

Administrators' Leadership Behavior, Psychological Needs Satisfaction And Team Effectiveness Among Ministers

Amelia L. Soriano¹

Wealthy C. Estrada²

¹Central Luzon Conference, Malabon, Metro Manila, Philippines
amiesoriano@yahoo.com

²Manila Adventist College, Pasay City, Philippines wcestrada@hotmail.com

Abstract

This study determined the administrators' leadership behaviour, psychological needs satisfaction and team effectiveness among ministers. Demographic variables such as position, age, educational attainment and length of service were considered as demographic variables. The study used the descriptive-correlational design using 246 respondents. The respondents perceived the leadership behaviour of the administrators at a high level. The level of psychological needs satisfaction was also high. Team effectiveness as perceived by the respondents was also high. Results showed a positive correlation between leadership behaviour in terms of directive, participative, supportive and achievement-oriented leadership to team effectiveness. Likewise, psychological needs satisfaction in terms of love and belongingness, power, freedom and fun had positive correlation to team effectiveness. The best predictor of team effectiveness was achievement-oriented leadership. When moderator variables were considered, educational attainment predicted team effectiveness. The lower the educational attainment, the better was their effectiveness of the minister.

I. INTRODUCTION

In organizations worldwide, work teams are indispensable because they work intensely on a specific, common goal using positive synergy based on individual and mutual accountability and complementary skills. As organizations in the 21st century have restructured themselves to compete more effectively and efficiently, they have turned to teams as a way to use their employees' talents better. In recent years, American businesses have embraced employee involvement as they participate in a highly competitive marketplace (Das & Jajaran, 2006). Employee contribution to team effectiveness is being viewed as an important factor in the struggle to remain successful (McCarter, 2015).

In the Philippines, Filipinos generally have a moderate level of team effectiveness.

This is attributed to their trait and value of smooth interpersonal relationships (*pakikisama*). Filipinos are good at dealing with workmates and can communicate well. They treat each other as family and share each other's problems. A research done among employees of the National Food Authority in Baguio City found that team effectiveness level fell on the fair level due to operational problems and lack of administrative leadership (Mejorada, 2002).

A performance evaluation of the North Philippine Union Conference, conducted in 2009 by an evaluation team headed by the president, showed an over-all result of satisfactory. The goal is excellence. This means that there is still great need for united efforts to reach the maximum level in doing God's work and a high potential of better teamwork among administrators and workers. Surely there would be maximum performance in various church ministries if

unity or teamwork was practiced in denominational workplace both in office and in the field.

Organizations have various symptoms of unproductive teams. Miscommunication is one factor. Even the lack of disagreement among team members may reflect an unwillingness to show true feeling and ideas. There are also malfunctioning meetings characterized by boredom, lack of enthusiastic participation, failure to reach a decision, or domination by one or two people. Conflict within the team is often characterized by a suspicious, combative environment and by highly personalized conflict among team members. Further, teams fail due to lack of leadership; lack of focus and capability; lack of clarity about team purpose, roles, strategy and goals; lack of support; lack of consistency of direction; lack of resources (Dressler, 2001).

Leadership plays an important role in team effectiveness (Sashkin & Sashkin, 2003). Leadership is defined as the ability to get people along towards the achievement of a given task without coercion (Chapman & O'Neil, 2000). According to Ward (2007), leadership is the art of motivating to get along towards the achievement a common goal. McShane and Von Glinow (2008) wrote that "leadership is about influencing, motivating, and enabling others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization of which they are members" (p.402).

Team effectiveness relies on the satisfaction and well-being of its members. People join groups to fulfil their personal needs, so effectiveness is partly measured by this need fulfilment.

Human being are motivated to fulfil five basic essential needs, which include the need for survival, the need for love and belongingness, the need for power, the need for freedom, and the need for fun (Wubbolding, 2001).

It is agreed among researchers that human being everywhere have the same essential needs. As Glasser (2002) has pointed out, behaviors are answers to unmet needs or wants. A behavior is a choice. To

fulfil the needs, we behave. The individual is true from this point.

It is within the context that this researchers was led pursue this study to determine the relationship of leadership behaviour and psychological needs satisfaction to team effectiveness.

This study aimed to determine the relationship of leadership behavior and psychological needs satisfaction to team effectiveness of the North Philippine Union Conference (NPUC) administrators and ministers. Further, the results of the study were used to help the researcher to develop a program for effective leadership behaviour to enhance team effectiveness.

II. Methods

Research Design

The researcher used the descriptive correlational type of study to find out the nature of the data and describe the entire process of research.

The design was deemed appropriate for the study, since it determined the relationship of the administrators' leadership behavior (participative, supportive, directive and achievement-oriented) and psychological needs satisfaction (love and belongingness, power, freedom and fun) to team effectiveness (mutual trust, unified commitment, clear goals and good communication).

Population and Sampling Techniques

The study was conducted in the North Philippine Union Conference territory. The respondents were 31 administrators and 215 ministers in various conferences, and mission institutions.

Purposive sampling was used in the study wherein the researchers selected their respondents based on two criteria: ordained ministers and ministerial workers.

Research Instrumentation

The researchers utilized a four-part self-constructed questionnaire

based on related literature.

These three sets of instruments used the five-point Likert scale on Administrators' Leadership Behavior, Team Effectiveness, and Psychological Needs Satisfaction of Ministers.

Since the research instrument was self-constructed, the pilot study was administered to 50 ministers of the Central Luzon Conference.

The instrument was determined through factor analysis for reliability test. The reliability test of the Administrators' Leadership Behavior Questionnaire (ALBQ), the Team Effectiveness Questionnaire (TEQ), and Psychological Needs Satisfaction Questionnaire (PNSQ) were determined by Cronbach Alpha. The result of the reliability coefficient for leadership behavior was .9714; that for team effectiveness was .9694; and that for psychological needs satisfaction was .9330

Data Gathering Procedures

For the final study, a letter of endorsement was secured from the dean of the School of Graduate Studies of the Adventist University of the Philippines addressed to the presidents of the six missions and conferences and four institutions in the North Philippine Union Conference territory. Follow-ups were done through phone calls and visitation.

After permission was granted to conduct the study, the ministers and administrators were personally visited. The questionnaire was administered to them during the workers' fellowship and seminars in their respective missions, conferences and institutions.

Data were gathered and tabulated, tallied and subjected to statistical treatment through Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) by the university statistician.

Statistical Treatment Data

Table 1
Administrators' Leadership Behavior.

Area	Mean	SD	VI	Rank
1.Directive	4.03	0.68	Highly Directive	3

After the data were tabulated, tallied and completed using SPSS/PC package, the result was analyzed according to appropriate statistical measurements which are as follows:

Descriptive Statistics - Frequency and percentage were used to determine the profile of the respondents.

Mean and Standard Deviation were used to determine the levels of leadership behavior, psychological needs satisfaction, and team effectiveness.

Correlation Analysis using Pearson Product – Moment Correlation was used to determine the relationship of leadership behavior and psychological needs satisfaction to team effectiveness.

Regression – Multiple Regression was used to find out which of the dimensions of leadership behavior and psychological needs satisfaction were the best predictors of team effectiveness.

III. RESULTS

The Extent of Administrators' Leadership Behavior

Table 1 presents the extent of leadership behavior of the administrator respondents in terms of directive leadership, participative leadership, supportive leader-ship, and achievement-oriented leadership. Achievement-oriented behavior ranked first with a mean of 4.11 and a standard deviation of 0.71 this was followed closely by supportive behavior with a mean of 4.06 and a standard deviation of 0.78; directive behavior with a mean of 4.03 and a standard deviation of 0.68. Participative leadership behavior ranked the lowest with a mean of 3.91 and a standard deviation of 0.77.

2.Participative	3.91	0.77	Highly Participative	4
3. Supportive	4.06	0.78	Highly Supportive	2
4. Achivement-Oriented	4.11	0.71	Highly Achivement-oriented	1
Overall Mean	4.03	0.74	High	

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 – Very High;

2.50 – 3.49 – Moderate

1.00 – 1.49 – Very Low

3.50 – 4.49 – High

1.50 – 2.49 – Low;

The results of the study showed that the administrator respondents were firstly achievement-oriented leaders. They saw to it that goals were set within the organization. They encouraged high performance, trusted their workers, motivated them to work hard, and had faith in their capabilities.

Psychological Needs Satisfaction of Administrators and Ministers

Table 2 shows that psychological needs satisfaction of administrators and ministers. The psychological needs satisfaction was rated high in terms of fun, love and belongingness, freedom and power, with a mean of 3.95, 3.90, and 3.74 respectively.

	Mean	SD	VI	Rank
Love & Belongingness	3.95	0.59	High	2
Power	3.74	0.60	High	4
Freedom	3.90	0.57	High	3
Fun	3.96	0.76	High	1
Grand Mean	3.88	0.60	High	

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 – Very High

2.50 – 3.49 – Moderate

.50 – 1.49 – Vey Low

3.50 – 4.49 – High

1.50 – 2.49 – Low

The overall mean of 3.88 indicated that the ministers were highly satisfied with the way their psychological needs were being met. It implied that they had fun among themselves, that they loved one another, and that they had freedom to do and exercise their power.

Level of Team Effectiveness

Table 3 shows the over-all team effectiveness of ministers. All the dimension of team effectiveness had a high level of team effectiveness. Unified Commitment with a mean of 4.06 ranked first, followed by Clear Goals with a mean of 4.01, Good Communication with a mean of 4.00 and Mutual Trust with a mean of 3.94.

Table 3
Level of Team Effectiveness of Ministers

Team Effectiveness	Mean	SD	VI	Ranked
Mutual Trust	3.94	0.73	High	4
Unified Commitment	4.06	0.64	High	1
Clear Goals	4.01	0.71	High	2
Good Communication	4.00	0.73	High	3
Grand Mean	4.02	0.74	High	

Legend: 4.50 – 5.00 – Very Highly Effective
3.50 – 4.49 – Highly Effective
2.50 – 3.49 – Moderately Effective
1.50 – 2.49 – Ineffective and
1.00 – 1.49 – Very Ineffective

The overall mean of 4.02 with a standard deviation of 0.74 revealed a high level of team effectiveness among ministers of NPUC. It implied that though there was a need for improving the level of mutual trust among ministers, the ministers were dedicated to their teams and exhibited loyalty to the organization. They were willing to help and take risk. They knew the ‘whys’ and ‘whats’ of happenings and were able to review rules and policies, define goals clearly, and classify each member’s responsibilities. They enjoyed working together and had open communication with one another.

Relationship between Administrators’ Leadership Behavior and Team Effectiveness

A strong positive correlation was seen when the individual dimensions of leadership behavior and team effectiveness were considered. Participative leadership and good communication ($r=.829/p=.000$) ranked first, followed by supportive leadership and good communication ($r=.827/p=.000$). Ranking third was achievement-oriented leadership and clear goals ($r=.823/p=.000$); fourth was achievement- oriented leadership and mutual trust ($r=.822/p=.000$); and fifth was achievement- goals leadership and good communication ($r=.815/p=.000$). The last was directive leadership and commitment ($r=.654/p=.000$).

When the individual dimensions of

leadership behavior and team effectiveness were considered, there was a strong positive correlation. Achievement-oriented leadership and effectiveness ($r=.847/p=.000$) ranked first, and directive leadership with team effectiveness ranked last ($r=.748/ p=.000$).

The results of the study showed that administrators’ leadership behavior and team effectiveness had a strong positive correlation. This implied that the higher the leadership behavior was exhibited, the greater was the ministers’ team effectiveness.

Relationship between Psychological Needs Satisfaction and Team Effectiveness.

When the individual dimensions of psychological needs satisfaction and team effectiveness were considered, there was a strong positive correlation: Fun and good communication ($r=.686/p=.000$) ranked first, followed by power and mutual trust ($r=.639/p=.000$) and love and belongingness ($r=.574/p=.000$). The last was freedom and mutual trust ($r=.420/p=.000$).

When individual dimensions of leadership behaviour and team effectiveness were considered, there was likewise a strong positive correlation. Fun and team effectiveness ($r=.694/p=.000$) ranked first; and freedom and team effectiveness had the least r of $.469/p=000$.

The results of the study indicated that psychological needs satisfaction of both administrators and ministers had strong

correlation with team effectiveness in terms of power and fun, and vice versa; and moderate correlation with team effectiveness in terms of love and belongingness, and freedom, and vice versa. This implied that the greater the psychological needs satisfaction, the greater was the level of team effectiveness.

Predictors of Team Effectiveness as a Whole

Achievements-oriented leadership had a t value of 6.172 with an R² of .718. Participative leadership had a t value of 3.372 with an R² of .058. Fun had t value of 5.050 with an R² of .028. Supportive leadership had t value of 2.409 with an R² .004. Directive leadership had a t value of 2.093 with an R² of .003. Achievement –oriented leadership, participative leadership, and fun all entered the regression coefficient. Other variables were excluded.

Table 4
Regression Coefficient on Predictors of Team Effectiveness as a Whole

	Unstandardize d Coefficient B Std. Error		Standar- dized Coefficient t Beta	t	Sig	Total R ²	Total R ²
(Constant)	.344	.123		2.795	.006		.811
Achievement-Oriented	.341	.055	.364	6.172	.000	.718	
Participative Leadership	.174	.052	.202	3.372	.001	.058	
Fun	.168	.033	.192	5.050	.000	.028	
Supportive Leadership	.134	.056	.158	2.409	.017	.004	
Directive Leadership	.095	.046	.097	2.093	.037	.003	

Eighty-three point six percent (83.6% of the variance in team effectiveness indicated that achievement-oriented leadership, participative leadership, supportive leadership, fun, and educational attainment

were predictors of team effectiveness. However, achievement-oriented behavior contributed the highest (74.4%) variance. It is implied that 26.4% of variance accounted for was contributed by other factors.

Table 5
Regression Coefficient on Predictors of Team Effectiveness considering the combination of Leadership Behavior, Psychological Needs Satisfaction, and Demographic Profile as a Whole

	Unstandardized Coefficient B Std. Error		Standardized Coefficient Beta	t	Sig	Total R ²	Total R ²
Achievement-oriented Leadership	.344	.052	.353	6.408	.000	.734	83.6%
Participative Leadership	.225	0.47	.26	4.824	.000	.064	
Fun	.165	.030	.188	5.257	.000	0.27	
Supportive Leadership	.181	.153	.211	3.409	.001	.007	
Educational	-.056	.023	-.066	-2.472	.014	.004	

Attainment							
						.836	

The only moderator variable that entered the regression is educational attainment. It predicted team effectiveness. The lower the educational attainment, the better was the team effective-ness of the ministers.

IV. Conclusion and Recommendations

Since achievement-oriented leadership behavior was found to be the best predictor of team effectiveness, it is recommended that administrators consciously practice the same at a higher level by involving ministers in goal-setting which could lead to team effectiveness. Considering that participative leadership behavior was found the least ranking among the four dimensions, it is recommended that administrators seek to engage more participation from their workers, especially in terms of solving problems and making decisions that involve them.

Mutual trust as a component of team effectiveness had the lowest mean. Trust cannot be imposed but earned, it is recommended that administrators cultivate trust among their workers by being transparent and fair in their dealing with them and by faithfully keeping their commitments.

The importance of team work cannot be overemphasized, it is recommended that administrators endeavor to serve as team leaders who recognize and value the contribution of each team member.

Since the study was conducted in the North Philippine Union Conference, it is recommended that the future researchers conduct similar studies in the two other conferences: the Central Philippine Union Conference in the Visayas and the South Philippines Union Conference in Mindanao.

The study included only

four dimensions. Other variables that could shed further light on the study may be considered by other researchers.

REFERENCES

- Chapman, E., & O'Neil, S. (2000). *Leadership: Essential step every manager needs to know*. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Da & Jajaran, (2006). *Management of Organization*. USA:Houghton Co.
- Dressler, L. (2001). *How to Achieve High Commitment Decision*. Berret Kohler Publishing, Inc., San Francisco.
- Glasser, W. (1998). *Control Theory*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McCarter, J. (2005). *Human behavior at work*. (6th ed.) Boston: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- McShane, S.L., & Von Glinow, M.A. (2008). *Organizational behavior*. (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Will Irwin.
- Mejorada, L. (2002). *Team Effectiveness among National Food Authority Personnel*. University of Baguio, Baguio City, Philippines.
- Ward, M., Reid (2007). *Legacy Leadership*. Charlston, Book Surge, Publishing 2008
- Wubbolding, R. (2001). *Reality Therapy: The Soul of Leadership*. American Psychological Association.