



LEADERSHIP

Jeughale Poonam Balasaheb

Research Scholar, JJTU

Abstract

An important distinction is made by some between leadership and management. To manage means to direct, to bring about to accomplish, and to have responsibility for. The functions of management, as described in chapter one, are planning, organizing, directing, and controlling. The successful manager is viewed as someone who achieves results by following the prescribed activities and by maintaining behaviors and products within prescribed limits. To lead, however, is to inspire, to influence, and to motivate. Effective leaders inspire others to pursue excellence, to extend themselves and to go beyond their perform job requirements by generating creative ideas.



Scholarly Research Journal's is licensed Based on a work at www.srjis.com

Lee Iacocca, the son of Italian immigrants, rose spectacularly through the ranks of Ford Motor Company to become its president, only to be toppled eight years later in a power struggle with Henry Ford II. After being fired from Ford, however, he immediately went to Chrysler Corporation and led that company back from the brink of financial disaster by convincing the United States government to provide Chrysler with a \$1.2 billion loan guarantee. Iacocca has been heralded as the epitome of an effective modern leader by the authors of a book about leaders.

He provided the leadership to transform a company from bankruptcy to success. He created a vision of success and mobilized large factions of key employees to align behind that vision. Almost exclusively because of Iacocca's leadership, by 1983 Chrysler made a profit, boosted employee morale, and helped employees generate a sense of meaning in their work. He empowered them. In Fact, we believe that Iacocca's high visibility symbolizes the missing element in management today his style of leadership is central to organizational successful. Because of his success in rescuing Chrysler and the highly visible role he played in restoring the Statue of Liberty, Iacocca became a media celebrity and an American folk hero. During the 1988 presidential campaign, many People urged him to run for the presidency. Public opinion polls confirmed his popularity and showed that he was a viable political candidate until he withdrew himself by saying, 'And if drafted, [shall not run].'²

Lee Iacocca is described as a big man with an imposing presence. He stands 6'1" and weighs 194 pounds. His facial features and personal mannerisms have led one author to describe him

as a ‘Florentine prince.’” A biography of Iacocca attributed his leadership ability to six character traits:

1. The ability to break away from rigid, stereotyped thinking and use upbeat, energetic approaches to problem solving.
2. His realism and courage.
3. His devotion to homework by being thorough, careful, and well informed.
4. His aggressive curiosity.
5. His uncommon capacity for personal growth.
6. His ability to surround himself with people possessing strong personality ties without being intimidated or threatened by them.⁴

In his autobiography, Iacocca describes three key elements that contributed significantly to his successful leadership. First, Iacocca believed that he was extraordinarily effective in motivating people because he knew them well, he expressed sincere appreciation for their contributions, and he provided a vision for them of where the company was going. Second, Iacocca developed a quarterly review system that focused the energies of his people on successful goal accomplishment. Every three months, Iacocca required his managers to submit specific written goals and objectives and then, in a face-to-face, MBO type interview, he required them to explain how they planned to achieve the goals. Finally, Iacocca believed in being decisive. Although he was a strong advocate of being well informed and gathering all the facts before making a decision, he also argued that if you waited until you had 100 percent of the facts, the opportunity would have passed. Although he liked to be fully informed, he was not afraid to go with his gut feeling and he did not rely on committee* decisions. Iacocca’s definition of management by consensus was, “Consensus, is when we have a discussion. They tell me what they want, then I decide. Leadership is an extremely popular topic in organizational behavior because of the role we assume it plays in group and organizational effectiveness. We assume that the success of a group depends primarily on the quality of leadership. To have a winning season requires a good coach; to achieve a military victory commander; and to have a productive work group requires a supervisor. Whether they deserve it or not, leaders are usually credited for the group’s success and blamed for the group’s failure. When a team has a losing season, instead of firing the team, the coach is fired. Although leadership is similar to management, there is a clear difference between these topics. For managers to be effective, they need to be good leaders. However, not all leaders are good managers. Leadership is more narrowly defined; it refers to influencing the behavior

Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies

of others. Not all acts of influence, however, are necessarily acts of leadership. There are important differences, for example, between leadership and the exercise of power described in the next chapter.

Definition of Leadership

The word “leadership” has been used in at least three different ways. Occasionally it refers to a position within an organization, e.g., “We are inviting all of the leadership to attend the seminar. ‘Leadership’ has also been used to describe a personality characteristic, e.g., ‘Our new supervisor doesn’t have as much leadership as our previous one.’”

Neither of these definitions is very useful in studying organizational behavior, and a better definition is needed to understand why some individuals are at the more effective leaders than others. The most useful definition of leadership, well, and the one we will use in this chapter, is a form of behavior by which one person influences others. ‘Our team won the championship because of the leadership of the quarterback.’ In other words, leadership is the *incremental influence* one individual exerts over another, above and beyond mechanical compliance with routine directives. Leadership occurs when one individual MBO-influences others to do something voluntarily rather than because they were required to do it or because they feared the consequences of noncompliance. It is this voluntary aspect of leadership that distinguishes it from other influence processes, such as power and authority.

Although leaders may use force or coercion to influence the behavior of followers, leaders by our definition use their ability to induce voluntary compliance. By this definition, anyone in the organization can be a leader, whether or not that individual is formally identified as such. Indeed, informal leaders are extremely important to the effectiveness of most organizations.

An important distinction is made by some between leadership and management. To manage means to direct, to bring about to accomplish, and to have responsibility for. The functions of management, as described in chapter one, are planning, organizing, directing, and controlling. The successful manager is viewed as someone who achieves results by following the prescribed activities and by maintaining behaviors and products within prescribed limits. To lead, however, is to inspire, to influence, and to motivate. Effective leaders inspire others to pursue excellence, to extend themselves and to go beyond their perform job requirements by generating creative ideas. It has been said that managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing.” This distinction is somewhat overstated, since effective leaders do a lot of managing and effective managers need to lead. But it serves to emphasize an important organizational outcome: the creation of an energetic and highly

Copyright © 2017, Scholarly Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies

committed work force that is successfully adapting to the demands of a changing environment and competently producing a viable product or service

Need for Leadership

Why is leadership necessary? Most organizations are highly structured and have relatively clear lines of authority, stated objectives, and momentum to carry them forward. Why, then, is there a need for incremental influence beyond the routine directives and formal job requirements? Four reasons have been proposed to explain the need for ongoing leadership.

Incomplete organizational structure.

The first reason why leadership is necessary is because there is a degree of incompleteness in every organization design. Social organizations cannot be designed to be like machines, which are simply turned on and allowed to run untouched. Leaders are needed to structuring the tasks, decide who should do what, and delegate work assignments, level. Leaders help the people they lead to accomplish their collective goals.

External change.

The second reason why leadership is necessary is because the organization exists in a changing environment. As the external environment changes, leaders are needed to identify the strategic mission of the organization and help it adapt to its changing environment.

Internal change.

The third reason for leadership stems from the dynamics of internal change in the organization. Leadership is needed to coordinate the efforts of diverse organizational units, particularly during periods of rapid growth or decline. Leadership is necessary to solve internal conflicts and settle differences of opinion.

Motivate and inspire.

The fourth reason why organizations require leadership stems from the need to motivate people and maintain their involvement in the organization. Individuals are not permanent fixtures within the organization. Instead, they come and go, and when they are present, their needs and Intel interests change. Effective leadership provides meaning and purpose by creating a vision of where the organization is going. This ability to inspire and motivate others and transform them into committed contributors to the organization is the function of leadership that has captured the interest of philosophers and scholars and propelled the study of leadership.

Patterns of Organizational Leadership

The type of influence required for effective leadership is not the same for all leaders. Depending on their level in the organization, different cognitive and affective skills are required of leaders. Three basic leadership roles have been identified: origination, interpolation, and administration.

1. **Origination.** Origination refers to strategic decision making regarding policy formulation or structural change. These critical decisions determine the culture and mission of the organization.
2. **Interpolation.** Interpolation refers to interpreting strategic decisions and designing a method for implementing them within the organization. Interpolation includes adapting or supplementing the present structure to new policy directives,
3. **Administration.** Administration consists of implementing the policies and procedures that have been provided to keep the organization operating efficiently. These three types of Leadership are typically performed at different levels in the organization and require different abilities and skills, as shown in Exhibit 161. The origination of new programs and policies, which may involve a change in the organization’s structure or a reinterpretation of the organization’s mission, occurs at the top level of the organization. Individuals at this level must have an understanding of the entire organization and of the ways it interacts with the external environment. Top-level managers symbolize the organization and what it stands for.

Interpolation — interpreting policy decisions and applying them to the existing organization—is typically done by intermediate-level managers. Middle-level managers must maintain a two-way orientation by taking directives from those above and accommodating them for people below.

Type of Leadership Process	Typical Organizational Level	Cognitive (Knowledge)	Affective (Emotion)
Origination: change, creation, and elimination of structure	Top echelons →	System perspective →	Charisma →
Interpolation: supplementing and piecing out of structure	Intermediate levels: pivotal roles →	Subsystem perspective: two-way orientation →	Integration of primary and secondary relations: human relation skills

Administration: use of existing structure	Lower levels →	Technical knowledge and understanding of system of rules	Concern with equity in use of rewards and sanctions →
---	-------------------	---	---

Physical Traits

Trait studies examined such physical factors as height, weight, physique, energy, health, and appearance. To the extent that anything can be concluded regarding the relationship between these factors and leadership, it appears that the leaders tend to be slightly taller and heavier, have better health, a superior physique, a higher rate of energy output, and a more attractive appearance.

To illustrate, one of the early studies on the effects of height found that executives in insurance companies were taller than policyholders, that bishops were taller than clergymen, that university presidents were taller than college presidents, that sales managers were taller than sales representatives, and that railway presidents were taller than station agents.” Results of this sort, however, have not always been consistent. While one literature review found nine studies showing that leaders tend to be taller, it reported two studies showing that leaders tended to be shorter. Attractiveness and a pleasant appearance found to be highly correlated with leaders among Boy Scouts: but among groups of delinquent youth, leaders were rated as more slovenly and unkempt.’

In summary, studies of personal characteristics are not particularly interesting or useful. The results are generally too weak and inconsistent to be useful in selecting leaders, nor are they useful for training purposes, since very little can be done to change most of these physical traits.

Intelligence

Numerous studies have investigated the relationship between leadership and general intelligence, and they generally agree that leaders are more intelligent than non-leaders. The relationship between intelligence and leadership probably stems from the fact that so many leadership functions depend upon careful problem solving. All three leadership roles—origination, interpolation, and administration require significant mental ability.

One review of leadership studies reported twenty-three experiments showing that leaders were brighter and had greater levels of intelligence.” Only five studies reported that intelligence made no difference. In general, it appears safe to conclude that leaders are more intelligent

than non-leaders, but again the correlations are small. Obviously, many other variables besides intelligence influence leadership effectiveness.

An interesting conclusion coming from these studies is the suggestion that leaders should be more intelligent than the group but not by too wide a margin. Members who are significantly brighter than other group members are seldom selected as leaders. Because of their superior intellect, other group members tend to reject them; they are too different from and out of touch with the rest of the group. Individuals with high IQ's tend to have different vocabularies, interacts, and goals, which create communication and interpersonal relations problems.

Leadership effectiveness also appears to be related to two other variables closely associated with intelligence: scholarship and knowledge. Leaders generally excel scholastically and receive better than average grades. General information, practical knowledge, and simply knowing how to get things done appears to be important for effective leadership, and several studies have shown a positive relationship between general knowledge and leadership ability.

Personality Traits

Studies of the relationship between leadership and personality traits have examined a lengthy list of factors. Unfortunately, most of the results have been inconsistent and even contradictory. Only a limited number of personality traits appear to be related to leadership, and most of these relationships are not especially strong. A list of the personality traits most frequently associated with leadership are lead shown in Exhibit 16.2. This list is based upon the 1948 review by Ralph Stogdill were of 124 studies of leadership traits)⁴ This list suggests that the average leader is use a more social, displays greater initiative, is more persistent, knows how to get things done, is more self-confident, displays greater cooperativeness and adaptability, and possesses greater verbal skills to facilitate communication. Studies examining personality integration or emotional adjustment consistently found that leaders were more emotionally mature than non-leaders. Rather consistent. The support was also found for the relationship between leadership and self-confidence or self-esteem. Indeed, the relationship between self-confidence and leadership generally produced some of the highest correlations of any of the personality traits tested Consequently, it is not correct to conclude that personal characteristics are unrelated to leadership; there are indeed some relationships, but they are more complex than they first appear to be.

Capacity	Achievements	Responsibility	Participation	Status
Intelligence	Scholarship	Dependability	Activity	Socioeconomic position
Alertness	Knowledge	Initiative	Sociability	Popularity
Verbal facility	Athletic accomplishment	Persistence	Cooperation	
Originality	Personality adjustment	Aggressiveness	Adaptability	
Judgment		Self-Confidence	Humor	
		Desire to Excel		

Personality Factors Most Frequently Associated with Effective Leadership

While the trait studies focused on individual leaders, another line of research examined leader behaviors within the context of a group and attempted to describe what leaders actually do. These studies essentially asked whether certain ways of behaving were more effective than others: How do effective readers behave differently from other group members? Most of these studies occurred during the 1940s and 50s.

Various styles of leadership were defined as a result of these studies of leader behaviors. One of the earlier studies compared three leadership styles: authoritarian democratic and laissez-faire. Perhaps the best research on styles of leadership, however, occurred simultaneously at The Ohio State University and the University of Michigan. At each university, researchers identified two leader behaviors that were essentially similar, even though both investigations were conducted independently. These two dimensions of leadership have been to form an instrument, called the Managerial Grid®, that has been used for research and training.

Authoritarian, Democratic, and Laissez-faire Leadership

The contrasting political systems in the United States and Germany preceding World War II inspired one of the early classic studies of leadership that compared the effects of three leadership styles: authoritarian, democratic, and laissez-faire.¹⁵ This study involved groups of ten-year-old boys who were organized in groups of five. Each group met regularly after school to engage in hobbies and other activities under the direction of a leader who adopted one of the three styles of leadership. Every six weeks the leaders were rotated among the groups so that each group experienced each type of leadership. The leaders of these groups, who were graduate students in social psychology, were trained to lead the boys using one of three leadership styles. Under the democratic style of leadership, group decisions were made by majority vote in which equal participation was encouraged and criticism and punishment

were minimal. Under the autocratic leader, all decisions were made by the leader and the boys were required to follow prescribed procedures under strict discipline. Under the laissez-faire leader, the actual leadership was minimized and the boys were allowed to work and play essentially without supervision.

During the eighteen weeks of this study, the performance of the boys was observed in order to assess the effects of the three leadership styles. Under democratic leadership, the groups were more satisfied and functioned in the most orderly and positive manner. Aggressive acts were observed most frequently under the autocratic leadership. The effects of the leadership styles on productivity were somewhat mixed, although actual objective measures of productivity were not obtained. Under autocratic leadership the groups spent more time in productive work activity and had more work-related conversations. However, the autocratic groups appeared to be more productive Only when the leader was present. When the leader left the room, the amount of work-related activity dropped drastically.

The results of this study were somewhat surprising to the researchers who had expected the highest satisfaction and productivity under democratic leadership. This study was conducted under the direction of Kurt Lewin, a behavioral scientist who came to America from Germany just prior to World War. Lewin believed that the repressive autocratic political climate he had left in Germany was not as satisfying, productive, or desirable as a democratic society. He expected the results of the experiment to confirm his hypothesis. Although the boys preferred a democratic leader, they appeared to be more productive under autocratic leadership.

Production-Centered and Employee-Centered Leader

Behaviors

About the same time as the Ohio State University researchers were discovering the dimensions of initiating structure and consideration, a similar research program at the University of Michigan identified two similar dimensions of leadership behavior which they labeled production-centered and employee centered behaviors². *Production-centered* behaviors were similar to initiating structure in which leaders established goals, gave instructions, checked on performance, and structured the work of the group. *Employee-centered* behaviors were similar to the dimension of consideration in which the leader developed a supportive personal relationship with subordinates, avoided punitive behavior, and encouraged two-way communication with subordinates.

Studies on the relationship between production-centered and employee centered behaviors also found them to be independent dimensions of leadership. A review of twenty-four studies dispelled a popular myth which suggested that supervisors focused on either production or employees, and to the extent they focused on one, they were necessarily disinterested in the other. These studies indicated instead that supervisors can be interested in both production and employees.²² Therefore, a leader who has a strong production orientation is not necessarily disinterested in the employees. Knowing an individual's orientation on one leader dimension says nothing about that person's orientation on the other.

Managerial Grid

A conceptual framework combining a concern for task accomplishment and a concern for people was created by Robert Blake and Jane Mouton called the Managerial Grid.- An illustration of the Managerial Grid is shown in Exhibit Managerial Grid® 16.3. The concern for production dimension is measured on a nine-point scale and represented along the horizontal dimension, while the vertical dimension measures an individual's concern for people, again using a nine-point scale. Blake and Mouton assume that the most effective leadership style is a 9,9 style, demonstrating both concern for production and concern for people. By responding to a questionnaire developed by Blake and Mouton, individuals can place themselves in one of the eighty-one cells on the managerial grid.

Five different grid positions are typically used to illustrate different leadership styles. A 9,1 leader is primarily concerned with production and task accomplishment and unconcerned about people; This person wants-to get the job - -done and wants a schedule followed at all costs. The 1,9 leadership style reflects a maximum concern for people with minimum concern for production. This individual is not concerned whether the group a small produces anything, but is highly concerned about the members' personal needs, interests and inter-personal relationships. The 1,1 leadership style reflects minimal concern for both production and people and is characteristic of a person who essentially abdicates the leadership role. The 5,5 leadership style reflects a moderate concern for both people and production, while the 9,9 leadership style reflects a maximum concern for both production and people. A 9,9 leader wants to meet schedules and get the job done but at the same time is highly concerned about the feelings and interests of the group members.

Source: R.R. Blake and J.S. Mouton, *The New Management Grid* (Houston: Gulf Publishing Company, 1978), p. 11. Reproduced by permission.

SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP

In analyzing leadership at the organizational level of analysis, the effectiveness of the different leadership styles must be combined with different organizational factors to assess their effect effectiveness. At this level of analysis, the study of leadership has given rise to contingency theories of leadership or situational leadership theories. Four situational leadership theories have received the primary attention: Paul Hersey's and Ken Blanchard's situational leadership model, Fred Fiedler's contingency theory of leadership, Robert Houses path-goal theory of leadership, and Victor Vroom and Philip Yetton's normative decision-making model of leadership.

Contingency Theory of Leadership

The most popular and extensively researched situational theory of leadership was first proposed by Fred Piedler during the 1960s. Fiedler's model claims that group performance depends on the interaction of the leader style and the favorableness of the situation. Fiedlers major contributions consist of(1) identifying the leadership orientation of the leader and developing a way to measure it, and (2) identifying three situational factors influencing leadership and developing a method of measuring them

Leader orientation. Fiedler's definition of the leader's orientation emerged largely from earlier studies in which leaders were classified as either relationship-oriented or task-oriented. Relationship-oriented leaders look at others as coworkers and see close interpersonal relations as a requirement for accomplishing the task. Task-oriented leaders show a strong emotional reaction against people with whom they have difficulty working. If they are forced to make a choice between getting the job done or worrying about interpersonal relations, they choose the task first and worry about interpersonal relations later. Following earlier research, Fiedler suggested that individuals could be placed along one continuum characterized by two basic leader orientations:

relationship-oriented versus task-oriented.

LPC scale. Leadership orientation is measured by the least preferred coworker (LPC) scale, as illustrated in Exhibit 16.5. Individuals are asked to think of a person with whom they have worked who they least preferred as a coworker, and describe this person using sixteen scales. When the responses arc summed, an individual with a favorable description of the least preferred coworker would have a high LPC score, suggesting a relationship-oriented leader. An unfavorable description of the least preferred coworker would result in a low score, suggesting a task-oriented leader.

Difficulty in interpreting the LPC scores has been a problem for Fiedler's contingency theory. The LPC scale is not related to any of the well-known personality measures. In spite of uncertainty about what exactly it measures, however, the evidence indicates that it is a reliable measure of something, and Fiedler concludes that "there can be little doubt that we are dealing with a very important aspect of personality." A review of 25 years of research using the LPC scale concluded that high LPC leaders are primarily relationship-oriented while low LPC leaders are primarily task-oriented consistent with Fiedler's claims. In general, a low LPC leader is more directive, more structuring, more goal-oriented, and more concerned with efficiency. A high LPC leader is more considerate, more human relations oriented, more participative, and more sensitive to the feelings of others.

Situational favorableness. Fiedler's model claims that whether a high LPC leader or low LPC leader will be more effective depends upon the favorableness of the situation. In some situations, a high LPC leader is most effective, while a unenthusiastic low LPC leader is more effective in other situations. Fiedler claimed that the favorableness of the situation is determined by three variables: (1) whether the relationships between the leader and the members are good or poor. (2) whether the task is relatively structured or unstructured, and (3) whether the power position of the leader is relatively strong or weak.

Leader behaviors. The path-goal model suggests that leadership consists of two basic functions. The first function is path clarification: the leader helps subordinates understand which behaviors are necessary to accomplish the tasks. The second function is to increase the number of rewards available to subordinates by being supportive and paying attention to their personal needs. To perform these functions, leaders may adopt a variety of leadership styles. Four distinct leadership styles are explained in the model:

1. *Directive leadership:* tells subordinates what is expected of them and provides specific guidance, standards, and schedules of work.
2. *Supportive leadership:* treats subordinates as equals and shows concern for their well-being, status, and personal needs; attempts to develop pleasant interpersonal relationships among group members.
3. *Achievement-oriented leadership:* sets challenging goals expects subordinates to perform at their highest level, and continually seeks improvement in performance.

4. *Participative leadership*: consults with subordinates and uses their suggestions and ideas in decision making. Unlike Fiedler's model, which suggested that leadership style was resistant to change, the path-goal model suggests that these four styles can be performed by the same manager at different times and in different situations. In other words, the path-goal theory suggests that if a directive leader discovers the situation has changed and now requires a participative leader, it is possible. For the leader to change. The appropriate leadership style depends on the situation