International Review of Management and Marketing

ISSN: 2146-4405

available at http: www.econjournals.com

International Review of Management and Marketing, 2017, 7(4), 191-200.

Leadership Styles, Organisation Culture, and Employee Performance*#

Krishna Kistan Govender*

School of Management, IT and Governance University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Email: govenderkrishna@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Since poor service delivery has been linked to the inability to build a desired culture driven by inter-alia, a lack of vision and leadership, this article reports on a study which explored the above relationship by conducting a survey among a convenient cluster sample of respondents in specific public sectors in South Africa, using pre-developed and validated questionnaires. It became evident that although transformational and transactional leadership have a significant relationship with organizational culture, there was no significant correlation between "power" and "task" culture and performance. Transactional leadership showed a direct effect on employee performance, compared to transformational leadership. The implication for service delivery is that appointments to leadership positions in the South African public service should be on the basis of assessments rather than "comradeship."

Keywords: Public Sector, Service Delivery, Performance, Organizational Culture, Leadership
JEL Classifications: L1, L2, M14

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at 4tyh International Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance, St Petersburg, Russia, 14-15th April 2016.

\# Although the paper has been developed from the MBA dissertation of T Magada, who was a student at Regenesys Business School supervised by the author, the paper has been written entirely by the author.

1. INTRODUCTION

Leadership has been viewed as a trait, behavior or, from an information processing perspective, and several researchers, inter-alia, Goleman et al. (2002) have discussed various leadership styles, inter-alia, transformational, transactional, bureaucratic, autocratic and charismatic. Leadership is a relatively stable pattern of behavior exhibited by a leader when dealing with employees (Amirul and Daud, 2012).

Aziz et al. (2012) assert that since the early 1990s, most public sector organisations started to adopt multifaceted leadership styles, and most public sector organizations have a dominant culture which expresses the core values shared by majority of the members. Aga (2016) asserts that though transactional leadership is considered as a necessary precondition for transformational leadership to be effective, and according to Seloane, (2010. p. 81) "transformational leadership and organizational culture (OC) have been theoretically and empirically linked to organizational performance.

The literature concurs that there is no one typology of leadership styles (Aga, 2016), and the full range of leadership theories encompass the transformational, transactional and laissez-faire styles (Sohmen, 2013). Public service leaders are faced with an ever changing environment and the pace seems to be getting faster, and the 21st Century challenges require leaders to be agile and transformational in nature. Kolisang (2011. p. 28) (2011: 28) is of the view that in "highly innovative and efficient organizations, transformational leadership style is more likely to be the dominant style, since in this environment, the culture and relationships are built on honesty, team efficiency, value of individual and everyone gets involved in providing a solution to a problem. The public sector in South Africa (SA) is constantly faced with leadership changes, unstable socio-political developments, and broader environmental influences. Establishing a solid culture to maintain high level of service standards is imperative for an efficient and stable public service, even in the face of changing leadership and the environment. It is for this reason that Raga and Taylor (2005. p. 22) argue that "enforcing and promoting an ethical culture cannot be left up to policy makers alone and

promulgation of codes of conduct is not good enough, leaders must drive a culture that supports and promotes ethical behavior." The Public Service Commission (PSC, 2014) highlighted the importance of creating a culture of transparency and honesty for the efficiency and expediency of the public service while gaining public trust. Chipkin and Lipietz (2012) observed that (in SA), the African National Congress (ANC) government, faced with the transformation challenges, integrated former "Homeland" administrators "often with rudimentary qualifications and apprenticed in dysfunctional administrations." Thus initiatives such as "Batho Pele" were introduced in an effort to establish a "new" culture within the public sector (Matshiqi, 2007. p. 2,8) (2007: 2,8).

Current theory acknowledges the relationship between leadership and culture but lacks clarity on specific leadership traits and cultures for success in the public sector. However, the lack of a scientific basis for selecting leaders into SA public offices intensified the misalignment between leadership style and culture for success, resulting in perpetual decline in employee performance (Niemann and Kotze, 2006). Several researchers (Mokgolo et al., 2012) therefore argued that transformational leadership, which requires an outlook that differs considerably from a mind-set of compliance, is what our current (SA) society needs.

The current administration in SA has ushered a change in leadership and subsequently a change in culture, as is evidenced by new policies, structures, financial and other frameworks aimed at enhancing public sector accountability (Alexandre, 2007). Alexandre (2007) continues to state that what underpins sustainable change is OC which is driven effectively by a transformational leadership style. A strong relationship between transformational leadership, subordinate acceptance and performance puts this style in a strong position to be adopted in areas where there is frequent change of leadership (Mokgolo et al., 2012).

It is apparent from the above that suitable leadership styles must be established in the public service, to ensure congruency with culture where performance is the goal, and a match between leadership style and culture to ensure high levels of performance. Thus, the primary aim of this article is to explore the relationship between leadership style, culture and performance in public sector organizations in South Africa (SA). The study was conducted among a sample of public service organizations in one of the largest provinces in South Africa, using the methodology described below.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A survey, using pre-developed and validated questionnaires was deemed appropriate for data collection (Collis and Hussey, 2003). The study population was 5 068, which was all the leadership positions in the public sector in the Gauteng province (National Treasury Republic of South Africa, 2014; Gauteng Province, 2015). By using Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) small sample formula, the sample size was determined to be 94 (which was rounded off to 100), with a confidence level of 95% and confidence interval of 10% (Magada and Govender 2016). Due to the spread of the population across the province, cluster sampling was used (SAGE Publications, 2010). The following sectors were considered as clusters, namely, Education, Health, Social Development, Roads and Transport, Community Safety, Housing, Sport, Arts, Culture and Recreation, Economic Development, Agriculture, Local Government, Finance, and Infrastructure, from which two, namely, local government and economic development, and participants were selected using a convenience method as they were accessible. An electronic invitation for participation in the surveys was issued to participants in the above mentioned clusters.

OC was measured using Harrison and Stokes' (1992) OC Analysis (OCA) questionnaire not only because of its easily understood language, but because it was found to be reliable in the SA context (Harrison and Stokes, 1992; Stuyvesant, 2007). The aforementioned measuring instrument has sections containing statements which relate to the four (4) cultural orientations/types, namely, power, role, achievement and support measured on a 5 point Likert scale, where 0 = Not applicable, 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Agree.

The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X short) developed by (Bass and Avolio, 2004) was used since it could be adapted for different settings (Jogulu, 2010; Dulewicz and Higgs, 2005; Hansman, 2007). The MLQ 5X short assesses a full range of leadership behavior and, also allows the researcher to look at the follower's effort and leader's effectiveness. The MLQ survey comprises 45 items for 'self-rating' by the "Leader" and, individuals in leadership positions referred as "Raters". The survey uses a 5-point Likert scale to measure the level to which a statement applies with; 0 = Not at all, 1 = Once in a while, 2 = Sometimes, Fairly often and 4 = Frequently. According to Alsayed et al. (2012), this instrument has been successfully used and, adapted for use in many countries in both, the private and public sectors.

To measure the (individual) performance, the Individual Work Performance (IWP) questionnaire developed by Koopmans et al. (2012) was used. The IWPQ consists of 18 items grouped into three sub-categories, namely, task performance, contextual performance and counterproductive behavior. Only the task and contextual performance groups were used because individual behavior as an output of the leadership behavior is addressed through the MLQ survey. The IWP comprised of 13 items, with two (2) categories measured on a 5 point Likert scale. The 5-point Likert measures the level at which a statement applies as; 0=Not at all, 1=Once in a while, 2=Sometimes, 3= Fairly often and, 4= Frequently.

3. FINDINGS

Although 100 questionnaires were distributed, only 54 of the OCA and IWPQ and 55 MLQ questionnaires were completed. Of the 55 participants who completed the MLQ surveys, 19 completed both the 'Rater' and 'Leader' forms, which implies that 19 of the participants were in leadership roles. The majority (64%) of the respondents were females, while 67% of the 19 participants who completed the MLQ survey were males. Most (46%) of the respondents were between the age of 49-60, while the second highest group (36%) was in the 30-49 year age group. 34% of the respondents had between 10-15 years' service. 38% of the

respondents have a post graduate degree and, 32% operated at middle management and, 26% were in non-management positions.

3.1. OC

With respect to the overall reliability of the OCA, the Cronbach's alpha values of the existing culture (0.73) and, the preferred culture (0.79) were deemed acceptable. Having considered factor analysis as a technique to validate the research instrument, the KMO value (.685) and the Bartlett's test significance ($p < .001$), confirmed that the data is indeed suitable for the factor analysis (Field, 2005). Through Principal Component Analysis (PCA), it became evident that four (4) factors with eigenvalue >1 were retained after varimax rotation[1]. The 10 factor model profile loaded as estimated and explained a total variance of 64.315 %. The factor loadings of all items were >0.5 with the highest loading (0.761) by LO40 on factor 10.

As revealed in Table 1, the most dominant existing culture as perceived by respondents is the "power" culture (mean 3.1). The power culture is characterized by people in authority who tend to exert total control over sub-ordinates (Harrison and Stokes, 1992). According to Maximini (2015), organizations that have a power-oriented organizational culture value compliance to policies and rules more than they do performance. Loyalty to those in authority is seen as important and is rewarded in "power" oriented organizational culture.

The "task" culture with a mean score of 2.86 is the next most dominant culture in the surveyed organizations. The "task" culture is characterized by a shared purpose and high drive to achieve the set goal (Maximini, 2015). According to Harrison (1972) cited by Maximini (2015), this type of culture evokes "strong personal commitment in high energy situations". The "role" culture achieved a mean score of 2.70 and this makes it a moderately dominant existing culture. About 23% of respondents strongly agree that the "role" culture is moderately dominant. The "role" culture focuses on the job role than the individual, and the organization that is role oriented, power is applied through a formalized process and procedures (Manetje and Martins, 2009; Maximini, 2015). The "person" culture is the least dominant, with a mean score of 2.48. The "person" culture has low formalities, as the needs of the individual are central to the existence of the organization, and even though authority can be assigned to an individual, no one individual dominates and has absolute control Manetje and Martins, 2009. Thus organizations that have "person" culture are "person-centric" in their approach to organizational activities.

Table 2 shows that most respondents indicated a "role" culture as being the most dominant. The "task" and "person" culture are the next dominant and moderately dominant 'preferred' cultures. However, 30.67% of the respondents do not perceive the "task" culture as existing in the preferred organizational culture. The "power" culture is the least preferred culture with a mean score of 2.11.

Table 3 shows that the existing "power" culture had a negative significant relationship with the existing "role" and "person" culture (Spearman's coefficient being −0.388, $P < 0.01$ and −0.286, $P < 0.05$) respectively. This can be because the respondents perceived the dominant existing "power" culture to have a diminishing effect compared to the "role" and "person" culture. The existing "task" culture is positively significantly related to the "person" culture (Spearman's coefficient of 0.319; $P < 0.05$. This makes sense in that the high drive towards performance that is found in a "task" oriented organization may need to be supplemented by a "person" culture for sustainability.

It is evident from Table 4 that the "person" culture is also significantly positively related to the "role" culture, with a Spearman's correlation of 0.562 ($P < 0.01$). The perceived existence of the "role" culture is perceived to be harmonious to the prevailing elements of the "person" culture. This implies that the low formalization found in the "person" oriented culture is offset by high formalization (i.e., hierarchical and policies) elements in the "role" culture. In the public sector, this combination would make sense in that most activities are governed by various legislations and rules but this should not be at the expense of the needs of individuals. Also, the needs of the individuals should however not supersede the functioning of the organization.

With reference to the preferred "power" culture, Table 4 shows a significant positive relationship with the "task" culture (Spearman's coefficient of 0.53, $P < 0.01$). The preferred "role" culture shows a positive significant relationship with the "person" culture (Spearman's coefficient of 0.344, $P < 0.05$). The elements of the preferred "power" culture are seen by the respondents as working harmoniously with the "task" culture. The elements of the "power" culture such as leaders who are firm and fair could be perceived as the required balancing effect to reducing the fluidity found within teams working in the "task" culture oriented environment. As resources become scarcer in the "task" oriented culture, leaders would have to employ the "power" culture to allocate resources.

It is also evident from Table 4 that the preferred "person" culture shows no significant relationship with the "power" culture (Spearman's coefficient being −0.012). This implies that respondents do not perceive the existing relationship between "person" and "power" cultures in their preferred organizational culture. There is no significant relationship between the preferred "person" and "task" culture (Spearman's coefficient being 0.039). The lack of a significant relationship between the preferred "person" and "task" culture makes sense.

3.2. Leadership Styles

With respect to reliability, the Cronbach's alpha values for the MLQ instrument was 0.834, which according to Nunnally (1978), cited by Kanste et al. (2006), is acceptable. When assessing the validity of a research instrument using factor analysis, a general rule is that only items that meet the following criterion should be retained, KMO>0.5, Bartlett's test of Sphericity $P < 0.05$ and factor loading >0.5 (Field, 2005). In light of the aforementioned, it is evident from Table 5 that the data is suitable for the factor analysis (Field, 2005).

1 Due to the length of this paper, the relevant factor tables are not included, but these are available for inspection, if requested.

Table 1: Perception of the existing culture

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
Power	50	3.1122	0.46309	0.214	−1.146	0.337	1.647	0.662
Task	50	2.8686	0.24669	0.061	−1.107	0.337	2.107	0.662
Role	50	2.7048	0.37622	0.142	−0.881	0.337	−0.380	0.662
Person	50	2.4828	0.39625	0.157	−0.807	0.337	−0.597	0.662
Valid N (list-wise)	50							

Table 2: Preferred organizational culture

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
Power	50	2.11208	0.496915	0.247	0.398	0.337	1.985	0.662
Task	50	2.93204	0.361044	0.130	−0.658	0.337	0.373	0.662
Role	50	3.22134	0.315426	0.099	−1.052	0.337	3.279	0.662
Person	50	2.92938	0.488623	0.239	−1.283	0.337	2.909	0.662
Valid N (list-wise)	50							

Table 3: Existing culture correlation

	Power	Task	Role	Person
Power				
Correlation coefficient	(0.801)	0.172	−0.388**	−0.286*
Sig. (2-tailed)		0.232	0.005	0.044
Task				
Correlation coefficient	0.172	(0.687)	0.204	0.319*
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.232		0.156	0.024
Role				
Correlation coefficient	−0.388**	0.204	(0.711)	0.562**
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.005	0.156		0.000
Person				
Correlation coefficient	−0.286*	0.319*	0.562**	(0.811)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.044	0.024	0.000	

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Items in parenthesis () = Item Cronbach' s alpha coefficients

Table 4: Preferred culture

	Power	Task	Role	Person
Power				
Correlation coefficient	1.000	0.530**	−0.130	−0.012
Sig. (2-tailed)		0.000	0.369	0.931
Task				
Correlation coefficient	0.530**	1.000	0.240	0.039
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000		0.093	0.790
Role				
Correlation coefficient	−0.130	0.240	1.000	0.344*
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.369	0.093		0.014
Person				
Correlation coefficient	−0.012	0.039	0.344*	1.000
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.931	0.790	0.014	

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

The Principal Component Analysis method was used to confirm the construct validity of the MLQ which was originally explained through a six factor model (Avolio et al., 1999). However, as revealed in Table 6, it was determined that the MLQ items loaded on 10 factors. Leadership, excluding the 'outcome' items of the MLQ instrument loaded onto the nine factors as per the nine factor model for leadership investigated by researchers such as (Antonakis et al., 2003; Bass and Avolio, 2004). However, the nine factor model investigated by Antonakis et al. (2003) and Bass and Avolio (2004) did not consider the behavioral or leadership outcomes aspects of the questionnaire. Thus, the 10th factor showed all nine (9) items for the 'outcomes' loading on the 10th factor, which was aptly named "Leadership Behavior Outcome" (LO). The 10 factor model profile loaded as estimated and explained a total variance of 64.315%. The loadings of all items were greater than 0.5 with the highest loading being 0.761, and the communality values for each of the items was higher than 0.5, which implies a satisfactory measurement (Field, 2005). To assess the discriminant validity, the correlation coefficients between the measures were gauged against the alpha coefficients of factors (Ogbonna and Harris, 2000), and this output is reflected in Table 6.

Table 5: MLQ KMO and Bartlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy	0.609
Bartlett's test of sphericity	
Approx. Chi-square	1809.512
df	990
Sig	0.000

The 45 items of the MLQ are grouped into 12 sub-items, which are further grouped into three main leadership behaviors and one group of outcomes. Table 7 reveals that the mean score for each of the three leadership practices were as follows: Transformational = 3, compared to self-score of 2.95 and a 'Rater' score of 3.04; Transactional = 2.73, compared to a self-score of 2.66, and a 'Rater' score of 2.76; and Passive Avoidant = 1.48, compared to self-score of 1.36 and a 'Rater' score of 1.53.

As reflected in Table 8, with respect to transformational behavior the mean score was the highest, with the 'Raters' perceiving the 'Idealized Influence' (Attributed) (IIA) behavior as being practiced most frequently (Table 9), while Leaders perceived 'Inspirational Motivation' (IM) as a the behavior they practiced

Table 6: MLQ Eigenvalues and variance

Factors	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10
	IA	IB	IM	IS	IC	CR	MBEA	MBEP	LF	LO
Eigenvalues	9.852	4.211	2.638	1.895	1.794	1.515	1.233	1.215	1.145	1.019
Variability %	23.895	10.215	6.398	4.597	4.352	3.673	2.991	2.946	2.777	2.471
Cumulative	23.895	34.110	40.509	45.105	49.457	53.131	56.122	59.067	61.845	64.315

LEGEND: IIA: Idealized influence (attributed); IIB: Idealized influence (behavior); IM: Inspirational motivation; IS: Intellectual stimulation; IC: Individualized consideration; CR: Contingent reward MBEA: Management-by-exception (active); MBEP: Management-by-exception (passive); LF: Laissez-faire EE: Extra effort; EFF: Effectiveness; SAT: Satisfaction

Table 7: MLQ Descriptive statistics

	Total			Raters			Self/Leader		
	N	Mean	Standard deviation	N	Mean	Standard deviation	N	Mean	Standard deviation
Transformational	68	3.0161	0.45079	49	3.0427	0.48256	19	2.9473	0.37285
Transactional	68	2.7298	0.48944	49	2.7604	0.50254	19	2.6578	0.47295
Passive avoidant	68	1.4816	0.75442	49	1.5338	0.80545	19	1.3552	0.63226

Table 8: Response to the MLQ sub items

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
					Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
Transformational								
IIA	68	3.07	0.69	0.477	−0.656	0.291	−0.275	0.574
IIB	68	2.79	0.58	0.339	−0.896	0.291	1.395	0.574
IM	68	3.17	0.53	0.284	−1.112	0.291	2.038	0.574
IS	68	3.10	0.55	0.302	−0.456	0.291	−0.848	0.574
IC	68	2.96	0.66	0.435	−0.910	0.291	0.847	0.574
Transactional								
CR	68	2.99	0.62	0.387	−0.787	0.291	0.042	0.574
MBEA	68	2.47	0.75	0.568	−0.877	0.291	0.754	0.574
Passive avoidant								
MBEP	68	1.63	0.87	0.753	0.120	0.291	−0.770	0.574
LF	68	1.34	0.84	0.709	0.444	0.291	−0.052	0.574
Outcomes								
EE	68	3.26	0.63	0.398	−1.267	0.291	1.518	0.574
EFF	68	3.34	0.52	0.268	−1.071	0.291	1.268	0.574
SAT	68	3.33	0.76	0.572	−1.374	0.291	1.646	0.574

CR: Contingent reward; MBEA: Management-by-exception (active); MBEP: Management-by-exception (passive); LF: Laissez-faire; EE: Extra effort; EFF: Effectiveness; SAT: Satisfaction

Table 9: Raters' responses to the MLQ survey

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
					Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
Transformational								
IIA	49	3.18	0.68	0.456	−0.941	0.340	0.522	0.668
IIB	49	2.88	0.57	0.326	−1.333	0.340	3.185	0.668
IM	49	3.16	0.57	0.330	−1.204	0.340	1.928	0.668
IS	49	3.07	0.54	0.296	−0.545	0.340	−0.712	0.668
IC	49	2.93	0.73	0.528	−0.914	0.340	0.440	0.668
Transactional								
CR	49	3.03	0.65	0.418	−1.021	0.340	0.475	0.668
MBEA	49	2.48	0.79	0.631	−0.916	0.340	0.735	0.668
Passive avoidant								
MBEP	49	1.71	0.92	0.842	0.104	0.340	−1.033	0.668
LF	49	1.35	0.89	0.797	0.578	0.340	−0.059	0.668
Outcomes								
EE	49	3.32	0.62	0.384	−1.661	0.340	3.393	0.668
EFF	49	3.32	0.57	0.325	−1.067	0.340	0.763	0.668
SAT	49	3.31	0.82	0.665	−.471	0.340	1.555	0.668

CR: Contingent reward; MBEA: Management-by-exception (active); MBEP: Management-by-exception (passive); LF: Laissez-faire; EE: Extra effort; EFF: Effectiveness; SAT: Satisfaction

frequently (Table 10). "Passive Avoidant" seems to be the least practiced behavior, as this reveals the lowest mean score by both the 'Leaders' and 'Raters'. However, as reflected in Table 10, the 'Raters' perceived Management by Exception (passive)

Table 10: MLQ survey

	N	Mean	Standard deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis	
					Statistic	Standard error	Statistic	Standard error
Transformational								
IIA	19	2.78	0.66	0.437	−0.187	0.524	−0.965	1.014
IIB	19	2.57	0.56	0.318	−0.042	0.524	−0.083	1.014
IM	19	3.20	0.42	0.178	−0.175	0.524	0.260	1.014
IS	19	3.18	0.57	0.325	−0.328	0.524	−1.333	1.014
IC	19	3.01	0.45	0.205	0.164	0.524	−0.746	1.014
Transactional								
CR	19	2.88	0.56	0.308	−0.107	0.524	−0.824	1.014
MBEA	19	2.43	0.66	0.429	−0.817	0.524	1.128	1.014
Passive avoidant								
MBEP	19	1.41	0.70	0.488	−0.532	0.524	−0.552	1.014
LF	19	1.30	0.71	0.511	−0.396	0.524	−0.877	1.014
Outcomes								
EE	19	3.11	0.65	0.421	−0.499	0.524	−1.190	1.014
EFF	19	3.41	0.36	0.126	0.220	0.524	−0.388	1.014
SAT	19	3.39	0.59	0.349	−0.223	0.524	−1.576	1.014

CR: Contingent reward; MBEA: Management-by-exception (active); MBEP: Management-by-exception (passive); LF: Laissez-faire; EE: Extra effort; EFF: Effectiveness; SAT: Satisfaction

(MBEP) to be more prevalent, than perceived by the 'Leaders'. This form of leadership is characterized by procrastination, avoidance of decision making, lack of influence, and a general lack of direction (Bass and Avolio, 2004). Senge (2004) argues that this type of leadership is ineffective to drive transformation. 'Contingent Reward' also scored a high mean of 2.99, which indicates that respondents observed elements of transactional leadership behavior together with transformational as high. According to Bass and Avolio (2004), "Contingent Reward' as a type of transactional leadership, ensures clarity of expectations and rewards.

The three outcomes measured by the MLQ survey, namely, extra effort, effectiveness and satisfaction are a measure of the Raters' perception of the Leader's behavior (Bass & Avolio, 2004). As reflected on Table 9, Effectiveness and Satisfaction both have the highest total mean scores of 3.34 and 3.33 respectively. Tables 8-10 reveal the 'Outcomes' score which is >3, which indicates that respondents perceived or experienced these factors fairly often or frequently. The combination of transformational and transactional leadership behaviors enables a leader to meet the follower's short term needs while inspiring for greater performance and commitment (Bass and Avolio, 2004).

3.3. Individual Performance

The Cronbach's alpha value achieved for IWP instrument was 0.86, which is an acceptable value according to Nunnally (1978), and Polit and Hungler (1999) cited by Kanste et al. (2006. p. 205), and similar to those obtained in a study by (Koopmans et al., 2014). Preliminary investigation of the suitability of factor analysis to confirm the validity of the data was determined through the KMO and Bertlett's test of sphericity. The KMO value (0.771) and the Bartlett's test significance ($P < 0.001$) achieved for IWP (Table 11), suggested that data is suitable for EFA (Field, 2005).

The Principal Component Analysis process retained two components/factors with eigenvalues >1, and these two factors

Table 11: IWP KMO and Bartlett's test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy	0.771
Bartlett's test of sphericity	
Approx. Chi-square	282.280
df	77
Sig.	0.000

explained a total variance of 63.149 %[2]. The factors were named Task Performance and Contextual Performance, in line with estimated loading. The "task" performance included all first five (5) items in the IWP instrument, while the "contextual" performance included the last eight (8) items of the revised IWP. The communality values are all greater than 0.5, and thus the quality of the measurement can be accepted as satisfactory(Field, 2005).

Table 12 shows that the majority of respondents perceived "task" performance statements as being applicable fairly often, while for "contextual" performance, only 38% perceived the statements as being applicable fairly often. The distribution in terms of the respondents' perception of their performance between the two scales is quite similar.

3.4. OC and Leadership Practice

Tables 13 and 14 reveal the Spearman's correlation coefficients reflecting the relationship between leadership and organizational culture. It is evident that transformational leadership has a positive significant relationship with the "role" culture with ($r = 0.315$; $P < 0.05$). Within this transformational leadership basket, inspirational motivation (IM) shows a significant positive relationship with both the role ($r = 0.447$; $P < 0.01$), and the person ($r = 0.369$; $P < 0.01$) cultures. Transactional leadership shows a significant positive relationship with the "task" ($r = 0.289$; $P < 0.05$), role ($r = 0.441$, $P < 0.01$) and person ($r = 0.355$; $P < 0.05$) cultures. Passive Avoidant shows a positive significant relationship with the "person" culture at ($r = 0.327$; $P < 0.05$).

2 The outputs are available for scrutiny from the corresponding author.

Table 12: IWP frequencies

	Responses N (%)
Task performance	
Not at all	1 (0.4)
Once in a while	30 (12.0)
Sometimes	69 (27.6)
Fairly often	98 (39.2)
Frequently if not always	52 (20.8)
Total	250 (100)
Task performance	
Not at all	7 (2)
Once in a while	45 (11)
Sometimes	120 (30)
Fairly often	153 (38)
Frequently if not always	75 (19)
Total	400 (100)

Table 13 reflects that the laissez-faire sub-category shows a positive significant relationship with the "role" culture. This could be due to individuals who are highly specialized and experiencing the "role" culture, together with "lack" of leadership, and the "lack" of leadership could be intentional to allow the specialist to perform with little restraint to achieve the goal or simply lack of confidence of the manager to lead highly specialized individuals. Both idealized influence behaviors (IIA and IIB) show no significant relationship with existing organizational culture. As reflected in Table 14, the overall leadership behavior significantly positively correlates with organizational culture ($r = 0.468$; $P < 0.01$).

3.5. Leadership Style, OC and Performance

It is evident form Table 15 that the bivariate correlation statistics for the OC and individual performance shows a significant relationship between "role" culture and "contextual" performance ($r = .282$; $p < .05$). The "person" culture significantly correlates with both "task" and "contextual" performance, with $r = .288$ and .325 respectively, and $p < .05$. There is no observable significant relationship between "power" culture and individual performance, and this is the same for "task" culture and individual performance. This trend is similar to that observed between leadership practices and culture with the lack of a significant relationship between leadership and "power" culture. It was also ascertained that the OC is also significantly correlated with individual performance ($r = .408$; $p < .05$). The aforementioned findings are similar to that reported by several researchers, albeit their research was conducted in a different environment (Doelman et al., 2012).

According to Bass and Avolio (2004), the extra effort (EE) outcome scale on MLQ measures how a subordinate is motivated to go the extra mile and perform beyond expectation. The significant relationship between "role" culture and the MLQ outcomes suggests that extra effort and effectiveness play a role in individual performance. The MLQ outcomes also indicates the behavioral effect of the employed leadership practices (Garcia-Morales et al., 2012). This seems to support the findings on individual performance and culture as per Table 16, whereby there is an observed significant correlation between contextual performance and "role" culture.

Table 13: Relationship between leadership styles and organizational culture

	Power	Task	Role	Person
IIA				
Correlation coefficient	−0.086	0.011	0.244	0.155
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.409	0.937	0.088	0.282
IIB				
Correlation coefficient	−0.079	0.066	0.089	−0.007
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.453	0.650	0.538	0.961
IM				
Correlation coefficient	−0.040	0.099	0.447**	0.369**
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.707	0.496	0.001	0.008
IS				
Correlation coefficient	−0.033	0.207	0.297*	0.176
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.752	0.148	0.036	0.220
IC				
Correlation coefficient	−0.035	0.010	0.307*	0.169
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.735	0.946	0.030	0.241
CR				
Correlation coefficient	−0.009	0.089	0.305*	0.148
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.932	0.538	0.031	0.306
MBEA				
Correlation coefficient	−0.014	0.252	0.049	0.373**
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.892	0.077	0.733	0.008
MBEP				
Correlation coefficient	−0.052	−0.001	0.064	0.322*
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.613	0.997	0.660	0.022
LF				
Correlation coefficient	−0.053	0.098	0.347*	0.230
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.607	0.500	0.014	0.108

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
CR: Contingent reward; MBEA: Management-by-exception (active); MBEP: Management-by-exception (passive); LF: Laissez-faire

Table 14: Relationship between leadership styles and organizational culture

	Power	Task	Role	Person
Transformational				
Correlation coefficient	−0.099	0.142	0.315*	0.264
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.493	0.325	0.026	0.064
Transactional				
Correlation coefficient	−0.003	0.289*	0.441**	0.355*
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.982	0.042	0.001	0.011
Passive avoidant				
Correlation coefficient	0.031	0.036	0.065	0.327*
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.831	0.803	0.656	0.021
	Organisational culture			
Leadership behaviour				
Correlation coefficient	0.468**			
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.001			

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

4. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF KEY FINDINGS

There is a relationship between leadership practices and OC in the public sector organizations surveyed. More specifically, leadership behaviours such as transformational and transactional have a significant relationship with OC are consistent with that of (Tsai, 2011; Xenikou and Simosi, 2006; Seloane, 2010). The relationship that exists between "passive avoidant" and existing

Table 15: Relationship between the existing organisational culture and individual performance

	Task performance	Context performance
Power culture		
Correlation coefficient	0.161	0.026
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.678	0.980
Task culture		
Correlation coefficient	−0.011	0.065
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.919	0.648
Role culture		
Correlation coefficient	0.246	0.282*
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.062	0.046
Person culture		
Correlation coefficient	0.288*	0.325*
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.041	0.0212
	Individual performance	
Organisational culture		
Correlation coefficient	0.408*	
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.029	

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

Table 16: Relationship between the organisational culture and leadership outcomes

	Power	Task	Role	Person
EE				
Correlation coefficient	−0.185	0.133	0.346*	0.134
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.198	0.357	0.014	0.353
EFF				
Correlation coefficient	−0.116	0.330*	0.313*	0.164
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.422	0.019	0.027	0.254
SAT				
Correlation coefficient	−0.076	0.150	0.219*	0.151
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.598	0.300	0.049	0.295

"person" culture could be explained by the prevalence of the "power" culture. The "power" culture is one where "pleasing a leader" is highly valued and, this could mean those who are able to please a leader; experience the feeling of 'being looked after'. This type of the behavior is not seen by respondents as transformational in nature and, this is evident in the lack of a relationship between the idealized behaviors (IIA and IIB) and OC. The lack of a significant relationship between all three leadership behaviors and the "power" culture could very well be due to the level of rejection of this type of culture within the public sector.

The "role" culture exhibited a significant relationship with 'context performance' while the "person" culture significantly relates to both 'task' and 'context performance.' The theory (Hay Group, 2011; Koopmans et al., 2012; Behn, 2006) suggests that the OC plays a major role on individual performance. Even though there is no significant correlation between the "power" culture, "task" culture and the two performance measures, some form of relationship exists, albeit not significant. The relationship between the "role" culture and context performance is understandable because the two constructs are largely about the environment in which the respondents deploy their skills with efficiency. There is a lack of a significant correlation between the "role" culture, "task" culture and "task" performance. This however does not necessarily imply that the "role" and "task" culture play no role in extracting individual effort for performance. The correlation between the "extra effort' and, both the "task" and "role" culture suggests that some form of individual performance can still be extracted through the "role" and "task" culture.

The literature emphasizes that OC is the key to unlocking leadership to influencing individual performance (Zehir et al., 2011; Ogbonna and Harris, 2000; Imran et al., 2012). In this study, transactional leadership is highly correlated with 'individual performance'. This contradicts previous studies which suggest that transformational behaviors are consistent with high performance (Bass and Avolio, 2004; Dorasamy, 2009; Xenikou and Simosi, 2006; Imran et al., 2012; Schimmoeller, 2010). Public service leaders must therefore pay careful attention to the type of OC in their organizations as this will affect individual performance. According to (Bass and Avolio, 2004), transformational leaders are able to get a follower to go beyond the "call of duty" and provide exceptional performance. Interestingly, while the personal and "role" culture exerts a positive effect on performance, the "task" culture shows a negative effect on individual performance.

Both leaders and followers perceived transformational leadership behaviors as being dominant in their organizations. A closer look at the transformational leadership behaviors showed that Inspirational Motivation (IM) and Intellectual Stimulation (IS) were scored the highest while, Idealized Influence (Behavior) (IIB) was scored the lowest. With the existing dominant culture being the "power" culture, it is possible that the "contingent reward" is being experienced in a "carrot and stick" dynamics.

5. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

As with all research, the findings must be tempered by some limitations which govern generalization of the findings. The public sectors studied may not have adopted the 'public sector' culture and, therefore findings on the relationship between culture and leadership may not be representative of the entire public sector in SA. The OC questions are objective and therefore the reasons for certain responses are not necessarily understood, although OC is a study of perceptions. Furthermore, the citizen of the region should also be included in a survey to get a more comprehensive picture. The selected sectors are located within the same metropolitan and participant perceptions of public sector leadership and culture may not be representative of the general public sector.

If there are no financial and time constraints, the sample could be expanded to include all government sectors and a national survey could be conducted. In order to determine the extent of the influence of one variable (transformational leadership) on another (IWP), regression modeling and other inferential statistical analysis could be considered. Furthermore, to test for mediation, path analysis could be used, as this approach has an advantage over simple regression, in that insight on direct and indirect effects is provided Ogbonna and Harris (2000).

REFERENCES

Aga, D.E. (2016), Transactional leadership and project success: The moderating role of goal clarity. Procedia Computer Science, 100, 517-525.

Alexandre, C. (2007), An Idiographic Analysis of New Public Management/Leader and Traditional Public Management/ Leadership. South Africa: DTech Dissertation: Cape Peninsula University.

Alsayed, A.K., Motaghi, M.H., Osman, I.B. (2012), The use of the multifactor leadership questionnaire and communication satisfaction questionnaire in palestine: A research note. International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 2(11), 14-19.

Amirul, S., Daud, H. (2012), A study on the relationship between leadership styles and leadeership effectiveness in Malaysian GLCs. European Journal of Business Management, 4(8), 193-201.

Antonakis, J., Avolio, B.J., Sivasubramaniam, N. (2003), Context and leadership: An examination of the nine-factor fullrange leadership theory using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. The Leadership Quarterly, 3(14), 261-95.

Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M., Jung, D.I. (1999), Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72, 441-462.

Aziz, S.F.A., Silong, A.D., Karim, N.A.A., Hassan, H. (2012), Leadership practices in public sector in selected countries: An integrative literature review. Journal of Management Policy and Practice, 13(1), 113-126.

Bass, B.M., Avolio, B.J. (2004), Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. 3rd ed. Binghamton: Mind Garden, Inc.

Behn, R.D. (2006), Performance Leadership: 11 Better Practices that Can Rachet Up Performance. Cambridge: IBM Center for The Business of Government.

Chipkin, I., Lipietz, B. (2012), Transforming South Africa's Racial Bureaucracy: New Public Management and Public Sector Reform in Contemporary South Africa. Johannesburg: Public Affairs Research Institute Public Affairs Research Institute.

Collis, J., Hussey, R. (2003), Business Research: A Practical Guide for Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students. 2nd ed. London: Palgrave Macmilla.

Doelman, H., Have, S., Ahaus, K. (2012), The moderating role of leadership in the relationship between management control and business excellence. Totsl Quality Managemenet, 23(5), 591-611.

Dorasamy, N. (2009), Enhancing an ethical culture through purpose directed leadership for improved public service delivery: A case for South Africa. African Journal of Business Management, 4(1), 56-64.

Dulewicz, V., Higgs, M. (2005), Assessing leadership styles and organisational context. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 20(2), 105-123.

Field, A.P. (2005), Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. 2nd ed. London: Sage.

Garcia-Morales, V.J., Jimenez-Barrionuevo, M.M., Gutierrez-Gutierrez, L. (2012), Transformational leadership influence on organizational prefromance through organizational learning and innovation. Jurnal of Business Research, 5(7), 1040-1050.

Gauteng Province. (2015), Gauteng Online: Annual Reports. Available from: http://www.gautengonline.gov.za/Pages/PublicationsandReports.aspx. [Last accessed on 2015 Apr 10].

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R.E., McKee, A. (2002), Primal Leadership: Realizing the Power of Emotional Intelligence. Boston: Harvard Business Press.

Harrison, R., Stokes, H. (1992), Diagnosing Organziational Culture. 1st ed. New York: John Willy and Sons.

Hansman, E.M. (2007), Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) as Leadership Assessment Tool in Colleges and Universities: An Exploratory Study on Potential Interest in Higher Education. Michigan: ProQuest.

Hay Group. (2011), Leadership 2030. New York: Hay Group.

Imran, R., Zahoor, F., Zaheer, A. (2012), Leadership and performance relationship: Culture matters. International Journal of Innovation, Management and Technology, 3(6), 713-717.

Jogulu, U.D. (2010), Culturally linked leadership styles. Leadership and Organisation Development Journal, 31(8), 705-719.

Kanste, O., Miettunen, J., Kyngas, H. (2006), Psychometric properties of the multifactor leadership questionnaire among nurses. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 57(2), 201-212.

Kolisang, L.O. (2011), Exploring the Relationship Between Leadership and Organisational Culture. Potchefstroom, South Africa: MBA Dissertation: North-West University.

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C., Hildebrandt, V., van Buuren, S., Beek, A.J.V., de Vet, H.C.W. (2012), Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 62(1), 6-28.

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C.M., Hildebrandt, V.H., de Vet, H.C.W., Beek, A.J.V. (2014), Construct validity of the individual work performance questionnaire. Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 56(3), 331-37.

Krejcie, R.V., Morgan, D.W. (1970), Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.

Magada, T., Govender, K.K. (2016), The Relationship Among Leadership, Organizational Culture and Performamce: A South African Public Service Organization Perspective. Proceedinsg of the 4th International Conference on Management, Leadership and Governance, 14-15th April 2016, St Peterburg, Russia.

Manetje, O., Martins, N. (2009), The relationship between organisational culture and organisational commitment. Southern African Business Review, 13(1), 87-111.

Matshiqi, A. (2007), Public service performance: Towards and better life for all. Policy: Issues and Factors, 20(5), 1-25.

Maximini, D. (2015), Organisational culture models. In the Scrum Culture. 1st ed. Switzerland: Spring International Publishing. pp.9-25.

Mokgolo, M.M., Modiba, M., Mokgolo, P. (2012), Transformational leadership in the South African public service after 2009 national elections. SA Journal of Human Resource Management, 10(1), 1-9.

National Treasury Republic of South Africa. (2014), Provincial Budgets and Expenditure Review. Pretoria: Forme Set Printers Cape (Pty) Ltd.

Niemann, R., Kotze, T. (2006), The relationship between leadership practices and organisational culture: An education management perspective. South African Journal of Education, 26(4), 609-624.

Ogbonna, E., Harris, C. (2000), Leadership style, organisational culture and performance: Emperical evidence from UK companies. International Jounral of Human Resource Management, 11(4), 766-788.

PSC. (2014), Assessing the Effectiveness of Training Provided by PALAMA in Improving Skills and Competencies of Public Service Leadership with a View to Inform Curriculum Development by the National School of Government. Pretoria: PSC.

Raga, K., Taylor, D. (2005), Impact of accountable and ethics on public service delivery: A South African perspective. The Public Manager, 34, 22-26.

SAGE Publications. (2010), Introduction to Quantitative. Available from: http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/36869_muijs.pdf. [Last accessed on 2015 Jan 12].

Senge, P. (2004), The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practices of Learning Organisation. New York: Doubleday.

Schimmoeller, L.J. (2010), Leadership styles in competing organizational cultures. Leadership Review, 10, 125-141.

Seloane, M.P. (2010), The Relationship Between Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture. Pretoria, South Africa: MAIP Dissertation: UNISA.

Sohmen, V.S. (2013), Leadership and teamwork: Two sides of the same coin. Journal of International Economic Development, 4(2), 1-18.

Stuyvesant M.J.V. (2007), The Influence of Roganisational Culture on Organisational Commitment at a Selected Local Municipality. Johannesburg, South Africa: MCom Dissertation: Rhodes University.

Tsai, L. (2011), Relationship between organizational culture, leadership behavior and job satisfaction. BMC Health Services Research, 11(98), 1-10.

Xenikou, A., Simosi, M. (2006), Organizational culture and transformational leadership as predictors of business unit performance. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21(6), 566-579.

Zehir, C., Ertosun, Ö.G., Zehir, S., Müceldili, B. (2011), The effects of leadership styles and organizational culture on firm performance: Multi-national companies in Istanbul. Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 24, 1460-1474.