BUREAUCRATIC LEADERSHIP AND STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING AT THE DEPARTMENT OF TRADE, INDUSTRY AND COMPETITION

Sibongile Mazibuko *, Emmanuel Mutambara **

* Corresponding author, Regenesys Business School, Johannesburg, South Africa
Contact details: Regenesys Business School, 165 West Street, Sandton, Johannesburg, South Africa
** Graduate School of Business & Leadership, University of KwaZulu-Natal, Westville, South Africa

OPEN ACCESS

Abstract

The relevance of bureaucratic leadership has long been a subject of heated debate among academics and businesses alike. A review of the literature found that bureaucratic leadership entails time-intensive — and often time-wasting — rules and procedures within a rigorous and painstakingly slow framework (Hamel & Zanini, 2017; Bishu & Kennedy, 2020; Mustanir et al., 2019; Berkowitz & Krause, 2020). Employees operating within a bureaucracy are given little choice in how they perform their work. The purpose of the study is to assess the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making within the Department of Trade, Industry and Competition (DTIC). The researchers employed an explanatory sequential mixed-method research design, conducted across two phases. Phase 1 was a quantitative study comprising an online survey and phase 2 was a qualitative study based on data collected from in-depth interviews. The study found that strategic decision-making at the DTIC is a time-consuming and onerous process and that strategic decisions were not made by the organisation's bureaucratic leaders, but were relegated to a political level, thus limiting the effectiveness of the DTIC's operations. To ease this tension in the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and decision-making, the researchers recommended adopting a hybrid leadership framework to engage all levels of management and leadership in the DTIC.

1. INTRODUCTION

Effective leadership is crucial to enhancing an organisation's operations and performance, whether in the private or public sector. Tasked with tackling complex management systems, most organisations focus on making strategic decisions that achieve their organisational goals most efficiently. As argued by Berkowitz and Krause (2020), the complexities organisations face relating to business or operational management are mitigated through effective leadership. While the traditional

model of bureaucratic leadership — sometimes referred to as administrative leadership — has proven ineffective and is often deemed an inappropriate approach to leading organisations to sustainable success, it remains the leadership model of choice for many government organisations, including the Department of Trade, Industry and Competition (DTIC).

Several scholars have suggested that organisations operating within a highly structured business environment, and bureaucratic leadership can have a massive impact. Hence, organisations with a high concentration of bureaucratic leadership should have an efficient management structure that is governed by implementable strategic decision-making (Wambua, 2022; Amanchukwu et al., 2015; Schaefer, 2004).

However, these scholars also acknowledge its potential to generate negative outcomes if the leader does not follow the theoretical approaches efficiently (Wambua, 2002; Amanchukwu et al., 2015; Ibara, 2010; Hamel & Zanini, 2017).

The ongoing discourse around the relevance of bureaucratic leadership has arisen from various standpoints on leadership and decision-making. Most agree that if an organisation's culture is orthodox and too hierarchical, it is associated with bureaucratic leadership. Academic commentary pertaining to this topic has tended to focus on bureaucratic leadership theories and strategic decision-making disjointedly rather than taking a holistic view. This was confirmed while perusing the Nexus database, which focused predominantly on the following topics regarding leadership perspectives of decision-making: reframing of organisations (Bolman & Deal, 2017); discontinuities and post-bureaucratic organising (Chudoba et al., 2002); and influences on strategic decision effectiveness (Elbanna & Child, 2007). Therefore, the basis for this study was derived from studies in the literature that provided insights into the use of bureaucratic principles in organisational leadership and management, and a thorough analysis of how leaders make strategic decisions.

Leaders apply different methods to drive individuals to perform tasks effectively as well as efficiently. This study took cognisance of typologies of leadership styles, including transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire (passive) leadership styles extracted from the full-range leadership model (Bass & Avolio, 1994).

Bass (1985) suggested that these three types of leadership styles form a continuum, with transformational leadership being the most active and effective, while laissez-faire leadership is the least effective.

A laissez-faire leadership style implies laziness, complacency, a lack of commitment, and avoidance of responsibility or action (Reddy, 2017). Conversely, the bureaucratic leadership process is based on fixed official duties or rules under a particular hierarchical authority (Mustanir et al., 2019). Bureaucratic leadership within business organisations depends on immutable rules, hierarchical structures, and elaborate mechanisms of control (Laureani & Antony, 2017).

This kind of centralised and mechanistic approach to management focuses on task execution. In theory, bureaucratic leadership is complemented by transformational and, from time to time, transactional leadership styles. However, these styles have not been readily adopted within the DTIC.

Therefore, this paper aims to explore the relationship between bureaucratic leadership practices and strategic decision-making in the DTIC, through a survey and interviews with the view to improve organisational goals. This is with the rationale of analysing the problems associated with implementing effective strategic decisions within organisations characterised by bureaucratic leadership for the DTIC. The study adopted a mixed method approach using both quantitative and qualitative research approaches to investigate the phenomenon. The study expands on limited empirical research on the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making in the DTIC, which is at times uneasy.

Following this introduction section, the rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 analyses the methodology that has been used to conduct empirical research. Section 4 presents the results of the study. Section 5 provides a discussion of the results. Section 6 draws the conclusion of the study.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

2.1. Background of bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making

Developed by Max Weber in 1947 (Avolio et al., 2009), bureaucratic leadership is a management system that requires employees to follow particular lines of authority. Weber argued that by using this leadership style, a business could make decisions that were aligned with the organisation's goals while allowing it to sustain its position in a competitive environment. According to Al Khajeh (2018), the bureaucratic approach to business, management and leadership focuses exclusively on the systematic completion of tasks. This approach is often useful in large-scale organisations as it can help to delineate a clear hierarchical structure and establish tasks requiring completion. However, bureaucratic leadership inhibits creative decision-making and often creates a stagnant situation regarding the implementation of overall departmental and governmental strategies. As per the findings presented by Imperial et al. (2016), bureaucratic or traditional leadership styles focus on unilateral viewpoints and inhibit collective action.

In reviewing the literature, the researchers sought to examine the theory behind the bureaucratic leadership approach. Bureaucratic leadership depends upon a strong chain of knowledge, strict regulations, and conformity by its followers.

Some scholars suggest that not everyone in a position of leadership possesses the qualities required of an effective bureaucratic leader (Amanchukwu et al., 2015; Bishu & Kennedy, 2020; Meier, 2019). Becoming a bureaucratic leader calls for qualities that allow an individual to motivate and encourage employees to follow their orders. The literature review analysed the preferred

qualties of a bureaucratic leader to influence employees effectively in their work role. The review also drew on the experiences of other scholars to highlight the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and the strategic decision-making process (Fiaz et al., 2017).

Bureaucratic leadership can be said to provide a map for the ultimate destination, while strategic decision-making provides direction (Nguyen et al., 2017). This is because through delegation bureaucratic leadership can provide a well-oiled running management structure whilst strategic decision-making can be at a whim and at times force leaders to decisions instantly. Leaders may be powerful in deciding on the eventual goal, but attempting to reach it without implementing a strategy is like walking through a dark forest without a compass (Zu, 2019). A leader's success in strategic decision-making could depend on their ability to bring people together and accomplish the tasks allocated to them without causing glaring dissension in an organisation.

According to Simard et al. (2018), strategic decision-making is helpful for bureaucratic leaders in evaluating both the external and internal environment of the business or the organisation. Bureaucratic leadership emphasises enhancing trust and motivating individuals, while simultaneously concerning itself with influencing, managing, organising, planning and problem-solving (Heaton & Parlikad, 2019). Leaders may be visionaries, but without the ability to offer something tangible, their vision is little more than hot air (Kumar et al., 2000). Therefore, a bureaucratic leadership style is highly efficient in reaching decisions that do not require much creativity or innovation from employees (Kumar et al., 2000).

Bureaucratic leadership has a massive impact on individuals and is successful in convincing them to attain the organisational goals (Ashaye & Irani, 2019). This particular leadership style also influences the rules, culture, structure, mission, goals and vision that are associated with strategic decisions within the organisation. According to Coccia (2017), bureaucratic leadership can be highly focused on both strategic planning and implementation, and hence operate within a long-term timetable, incorporating short-term output with long-term routine.

Other forms of leadership do not need to have a future-oriented approach to become successful. This is evident from real-life instances of some top operational leaders, who ensure the achievement of routine tasks and end up achieving only short-term task. Therefore, the change-oriented nature of bureaucratic leadership enforces decision-making that improves long-term performance (Vierendeels et al., 2018). Strategic decision-making involves developing organisational plans, creating assessments, and shaping or reshaping an organisation to help it flourish and attain its key goals (Geng et al., 2017). According to research, bureaucratic and strategic decisions are interlinked, which helps leaders convince others to do what is needed for organisational success. As stated by Watkins et al. (2017), strategic decision-making gives management a competitive advantage. As decision-makers, they possess the authority to adopt certain strategies.

While strategic decision-making is critical for ensuring an organisation's survival in a rapidly changing business environment (Bishu & Kennedy, 2020), bureaucratic leaders' decisions are based on the need to make regular adjustments to accommodate changing business situations. They are also required to maintain the momentum of the changing business world to achieve a competitive edge. Although the literature provided some valuable insights into bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making as standalone concepts, it did not provide sufficient data regarding the importance and utilisation of bureaucratic leadership principles within the strategic decision-making process (Maassen & Stensaker, 2019). This reinforced the focus of the study, namely the need to determine how the interrelationship between strategic decision-making and bureaucratic leadership leads to organisational performance.

2.2. Hypotheses development

The chi-square test of independence was used for hypothesis testing to determine whether there was an association between variables. While the actual study presented seven hypotheses, this study only addresses the first two:

$H1_0$: There is a strong relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making.

$H1$: There is a poor association between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making.

$H1_0$ and $H1$ were tested through the cross-tabulation of responses from the two questions: "How do you rate the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making in government departments?" and "How do you rate the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making at the DTIC?" (see Table 1).

Table 1. $H1_0$ vs. $H1$

Chi-square test	Value	df	Asymptotic significance (2-sided)
Pearson chi-square	21.472	9	0.011
Likelihood ratio	22.525	9	0.007
Linear-by-linear association	0.556	1	0.456
N of valid cases	105		

Table 1 reveals no statistically significant relationships between the two variables. The p-value is 0.011, which is greater than 0.05 (p = 0.011 < 0.005), implying that no statistical relationship exists between selected variables, therefore, accepting *H1* and rejecting *$H1_0$*. From the data presented in the table, the researchers sought to delve deeper by collecting qualitative data from face-to-face interviews.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research design

The study employed an explanatory sequential mixed methods design using both the quantitative and the qualitative approaches. During the first phase, the researchers collected and analysed quantitative data from an online survey, followed in the second phase by qualitative data from in-depth interviews. The intention behind this design was for the qualitative data to provide a deeper level of understanding of the information gathered during the initial phase (Creswell, 2014).

Therefore, the results from the first phase informed the type of questions to be developed, while also guiding the selection of participants for the second qualitative phase. Given that the nature of this study uses more of an inductive approach than a deductive approach. The researchers adopted an inductive approach by observing and analysing the respondents' perspectives, which aided in understanding the phenomena under study. Thus, deductive research entails the use of different hypotheses from existing theories (Kogan et al., 2012), whereas an inductive approach involves the development of a theory or factual conclusion by collecting and analysing data.

The setting of this study is the DTIC. The DTIC is a South African government department responsible for industrial and commercial policy. It promotes structural transformation towards a globally competitive economy within a dynamic industrial context (Al Khajeh, 2018).

The DTIC aims to execute a broad range of functions, including boosting manufacturing performance, attracting investments, incentivising industry, promoting exports, and facilitating job creation (https://www.thedti.gov.za). The rationale for the selection of this setting is that it expedites strategic decision-making for the businesses and organisations it aims to serve, thereby enhancing their operations, and is heavily reliant on sound leadership, well-designed and aligned government priorities and implementable departmental strategies.

3.2. Sampling design and population

A stratified sampling method was used for this study. Although stratified random sampling demands a greater administrative effort than other methods and analysis can be slightly complex, it also provides greater precision than other sampling methods. In addition, it reduces the level of variability and standard error of estimates by ensuring a greater level of efficiency.

The stratified sample for this study was drawn from the DTIC's employees, which reflected the true nature of the population. Another key benefit of stratified random sampling is that it offers better coverage of the population because the researcher has reasonable estimates for confirming whether the population is represented in the sample (Sharma, 2017). Inclusion criteria were workers with over two years of managerial experience.

The researchers identified a sample of around 200 middle to senior management respondents at the DTIC from a total population of 2000 employees below the middle and senior management. The reason for the selection of the middle and senior managers was that they serve as an interface between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making whereas those below are tasked with implementing strategic decisions.

3.3. Validity and reliability

Using positivist epistemology required the collection of empirical data and the analysis of the validity and reliability of the measurement instruments. Reliability refers to the extent to which measurement using the instrument can be replicated consistently and accurately in similar situations (Neuman, 2003).

According to Collis and Hussey (2003), validity is concerned with the extent to which the research findings accurately represent what is happening, i.e., whether the data is a true picture of what is being studied. A range of validity and reliability methods can be used in a study of this nature. Types of validity include content validity, face validity, construct validity or criterion validity. For example, this study used content validity to ensure data validity and face validity for the pilot study.

Clarity and understanding of the questions posed to the respondents were established by experts to allow the researcher to make the necessary adjustments before issuing the questions to the respondents. Likewise, a number of approaches can be used to test for reliability, including test-retest and inter-rater reliability. For this study, the test-retest method was applied. Each item was correlated with every other item across the entire sample.

4. PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS

Of the 200 research questionnaires that were distributed, 105 were completed and returned. Ten people from the initial sample of 2000 were selected for structured interviews. The following findings emerged from the questions posed in the online survey and in-depth interviews, which assessed the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making. Although research respondents were asked to provide their opinions on government departments in general, the primary focus was on the DTIC.

4.1. Dominant public sector decisions

As a concept, bureaucratic leadership was generally well understood by the respondents (94.3%). When asked whether strategic decision-making or strategic implementation best described dominant public sector decisions at the DTIC, almost half (48.6%) chose strategic decision-making, with 34.2% indicating strategic implementation. Only 7.6% believed that both decision-making and implementation best described dominant public sector decisions at the DTIC. The remaining 9.5% indicated "Other" but did not clarify what they meant by that.

4.2. Effectiveness of bureaucratic leadership

The results of the study show that an overwhelming majority of individuals who were questioned believed that bureaucratic leadership, as a leadership style, was either "most effective" (49.5%) or "more

effective" (28%), confirming that operations are carried out in an effective manner, thus ensuring efficiency. About a quarter of the respondents felt it was "less effective" (17.1%) or "least effective" (7.6%).

4.3. Importance of bureaucratic leadership

Most of the respondents interviewed (87.6%) suggested that, based on their experience within the DTIC, bureaucratic leadership was vital to strategic decision-making in government departments in general.

4.4. Relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making

Considering the respondents' ratings, the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making at the DTIC is deemed fair, pointing to definite room for improvement.

4.5. Relationship between bureaucratic leadership and management

A majority of respondents had a positive attitude towards bureaucratic leadership, with 54.3% rating it as good and 3.8% rating it as very good. This is probably because bureaucratic leadership provides a clear structure, hierarchy and a concise way of managing resources and personnel, which can make management more efficient. However, more than a third held a negative view, with 32.4% rating it as poor and 6.7% as very poor.

4.6. Rating of bureaucratic leadership at the DTIC

Of the 105 people surveyed, 9.5% rated leadership as very poor, 20% rated it as poor, 58.1% rated it as good, and 7.6% rated it as very good. A fraction of respondents (4.8%) did not respond to the question. This data suggests that bureaucratic leadership at the DTIC is adequate and effective in meeting the needs of the people it serves.

4.7. Results from the in-depth interviews

The following emerged from the in-depth interviews.
Question 1: How would you describe the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making in government departments?
Whilst respondents provided a range of responses to this question, some expressed the view that decision-making was for top-ranking leadership and that the lower ranks had no say but were obligated to implement what was decided in the upper echelons: *"Decision-making sits at the top management. Lower management, middle management are not supposed to be strategic thinkers"* (Personal communication, August 2022).
One problem identified by one respondent was that those in acting positions did not want to take responsibility for making decisions, thus causing delays. Another respondent stated that bureaucratic leadership was mostly bound by policies within the unit and did not necessarily bring about strategic decision-making. Another perception was that strategic decisions in government, including the DTIC, were not made by bureaucratic leaders, but were rather made at a political level.

Question 2: How would you describe the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making at the DTIC?
Participants' main concern was the timeframe — whether at the DTIC or other government departments, decision-making is a slow process.
Question 3: What factors drive bureaucratic leadership towards strategic decision-making at the DTIC?
Of the 10 respondents, four mentioned politics as the main factor. They maintained that the Ministers were the driving force and dictated what needed to be done. Whilst respondents agreed politics determined the decisions, each explained this in their own way: "[The Ministers] *put what needs to be done in the form of an Annual Performance Plan. Their direction is taken from the President's annual speech and what the Minister needs to deliver on becomes the performance indicators for what the rest of the people under him need to deliver on"* (Personal communication, July 2022).
"The political factor drives the bureaucratic decision-making in that whenever a new minister comes in, he/she comes with a new mandate. Ministers bring their own people they believe will drive decisions aligned to his bureaucratic strategic decision-making" (Personal communication, July 2022).
"The overall strategic decisions are vested with the political leadership. The DG [director-general] *will have to align his own vision with what the Minister wants to achieve in his ruling parties and Medium-Term Strategic Framework"* (Personal communication, August 2022).
According to the literature, this tension is nothing new (Auriacombe & Mavanyisi, 2003; Bohler-Muller et al., 2022; Mazibuko, 2007). The political-administrative interface and institutional design have not transformed over time. As a result, negative consequences filtering from these poorly managed tensions result in poor working relationships. Bohler-Muller et al. (2022) pointed out that when relationships become "apprehensive", they also become "dysfunctional". Respondents felt that removing the tension would mean permeating the "wall" that they perceived existed between top management and lower management.
Apart from the political factor, respondents cited factors driving bureaucratic leadership towards strategic decision-making at the DTIC such as a lack of consistency, accountability, changes in human resources, responsibility, diversity, and policies. Respondents mentioned that when the policies are proactive, leadership becomes more accepting of the changes. They added that diversity influenced how effectively changes in the DTIC could be addressed within the landscape of the economy they were trying to change.
The researchers deduced that, in the main, respondents did not have a problem with bureaucratic leadership per se, but with how it was implemented in addressing continuous professional development and organisational goals and objectives.

5. DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

According to the data, bureaucratic leadership was more likely to be understood than any other type of leadership. There was a high likelihood; therefore,

that bureaucratic leadership would have a positive impact on the DTIC. Despite the majority having a good understanding of what bureaucratic leadership is, respondents whose grasp of the concept was limited or absent points to a potential need for development.

Bureaucratic leadership is characterised by its adherence to established protocols and hierarchies. While it has a reputation for being rigid, authoritarian and counterproductive, it may also be viewed as effective and efficient. How bureaucratic leadership is implemented has a significant impact on its results.

In contrast to the belief held by a minority of employees at the DTIC, the data reveals that an overwhelming majority of the respondents thought that bureaucratic leadership played a positive role in the economy. Even those who felt that bureaucratic leadership was less effective acknowledged the possibility that they could derive some benefit from it, such as increased regulation and oversight. The results of the study suggest that, for the main part, employees within the DTIC had a positive perception of the effectiveness of bureaucratic leadership, possibly because it provides a distinct line of authority and a well-defined structure.

Those who think it to be effective stated that it had the potential to facilitate the simplification of processes and the enhancement of businesses' overall levels of productivity. The possibility exists that this would contribute, not only to growth but also to increased productivity.

It would appear from the findings that, given its propensity to promote stability and order, bureaucratic leadership could have a positive effect. According to the findings, bureaucratic leadership does play a significant role at the DTIC, with only a minuscule proportion who think its role is insignificant. Therefore, the data demonstrates the significance of bureaucratic leadership in the functioning of the economy. Top-down bureaucratic management within a government department such as the DTIC is beneficial to the economy as it ensures effective and efficient management of the department. This can lead to better economic outcomes, such as increased economic growth and improved living standards, among other potential benefits.

However, the possibility of unintended consequences exists, such as when bureaucratic leadership results in an excessive amount of regulation and paperwork. An overly bureaucratic leadership style may be harmful to the economy. It could give rise to less effective decision-making because of the tendency for its leaders to be more concerned with adhering to rules and regulations than making strategic decisions that could be beneficial to an organisation. The upshot could be a dearth of innovation and originality, which, in turn, could stymie the economy's expansion.

The primary reason for this viewpoint is that bureaucratic leadership is excessively focused on the organisation's goals and objectives in the short term and is not willing to take risks or make decisions with a long-term perspective and the potential to improve overall performance. Consequently, the organisation cannot adjust to shifting conditions or seize opportunities that may become available. In the end, this reduces the organisation's overall effectiveness.

Despite indications by almost two-thirds of respondents that the relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making was either good or very good, given that more than one-third believed the relationship was either very poor or poor, was cause for concern. Notwithstanding that more than a third of respondents viewed bureaucratic leadership as inflexible and unresponsive to employees' needs, it was evident that the majority of respondents viewed it as generally effective.

Moreover, bureaucratic leadership usually experiences less corruption and more efficient use of resources. Therefore, the data indicate that bureaucratic leadership is likely to have a positive effect on improving an organisation's goals. Although this study made a case for the DTIC only, it is essential to note that, despite its mandate, the DTIC's functions are not isolated from other government departments.

The research also unearthed some salient points, including favouritism, patronage and a silo mentality. Therefore, it could be said that bureaucratic leadership facilitates the vision of the future and assures individuals within the DTIC to fulfil their vision, which makes individuals put in the effort and face difficulties to transform vision into reality.

6. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that bureaucratic leadership affects the economy in various ways. From the perspective of government organisations such as the DTIC, bureaucratic leadership can promote compliance with regulations, thereby helping to create a stable business environment and stimulating economic growth. Bureaucratic leadership can also facilitate the efficient running of government programmes, which can save the taxpayer money and help to improve the economy. Finally, bureaucratic leadership can help to ensure that government decisions are made in a rational and efficient manner, thus eradicating corruption and ensuring that the government is making decisions in the best interests of the citizens.

Generally, bureaucratic leadership within the DTIC is open to change, however, it needs to make significant shifts in the way it operates. Various factors influence strategic decision-making within organisations, the most important among which is the decision-maker. Decision-makers such as the leaders who follow a bureaucratic leadership style with a reactive attitude possess a classical and work-oriented management approach, which helps the business to survive within the changing environmental conditions within the DTIC.

Thus, it could be said that bureaucratic leadership facilitates the vision and inspires individuals to make an extra effort and, where needed, face difficulties head-on, so that they can be an integral part of transforming the organisation's vision into a reality. In addition, the study concludes that a workable relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making is necessary for the effective and efficient operation of the DTIC. It is a centre, a synchroniser and an enabler that presents an idea of how government machinery should function.

However, owing to time constraints and limited resources, the study was limited to the DTIC, which affected the generalisability of the results to other government departments. A more plausible outcome may have been reached had other government departments been included. As some respondents did not complete the questionnaire, the response rate was only 52.5% (105 respondents), possibly because they feared exposure and being taken to task by the organisation for expressing their opinions.

This happened despite all the measures taken to explain and ensure anonymity and confidentiality. In addition, employees may have been experiencing survey fatigue, owing to the numerous research studies they were asked to partake in at the department. The relationship between bureaucratic leadership and decisive and consistent decision-making remains a challenge within the DTIC. Therefore, renewing the focus on developing bureaucratic leaders with strategic decision-making skills within the DTIC would help in achieving the necessary levels of authority and strengthening the organisation's trademark through the establishment of proper foundations.

Drawing from the above conclusions, the study recommends that, while there is a need to adopt a workable relationship between bureaucratic leadership and strategic decision-making, leaders at the DTIC also need time to listen to and consider the viewpoints of their employees. Furthermore, if attaining the DTIC's goals requires teamwork, motivation or extra effort, this need not entail a significant change like demoting employees. Considering ministerial viewpoints, the study recommends that such views should be driven and rooted in a strategic focus that incorporates the day-to-day functions without stifling the other managers' decision-making authority.

Overall, the study recommends that the management of the DTIC has to become more approachable, enabling staff to open up and communicate freely. It is recommended that the DTIC be more adaptive to a leadership mentality within a hybrid bureaucratic framework and that bureaucratic leadership must be aligned to the style of the leadership with the DTIC's vision and mission, thus achieving its objectives, which would be beneficial for the organisational business environment.

REFERENCES

1. Al Khajeh, E. H. (2018). Impact of leadership styles on organizational performance. *Journal of Human Resources Management Research, 2018*, Article 687849. https://doi.org/10.5171/2018.687849
2. Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J., & Ololube, N. P. (2015). A review of leadership theories, principles and styles and their relevance to educational management. *Management*, *5*(1), 6–14. http://article.sapub.org/10.5923.j.mm.20150501.02.html
3. Ashaye, O. R., & Irani, Z. (2019). The role of stakeholders in the effective use of e-government resources in public services. *International Journal of Information Management, 49,* 253–270. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.05.016
4. Auriacombe, C., & Mavanyisi, J. (2003). Political control over the bureaucracy. *Politeia, 22*(3), 72–84. https://doi.org/10.10520/EJC88098
5. Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60*, 421–449. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163621
6. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* Free Press.
7. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership.* SAGE Publications.
8. Berkowitz, D., & Krause, G. A. (2020). How bureaucratic leadership shapes policy outcomes: Partisan politics and affluent citizens' incomes in the American states. *Journal of Public Policy, 40*(2), 305–328. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0143814X18000405
9. Bishu, S. G., & Kennedy, A. R. (2020). Trends and gaps: A meta-review of representative bureaucracy. *Review of Public Personnel Administration, 40*(4), 559–588. https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X19830154
10. Bohler-Muller, N., Pienaar, G., Houston, G., Cosser, M., Kanyane, M., Sausi, K., April, Y., Viljoen, J., & Mchunu, N. (2022). *Synthesis evaluation of state capacity with a special focus on directors-general and heads of department: Final report.* Human Sciences Research Council. http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.11910/19283
11. Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2017). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (6th ed.). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119281856
12. Chudoba, K. M., Crowston, K., & Watson-Manheim, M. B. (2002). *Discontinuities and post-bureaucratic organizing: A framework and research propositions* [Paper presentation]. Academy of Management Conference, Denver, USA. https://crowston.syr.edu/content/discontinuities-and-post-bureaucratic-organizing-framework-and-research-propositions
13. Coccia, M. (2017). Varieties of capitalism's theory of innovation and a conceptual integration with leadership-oriented executives: The relation between typologies of executive, technological and socioeconomic performances. *International Journal of Public Sector Performance Management, 3*(2), 148–68. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPSPM.2017.084672
14. Collis, J., & Hussey, R. (2003). *Business research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate studies* (2nd ed.). Palgrave MacMillan.
15. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
16. Department of Trade, Industry and Competition (DTIC). (2022). *The DTIC annual report 2021/2022.* http://www.thedtic.gov.za/wp-content/uploads/Annual-Report-2022.pdf
17. Elbanna, S., & Child, J. (2007). Influences on strategic decision effectiveness: Development and test of an integrative model. *Strategic Management Journal, 28*(4), 431–453. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.597
18. Fiaz, M., Su, Q., Ikram, A., & Saqib, A. (2017). Leadership styles and employees' motivation: Perspective from an emerging economy. *The Journal of Developing Areas, 51*(4), 143–156. https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2017.0093

19. Geng, R., Mansouri, S. A., Aktas, E., & Yen, D. A. (2017). The role of Guanxi in green supply chain management in Asia's emerging economies: A conceptual framework. *Industrial Marketing Management, 63*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2017.01.002

20. Hamel, G., & Zanini, M. (2017, May 16). Assessment: Do you know how bureaucratic your organization is? *Harvard Business Review.* https://hbr.org/2017/05/assessment-do-you-know-how-bureaucratic-your-organization-is

21. Heaton, J., & Parlikad, A. K. (2019). A conceptual framework for the alignment of infrastructure assets to citizen requirements within a Smart Cities framework. *Cities, 90*, 32–41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.01.041

22. Ibara, E. C. (2010). *Perspectives in educational administration.* Rodi Printing and Publishing.

23. Imperial, M. T., Ospina, S., Johnston, E., O'Leary, R., Thomsen, J., Williams, P., & Johnson, S. (2016). Understanding leadership in a world of shared problems: Advancing network governance in large landscape conservation. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 14*(3), 126–136. https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1248

24. Kogan, J. R., Conforti, L. N., Bernabeo, E. C., Durning, S. J., Hauer, K. E., & Holmboe, E. S. (2012). Faculty staff perceptions of feedback to residents after direct observation of clinical skills. *Medical Education, 46*(2), 201–215. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2923.2011.04137.x

25. Kumar, N., Scheer, L., & Kotler, P. (2000). From market driven to market driving. *European Management Journal, 18*(2), 129–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(99)00084-5

26. Laureani, A., & Antony, J. (2017). Leadership and Lean Six Sigma: A systematic literature review. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence, 30*(4), 53–81. https://doi.org/10.1080/14783363.2017.1288565

27. Maassen, P., & Stensaker, B. (2019). From organised anarchy to de-coupled bureaucracy: The transformation of university organisation. *Higher Education Quarterly, 73*(4), 456–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/hequ.12229

28. Mazibuko, S. G. (2007). *Institutions, mechanisms and processes of political control over the public service: Perspectives on functional dependence.* [Master's thesis, University of Johannesburg]. https://hdl.handle.net/10210/2382

29. Meier, K. J. (2019). Theoretical frontiers in representative bureaucracy: New directions for research. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance, 2*(1), 39–56. https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvy004

30. Mustanir, A., Jermsittiparsert, K., Ali, A., Hermansyah, S., & Sakinah, S. (2019). Village head leadership and bureaucratic model towards good governance in Sidenreng Rappang. In P. Santoso, D. T. Tikson, E. Oyamada, & W. Carada (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 1st Hasanuddin International Conference on Social and Political Sciences.* European Alliance for Innovation (EAI). http://doi.org/10.4108/eai.21-10-2019.2291532

31. Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

32. Nguyen, T. T., Mia, L., Winata, L., & Chong, V. K. (2017). Effect of transformational-leadership style and management control system on managerial performance. *Journal of Business Research, 70*, 202–213. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.08.018

33. Ragab, M. A. F., & Arisha, A. (2018). Research methodology in business: A starter's guide. *Management and Organizational Studies, 5*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.5430/mos.v5n1p1

34. Reddy, T. (2017). *Leadership styles and strategy implementation in the Department of Trade and Industry (DTI).* [Doctoral dissertation, University of the Free State Business School]. https://scholar.ufs.ac.za:8080/bitstream/handle/11660/9185/ReddyT.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

35. Schaefer, R. T. (2004). *Sociology* (9th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

36. Sharma, G. (2017). Pros and cons of different sampling techniques. *International Journal of Applied Research, 3*(7), 749–752. https://www.allresearchjournal.com/archives/2017/vol3issue7/PartK/3-7-69-542.pdf

37. Simard, M., Aubry, M., & Laberge, D. (2018). The utopia of order versus chaos: A conceptual framework for governance, organizational design and governmentality in projects. *International Journal of Project Management, 36*(3), 460–473. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2018.01.003

38. Vierendeels, G., Reniers, G., van Nunen, K., & Ponnet, K. (2018). An integrative conceptual framework for safety culture: The egg aggregated model (TEAM) of safety culture. *Safety Science, 103*, 323–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2017.12.021

39. Wambua, S. (2022, March 16). *Leadership in bureaucratic environments impact on outcomes* [Post]. LinkedIn. https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/leadership-bureaucratic-environments-impact-outcomes-ngenyi-pgmdpro/

40. Watkins, D., Earnhardt, M., Pittenger, L., Roberts, R., Rietsema, K., & Cosman-Ross, J. (2017). Thriving in complexity: A framework for leadership education. *Journal of Leadership Education, 16*(4), 148–163. https://doi.org/10.12806/V16/I4/T4

41. Wieczorek, D., & Lear, J. (2018). Building the "bridge": Teacher leadership for learning and distributed organizational capacity for instructional improvement. *International Journal of Teacher Leadership, 9*(2), 22–47. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1202334.pdf

42. Zu, L. (2019). Purpose-driven leadership for sustainable business: From the perspective of Taoism. *International Journal of Corporate Social Responsibility, 4*(1), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40991-019-0041-z