practical significance.

1.11 Ethical responsibility

To ensure that the research endeavour was conducted within an ethical framework, the following ethical considerations were also borne in mind:

- All literature that was consulted is fully acknowledged, and referenced appropriately;
- Informed consent to do the study was obtained from the organisation, as well as from all employees prior to sampling;
- Confidentiality was maintained based on fair assessment practices;
- Respondents were dealt with courteously, respectfully and in an impartial manner; and
• Respondents were informed that a final report would be made available to the organisation for perusal.

1.12 Results

The results of the study are reported in the form of descriptive and inferential statistics. Data sets are displayed in summarised tables. The results were interpreted and explained in terms of existing research literature. A detailed summary of the results will be made available to the Vice President of the Human Resources department, as well as to all the employees who participated in the study. The results obtained from the study will be used to assist the company to develop a model with the specific competencies and requirements for leadership positions for the recruitment and selection process, as well as for future progression and succession planning.

1.13 Chapter outline

Chapter 1: Research orientation
Chapter 2: Leadership and Cognitive Styles
Chapter 3: Methodology
Chapter 4: Results and Analysis
Chapter 5: Conclusions, Recommendations and Limitations
Chapter 2
Leadership and Cognitive Styles

2.1 Introduction

One of the objectives of the research is to conceptualise the variables that are to be measured in the empirical study. This chapter attempts to conceptualise leadership style as a construct. It commences with some definitions and continues to explore leadership since the 1994 elections in South Africa. It searches for an understanding of leadership. It further explores gender, age and those characteristics that influence good leaders. It briefly explains the overlap between management and leadership. This chapter is concluded with the three main cognitive styles on which the research focuses; and this is followed by the chapter summary.

2.2 Leadership defined

According to Lewin (1939), a leadership style is how a leader relates to subordinates (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939). Leadership is a common phenomenon in the globalized world; it is assumed that, in order for an organisation to flourish, it requires a good leader. However, what is constantly asked is how effective the leadership of the organisation is in terms of leading the organisation to its proposed mission, vision and goals. According to Kotter (1988, p. 5), leadership may be defined as: “[T]he process of moving a group (or groups) in some direction through mostly non-coercive means”.

Caldwell (2004, p.2) defines effective leadership as, “leadership that produces movement in the long-term best interests of the group(s).” Understanding and defining leadership is thus imperative, in order to fully grasp the core fundamentals that surround this phenomenon. It is however important to always keep abreast of new and evolving definitions and understandings of leadership, as it is researched across the globe by many researchers.
Considering the vast amount of research that has been conducted on leadership, it is at times difficult to decide on a single definition. Therefore, for all the definitions that have been mentioned in the research conducted, many of these definitions have similar attributes to which the various researchers are referring.

One of the many definitions defines leadership as: “Leadership is both a process and a property. The process of leadership is the use of non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group towards the accomplishment of group objectives. As a property, leadership is the set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence” (Jago, 1982, p.1).

“Leadership is expressed or displayed through interaction between people and [it] necessarily implies its complement, "followership." For one to influence, another individual one must permit himself to be influenced by the leader. Simultaneously, follower(s) must be at least loosely organized around some common or agreed-upon purpose or mission” (Jago, 1982, p.1).

The working definition of leadership is provided on page 18 of this dissertation. It will be discussed in terms of its respective dimensions, namely: authoritarian, delegative and participative, as they are operationalized in the Leadership Style Questionnaire.

There are several influences in organisations, and leaders are challenged by the demands that are posed from all spheres, such as the economic, global and technological challenges within an organisation. According to Walumbwa and Lawler (2003), “Increased international and economic activities, the globalization of markets, the mobility of technology and changes in the workforce demographics have heightened interest in understanding and addressing ways of motivating culturally diverse workforces, on the part of both multinational corporations and indigenous companies” (p. 1083 – 1084).
Cognisance needs to be taken on how leaders would be able to address certain issues that are taking place more strongly than other challenges.

As one progresses in an era of changing technology, new inventions and a perplexed globalised world, it is important for organisations to invite, encourage and demonstrate change regarding their specific policies and procedures, but also amongst their staff members, who are critical in leading a company to perform and achieve its goals. Not only are organisations asked to invent and produce new ideas and projects, they also have to plan and implement specific tasks and objectives.

Consequently, in order to do this, those individuals who hold key positions in any organisation depend on their staff to filter down key performance objectives to their respective departments, as well as to their subordinates. “More and more, the need for leadership does not stop at the executive level either. Corporations are finding that even lower-level managerial, professional, and technical employees sometimes need to play a leadership role in their arena” (Kotter, 1988, p. 11).

Bearing the above in mind, it is important for organisations to not create division amongst senior and junior employees. They should rather create a unified organisation that embraces the fact that all employees – and not only those in senior positions – are the important role players in determining the success of the organisation, but all levels of employees should be included (Kotter, 1988).

According to Poloski (2001, p. 160), the traditional organisational structure, with its hierarchical, top-down approach, centralised control and historically entrenched values of stability and security, is an anachronism. The impetus now is towards flatter, more flexible and agile organisational forms. These changes have also triggered a radical shift in the role of managers from the traditional authoritarian, command-and-control style to a more open and participative management style.

With the emphasis now on cooperation, collaboration and communication, managers need to hone a completely different range of leadership skills.
As the organisation faces various issues in terms of remaining competitive within the global market, they also have to deal with challenges relating to issues pertaining to economic and political uncertainties. Managing an organisation in the current economic climate is not an easy task for any president of an organisation (Kotter, 1988). Various factors have to be taken into consideration, for example: organisations, therefore, have to maintain and retain the operational costs of running the organisation to maintain and provide good customer service, increasing or decreasing the demands of productivity, where deemed necessary, and maintaining the exceptional quality of the product – to ensure that the customer will return to purchase or recommend the product.

All these different factors have an influence on the way and manner in which an organisation is run on a daily basis, as well the type of leadership style that will be utilised to maintain the vision and mission of the organisation. According to Kotter (1988, p.13), “the leadership challenge at the top of complex organisations appears sometimes overwhelming. Establishing and implementing sensible strategies for business is rarely easy; but in many situations today, the technological, competitive, market, economic, and political uncertainties make strategic decision-making horrendously complicated.”

There are many leaders who are in positions of power, such as presidents, CEOs, managers, co-ordinators, such as manufacturing, retail, mining, or ruling the world. “Leadership is about leading people” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007), irrespective of how many people you lead. The people aspect of any organization is very important. Individuals who are in leadership positions within any organisation have important decisions to make. They must ensure that the world and their organizations are making and reaching their key goals and objectives; but also to ensure that the employees of the company are reaching job satisfaction and are happy in their day-to-day working activities.

This is because the majority of employees spend more than eight hours every day in their respective jobs (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).
A question that may be asked of employees is how committed they are to the organisation for which they work. According to Meyer and Allen (1997), “commitment may be considered a psychological state concerned with how people feel about their relationship with the employing organisation.” This may include an employee’s attitude towards the organisation, identification with the organisation and his/her loyalty towards the organisation. The researcher is of the opinion that if this question is asked, employees within any organisation will have varied responses. These responses may range from very committed; and some may respond in a very negative manner, attributing their commitment to their remuneration, and what they gain from the company.

A study concluded by Ogbanna and Harris (2000, in Gill, 2006 p. 158) investigated the relationship between leadership style, organizational performance and organizational culture. The four distinct cultures that they identified included: innovative, competitive, bureaucratic and communitarian, as well as the three leadership styles of: participative, supportive and instrumental (transactional) leadership style. The overall outcome of this study concludes that organizational culture mediates the relationship between leadership style and organizational performance.

Understanding cross-cultural aspects of leadership styles and behaviours within the organization is imperative, as this may influence and assist the global competitiveness, international mergers and acquisitions, assessing new market opportunities, international transfer of executives, localization of management, and international management and leadership-development programmes (Gill, 2006).

Cultural differences within the host organization or sister organizations may cause or create a challenge with regard to the way business is conducted in various countries across the globe. This may be as a result of simplistic issues, which would not affect other countries, such as language barriers and leadership style. However, leadership style is a universal phenomenon (Gill, 2006).
Consequently, Trompenaars (2000, p. 163, in Gill, 2006) proposes that the solution to the problem of cultural differences is not ethnocentric domination or even compromise, but the reconciling of opposing values. The challenge to organizational leadership is to develop a corporate culture that recognizes the diversity of values across national cultures and reconciles them within a corporate culture that supports the organisation’s vision and strategies.

Whereas this section explores the various demands that are posed at leaders, the next section focuses on how leadership has evolved since the 1994 elections in South Africa.

2.3 Leadership evolving post 1994 in South Africa

Since 2006, the Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment (BBBEE) strategy has been implemented with employers given targets for various activities, as well as the stipulation that the companies must be represented by individuals of colour (Nzukuma & Bussin, 2011). Organizations are given targets, which are driven by the leadership of the company. With this demand placed on companies, it could often be said that employees are employed for the wrong reasons. One of the issues facing organisations is that of equity – and having the correct off-ssets to promote an individual – could place tremendous pressure on employers if their top structure is very heavy in terms of white males in leadership positions.

Zuma (2010, p.1) states that “we have to think creatively about ways in which we can increase the extent to which communities, workers, co-operatives and other collective enterprises own and manage existing and new enterprises and increase their access to economic activities, infrastructure and skills training." Employers have to, therefore, be cognisant of the fact that while the emphasis is placed on the balancing of equity in the workplace, they are also directly affected, since the majority of people of colour are being head-hunted by other companies at the same time.
“To further exacerbate the tenuous skills shortage, suitably qualified, previously disadvantaged employees were head-hunted by other companies to fulfil the employment equity quotas and maintain their BEE status, and this [has] led to uncontrolled job-hopping” (Advocate, 2010, p.1). The fact that many managers are being head-hunted creates a loss of good leaders within the organisation.

Consequently, companies could be desperate to appoint an employee in a leadership position for the wrong reason. “It’s important to realize that just because someone holds a position of leadership, doesn’t necessarily mean they should. The problem many organizations are suffering is a recognition problem they can’t seem to recognize good leaders from bad ones.” (Myatt, 2012, p.1). This means that the job-fit for the position is mismatched, which impacts on the employer, as well as on the employee. Having an employee in the wrong position who does not have the necessary leadership skills could not only impact on the organization’s goals and objectives, but could also impact on those employees reporting to that individual.

This could result in the employees being unhappy as well as these employees who have the necessary potential leaving the employ of the company. If people are placed in leadership positions for the wrong reasons, the full spectrum of effective leadership could be thwarted.

Leadership is a universal term, which is often used interchangeably with management. According to Lussier and Achua (2000), there are five main key elements of leadership. These include leader-followers, influence, organizational objectives, change and people. These key elements are important and directly linked to the definition of leadership.

Influencing is defined as “the process of a leader communicating ideas, gaining acceptance of them, and motivating followers to support and implement the ideas through change” (Lussier & Achua 2000 p. 7).
Organisational objectives is defined as “effective leaders influence followers to think not only of their own interests, but [of] the interests of the organization. Leadership occurs when followers are influenced to do what is ethical and beneficial for the organization and themselves. Taking advantage of followers for personal gain is not part of leadership” (Lussier & Achua, 2000, p.8).

Globalization and change may be defined as influencing organizations more frequently than previously. Therefore, leadership is an important aspect of managing an evolving and emerging business. Lussier and Achua (2000, p.8) defined change as “influencing and setting objectives is about change”. Therefore, in the global competitive environment that the automobile manufacturers are currently facing, there is competition to recruit and attract the best staff complement. Such manufacturers would, consequently, only survive if they have the ability to attract, develop and maintain their best leaders. According to Lussier and Achua (2000, p.9), “global leadership skill is the key intangible resource that will leverage sustainable competitive advantage in the twenty-first century”. According to a former CEO, Welch (in Lussier and Achua, 2000), the leadership skill of supervisors is an important factor in retaining employees.

Ulrich, Losey and Lake (1997) were of the opinion that with the focus on global leadership, it is imperative that the focus of training should be on people and not so much on technology. The people of the organization are very important in the production process; and therefore, the emphasis should be on the training of the employees, since without this training, leadership would be hindered.

Whereas the above section discussed leadership development since 1994 in South Africa, the following section focuses on understanding leadership in a deeper way.

2.4 Understanding Leadership

“Traditionally, leadership has tended to be equated with autocratic command; and there are still many who see leadership mainly in terms of the issuing of orders, which are eagerly obeyed by followers whose loyalty is largely determined by the
charisma of the leader” (Gill, 2006, p.13). Individuals who are in positions of leadership be it the president of a country, or a co-ordinator, or manager, have an important job to perform, as does every other employee within the organization. With the assistance of the co-ordinator, manager, CEO or employee, the goals and objectives of the organization may be reached through recognized leadership techniques.

Kanther (1993a,b, in Gill 2006, p.12) is of the opinion that “when a company is failing and survival is at stake, [what] matters most in respect of openness and honesty is dialogue, mutual respect, collaborative problem-solving, and encouragement of initiative.”

Researchers have identified three leadership styles in various organizations (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939). The three main leadership styles that will be focused on throughout this research are: the authoritarian, the delegative and the participative leadership style. Individuals who are in positions of leadership may depend on their own personality, cognitive style and emotional intelligence; they may make use of either one specific leadership style, or they may incorporate various aspects of the different styles in their daily activities.

Research conducted by Goleman (2000, p.78) showed that “leaders with the best results do not rely on only one leadership style; they use most of them in a given week – seamlessly and in different measures – depending on the business situation.” This may therefore have a direct impact on the working atmosphere of the company, the team and the financial performance of the organization.

The researcher is of the opinion that many employees who are assigned and appointed to leadership roles within the organisation often abuse their position of power by manipulating others; and they may be very domineering at times. In order to be a good leader, the individual needs to be open to criticism, be willing to listen, and also be willing to learn – not only from superiors, but from his/her subordinates as well. Gaining respect and listening to one’s subordinates’ ideas, suggestions and
taking an interest in what the individual does, is important to not only foster a good relationship between the person in a leadership position and subordinates, but also to ensure that goals and objectives will be met with the assistance of subordinates.

According to Michelson (2006), “leaders should create power dynamics to secure the commitments necessary to achieve important organisational goals and objectives” (p. 195). In the above reciprocal relationship stated by Michelson (2006), the leader has the ability to be influenced by others in what he/she has to accomplish on a daily basis. The researcher is therefore of the opinion that within an organisation, no matter whether the employees are in leadership positions or not, interaction with fellow employees and colleagues should take place on a daily basis. This interaction can at times not be avoided, as information may be requested from another department or from a fellow employee. Therefore, interaction on a daily basis is inevitable. The individual who is in a position of leadership will not be able to sit in isolation, and fail to interact with his/her subordinates.

According to Schuitema (1998, p. 13), essentially, there are two techniques one may employ to get people to do what you want, namely: compulsive or seductive – the famous ‘hard’ or ‘soft’ approach. The power which a leader uses will definitely depend on the circumstances in which the leader finds himself/herself. However, at times leaders will abuse their power. Such abuse may be the result of altruism; it may be based on self-interest; it may also encourage nepotism and misappropriate the company’s best interests. Therefore, compulsive behaviour would nearly always get fellow employees to do something. This may not always have a favourable or desired outcome, but it should influence people to do things to get the task completed.

An individual’s tone of voice, or the manner in which they address people, may influence the way people react (Pitta, Fung & Isberg, 1999). Often employees become resentful, despondent, feel undermined and belittled when leaders use an aggressive tone of voice. This is often seen as the ‘hard’ approach of power within leadership. Therefore, the manner in which senior members of staff communicate
with their subordinates should always be taken into consideration. Communication is an important element in any organisation, and in some organisations the manner or tone with which one addresses staff could be seen as abusive or condescending.

In other countries, depending on the particular country’s culture, it may be acceptable to speak in a particular tone of voice (Pitt, Fung & Isberg, 1999).

Being in a position of leadership may exert some form of power within the organisation as well as towards the fact that such a leader has subordinates reporting to him/her (Daft, 2005). Therefore, as a leader, one may now be in a position to use one’s power productively, or to use one’s power in a negative manner, to abuse subordinates to get the job done, or by influencing the way one moves up the corporate ladder. Individuals, therefore, have the ability to share their knowledge and power with their subordinates in an appropriate manner by giving them an opportunity to grow and develop their potential. According to Daft (2005), “a significant way in which leaders can meet the higher motivational needs of subordinates is to shift power down from the top or the organisational hierarchy, and share it with the subordinates” (p. 244).

An outsider may at times ask who makes the final decision within an organisation. To make a decision, which would impact on the organisation in a positive or negative way – especially when negative – is always a concerning factor. An outsider who looks into an organisation may be of the opinion that all final decisions rest with the President of the organisation. This may at times be correct, especially if the organisation is a small to medium enterprise. In decision-making within a large automobile manufacturer, like General Motors South Africa, decisions are made at various levels by division heads, as well as those individuals who have employees reporting to them. “The executive who makes decisions independent of other executives will naturally make decisions with limited information depending upon the executive’s communication style and ability to collect, analyze, and evaluate information. An easier way is for the executive to work collaboratively with other executives.”
Harrison, (1999, p.5) defines decision-making as “a moment, in an ongoing process of evaluating alternatives for meeting an objective, at which expectations about a particular course of action impel the decision-maker to select that course of action most likely to result in attaining the objective.”

Some decisions that are made higher up within the hierarchical structure are often filtered down to other relevant individuals and employees, in order to ensure that the task at hand is adhered to and is processed accordingly. Oshagbemi (2008, p. 1905) suggests that managers in positions high in the organisational hierarchy tend to use some but not all of the four leadership styles – directive, consultative, participative and delegative. The impression seems to be that before they get to the higher organisational position they would have tried each of the leadership styles and dimensions, and decided to concentrate on only one, or two or three of them, but not on all four leadership styles.

Experience should have assisted them in selecting and concentrating on the style or styles of leadership that they have considered most appropriate during the performance of each of their organisational activities (Oshagbemi, 2008).

At times, those individuals or employees who are not in a position to make any decisions within an organisation may feel disgruntled about decisions that have been made at a higher level. Many questions can arise, as well as apprehensiveness from employees when decisions affect employees, as well as the organisation in a negative light. As stated by Kickul (2001), “advancement opportunities are often restricted by slower growth and leaner organisations’ structure; more employees are beginning to realise that meeting adequate performance standards does not guarantee job security with their employees” (Kickul, p.1).

Managers, together with their subordinates, may present specific scenarios in terms of a process to their immediate vice-president, in order to enable a smooth transition when implementing a change or a new process (Kickul, 2001). At times, those
employees who report to these co-ordinating managers may not have a say in terms of a decision that will be taken, or has already been made. Employees may feel that their input does not play an important role, especially if they believe that they could assist by implementing specific improvements.

As a supervisor or manager, one would inevitably have to provide feedback to staff from decisions that were made at a higher level (Parker & Kyj, 2006). At times this might not be an easy task; and there is in no way that you would be able to shift the responsibility onto a fellow employee. As an employee, one gains a level of respect and trust in one’s supervisor – not only because s/he is in a position of power, but also because they have the responsibility to filter down information that is shared at a higher level (Parker & Kyj, 2006).

According to Parker and Kyj (2006), it seems that “the easiest way for any supervisor to lose [the] respect of peers, and also simultaneously erode the reputation of authority, is by giving an unpopular directive or mission to staff, and [then] pointing the finger somewhere else, as the reason for [having done] so. In a typical supervisor’s career, numerous issues must be relayed to staff members, some of which are not popular and will not be taken cordially” Billington, (2009, p.1). At times, this information may either be positive or negative. There may be times when the supervisor may not want to share unpopular information. It is, however, important that a supervisor ensures that the information relayed to the employee is at all times accurate, and that time was spent with the employee to discuss the issue at hand.

Billington (2009) is further of the opinion that good leaders should ensure that all staff are carrying the flag of the organisation and embrace the vision and mission of the organisation and do not rely on the infamous ‘they’ flag. A supervisor/manager, therefore, has the responsibility to take ownership of what is shared, and to be honest and direct with fellow staff, should information need to be shared with fellow employees.
According to Billington (2009), the following are key aspects, in order to avoid the issue of blaming others within an organisation. These include:

- The supervisor must have a leadership style that allows staff members to give their true opinions on issues in an open forum or one-on-one;
- If at all possible, major decisions that affect the entire organisation should be made using the team-based approach. The team should include a diverse group of personnel from the organisation; this gives the decision increased credibility with less blaming;
- All procedural changes should be openly discussed with the staff before the issue is released to an entire department; and
- No matter what the position of authority is, if one sees something good, praise it.

In many instances, the middle- and lower-management team are the ones that ensure that the goals and targets are met, which have been agreed upon by the CEO. According to Baldoni (2009), “Today’s CEO needs to ensure that his strategies are executed with a combination of influence, persuasion, and good old fashioned discipline. No CEO can do it alone. One way to foster followership – to create strong followers – is to empower leaders in the middle.” Therefore, it is important to take cognisance of the fact that employees who are classified as middle management are those who not only think strategically, but who are the ones that follow through on the task at hand whether running day-to-day activities or handling a crisis.

Baldoni (2009) regards the following as being important aspects of a good leader:

- Thinking big;
- Influencing others: managers who lead from the middle must be those who can persuade, going beyond the essentials – structuring a good argument and building a strong business case. Genuine influence comes from being a valued resource and a trusted individual, attributes earned both by example and achievement;
Dealing with rejection: separating one’s ego from the role is critical in avoiding self-rejection;
Perseverance: the drive for success begins with oneself; but it must encompass the team. Organisations need resilient leaders who want to make not only themselves better but everyone else better too.

The next section will discuss the way an individual’s gender and age could influence leadership.

2.5 Gender and age differences in leadership

Having and fulfilling a job within the corporate industry is not an easy task when considering the various demands, which may affect an individual’s life outside the working environment (Enslin-Payne, 2010). Climbing the corporate ladder may be easy for some, whereas for others this may not be an easy task. Females may be of the opinion that they may experience the ‘glass-ceiling’ phenomenon, as many women are perceived as being family-oriented. Others may feel that they are being discriminated against because of the colour of their skin, due to racial segregation and the reputation South Africa’s has in the world. Therefore, this could have a lot to do with the promotion of white males, who have dominated the leadership positions in many industries. They usually hold the majority of senior positions, as well as positions of power – especially in the retail, wholesale and motoring sectors (Enslin-Payne, 2010).

While considering Enslin-Payne’s (2010) remarks, the researcher assumes that an aspiring female pursuing a career in the male-dominated automotive manufacturing industry would find this daunting; and it may evoke mixed feelings for both males and females. Traditionally, the working environment is filled with males who are in positions of leadership. With the drive to ensure that equity is reached within organisations, there is a clear change to now have more females in the ranks holding leadership roles. The consequence is that females are emerging and taking positions of leadership.
However, there remains a stigma and discrimination of how males and females in leadership roles differ in the manner in which they lead others.

According to Daft (2005), “male leaders tend to be competitive and individualistic and prefer working in vertical hierarchies. They rely on formal authority and position in their dealings with subordinates.” Whereas “women may also demonstrate these traits, research found that, in general, women tend to be more concerned with relationship building, inclusiveness, participation and caring” (p.438).

With the emerging markets – including South Africa, there is a drive to encourage the appointment of females into strategic positions. Many may question males and females being treated with the same respect and dignity, and that the only recognizable difference is their gender. However, the stereotype of male-specific and female-specific jobs is still debatable.

Sandelands, (2002, p. 163) is of the opinion that “there will always be conflicts between the rival claims of individual life and species life. Although equally individual, men and women will always self-segregate into groups (e.g. occupations, work roles, support networks)”.

Sandelands (2002, p. 163) further defines why men and women differ in the workplace, which still remains a common phenomenon, according to the author:

- Men rise higher than women in the ranks of virtually every business, government, and profession. Men are even over-represented at the highest reaches of professions dominated by women – such as social work and nursing.
- Many women report that their contributions in the workplace are not fairly recognised by men. Some report feeling almost invisible. Some women report that they are blocked from advancement by a ‘glass ceiling’ that tempts them with prize positions they cannot win.
• Women’s careers are more adversely affected by family demands than men’s careers.

Consequently, Sandelands (2002) is clearly of the opinion that although equally matched, men will always outrank women in status hierarchies, not because men are more talented, but because status is biologically more important to men than it is to women. Furthermore, “although equally individual, women will always feel more of a career-slowing tug toward children and home, not because women don’t care about work organizations, but because childcare is biologically more important to women than [it is to] men” Sandelands, (2002, p. 164).

As women are emerging in leadership roles, Daft (2005) is of the opinion that men may at times become less influential within the workforce, as such women become dominant role players, as their needs become attuned to the needs and values of a multicultural environment. At times, women are faced with the well-known phenomenon called the ‘glass ceiling’. “The glass ceiling is an invisible barrier that separates women and minorities from top leadership positions” (Daft, 2005, p. 449). With a small minority of women being appointed to senior positions in the workplace, there is, however, still a stigma relating to males being more dominant in the world of work.

“Many organisations were originally created by and for men, and the prevailing work practices and patterns of social interaction tend to privilege men, and disadvantage women, often in subtle ways” (Daft, 2005, p. 450). The automotive industry is primarily still dominated by white males in senior positions.

According to Daft (2005), a woman’s approach to leadership is an interactive leadership, which is defined as “a leadership style in which people develop personal relationships with followers, share power and information, empower employees, and strive to enhance others’ feelings of self-worth” (p, 452). It must be further stated that the role of an interactive leadership style is, however, not gender-specific; and such roles are, however, becoming increasingly valuable to both males and females.
A study conducted by Oshagbemi, (2008) stated that “while gender and management level, individually, do not seem to affect managers’ use of the overall leadership style, to the overall style their interaction does so significantly and negatively. Perhaps the negative sign suggests that women managers at higher management levels do not use the overall leadership style much. Rather, they prefer to use each of the leadership styles in preference to an overall style” (Oshagbemi, 2008, p.1906).

“The difference between the relationship orientations of men and women has sometimes been used to suggest that women cannot lead effectively, because they fail to exercise power” (Daft, 2005, p. 438). There is, therefore, a perception that some women assume that they are ‘soft’, while men are accepted as being ‘robust’. In addition, personal preferences and emotional psychological strength is assumed to cause much debate as to whether men are seen as much better leaders than females. According to a study conducted by Bass and Avolio (1994), it was concluded that women leaders rated more highly than men in fast-developing, flexible, learning organisations.

In the 1994 elections South Africa nominated their first black president, when all South African citizens were allowed to vote for the first time in South Africa’s first democratic elections. To equalise the demographic differences in the country, the drive after the elections was to give people who were from the previously disadvantaged racial groups, including women, the opportunity to be placed in leadership positions that were previously not easily accessible (Nzukuma & Bussin, 2011).

On a different note, it may be assumed that in many organisations the majority of employees who are employed at a more senior level are those individuals who were much older and who had been employed by the organisation for a number of years. As organisations grow in the twentieth century, many younger employees are able to make their mark by being employed in positions of leadership. At times, these
individuals may have to interact – either on a daily basis – or when serving on specific projects or tasks that need to be implemented.

Individuals who are older than others may not be able to identify with ideas and suggestions, which are beyond their usual way of getting the job done. The generation gap between these individuals may result in some form of conflict. According to Mitchell (2000), (in Oshagbemi, 2008, p.1897) “…age tends to give [a] greater or lesser degree of individualism among the workers – with the younger generation feeling more comfortable exhibiting individualistic behaviour.”

Oshagbemi, (2008) suggests that generations do matter, because of the resulting differences in attitudes and behaviours between the two generations.

Younger employees are often seen as individuals who want to create and implement change; and older employees may often see this as a threat, or may not be willing to adjust to change, as they may have been in a routine of completing certain tasks in a specific way. This may now impact on their proposed outputs. “Older leaders can draw on their years of experience to specifically make decisions with [a] greater degree of confidence, which younger managers do not seem to possess” (Oshagbemi, 2008, p. 1906).

Younger employees are often able to adjust much faster than older employees (Oshagbemi, 2008, p.1906). “On leadership styles and behaviours, compared with older workers, the researchers found that younger workers feel more comfortable in fast-changing environments, and are more willing to take risks and consider new approaches. They also operate with more energy and intensity, and have a greater capacity to energise others. In addition, they are more likely to seek out opportunities to take charge and push vigorously and competitively to achieve high-level results. Compared with older workers, younger workers also tend to work to develop and promote others” (Oshagbemi, 2008, p. 1898).
Oshagbemi, (2008, p. 1898) further stated that older workers study problems in the light of past practices, in order to ensure predictability, and to minimise risk. They tend to maintain a calmer and more understated demeanour. Older workers tend to maintain an in-depth knowledge of their field, and use this knowledge to approach problems. They cooperate and delegate more, and show a greater degree of empathy and concern for workers. Contrary to the practices of younger workers, the authors suggest that older workers work to develop and promote others.

According to a study conducted by Kakabadse (1998, in (Oshagbemi, 2008) he is of the opinion that “the more mature managers and leaders are, both in attitude and years, the better performers they become.”

Whereas gender and age can influence leadership, leaders also have some of the characteristics of a good leader. Such characteristics will be discussed in the next section.

2.6 The characteristics of good leaders

Research conducted by Charan and Colvin (in Gill, 2006 p.38) suggests that successful CEOs (who actually find themselves in leadership positions) have characteristics, which are characterised as cognitive, emotional and interpersonal. These could relate to an individual’s embedded value system.

These characteristics are defined as the following:

- Integrity, maturity and energy;
- Business acumen;
- ‘People’ acumen;
- Organisational acumen;
- Curiosity, intellectual capacity and a global mindset;
- Superior judgement;
- An insatiable appetite for accomplishment and results;
• A powerful motivation to grow and convert learning into practice (Charan and Colvin, in Gill, 2006 p.38).

The most common question asked about people in leadership positions is whether their leadership styles have matured, while they had been in various positions, or whether they were born with the innate ability to be a good leader. This debate has been ongoing for many centuries (Patton, 2012).

Furthermore, the understanding of leadership being innate or acquired, as individuals climb the corporate ladder, could raise further concerns amongst practitioners and researchers, as one may question whether an individual's leadership style was taught, developed or learnt over time.

Regardless of the position in which an individual is employed, in an organisation – at some point an individual will have to lead by example, and may at times have to individually make decisions or participate in joint decisions (Wang 1994). This in turn, relates to whether the employees currently employed are able to lead effectively. In order for organisations to be successful, they must, therefore, not only focus on their high-potential employees, but on all the other employees at the various levels in the organization.

With the skills shortage, it is not as easy to fill vacancies, as it was previously, since companies are now competing with other industries to obtain or to retain good leaders. Therefore, to win the war for talent, organisations have to make a concerted effort to ensure that the talent recruited is of the best calibre, as well as to nurture and develop current employees to their full potential (Wang 1994).

2.7 Leadership development

In order to deal with the loss of valuable employees, it is important for the organisation to concentrate on the employees who are still in the employ of the organisation. “Developing leaders who can lead from the middle is [the secret of] sound management practice. Not only does it create a stronger organisation in the
short run – it prepares emerging leaders to be more prepared for senior leadership positions’.

This practice gives people more room to employ their talents, as well as to hone their skills. Not everyone is cut out for senior leadership, but those who are, should be groomed as soon as possible. If middle managers are taught, encouraged, and challenged to demonstrate leadership, then they will be more likely do so with confidence. That is a factor that can only improve the organisation’s ability to survive and thrive (Baldoni, 2009).

Organisations effectively train those individuals who are in their employ, especially those who are being groomed to accomplish outstanding work performance and work ethic. Organisations, therefore, do not simply wait for leaders to come along, but they should actively try to develop them by seeking out persons with leadership potential. Furthermore, the idea is to expose them, to career-learning opportunities combined with a nurturing and mentoring environment. By doing this, many persons can develop and exercise leadership skills effectively in an organisation (Ahmandi, Jullien & Miller, 2005).

According to Gill (2006, p. 270), Leadership is learned, although one cannot explain entirely how it is learnt. The ability to lead and inspire others is far more instinctual than premeditated, and it is acquired through the experiences of one’s everyday life. The quality of such leadership comes out of the innate character and personality of the leader himself. One can only debate the view that an individual who has attended a top university and who has completed many degrees, may be an individual who has acquired the experience of being a person who can lead a group effectively.

According to Lussier and Achua (2000, p. 9), “effective leaders are not simply born or made; they are born with some leadership ability, and [they] develop it.” Hall and Norburn (1987) were of the opinion that “leadership is basically genetic – but it can be encouraged. Gill (2006, p.271) makes the remark that “the teacher (the bellows)
can accelerate the embryonic leaders (the spark) to burst forth (the crackling fire). The result? (hopefully): paradigm busters [who are] full of spirit and empathy."

However, Nicholson (2001 in Gill, 2006) is of the opinion that “the big lie sold to us by much of the management literature is the myth that any man or women can be turned into a leader, given the right developmental intervention” (p.272). The new science of behavioural genetics is steadily accumulating evidence on how much of an individual's character, style, and competence is inborn. As every parent with more than one child knows, each child is born different and stays different. The development of individual's weaknesses with regard to becoming a leader may be addressed in an individual's development plan (Jacobson, 2002). One would then question how effective the development plan would be once completed, and whether there has been any change in the individual. What then would the next step to follow? Some things may improve; others may change; and some may not change at all. This is important to consider when an employer is of the opinion that placing an employee through a rigorous development programme – hoping that the outcome will be positive – is the right decision.

It is important that an individual's development plan should yield the desired outcome and target the expected developmental needs of the individual (Jacobson, 2002).

Owen (2001 in Gill 2006, p.275) is of the opinion that leadership cannot be taught as a list of skills. Nor can it be bolted on to management development, as leadership is totally different to management; and it requires different thinking. Leadership potential is already in the individual; and therefore, it requires recognition, development, growth and practice. A week’s training course would not achieve this; it requires much more time and experience.

Jacobson (2002) further states that: “The ideal Individual Development Plan should primarily focus on two things:
• Leveraging each employee’s strengths/talents; and
• Providing new skills and knowledge that would help the employee perform better in his job. Remedial help for addressing weaknesses should be provided only in the event that the employee has a fatal flaw that would preclude him/her from being successful.”

Consequently, it is imperative to identify an individual’s strengths and weaknesses through a thorough psychometric assessment centre. This is to understand the individual’s current potential, as well as the possibility to predict whether the individual would be able to articulate and function in the perceived leadership role.

As mentioned earlier, it is essential to take cognisance of the fact that exposing an individual and completing the necessary training may not necessarily be successful either. Therefore, understanding the organization’s context is important, in order to ascertain what types of leadership behaviours fit the organisation best.

The above sections have discussed the characteristics of good leadership and how leadership comes about. The following section will discuss the overlap between the understanding of Leadership and Management.

### 2.8 Overlap between management and leadership

Understanding the differences and similarities that exist between leadership and management is important, as these two words are often seen as synonymous rather than being different. According to Rickkets (2009, p.1), “the terms ‘leadership’ and ‘management’ are seen very differently by diverse people. Some individuals see these terms as synonyms and frequently use them as interchangeable.

Others approach them as extreme opposites; so extreme, in fact, that they would argue that you cannot be a good manager and a good leader at the same time. Still other people reside somewhere in the middle and realize that while there is a difference between leadership and management, with the right knowledge, an
individual can successfully fulfil both roles. It is therefore imperative to understand the differences and similarities between leadership and management (Ricketts, 2009).

Ricketts (2009) further states that leadership should rather be seen as a process whereby an individual influences a group to achieve a common goal, so that leadership is:

- A process
- Involves influence
- Occurs in a group or context (you need to have at least one constituent)
- Involves goal attainment

The following are some leadership qualities, namely:

- Efficient coaching skills
- Confidence
- Consistency between word and action – “walking the talk”
- Creativity
- Empathetic listening
- Being visionary
- Inspiring
- Long-term focus
- Maintaining a balance between individual needs and team needs
- Awareness of realistic conditions
- Strong self-esteem
- Sense of priorities
- Service mentality
- Sincerity
- Technical or contextual expertise
- Trust
- Willingness to share responsibility
• Willingness to share credit or recognition

Management, on the other hand, may be defined as: “to exercise executive, administrative, and supervisory direction for a group or organisation” (Ricketts, 2009, p.1). It may be assumed that management duties are more task-oriented than specific leadership responsibilities – regardless of the organisation. The following are essential management skills where an individual uses knowledge and competences to accomplish a set of objectives (see Table 2.1) (Ricketts, 2009).

Table 2.1 shows a comparison between Management and Leadership competencies (Ricketts, 2009, p.3).

Table 2.1 Comparison between management and leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Budgeting</td>
<td>Establishing Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing agenda</td>
<td>Creating a vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting timetables</td>
<td>Clarifying the big picture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocating resources</td>
<td>Setting strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising and Staffing</td>
<td>Aligning people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide structure</td>
<td>Communication goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making job placements</td>
<td>Seeking commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing rules and procedures</td>
<td>Building teams and coalitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling and Problem Solving</td>
<td>Motivating and inspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing incentives</td>
<td>Inspiring and energising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating creative solutions</td>
<td>Empowering subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking corrective action</td>
<td>Satisfying unmet needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ricketts (2009, p.3).

According to Waldron, Vsanthakumar and Arulraj (1997), “planning is the process of determining organisational aims, developing premises about the current environment, selecting the course of action, initiating activities required to transform plans into action, and evaluating the outcome” (p.3). The types of planning that managers engage in would depend on their level in the organisation and on the size and type of organisation. Consequently, planning and organising for any organisation
are very important aspects in meeting the objectives, goals and living up to the vision and mission of the organisation.

The majority of planning that is done for an organisation is done by those individuals who are in senior management positions. These strategic planning sessions pave the way for current projects, as well as foreseeable projects in the near future. These planning sessions may be viewed in a positive or negative light by employees who are not involved in the decision-making process. However, decisions that are made at a higher level need to be implemented at a lower level, in order for the core objectives to be met. “Top-level managers make decisions affecting the entirety of the firm. Top managers do not direct the day-to-day activities of the firm; rather, they set goals for the organization and direct the company to achieve them. Top managers are ultimately responsible for the performance of the organization, and often, these managers have very visible jobs” (eNotes, 2012, p.1).

Thus, the manner in which managers and lower-level managers filter down information is of an imperative nature. Decisions have been made and need to be implemented accordingly, and the goals and objectives that managers set out for subordinates, will determine whether these goals will be achieved. As a manager or supervisor, one has the choice to either set objectives by oneself, for subordinates, or one may include them in setting clear and concise objectives (Waldron, Vsanthakumar & Arulraj, 1997).

Individuals who are in supervisory or management positions may at times feel that they are not coping with the work load or being able to balance their personal and working lives. Taylor-Bianco, Bianco, Thacker and Thomas (2007, p.201) state that “managers must learn to cope (i.e. act in ways to maintain goals) despite rapid and widespread organisational change (i.e. disturbances or barriers).” They may not be able to reach certain goals and objectives that have been set out for them. Individuals may however, feel that they are in a position performing certain tasks that may be against their individual values.
At times, some individuals may be so caught up in the routine of their jobs that they may not be able to change their mindset and be able to produce new ideas for a particular project.

2.9 Leadership styles

Kurt Lewin (1951) proposed three leadership styles namely the democratic (participative), autocratic (authoritarian), and laissez-faire (delegative) style (Lewin, Lippit, & White, 1939). “Autocratic leaders” were originally described as leaders who used their power to force, or their ability to persuade in leading their followers. A powerful autocratic leader influenced followers because of the power of the leader’s position, or the power of the leader as a person made others expect that the leader would reward them for compliance or punish them for rejection (Bass, 1960, 1990). An autocratic leader was also defined as a person who used power to be strict rather than lenient, to supervise closely, and to ensure adherence to procedures (Blau & Scott, 1962). At the same time, an autocratic leader was also described as a directive leader. Traditionally in early studies these concepts described leadership as work related or person related behaviour which seemed to align with autocracy at one extreme end of the spectrum and democracy at another (Bass, 1990). Very few women were occupying leadership roles during this period, and the autocratic style of leadership was not one which would have been associated with female gender stereotypical characteristics (Jogulu, & Wood, 2006).

“Democratic leadership”, which was explained as a style whereby the leader pursued an open, trusting, and follower-oriented relationship. Leaders who adopted this style encouraged followers to establish their own policies, provided them with a perspective by explaining in advance the procedures for accomplishing the goals, and granted the followers independence to commence their own tasks and congratulating them in an objective manner. According to Bass (1990), this leadership style originated from America, and leaders adopting this style were described as caring, considerate, and easy to compromise and they also had a sense of responsibility and attachment to their followers (Jogulu, & Wood, 2006).
A third leadership style was described as “laissez-faire” leadership. The term laissez-faire means to let others act without interference, and according to the early studies of Stogdill (1974) laissez-faire refers to the extent that leadership is either avoided or attempted (Bass, 1990). Laissez-faire leaders were thought to have less confidence in their supervisory duties, or in their capability to manage, often avoiding meeting with their subordinates (Bass, 1990; Jogulu & Wood, 2006).

Clark (2007(a)) developed an instrument “The Leadership Style Questionnaire” to measure the three dimensions proposed by Lewin (1951). The aforementioned instrument was used in the empirical data collection process in this research. The construct of “leadership style” is discussed in the following sections.

Leadership styles can be measured for various organisational purposes and research. The Leadership Style Questionnaire is used in this research to collect data for the empirical study. The three dimensions of the instrument are: the authoritarian leadership style, the participative leadership style and the delegative leadership style. These dimensions are conceptualised in the next sections, commencing with the authoritarian leadership style (Bushman, 2007).

2.9.1 The Authoritarian Leadership Style

In order to manage an organisation effectively, managers should employ certain leadership styles to attract employee followership. Such styles are, therefore, discussed in the next sections.

According to Bushman (2007, p.1), “the authoritarian leadership style is used by managers who want or need to have full power in decision-making. This style is often expressed by the manager telling employees specifically what to do and how to do it, and is most often necessary when time is of the essence.” The extent to which supervisors or managers go about explaining the overall objectives of the organisation plays an important role in how the subordinates understand the
objectives, and how they foresee themselves playing an important role to attain these objectives.

Objectives must be explained in an understandable way, in order for the subordinates to either filter down this information to fellow employees, or in trying to set clear objectives for himself/herself. An individual who employs the authoritarian leadership style would in all probability tell subordinates what to do and how to do it.

In a study conducted by Oshagbemi (2008, p.1906), he states that “higher level organisational leaders tend to give only broad outlines, opinions and suggestions rather than directives to their lower managers. On the other hand, supervisors or foremen often need to give specific directives to facilitate operatives in doing exactly what is expected of them and when.”

Clark (in Bushman, 2007, p.1) states that this particular style should not be used too frequently, as it could lead to the perception of bossiness on the manager’s part by subordinates and employees. And this may result in reduced employee motivation and reduced dedication in the work situation.

Goleman (2000) is of the opinion that an individual who uses the authoritarian leadership style has the ability to motivate people and make them realise that the work they do fits into the larger vision of the organization. These employees thus understand and realise that what they do on a daily basis matters, and they understand why. This particular leadership style has the ability to maximise commitment to the organization’s goals and strategy. The authoritarian leader clearly states the end of the task, but gives subordinates plenty of leeway to devise their own means. They therefore have the freedom to be innovative, to experiment and to take calculated risks.

This particular business style is effective when a business is off-track in terms of its vision (Goleman, 2000). The leader then has the ability to chart a new course and to set his people on a fresh long-term vision. As with every leadership style, it has the
The ability to yield various outcomes. The limitations for this particular style is when a leader of the team is working with experts who are more experienced than he is; they may see the leader as being out-of-touch. Secondly, when the leader who is trying to be authoritarian becomes too overbearing, s/he may undermine the egalitarian spirit of an effective team (Goleman, 2000).

The next leadership style to be discussed is the participative leadership style.

### 2.9.2 The Participative Leadership Style

According to Clark 2007 (in Bushman, 2007, p.1), “the participative leadership style is used by managers who want or need to include employees when making decisions.” When this style is used, the manager encourages or expects employees to provide input that could help the manager make a final decision. This style is most often used when the manager has some of the information, and the employees also have some of the information that is needed to make a decision.

According to Clark (2007a), this particular leadership style promotes employee commitment and improves the employee morale within the organisation. This may be because the employees play an active role in the decision-making process, which gives them a feeling of importance and worth. This leadership style should also improve the employee-management relations amongst the staff, and it is a good policy to implement this style as often as is practical.

The participative leadership style is “ideal when a leader is himself uncertain about the best direction to take and needs ideas and guidance from able employees” (Goleman, 2000, p.85). Leaders may have a strong vision, but nevertheless, the generating of fresh ideas for executing that vision is appreciated from fellow employees. The benefits of using this particular leadership style – in which a large portion of the time is spent getting people’s ideas and buy-in – a leader has the ability to build trusting relationships, respect and commitment from fellow employees.
Employees could thereby have a say in the decision-making process, which would affect their goals and the manner in which they do their work, thereby initiating flexibility and responsibility amongst employees. In doing so, the leader therefore has the ability to maintain a high morale amongst the employees. With this in mind, employees who are exposed to the participative leadership style tend to be realistic about what can and cannot be accomplished in terms of goals and objectives.

The limitation of this style is when employees are not competent or informed enough to offer advice or clarity (Goleman, 2000). This may result in endless meetings, where consensus remains elusive, where the scheduling of more meetings is the only result. Individuals who operate in the participative style of leadership use the style to delay making crucial decisions, hoping that enough thrashing out would eventually yield insight. Employees often feel confused and leaderless; and this may often escalate conflicts.

“The participative leadership style, is the extent to which the manager shares a consensual decision-making process with [his or] her subordinates, or others, to achieve [his or] her objectives” (Oshagbemi, 2008, p. 1906). This decision-making process is, consequently, a joint one between the managers and the subordinates; they, therefore, all have an opportunity to makes some input, and are able to share ideas and suggestions regarding the specific objective at hand.

The next leadership style that will be discussed is the delegative style.

2.9.3 The Delegative Leadership Style

The delegative leadership style is used by managers who want or need to allow employees to make the final decision Clark, (in Bushman 2007, p.1-2). However, the manager is ‘still responsible for the decisions that are made.’ A good manager will realise that there are times when he or she cannot and should not spend the time necessary to do the research needed, in order to make a decision, particularly when
there are knowledgeable and perfectly capable employees who could be given the task.

This style shows employees that the manager trusts them, and this should improve their morale.

According to Clark (in Bushman, 2007), a manager who uses the delegative leadership style would only use this style when the situation is right and should not use it excessively. An overuse of this particular style portrays the manager as being lazy, and may cause high stress levels in the employees who are making all the decisions.

The delegative leadership style is the extent to which the manager attains the desired objectives by leaving subordinates or others free to make their own decisions (Oshagbemi, 2008, p. 1907). The latter study suggests that older workers, other things being equal, have a tendency to delegate more than younger workers. This could be a consequence of their specific organisational responsibility, for example, to train the lower-level managers or less experienced workers (Oshagbemi, 2008, p. 1907), possibly because they feel insecure, and are trying to make a good impression.

In a study conducted by Oshagbemi (2008), he further suggests that in relation to their management level, the age of delegative managers is important in explaining whether or not they would leave subordinates alone to make and implement their own decisions. While older managers tend to leave subordinates alone and/or encourage them to make their own decisions, younger managers tend to make the decisions for their subordinates (Oshagbemi, 2008, p. 1907).

Oshagbemi, (2008, p. 1906-1907), suggests that consultation and participation tend to diminish the higher one goes in the organisational hierarchy. This depicts an ideal situation where consultation and participation are highest lower down the organisational hierarchy, and diminish as one goes upwards. It can therefore, be
assumed that there is more involvement in terms of ensuring that objectives are set and met at the lower levels of the organisation, depending on the specific leadership style that is being used by employees who are in the position of leadership.

With the role of technology being on the increase in the world, as well as in organisations, many older employees may not be able to cope with the demands of change, and may frequently have to consult with their younger employees to assist them with specific tasks. At times, younger employees may not be willing to help the older employees with specific problems or tasks. Therefore, according to the study conducted by Oshagbemi (2008, p. 1907), he suggests that the older an employee, the greater the level of consultation and participation that s/he tends to engage in within organisations in the performance of the job.

As a result of the greater use of more and more technology today, and the use of more team work, older workers consult beneficially with others, including younger workers. Older workers are often eager to participate with other workers to share their experiences and facilitate faster or better performance of organisational duties and tasks.

Bushman (2007) is of the opinion that the most effective managers use leadership styles that are determined by a combination of the cognitive choice theory and the personality theory (p.2). Deliberately choosing the appropriate leadership style based on the situation, combined with using the leadership style that is most comfortable for the manager in terms of his or her individual personality, can lead to very effective leadership. It is thus best to use a combination of leadership styles (Bushman, 2007, p.2).

According to Germano (2010) Leadership has a direct effect on relationship within organisations and their success. They influence institutional strategies including their execution and effectiveness. Leaders can appear at any level of an institution and are not exclusive to management. Furthermore, a core factor in individual behaviour is cognition and thinking. Researchers (Van Eron & Burke, 1992; Yang et al., 2010)
therefore have demonstrated there is relationship between leadership/executive style and cognition. The three cognitive styles identified by Cools and Van den Broeck (2007) are further discussed in this chapter. It should be mentioned that the relationship between the said constructs found by Van Eron and Burke (1992) as well as in Cools and Van der Broeck (2007) (see chapter 1) in executive samples were of either of a descriptive or a qualitative nature. The same can be said of the relationship found by Yang et al. (2010). In the latter research the transactional/transformational model of leadership and different cognitive style dimensions were used that is quite different from this research. In the aforementioned research reports that the researcher came across, no reference was made to any cultural (ethnic) differences that was investigated.

2.10 Summary of leadership styles

This chapter has clearly outlined what leadership is, and how leadership can be utilised by various individuals in a position of leadership.

The chapter is concluded with three dimensions of the leadership questionnaire utilised for this study.

The next section discusses the three dimensions of the cognitive styles, according to the Cognitive Style Questionnaire (CoSI).

2.11 Cognitive Styles

Research reports on this topic are diverse and cognitive styles have been researched for the past few centuries (Cools & Van den Broeck, 2007; Foxall & Hackett, 1994; Kirton, 1976; Kaufman, 2004) and there has been an increased interest in this new phenomenon – especially within organisations. As a result of the limited information available on the topic, there is a lot of potential research that could be done in the near future relating to cognitive styles.
An individual’s cognitive style is defined as “a person’s preferred way of gathering, processing and evaluating information. Cognitive styles influence people with regards to how they scan their environment for information, how they organise and interpret information, and how they integrate their interpretations into the mental model and subjective theories that guide their actions” (Hayes & Allinson, 1998, p. 850). It is important to understand that each individual will therefore gather, process and evaluate information in a specific way, and may be influenced by the setting in which a person finds him or herself.

Kirton (1976) developed and introduced the adaptation-innovation theory, whereby individuals’ cognitive style can be determined and, subsequently, adapted on a continuum scale. Kirton’s (2003) Adaption Innovation Theory was based on the assumption that all people solve problems and are creative. In order to solve problems, however, people employ different cognitive styles.

Kirton (1976) described adaptors as “doing things better”. “They prefer to improve the team and/or organisation within the existing framework” (Kaufman, 2004. in Stum, 2009, p.68). Kirton (1976) identified the adaptors with the following descriptors:

- Concerned with solving problems rather than finding them;
- Seeking solutions to problems in tried and understood ways;
- Maintaining high accuracy in long spells of detailed work;
- Rarely challenging the rules;
- Sensitive to maintaining group cohesion; and
- Providing a safe base for the innovator’s riskier options.

He (Kirton) further referred to innovators “as those who would prefer to do things differently” (Kirton, in Stum, 2009, p. 69); and he described innovators as:

- Seemingly undisciplined, approaching tasks from unexpected angles;
- Treating generally accepted means with little regard in pursuit of goals;
• Capable of detailed tasks only in short bursts;
• Providing the dynamics to bring about periodic revolutionary change; and
• Having low levels of self-doubt when generating ideas.

Considering why people interact and respond in a specific way is very intriguing to those who conduct research on this subject. The concept of cognitive styles within the workplace requires much needed research and clarification, as it could assist in understanding the employees or organisation better, and may bridge the dearth of research. Cools (2009) states that “ideally future research in the field of cognitive styles should evolve towards ‘pragmatic science’, which combines high theoretical rigour with high practical relevance.”

Cognitive styles have been researched from various aspects over the past few years and many researchers have developed their research instruments – trying to establish and understand the manner in which an individual’s cognitive style works (Cools and Van Den Broeck, 2008; Kirton, 1976). The information below will conceptualise the concept of cognitive styles and provide insight into and assist in finding a relationship between leadership styles and cognitive styles.

Within an organisation it is interesting to ascertain why some employees are able to perform very well in specific tasks, whereas others perform their specific job in a less satisfactory manner. According to Streufort and Nogami (1989, in Sadler-Smith, 1998, p.186), this may be due to an “individual’s inherent way of organising and processing information, i.e. his or her cognitive style”. If this is the case, cognitive style has important implications for the management of human resources. The evidence suggests that cognitive style is linked in some way to personality traits; however, style has a greater functional proximity and relevance to the workplace than has personality (it may be considered a behavioural manifestation of personality).

This would then influence the manner in which the person handles the specific task at hand.
Messick (1984, in Sadler-Smith, 1998) described cognitive style as “characteristic modes of perceiving, remembering and problem-solving, reflective of information processing regularities that develop in congenial ways around underlying personality trends”. Whereas Witkin, Moore, Goodenough and Cox (1977, in Sadler-Smith, 1998) described cognitive style as “individual differences in the way people perceive, think, solve problems, learn and relate to others.” They further argued that this broad definition extends across both perceptual and intellectual activities; and they suggest that there are four main characteristics of cognitive styles, namely:

- They are concerned with the form rather than the content of learning;
- There are pervasive dimensions that can be assessed non-verbally;
- They are stable over time;
- They are bipolar.

Messick (1984, in Sadler-Smith, 1998) further suggests three characteristics of cognitive styles, namely:

- Bi-polarity;
- Value differentiation (i.e. they reflect qualitative rather than quantitative differences in thinking processes);
- Pervasiveness.

Riding (1991, in Sadler-Smith, 1998) described cognitive styles as:

- Reflecting the fundamental make-up of one’s personality;
- In-built and automatic ways of responding to information and situations;
- Stable and pervasive; and
- Kirton’s model is built on the assumptions that style is orthogonal to (i.e. conceptually independent of: [i] cognitive capacity; [ii] success; [iii] cognitive techniques; and [iv] coping behaviour).

Kirton (2003) recognises “the need for understanding cognitive style within the context of globalisation, as a result of managers that are faced with the problem of leading diverse teams in a rapidly changing culture”. Research conducted by
Jablokow and Booth (2006) defines the “cognitive gap” as: “The difference between difficulty of a specific problem and the cognitive ability of the problem-solvers seeking the solution, and the difference between the cognitive styles of the problem-solvers themselves” (p. 71-72).

Buffington, Jablokow and Martin (2002, in Stum, 2009, p. 72) researched the benefits of recognising an individual’s cognitive style within team dynamics. When noticing and valuing the cognitive gaps within the organisation, they observed the following characteristics, namely:

- Conformity and consensus – while adaptors tend to place more emphasis on group conformity, an understanding of the different cognitive styles brought about more consensus within the work groups;
- Relevance – understanding the cognitive gaps allowed adaptors to view the innovators’ contributions with more relevance. Understanding the cognitive styles of other individuals added value to their suggestions concerning problem-solving; and
- Conflict – while conflict exists between innovators and adaptors, an understanding of the cognitive gap reduced the conflict between the work groups.

This particular research, Cools and Van den Broeck (2008) developed a reliable, convenient and multi-dimensional cognitive style instrument, namely: the Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI), for use with managerial and professional groups (Cools and Van Den Broeck, 2008. p.103). This instrument was developed to measure cognitive styles in a sample of managers in a qualitative study.

The Cognitive Style Indicator (Cools & Van den Broeck, 2007), which was validated by previous research identifies, is a specific model, which distinguishes between three cognitive styles: a knowing style, a planning style, and a creating style. “People scoring high on the knowing style prefer rational and impersonal ways of information processing, and have strong analytical skills. They search for accuracy, and like to
make informed decisions on the basis of a thorough analysis of the facts and figures and logical arguments. People who score high on the planning style are attracted by structure and control; and they prefer a well-organised work environment. Planners therefore, like to make decisions in a structured way and are mostly concerned with the efficiency of the process. People who score high on the creating style search for renewal and prefer dynamic environments. They like to work in a flexible way and have a preference for a creative and unconventional ways of decision-making” (Cools and Vanderheyden, 2009, pp. 5-6).

The table below (Table 2.13.1) identifies the dimensions and facets of the cognitive style framework, as suggested by Cools and Van den Broeck, (2008, p.104).

Table 2.13.1: Dimensions and facets of cognitive styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowing Style</th>
<th>Planning Style</th>
<th>Creating Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>Possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical</td>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>Open-ended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>Organised</td>
<td>Novelty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational</td>
<td>Systematic</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Inventive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Cools & Van den Broeck (2008, p.104)

The table above clearly provides insight into the understanding of what an individual’s cognitive style entails; and it assists in identifying how an individual’s cognitive style may impact on his/her daily activities in the work place.

At this stage, it may be concluded that the specific aim of the present study (see section 1.5.2) was achieved by conceptualizing the leadership and cognitive styles in an integrated literature review.
2.14 Chapter Summary

This theoretical chapter has discussed the three concepts of leadership styles, namely the authoritarian, delegative and participative leadership styles. It has further elaborated on the characteristics of good leaders including the overlap between management and leadership. It is clear that there is a vast array of research relating to the concept of leadership, which has been the main focus during the past few years.

As regards the theoretical component of cognitive styles, there has not been much research done in this area; and it is clear that there is dearth of research relating to whether there is a relationship between an individual’s cognitive style and leadership style. The purpose of this research is to explore such a possible relationship.

This chapter, therefore, concludes the literature review for the study. The next chapter will discuss the methodology employed for the empirical study.
CHAPTER 3
Methodology

3.1 Introduction
The previous chapters focused specifically on the literature relating to leadership styles, as well as cognitive styles. This chapter describes the research design and the research methodology used in this study.

3.2 Research Design
A cross-sectional quantitative research design is envisaged for the following research endeavour; and this will be described below.

According to Kerlinger and Lee (2000), quantitative research emanates from the post-positivistic tradition, where the major constituents are physical objectives and processes. It is based on the assumption that knowledge comes from the observations of the physical world. Investigators who utilise this quantitative research process are able to make inferences, based on direct observations or specific derivatives of the direct observations. The goal, therefore, of quantitative research is to describe a cause-and-effect relationship between variables that have been identified.

However, whereas cause and effect also constitute a relationship between variables, this study would only concentrate on the relationship between variables – and not on the cause-and-the effect relationship.

De Vos, Strydom, Fouche, and Delport, (2005, p.73) have identified the following characteristics of quantitative research, namely:

- It is based on the epistemological roots of the positivist approach to research;
- The main purpose is to test predicted cause-and-effect hypotheses on social reality;
• The methods utilised are based on deductive logic;
• Quantitative research is suitable for a study of a phenomenon, which is conceptually and theoretically well-developed;
• The research design utilised is of a standardised nature, and is a fixed procedure that can be replicated for future studies;
• The data are collected in a systematic way, and in a standardised manner; and
• The resultant concepts are converted into operational decisions; and the results are in a numeric form and reported in statistical language.

The dependent and independent variables under investigation have already been discussed in Chapter 1. These variables, and the units of analysis, are not repeated in this chapter.

3.3 The Research Method

In this section discusses critical elements entailed in the methodology of the research are discussed. Aspects, such as population and sample, measuring instruments, data-collection and processing are discussed.

3.3.1 Population

The target population may be defined as “the entire group of possible respondents to [the] survey question. Since it is impossible to [examine] every new member of the population, one must [limit the] survey to every individual in the target population; one must survey a smaller sub-group of the population, known as a sample” (Knowledge-Base, 2005, p.1). The research population for this study included all the permanent employees, without differentiating between hourly or classified staff in the organisation, who are in a supervisory role, while having at least one or more employees reporting to him/her.
This includes both gender groups and the four racial groups reflected in the South African population. The individuals who were chosen for the sample met the necessary requirements of having subordinates reporting to them.

The population for the study, which is situated in a Port Elizabeth automotive manufacturing factory, includes all permanent employees, not differentiating between hourly or classified staff in the organisation, who are in a supervisory role, and who have at least two or more individuals reporting to him/her. This includes both gender groups and the four racial groups reflected in the South African society.

### 3.3.2 Sample criteria

The population and sample of the research were discussed in Chapter 1. The sample criteria are discussed in this section.

According to De Vos et al. (1998), a key requirement for selection is that all the individuals of the population must have the same chance of being drawn in the sample specified. Therefore, an equal opportunity will be created for all of the 300 employees to be selected for participation in the study. The sampling technique to be employed for the research endeavour is that of probability, or a random sampling method. According to De Vos et al. (1998, p.100), “probability or random sampling occurs when the probability of including each element of the population can be determined”.

Thus, a sample that is randomly selected, whereby each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected in the sample, is imperative.

The organisation has more than 300 employees who are in supervisory positions, with at least one or more subordinates reporting to them. Therefore, an equal opportunity was created for all of the three hundred employees to be selected to participate in the study. Thus, the inclusion criteria for the sample were that:
• The participant had to occupy a position in which they had subordinates reporting to them;
• They had to be permanent employees of the company;
• They could be either male or female;
• Be literate, in order to read the questionnaires; and
• They had to agree to participate in the research study.

The participants varied from the various racial and gender backgrounds, as well as economic backgrounds. Hourly employees were included in the study; therefore, there was no distinction between so-called blue-collar workers or white-collar workers. The number of employees who participated in the data-collection process was 115.

3.3.3 Measuring instruments

In this section the measuring instruments employed during this research project are discussed. In this section, the instruments highlighted in Chapter 1 will be explained in terms of the nature, interpretation, rationale and motivation for their use, as well as the validity and reliability. A copy of the biographical data questionnaire (Appendix A), the Leadership Style Questionnaire and Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI) used during the research project is filed as Appendices B and C, respectively; and the invitation to participate in the study as Appendix D.

The instruments used in this particular research have been used before in other research projects; however, the Leadership Style Questionnaire has thus far been used very rarely. The reliability and validity of the questionnaires will be reported on in this chapter. The biographical questionnaire will be the first instrument to be introduced in the following section.

3.4 The Biographical Questionnaire
A biographical questionnaire was compiled; and it is, therefore, a structured blank form (Appendix A). This particular questionnaire collects data relevant to gender, race, age, educational qualifications, length of service and the number of years in the current position. The following sections below will discuss the nature of administration, the rationale, and the reliability and validity of the instrument. Some of the questions included are information on race, gender and age. How long they have been employed (service history), how long they have been in a supervisory position, and how many subordinates they have reporting to them

3.4.1 Nature, administration and interpretation

The biographical questionnaire is a paper-and-pencil instrument; and it is a self-administered questionnaire. Written instructions were conveyed to the participants. There was no specific time limit imposed while the participants completed the biographical questionnaire. Participants would, on average, take three to five minutes to complete this particular questionnaire.

3.4.2 Rationale of and motivation for application of the instrument

The biographical information received is essential for the researcher, in order to categorize the participants and to obtain a perspective on the sample, for example, the age of the participants and whether the sample has an equal number of male and female participants, and suchlike. A biographical instrument is included to evaluate the possible variance in terms of biographic characteristics in the sample.

3.4.3 The reliability and validity of the instrument

Researchers (Gregory 2004; Smit, 1986) are of the opinion that biographical questionnaires usually collate data of biographical nature, and are reliable when respondents do not have any personal interest in the use of the information provided by them.
The next section will discuss the instrument used to measure leadership styles.

3.5 Leadership Style questionnaire

The above-mentioned instrument (Appendix B) measures leadership styles (Clark, 2007). The following section deals with the nature of administration and the interpretation of the instrument. The rationale and motivation of the instrument is discussed, followed by a discussion on its reliability and validity.

3.5.1 Nature, administration and interpretation

The leadership style questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert intensity response scale ranging from 1 (almost never true) to an intensity of 3 (occasionally true) to 5 (almost always true). The questionnaire takes approximately eight minutes to complete. The respondents are expected to circle the appropriate answer that best typifies them in terms of leadership. This particular instrument can be administered in groups or to individuals. The instrument consists of thirty statements.

A Likert scale is defined as “a type of closed-ended question that allows respondents to indicate how closely their feelings match the question or statement on a rating scale. It is good for measuring the degree of respondents' feelings or attitudes about something” (Knowledge – Base, 2005, p.1).

The paper-and-pencil questionnaire is in a statement format, and is self-administered with written instructions to the participants. Thus, for interpretation purposes, the questionnaires were checked to ensure that all the questions – with their answers - had been completed. The scores were then added up by using the scoring sheet, which depicts three different leadership styles, namely: Delegative, Participative and Authoritarian. The style that receives the highest score illustrates the particular respondent's leadership style.

In this research project, the data obtained by means of the questionnaire was analysed using Statistica (2009) and SPSS (1998).
3.5.2 Rationale of and motivation for application of the instrument

“The Leadership Style Questionnaire” developed by Clark (2007) was founded on Lewin and his colleagues (Lewin et al. 1939) theory of leadership styles called the democratic (participative), autocratic (authoritarian) and laissez-faire (delegative) style. The instrument was developed for management development and for generic purposes. Lewin et al.’s (1939) theory is the first theory explaining the leader’s style and interaction with subordinates and decision-making of managers (Jogulu, & Wood, 2006; Niehm & Miller, 2006; Yousef, 1998). Lewin’s theory pioneered many other theories such as the Ohio Studies and the Likert System (Sagie & Kowlosky, 2000) but while current leadership theories have grown in sophistication and breadth, they have not translated into a comparable range of effective practices and would therefore not suitable for this research (Zaccaro & Horn, 2003).

The questionnaire, which focuses on the three major dimensions of leadership, is important for the study that has been conducted, as it provides insight into the various leadership styles that managers and supervisors employ in their day-to-day activities, tasks, goals and interaction with colleagues in the workplace. The developer, Don Clark, provided permission to use the instrument (See Appendix E)

3.5.3 Reliability and validity of the instrument

The instrument was not validated before (Personal Communication, D. Clark, April, 11, 2008). A pilot study was conducted using 13 completed Leadership style questionnaires obtained from the same sample of individuals within the motor industry, as there was no additional evidence to conclude that the particular questionnaire yielded a good reliability coefficient. The Cronbach alpha coefficient was run, using the SPSS (1998) statistical package; and it yielded a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.59, which is between moderate and high, and can still be utilised for practical and theoretical research purposes (Smit, 1986).
Smit (1986) suggests that a cut-off reliability coefficient of 0.50 is sufficient when instruments are used in groups, while a coefficient of 0.95 is required for individual use (e.g. in psychometrics).

3.6 Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI)

The above-mentioned instrument measures the cognitive styles of employees in the research (Appendix C). The following section deals with the nature of administration and the interpretation of the instrument. The rationale and motivation for the use of the instrument are discussed here, followed by a discussion of its reliability and validity.

3.6.1 Nature, administration and interpretation

The Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI) was developed by Cools and van den Broeck (2007) and it comprises a 5-point Likert response scale, namely: “Doesn’t typify me at all” (1), while 3 represents (“neutral”), to “Typifies me totally” (5). The paper-and-pencil questionnaire is in a statement format and is self-administered. The instrument consists of eighteen statements. Written guidelines were given in the covering letter on how to complete the questionnaire.

The questionnaire takes approximately five minutes to complete. The respondents are expected to circle the appropriate answer that best typifies them in terms of their cognitive style. This particular instrument can be administered in groups, or to individuals.

3.6.2 The rationale and motivation for the application of the instrument

The main objective of this research is to determine the relationship between leadership and cognitive styles. The Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI) developed by Cools and Van Der Broeck (2007) distinct itself from other cognitive style instruments (Martin, 1998; Meins et al., 2012) in that it was developed for the work environment
as well as for the assessment of cognitive styles among managers (Cools and Van der Broeck, 2007). A further distinction is that it is, in contrast with other instruments, founded on Mintzberg’s (1976) theory that individual managers vary in the way they planning and making decisions. The instrument is therefore suitable for use in this research as it would probably show differences between individuals sampled for this research.

The use of this questionnaire will assist in providing insight into which cognitive styles are related to influence an individual’s behaviour in terms of his/her leadership styles. Therefore, this particular questionnaire was used, as it affords the researcher insight into managerial-supervisory style awareness; and it includes the three different cognitive styles.

Permission was requested and granted from the developers to utilise the questionnaire for this particular research project (Appendix F).

3.6.3 The reliability and validity of the instrument

Item and factor analyses demonstrated the internal consistency and homogeneity of the three cognitive styles, namely: knowing, planning and creating style. Substantial support was found for the instrument’s construct validity by including other cognitive style instruments, as well as personality and ability measures in the validation process. Criterion-related validity was confirmed by an examination of the relationships between these cognitive styles and the work-related characteristics. The developers considered there to be main contributions: (a) The development of a reliable cognitive style instrument for use in organisations, and in (b) the further refinement of the analytic-intuitive cognitive style dimension by splitting the analytic pole in a knowing and planning style (Cools, & van den Broeck, 2006, p. 24).

Cools and van den Broeck (2007) developed the Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI), in the form of an 18-item questionnaire. According to the developers, three studies were conducted to validate this particular questionnaire. The first study took part in a
large-scale research project regarding career decision-making. The second study was part of an internet-based research project, where it was used as a competence indicator. In the third study the instrument was administered to MBA students completing a Management and Organisation course. Cronbach alpha coefficients between 0.81 and 0.85 were obtained in the third study regarding the three dimensions of the scale.

3.7 Permission to conduct the study

The researcher set up a meeting with the HR manager to discuss the possibility of using General Motors South Africa’s employees as a sample for the proposed research project. Permission was granted from the Human Resources Department.

3.8 Procedure

The researcher requested that a report be run and compiled by the HR Systems Administrator, in order to eliminate all those employees who did not have any subordinates reporting to them. The report included both hourly and salaried employees. From the report, a sample of 200 employees was identified to participate in the study.

Further explanation (Appendix D) stipulates that participation in the study is on a voluntary basis, and that each participant’s confidentiality and anonymity would be maintained throughout the research study.

A total of 200 questionnaires were handed out to prospective participants during the month of June 2009, of which 120 questionnaires were returned, with only 115 which were usable and a return rate of 57.5%.

All the questionnaires were hand-delivered to all the participants, and were either returned via the internal mail system, hand-delivered to the researcher, or collected by the researcher after approximately seven days. The researcher maintained a list
of all the names of the prospective participants to whom questionnaires were given. The researcher ensured that all the relevant information had been completed when the questionnaires were collected.

A follow-up e-mail was sent to all those participants who had not returned their questionnaires – reminding them that they should complete the questionnaires and return them to the researcher as soon as possible.

### 3.9 Data-processing

The three questionnaires were compiled in a booklet for each participant who participated in the study. A consent form was included when explaining that participation in the study was on a voluntary basis, and that each participant’s confidentiality and anonymity would be maintained throughout the research study.

All the questionnaires were hand-delivered to the participants, and were collected in seven days’ time. The researcher saw to it that a list of all the participants identified was updated – to ensure that all the necessary questionnaires had been collected. The researcher ensured that all the relevant information had been completed when the questionnaires were collected.

All relevant departmental head secretaries were advised on who had received the questionnaires, and they followed up with all the relevant participants.

The software packages were utilised to, analyse, understand and determine the differences and relationship between individuals’ cognitive and leadership styles. These packages will be listed in the next section.

### 3.10 Data Analysis

A total of 120 questionnaires were returned, of which only 115 could be used. Raw data obtained from the questionnaires were converted into descriptive statistics for
analysis purposes. Microsoft Excel (2007) software was used to capture all the relevant information. The SPSS (1998) and Statistica (2009) research software package was utilised to, analyse, understand and determine the differences and relationship between an individual’s cognitive and leadership styles.

The results of the study are reported in the form of descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics yielded the following core elements: frequencies, the mean, standard deviation, kurtosis, and skewness. Inferential techniques included the assumptions on instruments’ significant levels, as well as on exploratory factor analysis.

The data sets have been displayed in summarised tables. The results were interpreted and explained in terms of existing research literature. A detailed summary of the results will be made available to the Vice-President of the Human Resources department, as well as to all the employees who participated in the study. The results obtained from the study will be used to assist the company to develop a model with, specific competencies and requirements for leadership positions – for the recruitment and selection process – as well as for future progression and succession planning.

3.11 Ethical responsibility to participants

To ensure that the research project is conducted within an ethical framework, the following considerations need to be borne in mind:

- All literature that was consulted is fully acknowledged and referenced appropriately;
- Consent was obtained from the organisation, as well as from all employees;
- Confidentiality was maintained based on fair assessment practice; and
- The respondents were all dealt with courteously, respectfully and in an impartial manner.
A covering letter explaining the research project, in addition to any queries or concerns that were raised by the participants, was discussed with them in person. The respondents were informed that a final report would be made available to the organisation for review and would be available for their perusal as well.

3.12 Chapter Summary

The research methodology and procedure of the study were outlined in this chapter. The study was based on a quantitative research design in which the participants were requested to complete a biographical questionnaire, to answer a section on leadership style, and some questions on cognitive style. The data collected from the completed questionnaires were captured and analysed using the SPSS (1998) and Statistica (2009) software. The results of the analysis will be discussed and presented in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4
Data analysis and results

4.1 Chapter Overview

In this chapter, the results obtained from the data analysis of the two instruments used during the study will be discussed in detail. In order to gain insight into the sample, the descriptive statistics, including the biographical details of the research participants obtained from the biographical questionnaire, will also be discussed. Thereafter, the results of the two measures, namely: the Leadership Style Questionnaire and the Cognitive Style Inventory (CoSI) are presented individually, in order to gain insight into the descriptive results, as well as to determine whether there is a relationship between the various aims of the study.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics of the biographical questionnaire

The biographical information that will be discussed below pertains to the information obtained from the biographical questionnaire (Appendix A), which was completed by the participants of the study. The information obtained includes data relating to gender, age, race, educational qualifications, length of service and the number of years in their current position.

4.2.1 Age

Table 4.1 is a distribution in terms of the various age groups reflected in the sample. The age group 30 to 39 years is the largest group, followed by the group aged between 40 and 49 years. The smallest group is represented by participants aged between 20 and 29 years; and this is followed by the group of 50 years and older.
Table 4.1 Sample distribution: Age (Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29 yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 yrs</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 yrs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+ yrs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2 Gender

The Gender-Distribution Table of the sample is depicted below in Table 4.2. Seventy-four per cent of the participants included in the study were males, whilst only 26% were females.

Table 4.2: Distribution of Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Racial Groups

Table 4.3 is a summary of the sample’s racial groups. Twenty of the participants were Africans; 55 participants (48%) were Coloureds; 34 participants (30%) were Whites and the remaining 4 participants (3%) were Asians. There were no participants in the other category. The single largest racial group consisted of individuals who see themselves as coloureds.

Table 4.3: Distribution of Racial Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.4 Educational Qualifications

The educational levels of the participants are shown below in Table 4.4. Fifty percent of the 115 participants had a Grade 10 – N6 educational qualification; 26% had obtained a National Diploma; 13% had obtained a degree; and the remaining 10 percent had obtained a postgraduate qualification. It seems that half of the sample (50%) had qualifications of Grade 10 - N6; while the remaining respondents had either a diploma or some other degree. The respondents seem to have been a relatively highly educational group.

Table 4.4: Distribution of Educational Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational qualification</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10 – N6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Diploma</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Total                     | 115| 100%

4.2.5 Length of Service

The sample distribution in terms of length of service is depicted in Table 4.5. The average employee’s length of service ranged from two years to a maximum of four years. Fourteen (12%) of the total number of participants included in the sample, had a length of service that equalled two years; 15 (13%) of the employees totalled an amount of three years; and 86 (75%) employees had been employed for longer than four years.

Table 4.5: Distribution of Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service (years)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.6 Number of years in current position

Table 4.6 reflects the sample distribution in terms of years in an employee’s current position. Of the 115 participants who participated in the study, 19 (17%) of the employees had been in their current position for at least one year. Sixty-four (56%) employees had been in their position for two years; 23 (20%) employers had been in their position for three years; while 9 (8%) of the employees had been in their position for a period of four years and longer. The majority of the participants (56%) were in the group that had been employed for two years.

Table 4.6: Number of years in current position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in current position</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.7 Number of subordinates reporting to each supervisor/manager

The table below (Table 4.7) illustrates the number of employees that report to supervisors or managers. The minimum number of employees that report to any particular manager or supervisor is currently two, with a maximum of 82 employees. The mean for the number of subordinates reporting to each supervisor is 9.26.

Table 4.7: Number of subordinates reporting to each supervisor/manager

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.8 Cronbach alpha coefficients for leadership styles
Table 4.8: Leadership styles Cronbach alpha coefficients

The reliability indices of the Leadership Style sub-scales are illustrated below in Table 4.8. The Authoritarian Leadership Style (LDS-A) obtained a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.68, The Delegative Style (LDS-D) 0.63, and the Participative Style (LDS-P) 0.71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LDS-A</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS-D</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDS-P</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.9 Cronbach alpha coefficients for cognitive styles

The reliability indices of the Cognitive Style sub-scales are illustrated below in Table 4.9. The Creating Cognitive style (COS-C) obtained a Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.74; the Knowing style (COS-K) 0.84; and the Planning style (COS-P) 0.90. If the criteria of the researchers (Kerlinger & Lee, 2000; Smit, 1986) are considered, the above reliability indices are all acceptable.

Table 4.9: Cognitive styles and Cronbach alpha coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scale</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COS-C</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS-K</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COS-P</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This instrument’s reliability coefficient is also acceptable for this research. The reliability of indices of both the instruments are well above the cut-off point (0.50) suggested by Smit (1986). Therefore, the instruments may be regarded as reliable for this study.

The section above described the descriptive statistics that were obtained from the analysis, as well as the reliability of the instruments. The following section discusses the descriptive statistics produced for the measuring instruments. The questionnaires
utilised in the study will also be discussed. The tables will highlight the data obtained during the analysis.

4.3 Descriptive statistics produced by measuring instruments

The following section describes the statistics produced for the Leadership Style Questionnaire.

4.3.1 Descriptive Statistics: Leadership Style Questionnaire

Table 4.10 shows the descriptive statistics produced by the three sub-scales of the Leadership Style Questionnaire. Delegative Leadership shows the greatest mean (33.77); this was followed by the Participative Leadership group with a mean of 31.98. Authoritative Leadership has the smallest mean of the three (28.55). The Authoritative and Participative leadership styles produced negative skew indices of -0.13 and -0.20, respectively with the Delegative style that produced a positive skew distribution (0.26) last.

Table 4.10: Descriptive Statistics: Leadership Style Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St.Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>28.55</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>33.77</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kurtosis indices of -0.38, -0.63 and 0.07 were produced by the three dimensions of Authoritative, Participative and Delegative leadership styles, respectively.

All three of the said styles produced indices on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test that could be regarded as normal distributions, since the \( p \) values were greater than 0.05 (0.83 > 0.05, 1.24 > 0.05 and 0.96 > 0.05, respectively) (Hinton, Brownlow, McMurry & Cozens, 2004).

4.3.2 Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI)
The following section describes the statistics produced by the Cognitive Style Indicator (COSI).

### 4.3.3 Descriptive Statistics: Cognitive Style Indicator

Table 4.11 shows the descriptive statistics produced by the three sub-scales of the Cognitive Style Indicator. The *Planning* sub-scale produced the greatest mean (28.33); this was followed by the *Creative* sub-scale (26.47). The *Knowing* sub-scale was the lowest (16.00). The three sub-scales also produced negative skew distributions (-1.48, -1.40 and -0.55, respectively). The three sub-scales also produced kurtosis indices of 3.08, 2.32 and 1.01, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St.Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COSK</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three the said styles produced indices on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test that could be regarded as normal distributions, since the *p* values were greater than 0.05 (1.81 > 0.05, 1.47 > 0.05 and 0.88 > 0.05, respectively) (Hinton et al., 2004).

### 4.3.4 Validity of instruments: Leadership Style Questionnaire

An initial principal component analysis (PCA) and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) were performed to determine the validity of the Leadership Style Questionnaire. There is no clear consensus in the literature about the minimum sample size for an exploratory factor analysis (Kline, 2013; Mundfrom, Shaw & Tian, 2005). However, Kline is of the opinion that a sample should not be lower than 100. It means that this research’s sample of 115 is just above the suggested size required for an EFA.

To verify whether the data generated by the instrument is suitable for a factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sample Adequacy (KMO) value 0.63 > 0.60 is above the cut-off and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity value is significant as *r* = 0.000 < 0.05.
An initial PCA revealed the presence of 10 components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 14%, 11%, 7%, 6%, 5%, 5%, 4%, 3%, 3% and 3% of the variance respectively. A further inspection of the data revealed that only two factors have more than two items loading on these factors. The remaining eight factors had maximum of two items loading on the respective factors. In order to purify the instrument, all items loading below .30 and those loading high on more than one factor were omitted. The following items were omitted: 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 21, 25, 26, 28, 29, 27 and 30. As a minimum of three items is required loading on a factor (see Pallant, 2010) it was decided to force a three factor structure as suggested by the developer.

The remaining items are displayed in Table 4.12 which is a factor transformation matrix.

Table 4.12 Factor transformation matrix of the Leadership Style Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Principal Axis Factor analysis was performed with a varimax rotation while enforcing three factors as suggested by the developer of the instrument. Although several items were omitted the three factor solution explains 46 of the total variance. The remaining items in the factor structure therefore suggest measuring the construct of leadership style what it was developed for.
4.3.5 Validity of instrument: Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI)

Like in the case of the Leadership Style Questionnaire, an initial PCA and EFA were performed to determine the validity of the Leadership Style Questionnaire. To verify whether the data generated by the instrument is suitable for a factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sample Adequacy (KMO) value 0.91 > 0.60 was found above the cut-off and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity value was significant as p = 0.000.

The instrument was previously used by Cools and Van Der Broeck (2007) and priori information was used to perform PCA and EFA. The initial PCA revealed the presence of four components with eigenvalues exceeding 1, explaining 41%, 9%, 6% and 5% of the variance respectively. A further inspection of the data revealed that component 4 has only two items loading on this particular component. All items loaded above $r = 0.30$ except item one that was omitted from further analyses.

Table 4.13 displays the items that were retained in a Factor transformation matrix of the Cognitive Style Indicator.

**Table 4.13  Factor transformation matrix of the Cognitive Style Indicator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A principal axis factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed while forcing a three factor structure. The three factors explain 60% of the total variance. It can be concluded that the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure.

4.3.6 Pearson correlation of scores on instruments

Table 4.14 displays a correlation matrix of the sub-scales relevant to the two instruments used in this research. Significant relationships will be discussed in this section. Several significant associations are noticed in the data display.

### Table 4.14: Pearson correlation of instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>AUTH</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>DELEG</th>
<th>COSK</th>
<th>COSP</th>
<th>COSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEG</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSK</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.24**</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.56**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

A strong positive association exists between Authoritative and Participative leadership (0.95, 2-tailed). Simultaneously, a weak positive relationship is detected between Delegative leadership and Participative leadership styles (0.19, 2-tailed). A weak positive relationship is reflected between a Knowing style and Delegative leadership (0.30, 2-tailed).

It is further noted that several relationships exist between some factors, namely: the Planning style and Participative leadership (0.24, 2-tailed), Delegative leadership (0.19, 1-tailed) and a Knowing cognitive style (0.75, 2-tailed). The first two mentioned are weak relationships, while the latter is strong. Similarly, positive relationships are depicted between Creative cognitive style and Delegative leadership style (0.24, 2-tailed), Knowing cognitive style (0.63, 2-tailed) and Planning cognitive style (0.56, 2-tailed). Except for the first mentioned, all are of a moderate strength.
On the one hand, it is interesting that relationships are reflected between the sub-scales of the Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI) (for example, Knowing, Planning and Creative) implying an interrelationship between factors of the same instrument. On the other hand, a similar relationship exists between Participative and Authoritative leadership styles. Those that do not reflect an association could be interpreted as conceptually opposite to each other. Those that do reflect a relationship may reflect a form of association, and probably because all the items share common variance with each other.

However, this is speculation and could only be confirmed by a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), which is beyond the scope of this research (Waugh & Chapman, 2005).

4.3.7 Pearson correlation for females

Table 4.15 depicts a Pearson correlation matrix of the instruments’ sub-scales when controlling for females’ responses whilst comparing the relationships between the sub-scales of the instruments.

Table 4.15: Pearson correlation for females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>AUTH</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>DELEG</th>
<th>COSK</th>
<th>CSP</th>
<th>COSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)  
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

A moderate positive relationship exists between Knowing cognitive style and Delegative leadership style (0.39, 2-tailed). Similarly, a moderate positive relationship is reflected between Planning cognitive style and Delegative leadership style (0.45, 2-tailed). Those females who have knowledge of the job content and who plan and analyse the work situation would delegate their responsibilities to subordinates with great confidence.
The said two relationships between female cognitive styles and the Delegative leadership style supports a study reported by Ivancevich, Konopaske and Matteson (2005), in which it was found that female leaders use a wide range of positive influence strategies in work relationships if they experience high levels of self-confidence.

These strategies, however, become narrowed if the woman lacks confidence in her leadership position. According to Landy and Conte (2010), women prefer democratic and participative leadership styles instead of the autocratic leadership style.

### 4.3.8 Pearson Correlation for males

Table 4.16 depicts a Pearson correlation matrix of the instruments’ sub-scales when controlling for males’ responses and comparing the relationships between the sub-scales of the instruments. Significant relationships are discussed in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>AUTH</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>DELEG</th>
<th>COSK</th>
<th>COSP</th>
<th>COSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEG</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSK</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

A weak positive relationship (0.29, 2-tailed) is reflected between a Knowing cognitive style and a Delegative leadership style. The afore-mentioned may be interpreted as the leader’s effectiveness is driven by task and procedural knowledge that influences the relationship between leaders and subordinates – in the sense that team leaders become acquainted with the team’s tasks and responsibilities. Henceforth, knowledge and responsibilities are delegated to subordinates, while the leader continues to explore improvements and to create trust (Robbins, 2005). Similarly, the
Planning cognitive style reinforces the leader’s participation in the team or strategies for organisational effectiveness.

A further inspection of the matrix reveals a strong relationship between the participative leadership style and the Authoritarian leadership style (0.95, 2-tailed). This means that these factors associate strongly within the instrument. The Knowing cognitive style correlates positively and moderately with the Delegative leadership style (0.39, 2-tailed). The same can be said for the Planning cognitive style, which correlates positively, but moderately with the Delegative leadership style (0.45, 2-tailed).

4.3.9 Pearson correlation for racial groups

When considering the results of the African group, significant and moderate positive correlations are shown between the three Cognitive Style Indicator sub-scales Knowing (0.46, 2-tailed), Planning (0.45, 2-tailed) and Creative Style (0.44, 2-tailed) and the Delegation scale of the Leadership-Style Instrument.

In the case of the Coloured group, a significant weak positive relationship is depicted between the Knowing sub-scale of the Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI) and the Delegative sub-scale of the Leadership Style Questionnaire (0.32).

The White group produced four significant correlations between the sub-scales of the Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI) and the Leadership Style Questionnaire. Although weak associations were found, Knowing correlates positively with the Authoritative (0.34, 2-tailed) and Participative (0.36, 2-tailed) sub-scales of the Leadership Style Instrument.

With reference to the Asian group, no significant correlations were produced. The small number of Asians represented in the sample may have had a negative influence on the strength of the associations.

The significant correlations, as reflected in Table 4.17, vary amongst the four racial groups; however, on inspection of Table 4.17 results, one notices a specific pattern
of positive correlations. All three sub-scales of the *Cognitive Style Indicator* are relevant to the African group; while the *Knowing* and *Planning* styles are relevant to the White group. The *Knowing* sub-scale is also relevant to the Coloured group; while it similarly correlates with the *Delegative* leadership style similar to the African group. Whereas the *Delegative* leadership style is relevant to the African and Coloured groups, the *Participative* leadership style is more prominent in the case of the White group, although the cognitive preferences are relatively the same.

Comparative studies are hard to find when seeking to explain the differences between the African and White groups. These rather reflect different leadership styles instead of similar styles. It seems that irrespective of the cognitive preferences, African (and to a lesser extent the Coloured group) would reflect a *Delegative* leadership style, whilst the White group would vary between an *Authoritative* and *Participative* leadership style, while having relatively the same cognitive preferences.

According to Lewin, Lippit and White, (1939) participative leaders encourage group members to participate, but retain the final say over the decision-making process. Group members feel engaged in the process and are more motivated and creative.

The above variation might be found in cultural differences. In Brislin’s (2000) explanation of individualistic versus collectivistic cultural groups, Europeans are labelled as individualistic, while Africans are categorized as being collectivistic. He (Brislin) found in his research that collectivists find groups as an extended family; and what the one has or owns must be shared with the group. A reflection of a *Delegative* leadership style may be seen as “sharing” the work or responsibility with the other members of the group.

The *Delegative* leadership style offers little or no guidance to group members and leaves decision-making to the other group members. This type of style takes the longest time to make decisions, because their attempts to change are based on old habits and traditions, rather than on the re-education of large numbers of people (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939).
In contrast, Brislin (2000) is of the opinion that although Europeans tend to create psychological distances, s/he would express his/her frame of mind by arguing that the individual is responsible for his/her own success. Henceforth, such an individual would further argue that if the individual as the leader of the group is not taking the initiative and working closely with the group (participation), the groups’ existence might eventually come to an end.

Table 4.17 displays the Pearson correlations between the sub-scales of the instruments used in this research, while controlling for racial groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFRICAN</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>AUTH</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>DELEG</th>
<th>COSK</th>
<th>COSP</th>
<th>COSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEG</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSK</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.91**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>0.60**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLOURED</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>AUTH</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>DELEG</th>
<th>COSK</th>
<th>COSP</th>
<th>COSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEG</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSK</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>AUTH</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>DELEG</th>
<th>COSK</th>
<th>COSP</th>
<th>COSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>0.96**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEG</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSK</td>
<td>0.34*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>0.59**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.61**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>AUTH</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>DELEG</th>
<th>COSK</th>
<th>COSP</th>
<th>COSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PART</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELEG</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSK</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSP</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.83*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSC</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
4.4. Summary of the results

When considering the above results, one could say that the research hypothesis can be partly supported. In general, significant relationships were found between the Cognitive Planning style and the Participative leadership style, the Delegative leadership style and the Knowing cognitive style, the Creative cognitive style and the Delegative leadership style and the Knowing and Planning cognitive styles.

The results of Table 4.15 for females suggest that females who have the knowledge of the job content and who plan and analyse the work situation would delegate their responsibilities to subordinates with greater confidence. In the same breath, Table 4.16 of the males suggests that males are driven by task and procedural knowledge that influences the relationship between leaders and subordinates – in the sense that leaders become acquainted with the team’s tasks and responsibilities.

The latter scenario explains the differences and similarities between the gender groups. As may be gathered from the statistics, it can be clearly seen that the other dimensions do not relate to each other in any significant way. There are similarities between the Coloured and African groups, as the delegative style is relevant in both these groups, while the participative style is more prominent in the White racial group. No significant correlations were produced for the Asian group.

At this point, it could be concluded that the specific empirical aim (see section 1.5.2) to determine the relationship between cognitive styles and leadership styles in a sample of employees, (specifically supervisors within the automotive industry) has been achieved.

4.5. Chapter Summary

The findings from the analysis yielded a substantial amount of results to support the literature that was sourced for this research project. The results of the instruments and several findings have been discussed in this chapter.
In the following chapter, the conclusions, recommendations and the limitations of the study will be discussed.
Chapter 5

Conclusions, Limitations and Recommendations

5.1 Introduction

The analysis and the results of the study were discussed and described in detail in the previous chapter. The aim of the present study was to identify whether there is a relationship between the cognitive and leadership styles of managers and supervisors in the automotive industry. This chapter will discuss the limitations and suggest some recommendations from the study.

The study enabled the researcher to explore the different leadership styles and cognitive styles. Significant relationships were found between some of the groups.

5.2 Conclusions

In Conclusion, it is clear that this particular research project achieved the objectives, as set out at the beginning of the study. Leadership styles have been researched for many centuries, and have been investigated as a phenomenon in the industrial context; and there was an extensive range of literature to peruse. The research provided interesting results, which could be used for further investigation into whether leadership styles are related to cognitive styles, or not. Further research should, therefore, be seriously considered in the near future.

5.2.1 The Literature review

There is a dearth of research pertaining to the theoretical component of cognitive and leadership styles and the relationship between these two concepts. The amount of literature that was accessed during the research has, therefore, been very scant, especially that relating to cognitive styles.

Literature by Lussier and Achua (2000), however, clearly identifies three main leadership styles, namely: the Authoritarian, the Participative, and the Delegative
leadership styles. Individuals think differently; and therefore, they practice different leadership styles.

The three-dimensional cognitive style model highlighted by Cools and van Den Broeck (2007) incorporates the three main dimensions, which were utilised in this research, namely: the Knowing, the Planning, and the Creating styles. Individuals operate within one of these styles, which are distinctively different from one another.

Determining whether there is a relationship between an individual's leadership and cognitive styles, thus, plays an important role – not only for the individual, but for organisations as well. Therefore, future research regarding this topic should be conducted in the near future.

5.2.2 The empirical research

The main aim of the research was to conceptualise leadership and cognitive styles and determine the relationship between these two constructs in a sample of employees – specifically supervisors – in the automotive industry.

The research was able to show a significant association between the cognitive planning style and the participative leadership styles, the delegative leadership styles and the knowing cognitive styles, the creative cognitive styles and the delegative leadership style, as well as the knowing and planning cognitive styles.

With regard to gender, females delegate responsibilities to subordinates with greater confidence; whereas males are driven by the task at hand, and the knowledge that influences relationships between leaders and subordinates.

The racial groups, namely: the Coloured and African groups showed that they have similar delegative leadership styles, whilst the White racial group preferentially utilises the participative leadership style.
5.3 Limitations of the study

The finding yielded interesting, as well as beneficial results; however, the researcher is aware that with any research project, there are limitations that need to be taken into consideration.

5.3.1 Sample Size

The number of participants who participated in the study was 115. This sample is considered to be very small; however, valid and reliable information was received during the research project. A larger sample across the automotive sector would yield stronger and more reliable data for analysis. The sample was, however, sufficient to yield appropriate statistics for this particular research project. The researcher is aware of the importance of the generalisability of results to the entire population. Unfortunately, the results cannot be generalised to the other automotive manufacturers within South Africa or abroad, since the study concentrated on only one of the three automotive manufacturers in the Eastern Cape.

5.3.2 Instrument limitations

The Leadership Style Questionnaire and the Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI) were utilised for this particular research project. The researcher was aware from the outset of the research that the reliability of the leadership style questionnaire was questionable. The researcher, therefore, conducted a pilot study with a small sample to test the Cronbach coefficient. Both instruments yielded good Cronbach alpha coefficients relating to its reliability and validity; and therefore measured what they were supposed to measure, as well as yielding reliable results.

The leadership style questionnaire, however, needs further adjustments, in order to improve on its reliability.
The reliability of the Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI) was demonstrated by the various research outputs, as anticipated by the developers of the questionnaire. This should, therefore, not place any limitations on future research projects.

5.3.3 Dissemination of results

The present study will create an awareness of individuals’ leadership and cognitive styles; and the dissemination of the results is, therefore, of great importance for an accurate understanding of these concepts. However, the results are more of a descriptive perspective, which does not provide information of an inferential or predictive nature.

5.4 Recommendations

- Further research is called for with regard to the relationship between leadership styles and cognitive styles, as this could lead to a better understanding when appointing employees in the organisation, which would create a more diverse workforce.

- A replication of the study should be done in the future with a greater population of managers and supervisors, but not only in the motor industry.

- The above research may be used as a basis for future research in South Africa, in order to determine the causal effect of cognitive styles on leadership styles.

- Psychometric instruments should be developed to predict the influence of cognitive styles on individual leadership styles.

- Human Resource Practitioners should be trained to understand how these psychometric assessments could be utilized in the appointment of potential employees.
5.5 Evaluative Summary

Leadership in organisations plays an important role. To ensure that organisations meet the expected goals and objectives, the correct people need to be placed in leadership roles, in order for the vision and goals to be met. Many organisations do not make it in this fast-moving technologically charged environment, while others withstand many turbulent times.

Understanding whether there is a relationship between an individual’s leadership style and cognitive style is a very important topic, should be researched further. This would enable organisations in recruiting potential employees, as well as in promoting individuals to leadership positions in the near future.
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Appendix A
Biographical Questionnaire

Dear Participant

The following information is required for research purposes only. Your confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained throughout the research endeavour.

Please answer ALL questions to the best of your ability. Your answers would be greatly appreciated and valued in making this research valid and reliable.

Name: ……………………………………………………………………………………

Age: …………………………………………

Educational Qualification: ……………………………………………………………

RACE: Please circle the appropriate answer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African</th>
<th>Coloured</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* If other please specify…………………………………………………………

1. Please indicate your length of service with General Motors South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 – 1 years</th>
<th>2 – 5 years</th>
<th>6 – 10 years</th>
<th>10+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Please specify your current position at General Motors South Africa

........................................................................................................

3. How long have you been in the position mentioned above

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 – 1 years</th>
<th>2 – 5 years</th>
<th>6 – 10 years</th>
<th>10+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. How many subordinates/employees report directly to you?

........................................................................................................
Appendix B
Leadership Style Questionnaire
Appendix C
Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI)

Cognitive Style Indicator (CoSI)*
Herman Van den Broeck
Eva Cools

Please indicate to what extent the following statements typify you. There are 5 possibilities.

1 = doesn’t typify me at all
2 = typifies me somewhat
3 = neutral
4 = typifies me rather well
5 = typifies me totally

1 I like much variety in my life. 1 2 3 4 5
2 I study each problem until I understand the underlying logic. 1 2 3 4 5
3 I prefer well-prepared meetings with a clear agenda and strict time management. 1 2 3 4 5
4 I like to contribute to innovative solutions. 1 2 3 4 5
5 New ideas attract me more than existing solutions. 1 2 3 4 5
6 I make definite engagements, and I follow-up meticulously. 1 2 3 4 5
7 I try to avoid routine. 1 2 3 4 5
8 I want to have a full understanding of all problems. 1 2 3 4 5
9 Developing a clear plan is very important to me.

10 A good task is a well-prepared task.

11 I prefer to look for creative solutions.

12 I always want to know what should be done when.

13 I like to analyze problems.

14 I like to extend boundaries.

15 I make detailed analyses.

16 I prefer clear structures to do my job.

17 I am motivated by ongoing innovation.

18 I like detailed action plans.

Scoring key

Add the scores you gave for each question in the boxes below, next to the indicated question number. Sum up the scores to see how you score on the different cognitive styles.

K \[ \text{\_\_\_}\text{\_\_\_} = 2 + 8 + 13 + 15 \]

P \[ \text{\_\_\_}\text{\_\_\_} = 3 + 6 + 9 + 10 + 12 + 16 + 18 \]

Cr \[ \text{\_\_\_}\text{\_\_\_} = 1 + 4 + 5 + 7 + 11 + 14 + 17 \]

Scoring norms

Knowing style (K):
Low score = 4 – 13.99
Moderate score = 14 – 16.99
High score = 17 – 20

**Planning style (P):**
Low score = 7 – 23.99
Moderate score = 24 – 28.99
High score = 29 – 35

**Creative style (Cr):**
Low score = 7 – 25.99
Moderate score = 26 – 30.99
High score = 31 – 35
Appendix D
Permission to participate in the study

Dear Participant

I am a Masters student at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University conducting a Masters Research project, which is a requirement to complete my Masters degree. I have been granted permission to conduct this research within General Motors South Africa.

I would appreciate if you could kindly complete the attached questionnaires. The aim of the research is to establish if there is a relationship between an individual’s cognitive style and leadership style.

The results of the study will be presented as a group (i.e. employees within the automotive industry in the Eastern Cape) and not on an individual basis; hence there is no need to give an answer because you think it is the right option to choose or because it is how you might like to be. A final report will be made available to the Human Resources Vice President.

I kindly request you to respond in an honest manner. Please answer all the questions. To promote anonymity and confidentiality none of the questionnaires will be made available to anyone except the researcher.

Your co-operation will be highly appreciated.

Terry-Anne Jones (Attwell)
Tel: 403 2609
Terry-anne.attwell@gm.com
Appendix E
Permission from Don Clark to use Leadership Style Questionnaire

From: Donald Clark [mailto:donclark@nwlink.com]
Sent: 11 April 2008 05:42 AM
To: Louw, Gerrit Johannes (Mr) (Missionvale Campus)
Subject: Re: Leadership Style Survey

Hi Gert,

Please feel free to use the survey and I would be very appreciative of any research studies.

Cheers,
Don


On Apr 10, 2008, at 6:45 AM, Louw, Gerrit Johannes ((Mr)) ((Missionvale Campus)) wrote:

Dear Don

We have noticed that you developed the Leadership Style Survey that is on display on your web page. We have a prospective student who is interested to use it for a Masters research project. I was wondering whether the instrument is available for research purposes. In other words, do you mind if she uses it within this context? I have also noticed that you don’t have reliability indices of the instrument. If you can guide us to some other validation studies, it would be appreciated. In any case, we will conduct a pilot study before it is considered for further use.
Would you mind to consider permission? We are prepared to forward you our results if interested.
Kind regards
Gert louw
Department of Industrial & Organizational Psychology
P O Box 77000
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
Port Elizabeth
South Africa
6031
Tel. + 27 (0) 41 504 1289/4302
Cell. +27 (0) 84 583 6063
Appendix F
Permission from Eva Cools to use Cognitive Style (CoSI) Questionnaire

From: Eva Cools [Eva.Cools@vlerick.com]
Sent: 04 February 2013 09:20 PM
To: Louw, Gerrit Johannes (Dr) (Summerstrand South Campus)
Subject: RE: Cognitive Style Indicator

Dear colleague,
Thanks for contacting me about this. I recall having given you the permission to use it in your research, but can not find the email back myself. However, I hereby grant you permission to use our instrument in your research. It would be great to receive the raw data of your research afterwards to enable us to do further cross-cultural validation research with the data. Wish your student good luck with the finalization of the study.
Best wishes,
Eva

From: Louw, Gerrit Johannes (Dr) (Summerstrand South Campus) [mailto:GerritJohannes.Louw@nmmu.ac.za]
Sent: 02 February 2013 07:01
To: Eva Cools
Subject: Cognitive Style Indicator

Dear Dr Cools,
You may recall me contacting you a few years ago in connection with the instrument the “Cognitive Style Indicator" (COSI) developed by you and your colleagues at Vlerick. You forwarded me a copy with permission to use it for research purposes. One of my masters students, Ms. Terry-Ann Attwell (nee Jones) eventually used it in her study. Although it is coming a long way now, the dissertation is now heading for the examination stage. However, the results produced by the COSI cannot be published if your permission to use the instrument is not filed in the manuscript. The email with your permission unfortunately went missing. This email is therefore to obtain your re-affirmation to use the instrument and the results generated by it.
We hope that you will consider my request favourably.
I hope to hear from you soon.
Best wishes.
Gert Louw
Department of Industrial & Organisational Psychology
Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University
P O Box 77000
Port Elizabeth
6031
South Africa
Tel. +27 (0) 41 504 1289
Leadership Style: Assessment

Next to each statement below, enter the number that represents how strongly you feel about the statement: almost always (1), frequently (2), sometimes (3), seldom (4), or almost never (5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I retain the final decision making authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I include employees in decision making, but I retain the final decision-making authority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My employees and I vote on major decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I lack the time to consider employee suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I ask for employee input on upcoming projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. For a major decision to be made, it must have the approval of each individual or the majority.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I tell my employees what to do and how to do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When things go wrong, I ask for my employee’s advice on how to stay on schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I send information for my employees to act on via e-mail, memos, or voicemail, not meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. When someone makes a mistake, I make a note of it and tell them never to do it again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I want to create an environment where my employees take ownership of their projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost Always 1</th>
<th>Frequently 2</th>
<th>Sometimes 3</th>
<th>Seldom 4</th>
<th>Almost Never 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. I allow my employee to determine what needs to be done and how to do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Newly hired employees are not allowed to make decisions that I don't approve first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I ask employees for their visions of their jobs and I use their vision where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My employees know more about their jobs than me, so they make their own decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. When things go wrong, I tell my employees that a procedure was incorrect and establish a new one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I allow my employees to set their own priorities with my guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I delegate tasks when implementing a new process or procedure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I closely monitor my employees to ensure they are performing correctly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. When there are differences in expectations, I work with my employees to resolve them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My employees are responsible for defining their jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I like the power that my leadership position holds over subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I like to use my leadership power to help subordinates grow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost Always 1</td>
<td>Frequently 2</td>
<td>Sometimes 3</td>
<td>Seldom 4</td>
<td>Almost Never 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I like to share my leadership power with my subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My employees need directions or threats to get them to achieve their objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My employees will exercise self-direction if they are committed to their objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My employees have the right to determine their own objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My employees mainly seek security.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My employees solve organizational problems creatively and with ingenuity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My employees can lead themselves just as well as I can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the tables below, mark the score of each statement. For example, if you scored statement 1 as Sometimes, then enter a 3. After you enter all the scores for each statement, total up the column.

### Leadership Style Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Participative</th>
<th>Delegative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This questionnaire helps assess your leadership style. The highest of the three scores indicates what style of leadership you normally use. If your highest score is 40 or more, it is a strong indicator of your normal style.

The lowest of the three scores is an indicator of the style you least use. If your lowest score is 20 or less, it is a strong indicator that you normally do not operate out of this mode.

If two of the scores are close to the same, you might be going through a transition phase, either personally or at work. However, if you score high as both participative and delegative, then you are probably a delegative leader.

If there is only a small difference between the three scores, then this indicates that you have no clear perception of the mode you operate out of, or you are a new leader and are trying to feel out the correct style for yourself.