CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL REVIEW
Leadership has been a widely researched area in Social Psychology and has been characterised by numerous concepts, theories and models. Whenever a group of people come together with a particular objective, one individual is generally found to emerge as a leader, exercising authority and making decisions (Dubin, 1951), creating effective changes in group performance (Cattell et al., 1953), initiating, organizing, clarifying, questioning, motivating, summarizing and formulating conclusions (Bass, 1954), succeeding in getting others to follow him and helping the group to solve its problems (Hemphil, 1954) and influencing group activities toward goal setting and goal achievement (Stogdill and Coons, 1957). What are the various functions that a leader generally performs or is expected to perform? What are the factors which bring about a differentiating behaviour in a leader from a non-leader? These and the related questions have been the focus of numerous theories and related researches, some of which are briefly reviewed here.

A Comparative Review of Leadership Theories and Related Research

Early theorists emphasized the physical and constitutional factors, intelligence and personality traits, which may distinguish a leader from a non-leader. Studies by Gowin (1915), Bellingrath (1930), Partridge (1934) and Hunter and Jordon (1939) emphasized the height, weight or appearance of a leader. Another set of studies emphasized that leaders were more intelligent (Gibb, 1947), had such personality characteristics as self-confidence (Richardson
and Hanawalt, 1944), were moderately equalitarian (Bass, 1954) and had an extrovert and sociable nature (Mann, 1959).

Stogdill (1948), however, attempted to give a direction to the emergent leadership studies. Reviewing a number of studies both for and against the earlier contentions of leadership Stogdill was of the view that there is no single physical characteristic or personality trait which is a consistent predictor of leadership. The leader exists, evolves and functions within a particular group. Therefore, leadership should not be viewed simply as the qualities or position maintained by an individual, but rather as an interaction process between the individual and the characteristics of the group, each affecting the other.

The shift from trait-approach to group-dynamic approach required that alongwith the leader, the group should also be taken into account; its nature, the task before it and the situation, that is, the characteristics of the members. These studies analyzed the effectiveness of the leader in terms of group productivity and member satisfaction.

In line with such studies, Lippitt and White (1943) examined leadership in terms of two extreme dimensions—authoritarian and democratic leaders. The authoritarian leaders were conceptualized as those who determine all policies of the group, dictate group task and assign the group members to teams, sparingly praise the members and maintain a distance from them. Democratic leaders, on the other hand, let the group formulate its policies, let the members choose their task, give ample praise to the subordinates
and participate with the group members. Their comparative study of the effectiveness of the two leadership types showed that the authoritarian in contrast to the democratic leadership produces (i) greater quality of work, but (ii) less work motivation, (iii) less originality of work, (iv) greater amount of aggressiveness towards the leader as well as members, (v) more suppressed discontent, (vi) more dependency, (vii) less friendliness and (viii) less group mindedness. Between the two, the democratic leader appeared to be more effective to them.

Studies carried out at the Ohio State University during early fifties highlighted two need-oriented dimensions of leadership behaviour called consideration and initiating structure (Shartle, 1956; Stogdill and Coons, 1957; Halpin, 1957). The consideration factor described a friendly, trusting, respectful and warm relationship between the leader and the subordinate. Initiating structure, on the other hand, was used to describe "the extent to which the leader is likely to define and structure his role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment" (Fleishman and Peters, 1962). Theoretically, the effective leadership was characterised by high scores on both consideration and initiating structure and the ineffective leadership by low scores on both the dimensions. The later researches based on this theory suggested that the effectiveness of either of the two dimensions is contingent on the pressure experienced by the subordinates (in terms of time urgency, task uncertainty, external threat etc.), intrinsic satisfaction provided by the task, information need of the
subordinates and subordinates' expectations which are culturally or experientially based, and perceived organization power, etc. (Kerr et al., 1974).

Another dichotomy was advocated by Blake and Mouton (1964) which they named as task-oriented and people-oriented leadership. Assuming nine levels of each type, they formulated a 9x9 managerial grid to map the specific configuration of task and people orientation in a leader. Blake and Mouton postulated that the 'team' style which has a score of 9 on both the concern for people and concern for task would be the most effective for subordinate growth and satisfaction.

Likert (1961, 1967) at the University of Michigan, emphasized the need to consider in leadership conceptualizations of both human resources and capital resources as assets requisite for proper management. He argued in favour of the theory of participative style of leadership based on three basic principles: (a) supportive relationship; (b) group decision-making and group method of supervision, and; (c) high performance goals. According to Likert, high performance of subordinates was dependent on the leader being perceived as supportive, a person who enhances the feeling of personal worth in the subordinates. Such a participative style was considered to be effective for all kinds of organizations, tasks and situations. Likert conducted a number of studies to support his theory. He showed that the exploitative-authoritative leader, who concentrates power in himself, demands compliance, discourages teamwork, threatens employees, disrupts communications
and thus makes his subordinates powerless and helpless, is universally ineffective.

The task and people orientation in a leader were also advocated by Fiedler (1967) in his contingency model, but with a difference. Instead of emphasizing the leaders' motives in handling the situation, showing more concern for the task or for the subordinates, Fiedler discussed the ways in which the situational variables could influence the leadership process. In his model, situational variables comprise of the amount of power a leader has over his subordinates; the extent to which he is accepted by his subordinates and the degree to which the group task is structured. Employing the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) scores to identify whether a leader is task or people-oriented, Fiedler predicted that, "In terms of promoting group performance, our data show that the task-oriented type of leadership is more effective in group situations which are either very favourable for the leader or which are very unfavourable for the leader. The relationship-oriented leadership is more effective in situations which are intermediate in favourableness."

Fiedler's assumption of matching leaders to the situation to improve group performance was a totally new concept. From this in fact emerged his concept of organizational engineering - that is, matching leaders with situations to obtain maximum benefit. A number of researches supported the theory (Fiedler, 1969, 1971, 1973; Csoka and Fiedler, 1972; Sashkin, 1972; Michaelsen, 1973; Rice, 1978). However, the model has been criticized on the basis
of methodology and data interpretation (Graen, Alvares and Orris, 1970), construct validity (Mitchell, 1970; Fiedler and Chemers, 1974; Schriesheim and Kerr, 1977; Singh, 1983) and the underlying logic (McMahon, 1972).

Major criticism of the contingency model is related to Fiedler's position that leadership style and situational favourability are independent and that situational favourability and group performance are disparate. However, according to Likert (1961, 1967), the process of activity in an organization can be conceptualized in terms of causal variables (e.g. leadership styles) and intervening variables which, in turn, predict end-result variables. The general environment of the organization, such as, the learning context of a school or college, represents such an intervening variable (Friedenberg, 1965; Sergiovanni and Elliott, 1975).

A third point on which Fiedler's model has been criticized is that it suggests an either/or relationship between task-orientation and people-orientation and that it does not consider in reality there exists a combination of the two dimensions. Thus attention is usually focused on the effectiveness of high and low LPC leaders. Leaders who score near the mean in the LPC scale tend to be ignored (Garland and O'Reilly, 1976). In later studies Fiedler and his associates found evidence of such intermediate LPC persons, noting that they are different consistently from those who have high or low scores on the LPC scale. Fiedler (1972) also found evidence which suggested that the leader's experiences have
the effect of changing situations from unfavourable to moderately favourable and from moderately favourable to favourable.

An extension of the Ohio State University studies took the form of the Path Goal theory of leadership. A basic proposition of the theory is that one of the major functions of a leader is to enhance the psychological states of subordinates which result in increased motivation to perform and also increased subordinate satisfaction with the job (House, 1971; House and Dessler, 1974; House and Mitchell, 1974). This function of the leader has been found to consist of (a) recognizing and/or arousing subordinate needs for outcomes over which the leader has some control, (b) increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment, (c) making the path to these pay-offs easier to travel by coaching and direction, (d) helping subordinates clarify expectancies, (e) reducing frustrating barriers, and; (f) increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction contingent on effective performance. Thus the subordinate's motivation to work hard is dependent on the leader's ability to enhance values and expectancies as the basis of his influence (Evans, 1970; Nebeker and Mitchell, 1974).

The theory also proposes that the effectiveness of performing either of these motivational functions is contingent upon the structure of the task. In situations where the task is unstructured or ambiguously defined, an effective superior will initiate structure in the work environment to help the subordinates avoid the pitfalls to successful task accomplishment and clarify the extent
to which their performance will be rewarded. In situations where the task is highly structured, however, the subordinates are likely to resent their supervisor's attempts to initiate greater structure. Therefore, an effective supervisor will engage in supportive or considerate leadership activities to reduce subordinate's dissatisfaction with their performance of routine tasks.

The path-goal model thus, has two contingent factors - the personal characteristics of the followers and the environmental pressures the subordinates face in accomplishing work-goals and achieving satisfaction. As shown in earlier researches, the followers having an authoritarian personality characteristic, that is, an uncritical acceptance of authority and an orientation to power as a value, have been found to be less favourable to a leader using a participative style (Adorno et al., 1950). The more internally oriented individual, is found to be more satisfied with the participative leader. Such a person sees himself or herself as the origin of rewards and probably feels more confident in participating (Runyon, 1973).

The major concern of the path-goal theory is to demonstrate how the leader affects the subordinates' perceptions of their work goals, personal goals and goal attainment. Better statistical analysis and operational measurement of the variables are needed (Osborn, 1974). The theory in its present forms has its roots in the more general expectancy theory of motivation (Saha, 1979).

In a later contingency model, Vroom and Yetton (1973) have been specifically concerned with leader styles in the process of
decision making. They have specified five styles of decision making in various situations and setups in relation to standards of organizational effectiveness:

AI: Leader solves the problem and makes the decision himself using whatever information is available to him.

AII: He obtains the necessary information from his subordinates and then makes the decision. He may or may not inform the subordinates about the problem.

CI: He shares the problem with the relevant subordinates individually, getting their ideas and suggestions without bringing them together in a group. He then makes the decision which may or may not reflect subordinates' influence.

CII: He shares the problem with his subordinates as a group, obtains their ideas, information and suggestions and then makes a decision which may or may not reflect their influence.

CIII: He shares the problem with his subordinates as a group. The group generates ideas, evaluates alternatives and comes to a joint decision, based on consensus. The leader behaves as an initiator and Chairman, who, instead of imposing his own solution, accepts the group decision and implements it.

The effectiveness of the five decision-making styles is found contingent on seven critical conditions, namely:

1. Importance of decision quality.
2. Amount of sufficient information available to the leader and the subordinates.
3. How much the problem is structured?
4. How much subordinate acceptance is probable and critical to implementing the solution?
5. Degree of certainty of acceptance of the decision by the subordinates.
6. How much the subordinates share the organizational goals obtained by solving the problem?
7. How much conflict is there among the subordinates in the acceptance of the solution?

The leadership model elaborated by Vroom and Yetton describes the dichotomy of leadership on a five point continuum, extending from autocratic to consultative styles, representing increasing degrees of potential participation allowed to subordinates. One contingent factor in Vroom's theory of leadership, which appears very relevant, is the personality and particularly authoritarianism of subordinates (Vroom, 1960; Vroom and Mann, 1960). If subordinates are authoritarian, they are likely to prefer an autocratic (i.e. A I and A II) style of leadership. If the subordinates have a stronger need for independence, they will have a greater tendency to accept the consultative (i.e. C II and C III) type of leaders. This is quite similar to the personality characteristics of subordinates as prescribed in the path-goal theory.

Characterising his transactional approach, Hollander (1978) defined leadership as "a process of influence which involves an ongoing transaction between a leader and followers". According to this approach, leadership involves the relationship of three
elements, each complex within itself. They are, the 'leader' with his/her personality, perceptions and resources relevant to goal attainment; the 'followers' with their personalities, perceptions and relevant resources, and the 'situation' within which the leaders and followers function. The process of influence and counter-influence within this situation helps to use human talents and physical resources for effective group functioning. Hollander showed that leader's status increases in proportion to his/her contribution to the group goal. They must prove their worth by competence and commitment to group values for which they then receive idiosyncratic credits. These credits allow the leader to diverge from accepted group norms and standards, to strike out in new directions or to be forgiven for minor transgressions.

In recent years Hunt and Osborn (1980) have tried to incorporate in leadership theory the concept of discretionary leadership, that is, behaviour under the leader's control as opposed to required leadership, behaviour that is not under the leader's control (Martin, Hunt and Osborn, 1981). According to them, the formal role requirements as dictated by organizational structures, rules and proceedings are often too generalized to deal with specific conditions in work units, especially in complex and unstable organizations. Through the use of discretion, the effective leader can, supplement the formal properties of the organization and fill in the gaps that arise between role requirements and organizational processes.

Martin and Hunt (1981) have drawn on reinforcement, exchange
and attribution theories to explain how discretionary leadership can affect employee performance and satisfaction. When the reinforcement contingencies are adequate and operate well, the required leadership is sufficient. Employees can easily determine what they have to do in order to obtain favourable outcomes. Gaps, however disrupt these contingencies. The effective leader uses discretion to clarify the desired performance and its relationship to favourable outcomes. The leader acquires influence by filling in the gaps.

Exchange theory, in fact, explains why a leader acquires influence by filling in gaps. By contributing to the group effort of filling in gaps, leaders help to develop bonds or positive exchange relations with the subordinates. He/she acquires influence by making a contribution that helps a group to attain shared objectives.

Attribution theory provides an alternative explanation of leadership phenomena. When subordinates attribute behaviour to the leader personally rather than to the role requirements inherent in the position, a leaders' behaviour carries more weight with subordinates. They will react more favourably to the leader and work harder to help him/her achieve the group goal.

The main advantage of Hunt and Osborn's (1980) theory is that it suggests more free movement for the leader. He/she is not always expected to give the required behaviour but can come up with a new behaviour according to the demands of the situation. Without emphasizing the interaction style, the authors have tried to suggest
that a sharp and sensitive leader who can perceive the demands of the subordinates and/or the situation for a new direction and is capable of giving such direction within subordinates' capabilities and the constraints of the group norm, is able to inspire the trust and confidence which is so essential for the growth of the subordinates as well as the group.

In another study Bass (1985) identified certain characteristics of leaders that could transform the dull nonenthusiastic subordinates into inspired, enthusiastic and motivated workers with a sense of optimism and purpose. These characteristics included showing of individualized consideration toward followers, providing of intellectual stimulation, pointing out new ways of looking at things and initiating them to reorganise their situation. This approach received further support from another study conducted by Life (1986). Life called it 'transformational leadership'. It was as though the leader had transformed the subordinates into new beings full of confidence, commitment and enthusiasm. These people were also found to be happy and satisfied in following their leader's instructions.

The review of the leadership theories discussed till now may be presented in a summary form as given below in Table I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories reviewed</th>
<th>Leadership proposed</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lippitt and White (1943)</td>
<td>Authoritarian and Democratic</td>
<td>Authoritarian leader effective for group productivity, democratic leader for member satisfaction</td>
<td>No reference made to the situational variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories reviewed</td>
<td>Leadership proposed</td>
<td>Strengths</td>
<td>Weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ohio State University Studies (1952)</td>
<td>Consideration and initiating structure</td>
<td>An effective leader is high on both the dimensions</td>
<td>No reference made to the situational variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Blake and Mouton (1964)</td>
<td>Task oriented and people oriented leader</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Likert (1967)</td>
<td>Participative and autocratic leadership</td>
<td>Effective leader increases the feeling of worth in the subordinates</td>
<td>Socio-cultural variables not emphasized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fiedler (1967)</td>
<td>Task and people orientation</td>
<td>1. Effectiveness of leader is contingent on the situation</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Leader can be matched with the situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Path-goal theory (1971)</td>
<td>Authoritative and participate leadership</td>
<td>Effectiveness of a leader depends on the adjustment of his style according to the needs of the subordinates and the requirements of the situation</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vroom and Yetton (1973)</td>
<td>Styles based on the decision-making strategy of the leader</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hollander (1978)</td>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bass (1985)</td>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>-do-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The leadership theories discussed above seem to agree on some aspects while differing on others. For example, all theorists consider task and people as the two main components of the group situation. The leader emerges to see the effective accomplishment of the task with due consideration to the people who work on it. The leader at times, depending on his own needs, personality characteristics, capacities, perceptions and values may choose to give more importance to one dimension over the other, which may prove facilitating or inhibiting to the productivity and growth of either task or people in the group.

The review of researches indicates that if a choice between the two orientations has to be made, more than often it is in favour of the leader who is people oriented, cares primarily for human relationships, treats group members as equals, seeks their full participation in decision making, is ready to give support where required, helps in the growth of the members and in the actualization of their potentialities. However, there is a third dimension to the problem, as pointed out by Fiedler. The situation, with its specific demands, normative structure and cultural expectations may impose limitations on the success of a particular leadership style. In such a situation, which of the two styles will be found effective in promoting group productivity and member satisfaction? At this stage, a review of available studies pertaining to the effects of leadership styles on group productivity, member satisfaction and group cohesiveness, given by Stogdill (1974) is very illustrative.
Table II gives a summary of a number of studies reviewed:

Table II: Summary of studies focusing on leadership styles and group outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Related</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Zero</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People-oriented style related to productivity</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Task-oriented style related to productivity</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. People-oriented style related to satisfaction</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Task-oriented style related to satisfaction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People-oriented style related to cohesiveness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Task-oriented style related to cohesiveness</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The review shows that the people-oriented leader is more often than the task-oriented leader negatively associated with productivity. The people-oriented leader does, however, lead to greater satisfaction and group cohesiveness. This indicates that a combination of both task and people orientation should best meet the aspirations of any group. The task, with its available technology and the relevant organizational structure makes certain demands on a leader which he/she has to meet. On the other hand, the needs, cognitions, perceptions, values, habits, interpersonal relations of the subordinates have also to be taken care of. This can only be understood in a particular social-cultural context. These taken
together will determine, (a) what kind of leader is going to be accepted, supported or resisted! (b) what the expectations from the leader are going to be! and consequently (c) how the subordinates are going to respond to the task system!

The importance of the social-cultural context emerges much more clearly in leadership studies conducted across different countries and cultures. Misumi (1972) in Japan found the combination of high performance-oriented and high maintenance-oriented leader to be effective in a group with high motivation for achievement. In a low motivation group, a performance-oriented leader has been found to be effective for productivity, while a combination of performance and maintenance style is found effective for member satisfaction. In India, mixed findings have been reported about the effectiveness of the two styles by a number of researchers (Ganguli, 1964; Thiagarajan and Deep, 1970; Kakar, 1974; Kumar and Singh, 1976; Sinha, 1976).

Hofstede (1980) conducted an extensive cross cultural survey on matched samples of respondents in forty countries to test if American theories of motivation, leadership and organisation worked abroad. A factor analytic treatment of the data showed that half of the variance between nations could be characterized by four basic dimensions—power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism vs collectivism and masculinity vs feminity. Hofstede reported that in nearly all countries there was a preference for a more consultative or democratic manager, but only in the countries in which power distance was already relatively
low, this preference was matched by a corresponding shift in perceived actual behaviour of the managers. In countries with large power distances, like India, there was a marked increase in employee's perceived fear to disagree with superiors. On the dimension of uncertainty avoidance, stress at work showed a distinct worldwide trend. On the dimension of individualism, an increase was obvious in all countries. There was also an average shift towards masculinity, though this was not obvious in all countries. He was of the view that many of the differences in employee motivation, management styles and organizational structure of companies throughout the world can be traced to differences in the collective mental programming of people in different national cultures.

A review of the existing literature and insights into Indian culture led Sinha and Sinha (1974) to identify six major Indian values which have a bearing on inter-personal interactions in an organizational setting. These are (a) lack of commitment, (b) lack of team orientation, (c) preference for personalized relationship, (d) dependence proneness, (e) preference for Aram (rest and relaxation), and (f) preference for show off. The fact that these modal characteristics characterise the Indian psyche led Sinha (1980) to conceptualize a particular leadership style which would be effective in the Indian situation. He called it nurturant task leader. The nurturant-task style has obviously two main components: concern for task and nurturant-orientation. This style requires that the task must be completed and that the subordinates
understand and accept the goals and the normative structure of
the group or organization and cultivate commitment to them.
According to Sinha, the nurturant task leader structures his and
his subordinates' roles clearly so that communications are
explicit, structured and task relevant. He initiates, guides and
directs his subordinates to work hard and maintains a high level
of productivity, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Responsi-
bilities are pin-pointed and areas of decision-making are synchro-
nized with them. He, thus, creates a climate of purposiveness
and goal-orientation.

His task orientation, however has been mixed with nurturance.
He cares for his subordinates, shows affection, takes a personal
interest in their well-being and above all is committed to their
growth. He wants them to grow up and mature so that they can assume
greater and greater responsibilities and spare the leader for other
tasks, like minding the boundary properties of the group or organi-
ization. Thus, his task-orientation and personal warmth and interest
develop into a relationship of trust and understanding and commit-
ment to productivity and subordinates' growth. All other aspects
of the leader-subordinate relationship, such as information sharing,
decision-making, monitoring and controlling of behaviour, motiva-
tion management, process of goal setting etc. are determined within
this framework.

Sinha (1980) maintains that the nurturant task style is
flexible and is therefore transitional in the sense that it
gradually leads to fuller participation of the subordinates. Its
emphasis on task orientation grows out of the leaders' conviction that no meaningful interpersonal relationship on a job can evolve unless it develops out of the effective handling of the task system. The task-system provides the focus for superior-subordinate relationship while the socio-cultural system provides the appropriate ways of handling the relationship. Out of the interaction between the socio-cultural and task-systems emerges the social-system of a job which dynamically ranges from familial to fraternal models. In this sense, nurturant-task leadership is a fore-runner to the participative style of leadership which stands for full participation of subordinates, group decision making and the role of a leader as 'one of us'.

The basic difference between nurturant-task and participative style lies in the order of priorities attached to task and people and the cognitive and motivational reasons for such differential priority allocation. The participative leader assumes the subordinate to be work motivated and believes that the more the freedom, autonomy, recognition and opportunity to participate in decision-making he gets, the harder he will work and the greater will be his involvement and creativity on the job. The nurturant task leader believes that a subordinate will not start growing only because he is accepted as equal from the very beginning, particularly when he knows that he is not yet equal or ready for full participation and that he must pass through a phase of initiation into the task-system and prepare himself before he can effectively participate.
The nurturant style is in contrast to the authoritarian style of leadership which is predominantly self-oriented. The main concern of an authoritarian leader is his personal vanity, status, power and image management. Hence, he demands complete loyalty, unconditional submissiveness and full compliance from his subordinates. He controls the communication network, restricts interaction, wants to make all decisions by himself and impose them on his subordinates. Thus, he maintains discipline with an iron hand; he cannot tolerate any non-compliance and drives his subordinates very hard, not because he is task-oriented but because task completion may help him in his image management. Under such a leader, a climate of distrust and resistance builds up. In order to cope with the rising resistance, he has to use punitive and harsh measures which only aggravate the situation. All this is, in fact, a cover up for his sense of insecurity and anxiety (Adorno, et al., 1950) and can never make him effective.

In an attempt to explore the effectiveness of nurturant task style, Sinha and Sinha (1977) selected three person groups and made them work under either authoritarian, nurturant task or participative types of leaders. The groups had to work on either structured or unstructured tasks. The performance scores were the number of ideas generated, accepted by others in the group and their appropriateness. The findings revealed that authoritarian leader was ineffective on all indicators of group productivity. The participative leader was comparable to nurturant task on the unstructured task and was slightly superior on the structured task. The member's
ideas were more accepted in the participative condition and least accepted under the authoritarian condition. As far as the appropriateness of ideas were concerned, the nurturant task leadership condition had the highest score, followed by authoritarian and participative leadership. In sum, while the authoritarian style was found to be by and large ineffective, the relative effectiveness of nurturant task and participative styles was not quite conclusive. A rating of the leaders by the subjects, on a number of variables revealed that the subordinates perceived the nurturant task leader, as compared to the participative leader, more strict, less participative, more assertive and more affectionate and helpful. The participative leader, on the other hand, was rated as friendly, permissive and accommodative.

Probing the issue further, Sinha and Sinha (1977) employed a semantic differential scale having twenty bipolar adjectives. A group of college students were asked to rate the three styles of leadership on this scale. The authoritarian leader was perceived as autocratic, influential and brave, but at the same time insecure, impractical, unsuccessful, dissatisfying, disrespected and unpleasant. The nurturant task leader was perceived as active, strong, dominant, firm, independent, alert, encouraging, scientific, extrovert and on the whole good. Participative leaders were rated as democratic, respected, satisfying, secured, skilful, practical and successful. They were also perceived to be relatively weak, coward, slack and uninfluential.
In another study, Sinha and Sinha (1978) found that participative leader when preceded by a phase of nurturant task leader is more effective than either nurturant task or participative leader. Furthermore, prolonged use of nurturant task style was reported to affect members' satisfaction adversely. Using similar design, Sinha and Choudhary (1981) studied the relationship between perceived preparedness of subordinates and the different styles of leadership. The findings showed that nurturant task style is more effective only when the subordinates are not prepared for the participative style or when they are working on their own. It becomes dysfunctional when the subordinates are prepared — a situation in which participative style is rated as effective. The authoritarian style was not found to be effective at all.

The nurturant task style was reported to have meaningful overlap with the participative style and the two were invariably inversely related to the authoritarian style. Studies conducted by Sinha (1977) to ascertain the areas of differentiation and overlaps between the three styles indicated that nurturant task style was a lot closer to participative than to the authoritarian style. The differences were highly significant. There was some overlap between nurturant task and participative style, but not between nurturant task and authoritarian or participative and authoritarian. Sinha and Choudhary (1978) examined the percentage of common variance among the three styles for a group of 63 engineers and executives in the service of the Government of Bihar. The common variance between the authoritarian and nurturant task
style amounted to 7 per cent, while between nurturant task and participative style, it was found to be 77 per cent. The three styles, according to Sinha (1980), however, form a crude continuum consisting of a number of strands of variables. Some of them may be related to need-dispositions and cognitive styles, while others are behavioural. An illustrative list of variables and their expected distribution as presented by Sinha (1980), is shown in Table III:

Table III: Expected distribution of variables across three leadership styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Nurturant task</th>
<th>Participative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Preference for structure</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Power-orientation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Control over subordinates</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People-orientation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Task-orientation</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Self-orientation</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Anxiety</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Insecurity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Rigidity</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cognitive complexity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of criticisms have been levelled against the independent status of the nurturant task style as reported by Sinha (1980). Some critics contend that because nurturant task and participative styles are both people oriented, the differences between
the two are not real but more of semantic nature. Sinha has strongly objected to such a view. To him, the people orientation of the participative style is of fraternal type based on the ethos of equal potentials of the leader and the subordinates. The nurturant task style, on the other hand, contains (along with task orientation) affection, care and warmth of benevolent paternal figure. It presents a relationship of inequality, where the nurturance of the superior is responded by the dependency of the subordinates. Such a tendency may be the offshoot of the family system which, in India as well as in Japan, functions as the model social unit even on the job (Dayal, 1976; Hofstede, 1980).

A second group of critics argue that any strong emphasis on task accomplishment reflects the presence of a secondary authoritarianism in a leader (Nandy, 1976). Because the task-oriented leader is latently authoritarian, his nurturance is a mere facade which is likely to wear out as soon as the leader is put under a stressful condition. Sinha and Sinha (1981) conducted an experimental study to check this contention. First year and fourth year students of a college were selected as subjects. Thirty groups of four students each were formed, three from first year and one from fourth year. The three students of first year in each group were selected on the basis of their high scores on authoritarian, nurturant task and participative styles separately. Among the thirty students in fourth year, ten were high on authoritarian, ten on nurturant task and ten on participative styles and they
were randomly assigned to the different groups. The students were asked to fill out leadership style scale before and after the experiment was conducted. During the experiment, stress was created on half of the groups through verbal instructions. Results showed that stress had created maximum difference between the discrepancy scores of the three styles, as compared to the non-stressful condition. This finding somewhat negated Nandy's contention. Other studies have, however, shown that leaders do change their style from open consultation in a non-crisis situation to a display of formal power, expert power and sanction power in crisis situation (Mulder, Koppelaar, Jong and Verhage, 1986).

Sinha's (1980) conception of the nurturant task style is based on the assumption that given the dominant socio-cultural values displayed by the Indians, there should be a high demand for a nurturant task leader in the initial stage of work-initiation. The nurturant task leader knows that the subordinates relish dependency and personalized relationship, accept his authority and look towards him for guidance and direction. He provides nurturance and meets their expectations till they become competent, gain self-confidence and are ready to accept a more participative interaction from the leader. Sinha's model thus provides a match between the leadership style and subordinates' expectations.

The reported preference for or predominance of the nurturant task style in the Indian context has given rise to a number of questions. Is it the actual style being practiced by the executives of the organisations or faculty members under study? Or, is it
socially desirable to endorse the nurturant task style as an alternative measure? In this relation, it may be fruitful to examine if any such or similar style with its behavioural and value manifestations has been conceptualized by contemporary Western or Asian authors.

The proposal that leadership effectiveness can be achieved when there is a match between the needs of the leader and the subordinates, has been emphasized in studies by Bush (1954) and Johnston (1981). Support for the effectiveness of the specific nurturant task style in different cultures and settings can also be seen in some other studies. Hunt and Osborn's (1980) discretionary leader who is flexible enough to adjust to the needs of the subordinates seems quite close to the nurturant-task leader. In a study over school-students, O'Hagan and Edmunds (1982) demonstrated that among six controlling strategies (type of teacher-behaviour) employed by teachers in the classroom, the students evaluated aggressive teacher behaviour as highly unjustified. The evaluation of non-aggressive teacher behaviour was also not favourable. The reactive instrumental teacher behaviour (very similar to nurturant task style), where the teacher punishes the pupils when they are not behaving properly – though even then he/she does not enjoy doing so – appeared to be the most effective.

Bass's (1985) concept of transformational leadership has characteristics comparable to the nurturant task leader. According to Bass, a relationship-oriented or considerate leader can only improve and maintain the quality and quantity of performance and
reduce tension in and among the employees by distributing rewards which is contingent on subordinates' performance. Apart from performing these functions, the transformational leader broadens and elevates the goals of the subordinates and increases the confidence in their ability to go beyond expectations. This he does by providing the model of a benevolent father, who is fair in all respects, who sets clear and high standards of performance, encourages followers with advice, help, support, recognition, openness, gives them autonomy, encourages their self-development, is willing to share his greater knowledge and expertise with them. Yet he can be formal and firm and can reprimand followers when necessary. Such a leader, according to Bass (1985) initiates trust, strong liking, admiration, loyalty and respect in the subordinates.

The above examples show that attempts have been widespread in different countries and cultures to identify such leaders who are not only successful in their transactions with the subordinates, but are also able to arouse enthusiasms, faith, loyalty and trust in the subordinates, through individualized orientation and intellectual stimulation. The identification of such effective leaders in the educational context is of particular interest.

Leadership in the educational context: The educational organizations though apparently different from the industrial or bureaucratic set up, display interaction processes that are comparable, though not identical to other organizational set ups. For example, the origins and nature of interpersonal relationships between a teacher
and students are different from those between a supervisor and his subordinates. In the latter case, a subordinate has to comply to the dictates of his supervisor, whereas in the former case a student may comply because he wants to and not because he has to (Merton, 1969). In such coacting groups the performance of one member does not affect the performance of others. On the other hand, task performance and its resultant effects depends on the motivation, skill and ability of the performer himself. Moreover, teacher is important because he/she helps the students in realizing their personal goals, which may not be the case for superior-subordinate relationships in a bureaucracy.

A question commonly raised in this context is that, do teachers influence student outcomes? And if they do, how, and to what extent? There are evidences both in favour and against teachers having any influence on students. Some are discussed below.

The schools/colleges, where teachers and students function, are organizations, where intelligence, independence, criticism and creative thinking are valued and encouraged. Colleges do not only impart degrees to students, which can later help in getting meaningful employment, but also help in moulding and finishing a complete individual, who can go out and meet the challenges of the world with courage, who can fight against injustice and who can positively contribute to the welfare of the society. The teachers play a significant role in imparting these values to the students.
A good deal of published research has promoted the idea that teachers and schools contribute little to student outcomes. Among those advocating such a belief are hereditarians, environmentalists and social psychologists who either emphasize the genetic component in student attainment (Jensen, 1969; Eysenck, 1971; Herrnstein, 1973; Wilson, 1975), or give more importance to family and home life, peer influence and pre-school experiences in affecting student outcomes (Deutsch, 1967; Hunt, 1978; Smilansky, 1979; Weigert, 1980). Still others conclude that student's family background, social class, IQ, motivation and ethnic group are the most important variables associated with student achievement (Coleman, 1966; Husen, 1967; Mosteller and Moynihan, 1972; Averch, 1972; Jencks, 1972). Close on their heels are another set of studies reported by Popham (1971), Moody and Bousell (1971) and Dembo and Jennings (1973) to the effect that teacher training and the presumed expertise that it produces has little measurable impact on student achievement.

An opposite viewpoint, however, asserts the presence of substantial evidence that teachers do have an influence on student outcomes. An extensive research carried out by Ryans (1961) on 6,000 teachers in 1,700 schools showed that certain teacher behaviour patterns have positive and significant correlations with student outcomes. In a similar study, Flanders (1970) concluded that students taught by indirect teachers (who question as opposed to lecturing, and permit student-initiated behaviours as opposed to giving directions) learn more than students taught by direct
Rosenshine and Furst (1973) have also found five teacher behaviours, such as, clarity, variability, enthusiasm, task-orientation and student opportunity to learn, as strongly related to student achievement. In recent studies, academic learning time, defined as the time that students spend engaged in academic tasks, has shown significant positive correlations with student achievement (Fisher, et al., 1980). Other studies have also shown that students of teachers who provide much academic learning time learn more than students of teachers who provide relatively little of this (Cookson, 1980).

Reviewing a number of studies on teacher behaviour and classroom learning, Good and Brophy (1984, 1985, 1986) and Brophy (1981, 1983, 1986) underline a number of teacher characteristics as responsible for student learning. Some of them are: Variety in the use of teaching methods and media, teacher enthusiasm, alertness in monitoring classroom activities, realistic expectations in line with student abilities and behaviours, realistic praise, indirectness, and comments that help structure learning of knowledge and concepts for students.

The teacher effectiveness studies indicate that teachers with their instructional patterns, experiences and personality can influence and shape student behaviour to a large extent. Ornstein (1984), however, cautions against giving too much weightage to the interaction among only teacher and the student variables as interactional effects of multiple variables in the real life
situation might show different results.

This leads to the questions: What are the teacher characteristics that make for effectiveness? What are the student characteristics that interact with teacher characteristics to enhance or redeem effectiveness? Are there other contextual variables, like class and institutional characteristics that affect student-teacher interaction processes? What are the student behaviours that are affected by teacher interaction processes?

Among the behavioural correlates of effective teaching, the personality characteristics of teachers have been found to play a significant role (Ryans, 1961; Gardener, 1968; Merton, 1969). Originality, creativity, adaptability, democracy and the ability to organise learning situations are some of the personal characteristics which have been found to result in high classroom participation.

**Teaching Styles:** Teaching styles have been found effective in influencing student outcomes. Four instructional models of teachers, based on their classroom behaviour, orientation toward others and toward the environment were hypothesized by Joyce and Weil (1972). These four teaching style families, as they called them, were – (1) social interaction, (2) information processing, (3) personal source, and (4) behaviour modification. In an attempt to identify the human values related to each of the four teaching style families, Rosenblatt and Parish (1979) administered the Rokeach (1973) value survey to students who were also administered
Teaching Style Q - Sort (Heikkenin, 1977). The findings tend to suggest that certain human values are, indeed of varied importance for individuals in different teaching style category. For example, individuals in the personal source family rated 'obedience' as significantly less important than individuals in the behaviour modification family. Members of information processing family gave more importance to 'freedom' than members of social interaction family. Males placed significantly higher priorities than females on a comfortable life, an exciting life, pleasure, ambition and broad-mindedness. The females gave priority to happiness, inner harmony, self-respect, cheerfulness, forgiveness and love.

In another study, Tuckman, Steber and Hyman (1979) asked three levels of principals—elementary, intermediate and high school level—to rate effective and ineffective teachers on four dimensions—creativity, dynamism, organised demeanor and warmth and acceptance. Intermediate Principals rated their effective teachers higher on creativity than did high school Principals. High School Principals rated warmth and acceptance low and upgraded dynamism as the characteristic of effective teachers. Principals of all the three levels, however, rated organised demeanor as an important trait of effective teachers. These differences were found consistent with the teaching requirements at the different levels. In a recent study, school students in large numbers were found to appreciate and rate highly only such teachers who had the ability to explain the course material and who were generally aware of student needs (Cullingford, 1987).
A group of investigators have given high weightage to the intelligence, academic excellence, winning of awards and publishing of books as measures of teacher effectiveness. Not much support was, however, obtained in this direction. Andrew (1970) found that college teachers who had received an award for outstanding work, did not differ in their attitudes towards the nature and purpose of learning processes, student-teacher relationships, teacher-role and student-teacher rapport from those college teachers who had not received such an award. In a similar study McDaniel and Feldhusen (1970) found that being the first author of books, articles and papers was negatively and significantly related to teaching effectiveness, while being the second author was positively and significantly related to teacher's ratings. Time spent in counselling was positively related to teacher ratings while time spent in administration was negatively related to it. Saha (1979) observed that the variable of intelligence significantly affects the effectiveness of a leader. Ability has no significant effect and motivation affects only the speed of group decision-making but not its quality.

Gender differences have been found to exercise significant influence on the effectiveness of a teacher. Heyas (1962), and Schopler (1967) reported that females are considered to be weaker managers than males. Fogarty, Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) found that males use a more authoritarian style of supervision than females. A study by Schein (1973) also showed that males were higher on leadership ability, aggressiveness and self-reliance.
than females. Rosen and Jerdee (1973, 1974), Cohen and Bunker (1975), Dipboye, Fromkin and Wiback (1975) and Bartol and Butterfield (1976) have provided evidence to prove that given identical qualifications, the persons' gender influenced evaluations. In high task- clarity situations, however, Ruch and Newton (1977) did not find sex characteristics to have any effect on group control.

Skipper (1976) developed a rating scale consisting of ten administrative skills found in leaders. He asked twenty university administrators to rate their colleagues on this rating scale. It was found that most effective administrators were rated as more ethical, honest, calm, alert, insightful, tolerant, willing to make decisions, confident, goal-oriented and inventive as compared to the least effective group. The characteristics attributed to the least effective administrators showed that they were undependable, deceitful, irritable, impulsive, defensive, stereotyped, rigid, sarcastic, retiring, lacking in ambition, more inclined to put off difficult decisions and having fewer ideas than those administrators rated effective. The differences were found to be statistically significant at the .001 level.

The attribution theorists have examined the question - Can leadership be ascribed to a person? Kelley (1973) maintains that the process of attributing causality is not so simple for an observer. Before an observer can make inference about causality, information about a given outcome must be assimilated into a specific pattern of assumed relations among multiple plausible causes, known as causal schema. Both Calder (1977) and Pfeffer (1977)
are of the view that leadership is ascribed to a person when he is perceived by the viewer as the causal agent.

A second factor that can affect the degree to which a person is perceived to be an important causal agent is the perceptual salience of the person. Of the nine dimensions of cognitive styles Distefano (1969) and Messick (1970) investigated the interpersonal perception between field-independent and field-dependent teachers and students, and found that individuals with similar cognitive styles tended to describe each other in highly positive terms, while those having different cognitive styles described each other in more negative terms. However, Sigel and Coop (1974) Witkin et al. (1975), and Reiner (1976) found contradictory results. Coward, Davis and Wichern (1978) also could not find any supporting evidence. Taylor and Fiske (1978), Phillips and Lord (1981) suggest that causes (or people) upon which observers focus their attention or for which information is available in memory, are perceived to be highly plausible causal explanations for an outcome. Some researchers, however maintain that the perception of an ideal teacher depends on certain cognitive-style matches between students and teachers.

The conception of teachers as leaders in the teaching-learning situations has facilitated the application of the leadership theories in the educational context. The teaching styles used by teachers in the instructional processes have been put under heavy scrutiny for effectiveness/ineffectiveness in the teacher-student interactional situations. The person x situation theories
maintain that teachers can be either task-oriented or people-oriented. An effective task-oriented teacher is one who specifies the expected learning outcomes and then structures his teaching to lead to this outcome. Teachers using this style have been found to be effective in a number of studies (Kleinman, 1964; Chall and Feldman, 1966; Torrance and Parent, 1966; Fortune, 1967; Skinner, 1968; Popham and Baker, 1970). By contrast, the people-orientation advocates argue that an effective teacher incorporates students' ideas in the classroom, praises students for their performance and acts 'warm' in the class. Research in support of these predictions have been mixed (Allen, 1969; Flanders, 1970; Wright and Nuthall, 1970).

In applying the Fiedler's contingency model to the academic context, it appears logical to argue that the teacher style which maximizes learning will depend on the favourableness of the situation for teaching. In a situation that is intermediate in favourableness, the human-relations oriented teacher will be more effective (in terms of meeting the goals of the organization) than the task-oriented teacher. In highly favourable and unfavourable situations, the task-oriented teacher will be more effective than the human-oriented teacher. However, only partial support for Fiedler's model in colleges (Hardy, 1969) and schools (Reave's and Derlega, 1976) has been obtained. In only few studies, the person-oriented teacher has been found more effective in both types of situations (Christensen, 1960; Reed, 1962; Kleinman, 1964; Combs, 1965; Soar, 1966; Fortune, 1967; Gage, 1969).
The effectiveness of Sinha's (1980) nurturant task-style in the educational context has been tested and established in some studies. Sinha (1980) examined five academic departments across two universities, one rural and one urban. A group of students and teachers spelled out the various leadership acts of the head of their respective departments. These were edited for their content validity and placed in either of the five categories: authoritarian, nurturant task, participative, bureaucratic and laissez-faire. Results showed that the largest number of acts were found to be associated with nurturant task style. Authoritarian style followed closely, while the participative and the other two styles lagged far behind. The university in the rural setting was found to be higher on authoritarian leadership style, while the one in the state capital was found to be higher on nurturant task style and participative style. The heads of the science departments were found to be slightly more nurturant and participative than those in Arts departments.

Leadership styles and socio-cultural values: Sinha's (1980) choice of leadership style in the Indian culture is deeply embedded in the conception of seven social values, which have a bearing on interpersonal interactions in an organisational setting. Sinha and Sinha (1983) correlated these seven values (described elsewhere by Sinha and Sinha, 1974) and three leadership styles by administering these scales on one hundred and ninety male undergraduate students of a college. The obtained correlations between leadership styles and the values are given in Table IV.
Table IV: Correlations between values and leadership styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Nurturant task</th>
<th>Participative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependence proneness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aram</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show off</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team orientation</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work commitment</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized relations</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P > 0.01  *P > 0.05

Table IV indicates that the authoritarian leaders cherished authoritarian values, tended to show off, but also preferred personalized relationship and reported commitment to work. The nurturant task leaders were team oriented, committed to work, preferred personalized as well as dependency relationship and were wildly fond of aram. The participative leaders were team and aram oriented but also had ingredients of show off and personalized and dependency relationship. The positive association between the nurturant task leadership and the functional values and of the authoritarian and participative leadership with the dysfunctional values substantiate Sinha's contention of the potential effectiveness of the nurturant task leadership in Indian organizations.
Follower characteristics and Behaviour: The need to study the effectiveness of leadership styles hypothesizes side by side the need to illustrate the subordinate characteristics and behaviours which affect these interaction processes and are affected by it. In the teacher-student interaction process, where teachers are conceptualized as leaders and students as subordinates, the student characteristics that generally come into play are the gender differences, the socio-economic status, educational level, motivation, and family and peer influences. These student characteristics have been found to have significant influence on students academic performance, commitment, satisfaction and adjustment in their respective institutions.

The parental socio-economic status has been found to have a strong positive relationship with the academic achievement of students. A number of studies have reported significant positive correlations between socio-economic status and academic performance in both school and college students (Klein, 1971; Dunnell, 1971; Levine, Stephenson and Mares, 1973; Alwin, 1976; Saini, 1977; McGill, 1979; Cuttance, 1980; Munroe, 1981), while few have observed moderate-to-very-weak relationship between socio-economic status and academic achievement of students (Lambert, 1970; Wright and Bean, 1974; Fetters, 1975; Hennessy, 1976).

Results of a meta-analysis of studies on socio-economic status and student academic achievement conducted by White (1982) makes it clear that the expected strength of socio-economic status and academic achievement is much weaker than has frequently been
assumed.

Not many studies could be found in the literature that focussed on whether differences in the gender of students were related to their academic achievement and their later success. A few studies have reported the relationship between sex stereotypes and cognitive measures. Curriculum like science, has been projected to have masculine image (Weinreich-Haste, 1981) while arts is considered to be a female subject. Smithers and Collings (1981) showed that females studying science in the sixth form see themselves as significantly more masculine than art specialists. Kelley and Smail (1986) found males to be more sex stereotyped than females.

Some studies on school and college performance have shown that females achieve fewer first class degrees and also fewer failures than men (Rudd, 1984). This may be because of low and selective representation of females in the schools and colleges (Rudd, 1984). Kornbrot (1987) found the academic performance of female students better than males. When social class and gender were investigated together, class effects tended to be larger and class by gender interactions were common (Humphreys, 1984; Archer, 1987).

The studies reported by and large emphasize the difference between the academic performance of the two sexes. The cause may not be only low representation as mentioned by Rudd (1984). The socio-cultural values specific to societies may need to be investigated. For example, in the Indian society, the general motivation and encouragement given to females is much less than that given to male offsprings (Karlekar, 1983). In such a situation, females who
get a chance to join schools and colleges may tend to have a more
competetive attitude and therefore perform better than their
counterparts. However, this needs further investigation.

Sinha (1970) conducted a study on two hundred students and
found n-achievement to be positively and significantly related
to academic achievement. Bowman (1973), in a theoretical ana-
lysis of student outcome, states that student character-
istics both cognitive and affective have important consequences
in academic performance. Several other studies have reported
similar findings (Reddy, 1973; Gupta, 1974; Patel, 1975; Singh,
A congruence between student values and their fields of study has
been found to enhance academic performance (Feldman and Newcomb,
business students also revealed that successful students differ
significantly from less successful students on values.

Educational Level as a Variable: Do factors underlying academic
performance, commitment and adjustment differ at different educa-
tional levels in the schools and colleges? This is a question
generally asked to ascertain and identify variables affecting
students at different points of time in their academic life. In
an extensive study carried out on students on 9th grade in school
and first year college, Banreti-Fuchs (1975) found that while
certain factors were common in the two groups, there were also
a number of factors on which the two groups differed. Working
of the child and indulgence. Schaefer (1961) suggested that two dimensions, love-hostility and control-autonomy could account for the many variables of maternal behaviour. Stott (1967) maintained that important variables in family interaction may be subsumed under four headings: interpersonal climate of the home, mutuality of interests and activities and parental guidance. It is considered that these psychological characteristics of homes influence the development of such child qualities as dependence-independence, passivity-hostility, aggressiveness-friendliness, creativity, originality of thought. These, in turn, exert an influence on the child's relationship with others and on his/her performance in school and college.

A number of studies have shown that a warm and nurturant parent is able to influence a child positively than a cold and punitive parent (Clausen, 1968, Maccoby, 1968; Bandura, 1969; Walters and Stinnett, 1971). The strict parent displays behaviour correlates identical to an authoritarian leader. Much of the aggression outside the family was found related to authoritarianism in the child-rearing practices (Thomas, 1987).

Role of College Environment: The student characteristics interact with the teacher characteristics to influence student outcomes in schools and colleges. However, the school and college context which provides the situational set up for this interaction, includes conditions termed as school or college environment that may impede or facilitate the student outcomes.
The formula, \( B = f(P,E) \) propounded by Lewin (1935) denoted that behaviour is a function of both person and environment. Since then, a number of theorists have shown how these two interact. Stern (1970) drew on Lewin as well as Murray (1938) and advocated the model of need-press congruences. Conceptualizing personality needs as organizational tendencies which appear to give unity and direction to a person's behaviour and environmental press as external situational counterparts to the internalized personality needs, Stern visualised congruence-incongruence between the two. The complementarity between personal needs and environmental press tends to produce satisfaction and fulfilment in the participant—a case of congruent relationship. The result of incongruent relationship is generally discomfort and stress in the participant. Stern developed the 'Activities Index' to measure students' needs based on personal preferences. The 'College Characteristic Index' was developed to describe activities and events associated with different types of academic settings.

Stern (1970) proposed two main dimensions of the college environment: (1) developmental press and (2) control press. Developmental factors relate to press for facilitating growth and self-enhancement in the students. Control factors reflect organizational stability and bureaucratic self-maintenance. The developmental factors are assessed through the students' and teachers' perception of the academic environment. On the other hand, the control factors can be measured using techniques of naturalistic
enquiry.

Working over very large samples of college students, while Stern obtained supporting evidence for his earlier theoretical assumptions, he reported differences among male and female students on certain need characteristics (e.g. Achievement orientation and emotional warmth). Differences in organizational structure were found between two educational levels.

In relation to student learning outcomes, environmental dimensions (class environment, school environment or college environment) have been studied both as independent and dependent variables. Walberg (1970) has presented a heuristic model of the two important roles played by learning environments both as dependent and independent variables in curriculum evaluation research. He proposed three major classes of determinants of student learning - (1) curriculum (teaching method, instructional materials, etc.), (2) aptitude (general ability, attitude, interest etc.) and (3) environment. The model is presented in Fig. I.
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Colley and Lohnes (1976) prescribe the same three construct domains for evaluative research. They call these, instructional dimensions,
initial characteristics of the learner, and contextual variables. Harnischfeger and Wiley (1978) have proposed a model in which acquisition (i.e. student achievement) is linked either directly or indirectly to the teaching-learning process (which is similar to college environment), and to background variables (which include curriculum and student characteristics as well as teacher background variables).

A number of studies have been reported on the interaction between aptitude and environment referred to as person-environment fit. However, researches on interaction between curriculum and environment have been few.

O'Reilly (1975) used the learning environment inventory (LEI) in mathematics classes in investigating the relationship between achievement and classroom environment over a sample of 48 students of grade 9 and 10 classes in twelve schools in Eastern Ontario. It was found that ten significant correlations emerged between mathematics achievement and the LEI scale, but this number dropped to three when general ability was controlled.

Brookover, Gigliotti, Henderson and Schneider (1973); Brookover and Schneider (1975); Brookover, Scheneitzer, Schneider, Beady, Flood and Wisenbaker (1978) have reported positive relationship between perception of school environment and student achievement. They observed in their studies correlations between achievement and environment scale ranging from 0.01 to 0.77.

Walberg, Singh and Rasher (1977) conducted a study in India
and found that the simple correlations between raw end-of-course achievement scores and different learning environment scales ranged from 0.41 to 0.70 for science and from 0.58 to 0.81 for social studies. When IQ effect was partialled out, these correlations ranged from 0.17 to 0.57 for science and from 0.36 to 0.73 for social studies.

Moos and Moos (1978) used a Classroom Environment Scale (CES) to explore relationships between environment perceptions and student absence and grades over a sample of nineteen high school classes in one school. Simple correlational analysis revealed that the number of significant relationships between the outcomes and either the student or teacher perceptions on CES scale was about six times than expected by chance. Mean grades were significantly correlated with student perceptions of greater involvement, affiliation and teacher support and less role clarity and teacher control. It was also found that the median number of absence was significantly correlated with student perceptions of less teacher support.

Earlier researches have seldom examined the joint influence of the classroom/school environment and the family on student outcomes. Marjoribanks (1979, 1980) conducted a valuable study in which both school and family variables are related to the outcomes of intelligence, personality and school related affective characteristics among a sample of 250 Australian 12-year olds. Multiple regression analysis involving linear, curvilinear and interaction terms showed relationship between commitment to school (outcome) student perceptions of intellectual orientation (school
environment) and different levels of parents' press for achievement (family-environment). In later studies Marjoribanks (1982, 1986) found that boys who had the support of an academically oriented family, and who saw their high school environment as more intellectual and less punitive, had a better academic self-concept and showed more enthusiasm for school. As parental press for achievement rose, boys' commitment to school increased even when the intellectual orientation of the school was held constant. Similarly, boys' appraisals of the intellectual orientation of the school were positively related to their commitment to school even when parental press for achievement was held constant. More generally, school level educational outcomes may be explained in part by school-level differences in students' average family environments.

Sinha (1980) maintained that the climate of an organization is basically determined by three factors - (1) organizational structure, (2) leadership styles and (3) socio-cultural values. Assuming that climate mediates the effect of leadership styles on organizational efficiency, Sinha studied 522 executives drawn from eight organizations in Bihar. Results showed that the leadership styles (Authoritarian, nurturant task and participative) did not affect member efficiency directly. The authoritarian and nurturant task style affected the organizational climate, which in turn strongly influenced efficiency. The authoritarian executives created an authoritarian climate of work which decreased
efficiency. The nurturant task leader maintained a task-oriented work climate which significantly enhanced the efficiency level of the members and the organization. The participative style negatively affected the bureaucratic climate, but had negative influence on the efficiency factor also.

In another study on work related values and climate factors, Sinha (1986) found significant differences between effective and ineffective organizations on the pattern of relationship between work measures and climate factors and values. The effective organizations seemed to maintain a work conducive climate of strong work norms, task-oriented superior-subordinate relationship and work-contingent reinforcement. The main feature of the ineffective organization was its failure to create and maintain a work-conducive climate. As a result, the executives worked less hard, and felt less positive about their job. These executives related higher values to the centrality of work and family, hard work and life satisfaction more often than did their counterparts in the effective organizations.

Moos (1987) has provided a conceptual framework of links between personal and environmental factors and individual adaptation. This may be presented in Fig. II.
The above conceptual model posits that the association between the environmental system (Panel I) and individual adaptation (Panel V) is affected by the personal system (Panel II), as well as by cognitive appraisal (Panel III) and coping resources (Panel IV). As the conceptual framework implies, there are some direct connections between environmental factors and individual adaptation. However, part of the influence of the contextual factors depends on the characteristics of individuals who experience them. Thus, the heterogeneity of individuals' reactions to environment highlights the importance of matching specific groups of persons with appropriate environments.
Intellectual Commitment of Students: Many of the student outcome studies have concentrated on student academic achievement and satisfaction. Very few studies could be located that have tried to investigate students' intellectual commitment and academic adjustment in their respective institutions. The review of literature indicated that commitment has often been used by researchers interchangeably with involvement, although, there is a difference between the two. While job involvement seems to be a distinct psychological process, commitment is a behavioural construct (Wiener and Gechman, 1977). When individuals are committed to a cause, person, activity or institution, they must express this by an overt act.

Researches by Salancik (1977); Pfeffer and Lawler (1980); O'Reilly and Caldwell (1981); O'Reilly (1983) and O'Reilly and Chatman (1986) have suggested that commitment is the internalization of values which may occur as a result of a combination of clear role models, self-selection process, social pressures, justification and restrospective rationalization. Overt commitment behaviour may include the amount of personal time devoted to work activities, the amount of talk, conversation and reading related to work, or personal sacrifices for the sake of the job or work (e.g. voluntarily postponing or giving up a vacation to complete a manuscript for a journal).

In an earlier study conducted by Hummel-Rossi (1976) it was found that certain personality characteristics of students along with peer-influences tend to determine the intellectual commitment
of students with academic environment having a moderating influence. Chusmir (1986) compared male and female employees and found a high correlation between satisfaction of needs and job commitment in both the sexes. However, in females, sex role conflict was found to be negatively correlated to commitment.

**College Adjustment:** While defining adjustment Erikson (1959) proposed that adjustment grows out of an individual's identification with the environment and his mastery over it. A person who had actively mastered the environment, showed unity of personality, and perceived the world realistically, was a well adjusted person. White (1963) used the term psychological adjustment and defined it as a person's competence in manipulating and influencing his external environment. The sense of competence refers to how competent a person feels intrapsychically and not necessarily how competently or effectively he actually performs on his work. These definitions make it apparent that adjustment basically involves the perception of individual competence in the manipulation of the environment.

Becker et al. (1968) at the Kansas University applied the idea of situational adjustment to the experiences of college students. They found that students learn the requirements of social situations and what makes for success in them. Then they try to turn themselves into the kinds of person that the academic context demands. Miller and Parlett (1974) found supporting evidence to it. In a Scottish University when the academic environment was
defined by examination, different students were led to the employment of distinctive strategies of adaptation. Miller and Parlett reported some evidence of discrepancy between the formal requirements of academic environment and the actual requirements as perceived by students.

Hackman and Dysinger (1970) tried to relate both adjustment and commitment to the students' persistence in college. According to them students with high college adjustment and moderate to high college commitment were most likely to continue in a college. Students with high college adjustment and moderate to low commitment tend to transfer to other colleges. Students with low adjustment but moderate to high commitment tend to persist in a college until they are forced to leave because of poor grades. Finally, those students with both low college adjustment and moderate to low commitment were likely to drop out and were unlikely to re-enroll at any college.

Proposed Leadership Effectiveness Model: The above review of research in the area of leadership (concepts, models, strategies etc.) suggests that there is an urgent need of identifying a matching strategy between teacher leadership style and situational demands, students needs and their situational characteristics, and, task requirements (Gerstein and Reisman, 1983; Szilagyi and Schweiger, 1984; Life, 1986). An application of this model into the teaching-learning situation would necessitate a match-making between teachers and academic settings with student characteristics
forming the list of the situational variables.

The above review also indicate that a number of studies have explored the relationships between school/college environment and student outcomes, like, academic achievement, motivation, satisfaction etc. Studies have also focussed on teacher-student interaction, showing the effectiveness of one teaching style over the other. However, an integrative study, involving variables at all the three levels, namely, teacher-situation-student outcomes, seems to be missing. This needs to be investigated though, as it may help in the proposed match-making.

Further, while student outcomes such as academic achievement and satisfaction have been studied at length, the intellectual commitment and college adjustment of students have not been given adequate attention. The relevance of these variables should not be undermined, because these may not only help the students in achieving academic objectives, but may also enhance their behavioural output in the desired direction. Therefore, the main and interactional effects of teacher, environment and student variables need to be investigated. In the light of the above contention, a conceptual model of teacher effectiveness has been evolved using Borichs (1986) process-process model. This is presented in Fig. III. The model is proposed to be tested in this research. The used method and its results are reported in the later chapters.
Process variables

Teacher Styles
- authoritarian
- nurturant task
- participative

Interaction Process
- Teacher Behaviour
- Student Behaviour

Student Outcome
- intellectual commitment
- college adjustment

Mediating variables

Student Characteristics
(1) Sex
(2) Socio-economic status
(3) Need-systems

Social Characteristics
(1) family-peer interactions
(2) group atmosphere

College Characteristics
(1) educational level
(2) college type
(3) college environment