CHAPTER - II

CONCEPTUAL VISION
Leadership is a complex context. Many authoritative researchers agreed that leadership is a complex process having multiple dimensions. The complexity of defining leadership was pointed out by many scholars. One of them is Stogdill (1974). Various leadership theories emerged and they developed multifarious leadership context.

Munson (1921) highlighted the directive aspect. Leadership is the creation and directive force of morale. It is also envisioned as process. The process is an agent inducing subordinates to behave in a desired manner (Bennis, 1959). There is an influence to behave in a desired manner. According to Hollander and Julina (1969) leadership is about presence of a particular influence between two or more persons. Leadership without direction function is unimaginable. Fielder (1967) highlighted the directing and coordination aspects of leadership. So the role of leader does not end after directing. He or she does more.

Leadership is not a compulsion, is compliance. Desire is an aspect of leadership. There is desire and compliance that brings about interpersonal relationship. According to Merton (1969), and Hogen, Curphy and Hogen (1994) leadership is an interpersonal relation in which others comply because they want, not because they have to. The relationship is mutual and directional. Fielder (1967) highlighted the importance of direction. It is a vision. The vision acts as a guide. Bass (1965), Tichy and Devanne (1986) emphasized the significance of
creating vision. So the role of a leader is not confined to creating and communicating vision. It is a process of influencing organized group towards accomplishing the vision (Roach and Behling, 1984).

Many researches have highlighted the significance of goal and vision. A leader should have the ability to find a common goal. Accomplishing the goal should bring about a win-win situation for both the leader and the follower. It is the process of influencing an organized group towards accomplishing its goal (Roach and Behling, 1984). So a leader must have an eye for opportunities (Campbell, 1991). Achieving goal is not about having an efficient process and influence. It should be effective to achieve the goal. Ginnett (1996) highlight the significance of creating conditions for the team to be effective.

It is seen that each group of researchers focus on different characteristics /attributes regarding the leader, the follower, and the situation. Though the focuses are on different characteristics /attributes, but are interlinked. The significance is accomplishing the goal and vision. In the literature it is cited as directing, common goal, and vision. The literature deduces that a successful leader is an effective leader. It is because of the emphasis on goals and vision. Another important aspect is the means to achieve the vision. It is the means like directive force, process, behavior, influence, coordination, compliance, and desire.

The leadership models/theories present a framework of leadership. The theories and models highlight the means and the end. According to Vroom (1974) the traditional theories and behavioral has been described as false starts because of their erroneous and oversimplified approach to leadership. The theory is the widest
area where researches are being done for a complete century. Such vast and abundant research builds a body of data that point to the important role of various personality traits in different kinds of leaders. The validity of these theories was challenged by many researchers; one of them is Stogdill (1948). He suggests that no consistent set of traits differentiate leaders from non-leaders across a variety of situations. The cumulative findings of trait studies concluded that some traits increase the livelihood of success as leader, but none of the traits guarantee success (Yukl and Van Fleet, 1992). This finding highlighted the main drawback of trait theory. In spite of all the limitations trait theory face, it also has several identifiable strengths. Some benchmarks what one need to look for he or she wants to be a leader is clearly emphasis in the trait theory of leadership. The trait theory of leadership has its relevance and importance in understanding the leadership process and direction for further studies.

The group and exchange theories suggest positive exchange between the leaders and the followers for accomplishing group goals. According to Bass (1990) social exchange view of leadership indicates that group members make contributions at a cost to themselves and receive benefits at a cost to the group or other members. The interactions are continuous because member finds the social exchange mutually rewarding. The inability of the trait theory to explain leadership led to the development of behavioral theories.

The most comprehensive and replicated of the behavioral theories resulted from the research began at Ohio State University in the late 1940s (Stogdill and Coons, 1951). Ohio State Studies has its limitations. Leaders who
emphasize initiating structure generally improve productivity, at least in short run. But, leaders who focus on initiating structure and low on consideration generally have large high incidence of grievances, absenteeism, and high turnover rates among employees. Research study failed to show a significant relationship between leadership behaviors and group performances. This indicates that individual and team productivity is largely influenced by other factors including social status of employee within the group, the technology used employee expectations of certain style of leadership and employee view of leader's source of power. Attention was not given to the effects of the situation on effective leadership style/behavior.

Survey Research Centre of University of Michigan conducted leadership studies in the late 1940s. Research finding identify two types of leadership behaviors, called employee oriented and production oriented (Kahn and Katz, 1960). The Michigan studies favored employee oriented. Research in Finland and Sweden believed that Ohio and Michigan studies are done during 1940s and 1960s when the world economies were more or less stable, so it failed to capture the more dynamic realities of developing economies.

Scandinavian studies show that leaders of 1990s support development oriented behavior. Moreover it is also appears that leaders who demonstrate development oriented behavior have more satisfied subordinates and are seen as more competent by those subordinates (Robbins, 1996). Researcher in Finland and Sweden have been exploring whether there are only two dimensions that capture the essence of leadership behavior because of the belief that these fail to capture
the dynamic realities of today (Ekvall and Arvonen, 1991; Lindell and Rosenqvist, 1992).

Industrial psychologists (Blake and Mouton, 1964) developed a graphical portrayal of a two dimensional view of leadership style called managerial grid which has been renamed as Leadership grid. There is little substantive evidence to support the conclusion that a Team Management Style is most effective in all situations (Larson, Hunt, and Osborn, 1976; Nystrom, 1978).

Vroom and Yetton (1973) developed a leader participation model in the year 1973, which is related to leadership behavior and participation to decision making. Recent revision of this model by Vroom and Jago (1988) predicted any of the five behaviors are feasible in a given situation. The leader-participation model assumes that the leader can adjust his or her style to different situations. Research testing of the original leader-participation model was very encouraging. (Field, 1982; Leana, 1987; Ettling and Jago, 1988; and Field and House 1990). As the model is revised, and is new, its validity needs assessment.

Contingency theories of leadership were developed because of the fact that there is no one best way to lead in all situations. Many studies have attempted to isolate critical situational factors that affect leadership effectiveness. Popular moderating variables used in the development of contingency theories include the degree of structure in the task being performed, the quality of leader-member relations, the leader’s position power, subordinates’ role clarity, group norms, information availability, subordinate acceptance of leader’s decisions, and subordinate maturity (Howell, Dorfman, and Kerr, 1986).
Fiedler (1996) developed the first comprehensive model of leadership. He developed an instrument called least preferred coworker (LPC) questionnaire. There is considerable support at least substantial part of the model (Peters, Hartke, and Pohlmann, 1985; Schriesheim, Tepper, and Tetrault, 1994). However, according to Rice (1978), Schriesheim, Bannister, and Money (1979) and Kennedy, Houston, Korgaard, and Gallo (1987) logic underlying the LPC is not well understood and studies have shown that respondents’ LPC scores are not stable. Further, there is difficult to determine how good the leader-member relations are, how structured the task is, and what position powers the leader has (Schein, 1980; and Kabnoff, 1981).

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) subscribed that a successful leader is one who can accurately access the forces that determine what behavior would be most appropriate in any given situation and is flexible enough to adopt the most functional leadership style.

Currently the Path Goal Theory of Leadership is one of the most respected approaches in the field of leadership (Robbins, 1996). House (1971) points out that the theory derives key elements from the Ohio State leadership research on initiating structure and consideration and the expectancy theory of motivation. Evans and Robert (1970) developed path goal theory of leadership in 1970s. Research to validate the logic underlying the theory is generally encouraging (Keller, 1989; and Wofford and Liska, 1993).

Hersey and Blanchard (1974, 1988) developed situational leadership theory. There is high similarity between the four leadership styles and the four
extreme “corners” in the Managerial Grid (Robbins, 1996). Hersey and Blanchard (1988) argue that the grid emphasized concern for productivity and people, which are attitudinal dimensions, and situational leadership emphasizes task and relationship behaviors. Some researchers provide partial support for the theory (Vecchio, 1987; and Norris and Vecchio, 1992) and others find no support of its assumptions (Blank, Weitzel, and Green, 1990). The theory has received little attention from the researchers, so the conclusions need be guarded.

Another theory, Attribution Theory of Leadership, is based on cause and effect relationship. The theory deals with people, and it is based on cause and effect relationships. McElroy (1982) explains that it is merely an attribution that people make about other individuals. Lord, DeVaer and Alliger (1986) Powell and Butterfield (1984) observe that people having high on both initiation and consideration are consistent with attributions of what makes a good leader. Attribution framework gives an account of leadership outcomes. Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich, (1985) finds that extremely negative and positive results are prone to be attributed to leadership performances.

There is an extension of attribution theory. It is known as Charismatic leadership theory. The theory is an extension of attribution theory (Robbins, 1996). Followers make attribution of heroic or extraordinary leadership abilities when they observe certain behaviors (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). Research in the field show significant correlation between charismatic leadership and high performance and satisfaction among followers (House, Woycke, and Fodor 1988; Waldman, Bass, and Yammarino, 1990). According to Conger and Kanungo
(1988) a small minority believe that charisma cannot be learnt, however, most experts opine that individual can be trained to be charismatic.

There is interest in differentiating transitional and transformational leaders (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1990; and Yammarino, Sprangler, and Bass, 1993). Burns (1978) believe that leadership could take one of the forms i.e. transactional leadership and transformational leadership.(Robbins, 1996) Bass, (1990) subscribes that the two approaches should not be viewed as opposing approaches to getting things done. Studies with U.S., Canadian, and German military officers found, at every level that transformational leaders are more effective than their transactional counterparts. Bass and Avolio (1990) finds research evidences indicating transformational leadership more strongly correlated than transactional leadership with lower turnover rates, higher productivity, and higher employee satisfaction.

Organizational excellence starts with leaders of good and strong character who engage in the entire process of leadership. Leadership characteristics build on three main components of organization- the structure, followers and leaders. These components overlap on one another and are inseparable; the area of overlapping represents the leadership domain.

The silent characteristics of leaders, according to Allio (2003), which he called five fundamental hallmarks of truly effective leaders- authenticity, character, vision, will and wisdom. Adair (2004) sees leadership characteristics as fundamental values of leaders based on three core areas- Task, Team and Individual. The fundamental values which bring out the best in these three cores
represent the leadership qualities. Mumford, Zaccaro, Harding et al., (2000) five components of leadership characteristics were propounded- skill perspective, attribute perspective, standard bearers, integrators.

From the above analysis of different approach and viewpoints we understand that leadership characteristic is the composition of beliefs, values, skills and traits, thereby resulted in a complex study.

In spite of the limitations each perspective has all of them contributed to the understanding of leadership characteristics. The characteristic of leader is influence by lots of internal as well as external factors and also by the leader’s styles.

Hence the characteristic of leadership has to be viewed as a means to achieve the task of building the followers and organizational build up so as to bring organizational success in long run.

The role of followers seems undervalued even though they play significant in the rise and fall of the organization. The outcomes are contributed to the leader. No sufficient attention been given to the fact that many individual in the organization are both leader and follower at the same time. Study on followership is important because people spend so much time as followers.

Robert Kelley (1988, 1992) did pioneering and wide studies in followers and followership. An analysis of followership will through light on leadership. Without an analysis of the role of follower study on leadership would be like trying to understand gravity without considering mass.
The theoretical underpinnings of followership have emerged from two well known leadership theories - Social Exchange Theory (Hollander's, 1978) and Leader Member Exchange (LMX) theory (Graen and Scandura 1987). Social-exchange theory explains the concept of idiosyncrasy credit, which explains why certain individuals emerge as leaders among their peers thereby increasing their potential to influence others by building their store of idiosyncrasy credits in the borderless organizations.

Hollander (1978) in his transactional approach to leadership explains the process of influence and counter influence among followers in leaderless group. This approach focuses on the exchange of benefits between the emerging leader and followers thereby resulted in a gain-gain/win-win strategy. Graen and Cashman, (1975) in their Leader-Member Exchange Theory (LMX Theory) described two kinds of relationship between leader and followers and its affects on the types of power and influence tactics leaders use. The two theories suggest the relationship between leader and followers and the need to collaborate between these two extreme ends.

The roles and relationship between the followers and leader varies highly on few attributes of the followers like education and experience followers like education and experience follower power and influence and other characteristics. Leader are more effective when they understand and appreciate their subordinates’ background, training, education, experience, power and more importantly when leaders personality match personalities of the followers.
Another interesting area which gives a major impact on followers’ behaviors is their styles. Ohio State University leadership studies categorized leadership into two broad dimensions. Kelly (1992) derived these two dimensions for followership. He did it by interviewing leaders and followers. One of these dimensions ranges from independent, critical thinking at one end to dependent, uncritical thinking on the other. The second dimension ranges from active to passive. The following are the five different styles:

The study of leadership has various approaches – traditional theories, behavioral theories, contingency/situational theories and recent approaches like attribution theory of leadership, charismatic leadership theory and transformational theory. Stodgill (1974) pointed out the complexity of defining leadership. Hughes, Ginnett, Curpy (1999) identified different definitions. Each of the approaches has their strengths weaknesses. Vroom (1974) subscribes that traditional theories and behaviors are oversimplified approach to leadership. Yukul and Van Fleet (1992) challenged the trait theories because some traits increase the likelihood of success as leader but none of the traits guarantee success. The contingency theories of leadership were developed because it was assumed that there is no one best way to lead in all situations.

The study touches upon aspects of all the approaches. The study of leadership characteristics are mainly based on the following three perspectives – trait perspective, skill perspective and tribute perspective. The perspective are drawn from Stogdill (1948), Mann (1959), Stogdill (1974), Lord, DeVader and Alliger (1986), and Kirk Patrick and Locke (1991). The research brings out the
gap between the leadership practices of the top executives and expectation of the followers. This is done by measuring the leadership characteristics based on the leader’s perspective and again measuring the same leadership characteristics based on the follower’s perspective.