Chapter II

Literature Review

In the present business scenario leadership is becoming less tangible which is putting pressure on leaders and managers to deal effectively with complexity and choice. This is especially true in case of environments such as senior management levels where knowledge is a critical resource. The key to viability of an organization lies in having ‘explicit’ knowledge (data and statistics) of the organization and of the environment. However, more important is the ‘tacit’ knowledge, or an inner sense or an elusive intuition or an instinct which is described as a ‘key skill’ for leaders (White, et al 1996). This key skill comes from inner strength and having the resilience to maintain energy in the face of complex organizational challenges. White, et al (1996) while discussing the “Future of Leadership” indicated that ‘Self Awareness’ is the foundation of tacit knowledge.

2.1 Understanding Self Awareness

Self awareness is defined as one’s ability to self observe (Wicklund, 1975) and to precisely evaluate one’s behavior with respect to set norms (Atwater and Yammarino, 1992). Self awareness is the practice of reflecting on and accurately assessing one’s behaviors and skills as they are manifested in workplace interactions (Church, 1997).

Self awareness refers to the capacity to become the object of one’s own attention (Duval & Wicklund, 1972), in which the person actively
identifies, processes, and stores information about the self. It is an awareness of one’s own mental states (e.g., perceptions, sensations, attitudes, intentions, and emotions). Researchers argue that self awareness is critical because it enables the development of human qualities, including self regulation, one’s ability to self monitor. To improve one’s current behaviors and thoughts, it depends up on individual capacity to examine the self (Carver & Scheier, 1981; Silvia & O’Brien, 2004). Malcolm Higgs (2002) has described self awareness as “the awareness of our own feelings and the ability to recognize and manage these”.

Self awareness involves knowing the appropriate emotional response to a situation by widening the base of emotional recognition that leaders possess (Gowing, 2001; Jacobs, 2001; Macaleer and Shannon, 2003; Zuckerman et al., 1976; Mirvis, 2008). Abrahams (2007) described Self awareness as “an individual’s ability to understand ones feelings, even as they change from moment to moment.”

Rath & Conchie (2008), while discussing self awareness say that “A leader needs to know his strengths as a carpenter knows his tools, or as a physician knows the instruments at her disposal. What great leaders have in common is that each truly aware of his or her strengths — and can call on the right strength at the right time.”

Goleman (1998), who researched extensively on emotional intelligence, has said that self awareness is a component of emotional
intelligence. Self awareness involves leaders being aware of their strengths and weaknesses and possessing the ability to be frank and honest about them. He also said that self awareness in turn has three components - emotional awareness, self assessment and self confidence. Table 2.1 describes Goleman’s emotional intelligence and its components.

**Table 2.1 Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence Components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Awareness:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Social Awareness:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate Self Assessment</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Awareness</td>
<td>Organizational Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>Service Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Management:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relationship Management:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Drive</td>
<td>Building Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability</td>
<td>Change Catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Conflict Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Control</td>
<td>Developing Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teamwork and Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a recent work done by Stéphane Côté and Ivona Hideg (2011) they pointed that ability to use emotions to get the work done is an important aspect of emotional awareness, which as per Goleman is a component of self awareness. While Schwartzman (2003) say that “Self awareness brings the realization of underdeveloped competencies”

In the context of psychological understanding, “self awareness” refers to the capacity to become the object of one’s own attention. It occurs when an organism focuses not on the external environment, but
on the internal setting. It becomes a reflective observer, processing self-information. Self awareness is the ability to read one's emotions and recognize their impact while using gut feeling to guide decisions (Alain Morin, 2004).

2.1.1 Measuring Self Awareness

Measuring self awareness is not a straightforward matter (Clive Fletcher & Caroline Bailey (2003)). As yet there is no consensus among researchers in this field on how best to represent self awareness conceptually or statistically (Baldry and Fletcher, 2000).

A few key studies that have dealt with this issue are by Atwater & Yammarino (1992), Church (1997), and Van Velsor et al, (1993). These studies have all viewed self awareness as congruence between ‘self’ and ‘other’ ratings via a 360-degree feedback. This type of conceptualization has traditionally been represented statistically by difference in scores (Church, 1997), and in certain 360-degree feedback systems it may be described as a “gap”, and within 360-degree literature this has also been referred to as “congruence-d” (Warr and Bourne, 1999).

This method of measuring self awareness has also attracted criticism. These criticisms were consolidated by Clive Fletcher and Caroline Baily (2003), saying that informing an individual that he/she has self awareness of a certain value of ‘d’ is of no use unless there is a context to it. The main criticism of this conceptualization lies in the fact
that this index can reflect only the extent to which “self” and “other” ratings co-vary, rather than actual self awareness.

Given the problems associated with the measurement of self awareness and the lack of guidance in multi-source multi-rater literature to date as to which measure has greatest functional value, Clive Fletcher and Caroline Baily (2003) suggested that there is some utility in considering alternative ways and contexts in which one can establish an individual’s level of self awareness. Clive suggested that evaluating self awareness in other methodologies rather than a multi source feedback would be a useful option. The present research attempts to pursue this suggestion.

2.1.2 Self Awareness Components

Gregory Ashley (2007) attempted to measure Self awareness - with four components which he named as "1) Self Critical, 2) Desire for Realistic awareness, 3) Indifference to external cues and 4) Self Reflection". The measurement was not successful as the internal consistencies of this scale have not been positive. The correlation values between these components are varying between – (minus) 0.6 and 0.73. Significant negative correlations were found between ‘indifference to external cues’ and self critical subscale (r = -.37), and self reflection subscale (r = -.38).

These components were a result of exploratory factor analysis. The hypothesized dimensions were: 1) Recognition of internal and external
standards, 2) Recognition of one’s positive and negative attributes/abilities, 3) Introspection and self reflection, 4) Accurately detecting gaps in personal behaviors, traits, and goal progress. Since the hypothesized dimensions and factor analysis dimensions are different and the internal consistency is –ve, this research is inconclusive on the components of self awareness and hence these components cannot be used for the present research.

Goleman’s self awareness components were part of popular emotional intelligence construct and were tested many a time for internal consistency and also since these components contain elements which can be easily linked to present day business environments, the researcher proposes to use Goleman’s components for measuring self awareness. Following are the components of self awareness and their meanings as given by Goleman.

*Emotional Self Awareness*: Recognizing one’s emotions and their effects. People with this competence: Know which emotions they are feeling and why; realize the links between their feelings and what they think, do, and say; recognize how their feelings affect their performance; have a guiding awareness of their values and goals.

*Accurate self assessment*: Knowing one’s strengths and limits. People with this competence are: Aware of their strengths and weaknesses; reflective, able to learn from experience; open to candid
feedback, new perspectives, continuous learning, and self development; able to show a sense of humor and perspective about themselves.

_Self confidence:_ Sureness about one’s self worth and capabilities. People with this competence: Present themselves with self assurance; make their presence felt; can voice views that are unpopular and go out on a limb for what is right; are decisive, able to make sound decisions despite uncertainties and pressures.

### 2.1.3 Role of Self Awareness in Leadership Development

Luthans and Avolio (2003) in their ‘Authentic Leadership’ model say that, one of the core elements for leadership development is Self awareness. Self awareness has to grow so that they can change their behavior and employ new leadership strategies (Sosik, Potosky, & Jung, 2002) to face challenges. Dotlich (2005) claimed that Self awareness is the most important contributor to leadership development. “Leaders who do not succeed tend to be people who lack self awareness.” Self awareness is a characteristic of effective leaders (Boyatzis & Van Oosten, 2003). “From the ancient past to contemporary times, philosophers have described great leaders in terms of their self awareness” (Abrahams, 2007).

Avolio (2005) in his book ‘Leadership in Balance’ has said that self awareness is central to leadership development. Figure 2.1 below, adapted from this book, shows how central is self awareness for
leadership development. By understanding self better - a leader gains more control, be more flexible and confident in his/her approach, deals with challenges in a more positive and less anxious way, interact better, communicate more effectively, and understand relationships with others more fully, make better decisions, reduce stress levels, and finally get more out of life.

**Figure 2.1 Avolio Leadership Development Model**

Scanlon (1997) has indicated that self awareness is very critical to leadership development. Koonce (1996) suggests that a manager who is "unaware of his/her blind spots or how she/he impacts others, is a walking disaster in the workplace, and the leader may lead the troops over the cliff". It is widely accepted that enhanced self awareness leads to increased effectiveness (Bernardin, 1986; Burke et al., 1985).

Knowdell (1996) found that at the initial stage of the development process, a leader assess his/her strengths, weaknesses and work styles.
This study suggests that managers participating in the career development process should improve self awareness as a component.

Improved self awareness results in leaders investing in team development and to increase team performance (Dering et al., 2006). The higher levels of self awareness of the leader can create a culture of openness and transparency that would lead to individual, team, and organizational success (Argyris, 2004; Berman & West, 2008). Leaders need to continue in their own development in order to help their teams maintain their ability to perform well in disruptive conditions (Berman & West, 2008).

Carver, et al., (1985) believe that self awareness processes activates a feedback system that works to regulate behavior. The regulation occurs via a comparison of behavior with relevant standards, thus increasing the likelihood of behavior/standard consistency. For the individual high in need for feedback, the formalized feedback processes in place in most achievement settings may be insufficient, and therefore such individuals may proactively solicit feedback or spend more time making feedback inferences. Feedback-seeking is theorized to have a positive correlation with self awareness processes.

Leaders develop their self image by seeing themselves in relation to their environment. In many cases, the key to success and effectiveness may be due to more of self awareness rather than ability (Brouwer, 1965). Ann et al. (2000) indicated that individuals high in Self
awareness are more receptive to leadership development feedback. Amundson (1995) postulated that one of the key variables that moderate an individual’s career development is the level of self awareness. He goes on to state that a leader with these “high levels of self awareness is in a better position to respond proactively to external circumstances”

2.1.4 Summary of Self Awareness

Self awareness involves leaders being aware of their strengths and weaknesses and possessing the ability to be frank and honest about them. Self awareness, so far was measured by using self–other rating gap which has issues and needed another way of measuring it. Goleman (1998) provided components of self awareness as emotional awareness, self assessment and self confidence. Self awareness has a key role in leadership development.

2.2 Leadership Theories and Approaches

Scholars became interested in leadership since the early 20th century and the history of leadership theory that emerged can be classified into following categories.

*The Great Man Theory*: The Great Man theory says that leaders are born not made. The theory assumes that leadership is an inherent quality of the person. The inspiration for this theory was the presence of military leaders of that time.
**Trait Theory:** The Traits theory focuses on certain personal qualities and behavioral patterns in individuals and the theory claims that the presence of ‘these qualities’ makes up the leaders.

**Contingency Theory:** This theory proposes that leadership style is not independent of the situation in which it unfolds. Leadership cannot just be attributed to the leader. Various other factors like the qualities of followers, the specific situation and the unique quality of the leader all contribute to the success of the endeavor.

**Situational Theory:** This theory says that leadership depends on the situation. A leader who can adapt his style to any situation has a better chance of being successful.

**Behavioral Theory:** Researchers who profess this theory believe that leaders are actually made, not born. Individuals can learn the skills of leadership by observing and practicing the behaviors of other leaders.

**Participative Theory:** This theory says that ideal leaders take the input of group members to make decisions. Although the decision making authority still resides with the leader, she/ he invites opinions and suggestions from the team.

**Relationship Approach in the Leadership Theory:** The latest theory in the evolution of leadership is that of a ‘relationship’ between leader
and follower. This theory claims that leadership emerges from the inter-
relationship between the leader and the followers.

**Leadership Approaches**

Surfaced in the early part of the 20th century, Trait theory prevailed for a few decades as a prominent leadership construct, stating that leaders possess specific characteristics, for example, intelligence and self confidence which set them apart from followers.

By the early 1950s, however, the field of psychology began to influence the leadership theory framework. Behaviorists suggested that leadership could more accurately be understood and assessed in behavioral terms. They also suggested that task accomplishment structures were critical aspects to understand the nature of leadership. These behavior theories did not, however, adequately address situational variables and group processes (Yukl, 1994). Situational and contingency theories in 1960s gave responses to these shortcomings. Situational and contingency theories, like trait and behavior theories, are primarily leader-oriented where followers are considered the beneficiaries of leader influence.

Relationship approach theories were developed during the major industry recession of the 1970s, and these came to be known as ‘New Paradigm’ models, which relate to concepts such as Charismatic Leadership (Conger,1989), Transformational Leadership (Burns, 1978),
Transcendental Leadership (Burns, 1978; Fairholm, 1998; Cardona, 2000; David Jordan, 2005) Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977), and Visionary Leadership (Sashkin, 1988).

While ‘old paradigm’ models see leadership as a process, some new leadership definitions have stressed the role of a leader as ‘defining organizational reality’ (Bryman, 1992). The history of leadership, since the earliest formal studies in the 1930s, has been the subject of reviews very often (Metcalfe & Metcalfe, 2005) and recent research interest in leadership has focused on relationships between leaders and followers.

This has been discussed as important, not only because all leaders are also followers, but also because modern views of leadership place considerable focus on the power and importance of followers (Metcalfe & Metcalfe, 2005). Bass and Avolio’s (1994) belief is that an essential distinguishing feature of leaders is their ability to transform followers to perform beyond expectations. In this, they support Burns’s (1978) belief that by engaging the followers’ higher needs, transformational leaders move followers beyond their self interest to work for the larger organizational interest.

In his path breaking book, Leadership, Burns (1978) conceptualizes the constructs of transactional and transforming leadership. Since its publication, it is considered as the source from which new leadership theories and approaches have emerged (Bryman,
Avolio and Bass (1991) broadened and enriched Burns’ (1978) model with the introduction of their full range of leadership model. Drawing an inference from Burns’ (1978) work, several researchers have begun exploring transcending leadership as a discrete construct. Though briefly mentioned by Burns, neither he nor Bass delved into the prospective phenomenon of transcending leadership to any meaningful extent (David Jordan 2005).

Among the integrative “new leadership” approaches to leadership theory, one particular paradigm has received large attention in the literature – the full range of leadership model. Inspired by Burns (1978) and operationalized by Avolio and Bass (1991), the full range of leadership model integrates the two constructs of transactional leadership and transformational leadership by delineating seven behavioral factors, and adding a laissez-faire (non-transactional) leadership dimension.

While above paragraphs give overview of leadership approaches, some of the notable theories that have emerged over the period of time and their origin are listed here:

- Great Man Theory (Carlyle, 1907)
- Charismatic Leadership (Weber, 1947)
- Task Motivated-Relationship Motivated Leadership Theory (Bales & Slater, 1955)
- Theory X and Theory Y (McGregor, 1960)
- Two-Factor Approach (Blake & Mouton, 1982)
- Path-Goal Theory (House, 1971)
- Transforming-Transactional Model (Burns, 1978 and Downton, 1973)
- Leader/Member Exchange Theory (LMX) (Dansereau, et al., 1975)
- Servant Leadership (Greenleaf, 1977)
- Situational Leadership (Kenneth Blanchard et al. 1985)
- Moral Leadership (Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1996; and Anello & Hernandez, 1996)
- Visionary Theories of Leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Sashkin, 1988; and Westley & Mintzberg, 1989)
- Principle-Centered Leadership (Steven Covey, 2003).
- Values-based Leadership (Fairholm, 1991)
- Full Range of Leadership Model (Avolio and Bass 1991)
- Spiritual Leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1995; Conger, 1994; Fairholm, 1998)
- Strategic Leadership (House & Aditya, 1997)
- Transcendent/Transcendental Leadership (Burns 1978; Cardona, 2000)

Amongst the above listed theories, the most popular leadership theory to date which is in practice today is “Full range of leadership model” defined by Avolio and Bass (1991). Transactional leaders approach followers with a goal of exchanging one thing for another. The concept of transactional leadership is narrow in that it does not take the entire situation, employee, or future of the organization in mind when offering rewards. Transactional leadership focuses on control. In
contrast, transformational leaders look at where the organization should be heading and determine how to handle internal and external change and employee needs to reach that goal.

Subsequent to transactional, leadership theories say that leaders are seen to inspire and motivate people to work for the greater good. They are also concerned about the development of each individual rather than just focusing on the task. Transformational, servant and the transcendental leadership style fall under this category.

George Alexakis (2011) while analyzing the recent leadership theories has singled out transformational and servant leadership styles as the progressive leadership models towards transcendental leadership.

Considering the immense popularity of transactional and transformational theory and the nascent level of research on servant leadership and transcendental leadership theory, the researcher has chosen these four leadership styles for the focus in this research. The researcher presents better understanding of these leadership styles (viz. transactional leadership, transformational leadership, servant leadership and transcendental leadership) in the following pages.

2.3 Transactional Leadership

Transactional leadership seeks to motivate followers by appealing to their self interest. Transactional leaders use conventional reward and punishment to gain compliance from their followers (Bass 1985).
Transactional leadership is the leadership defined by an economic based exchange relationship. In this relationship the leader promotes uniformity by providing extrinsic rewards to the collaborators (Cardona, 2000).

Burns (1978) argued that transactional leadership involves an exchange between leader and follower. Followers receive rewards (Salary, Recognition, etc.) when they act according to their leader's directions. The leader clarifies the performance criteria to the followers and what they receive in return is the tasks / work done (House, Woycke & Fodor, 1988). Transactional leadership theories are founded on the concept that manager-subordinate relations are based on a series of exchanges between them. The general notion is that, when the work and the environment of the subordinate fail to provide the required motivation, the manager, through his or her behavior, will be effective by compensating for the deficiencies. Subordinates receive certain valued outcomes (e.g. wages) when they act according to their manager’s wishes.

Transactional leaders accept the goals, structure and culture of the existing organization. They do so because these types of leaders are not inclined to bringing change. Some researchers added to Burns’ (1978) original theory. Transactional leadership encompasses the following components as per Bass (1985):
- Contingent Reward: To influence behavior, the leader clarifies the work needed to be accomplished. The leader uses rewards or incentives to achieve results when expectations are met.

- Management by Exception – Active: To influence behavior, the leader actively monitors the work performed and uses corrective methods to ensure the work (task, compliance and coordination) is completed to meet accepted standards.

- Management by Exception - Passive: To influence behavior, the leader uses correction or punishment as a response to unacceptable performance or deviation from the accepted standards. The leader does not monitor of the follower.

Transactional leaders leave a lot of responsibility on followers, do not set clear goals, and do not help their group to make decisions. These leaders tend to lose control of the activities. The present research uses above definitions for the purpose of the study.

2.3.1 Transactional Leadership Summary

This style of leadership has basis on leader member exchange – rewards in return to work. Bass (1985) has popularized it and indicated that it has 3 components, Contingent Reward, Management by Exception – Active, and Management by Exception – Passive.
2.4 Transformational Leadership

Downton J.V. (1973) in Rebel leadership first coined the term transformational leadership. Burns (1978) introduced the concept of transformational leadership in his book ‘Leadership’. He described it not as a set of specific behaviors, but rather an ongoing process by which "leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of morality and motivation".

Transformational leaders provide a purpose that goes beyond short-term goals and focuses on higher order intrinsic needs. Transformational leaders raise the standard by appealing to higher values of followers. In doing so, they model themselves and use charismatic methods to attract followers to the values and to the leader. Transformational leadership is defined as the process of cultivating followers' commitment to organizational objectives and shaping the culture in ways consistent with the organizational strategy (Yukl, 2002). Transformational leadership is directed towards inspiring followers to share and pursue the leader's vision (Yammarino & Bass, 1990) and motivating followers to go beyond their own self interest of exchanging effort and compliance for rewards (Hatter & Bass, 1988). Transformational leadership, then, helps concentrate followers' efforts on long term goals (Howell & Avolio, 1992).
Yukl, (1994) stated that followers of a transformational leader feel trust, admiration, loyalty and respect toward the leader, and he also stated that under such leadership, followers are motivated to do more than they originally are expected to do. Bass & Avolio, (1994) stated that studies on the subject of leadership have focused more on transformational leadership, which deals with the leader’s effect on followers.

Transformational leadership is the leadership defined by a work-based exchange relationship. In this relationship the leader promotes alignment by providing fair extrinsic rewards and appealing to the intrinsic motivations of the collaborators (Cardona 2000). Burns (1978) was one of the first authors to believe that true leadership not only changes the status quo and achieves objectives within the given environment, but changes everyone involved in the actions for the better, and at the same time, enables both leaders and followers.

Transformational leadership as defined by Bass (1985) has evolved from and encompasses elements of previous leadership types such as trait and behavior theories, charismatic, and situational leadership. The four components of transformational leadership are:

Charisma / Idealized Influence: This is the extent to which the leader behaves in ways that cause people to identify with the leader. Charismatic leaders show convictions and take position of their own. Idealized influence is about the leader having a clear set of principles and
values, displaying them in every activity, and proving to be a role model for the people around them. For both leader and follower, trust is built on ethical and moral foundations.

**Inspirational Motivation:** Inspirational motivation is the extent to which the leader articulates a vision that is attractive and inspires people. Leaders with inspirational motivation push followers for higher achievements, communicate optimism about future goals, and provide meaning for the task at hand. Followers need to have a strong sense of purpose if they are to be motivated to act.

**Intellectual Stimulation:** It is the extent to which the leader challenges assumptions, takes risks and seeks followers' ideas. Leaders with this trait stimulate and encourage creativity in their followers.

**Individualized Consideration or Individualized Attention:** It is the extent to which the leader attends to each follower's needs, acts as a coach or mentor to the follower and listens to the follower's needs and concerns. This approach not only improves the next generation of leaders but also fulfils the individual's need for self actualization, self fulfillment, and self worth.

### 2.4.1 Issues with Bass’s Transformational Leadership Model

Bass’s transformational leadership has been criticized for leader-centered assumptions (influence from the leader to the follower), limited in the impact of follower characteristics on the charismatic leadership process, and heroic bias. Followers’ identification with the leader not only
creates obedient followers, but followers’ primary self identity becomes service to the leader, drive followers’ overdependence on the leader, resulting inactive followers and active leaders (Beyer, 1999; Graham, 1991; Yukl, 1999)

The basis for charisma seems to be irrational, emotional, thus risky, and institutionalization of charismatic leaders can result in an unethical charismatic leader (Howell & Avolio, 1992). Transformational leadership model results in a charismatic leader who is primarily concerned with one’s own self interests (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Deluga, 2001), and a vision which may project leader’s self interest regardless of long-term organizational effectiveness (Conger, 1999; Kark et al, 2003; O’Connor et al, 1995; Yukl, 1999).

Personalized charismatic leaders use emotions to maintain psychological distance from followers (Shamir, 1991; Turner, 1993). Followers buying into this type of relationship are typically seeking to identify with the leader as a person rather than with the leader’s ideas. Rafferty and Griffin (2004) suggested that in the absence of encouragement and confidence building efforts, articulating a vision by the leader may have a neutral or even negative influence on followers.

US research on the transformational leadership has been based on observations of top managers in organizations rather than middle and lower level managers (Bryman, 1992). Metcalfe and Metcalfe (2005) have identified similar issues with existing transformational leadership model.
The point of view brought in by Metcalfe and Metcalfe (2005) is that, transformational leadership is criticized for lacking in morality and ethics. Some of the issues identified are given below:

The transformational leadership model does not say leaders should serve followers for the good of followers. The critical measure of leadership excellence should be leader’s grounded character such as integrity, trust, and human dignity that influence a leader’s vision, ethics, and behaviors rather than charisma. Authentic transformational leadership need to be true to self and others and must be grounded in moral values and ethical foundations.

2.4.2 New Paradigm in Transformational Leadership Theory

Metcalfe and Metcalfe (2005) brought in new dimension to transformational leadership, “Genuine concern for others’ well-being and development”. They summarized that the US models still focus on characteristics of the leader, and often at senior level of leadership, such as a chief executive resulting in ‘heroic’ models of leadership, in contrast, their study with its focus on middle level leaders, reveals more of a ‘leader as servant’ notion of leadership.

Their research was based on a gender-inclusive, black and minority, ethnic inclusive sample of over 3,500 managers and professionals, at different levels (chief executives, top, senior and middle managers), working in the UK National Health Service and local
government. The model that emerged has been found to be sufficiently robust to generalize to the private sector and other public sector organizations. Apart from being inclusive at all stages of its development, the model is new in that it is based on a ‘nearby’ rather than ‘distant’ or ‘heroic’ approach to leadership, using a ‘Grounded Theory’ methodology.

The table 2.2 describes the components of transformational leadership model developed by Metcalfe and Metcalfe. They called it as the Transformation Leadership Questionnaire (TLQ). The present study developed a transformational leadership questionnaire based on components of TLQ for the purpose of this research.

### Table 2.2 Components of TLQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leading and Developing Others</th>
<th>Personal Qualities</th>
<th>Leading the Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Showing Genuine Concern for others</td>
<td>Being Honest &amp; Consistent</td>
<td>Networking &amp; Achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabling others</td>
<td>Acting with Integrity</td>
<td>Focusing Team Effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Accessible to others</td>
<td>Being Decisive, Risk-taking</td>
<td>Building Shared Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging Change</td>
<td>Inspiring Others</td>
<td>Supporting a Developmental Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resolving Complex Problems</td>
<td>Facilitating Change S sensitively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.4.3 Transformational Leadership Summary

While Bass’s transformational leadership model has been very popular for more than a couple of decades, after having found issues with it, the model has been enhanced by Metcalfe and Metcalfe (2005).
The four components of Bass’s transformational leadership viz., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration are re-constructed by Metcalfe and Metcalfe in to three components viz., leading the organization, leading and developing others and personal qualities.

**2.5 Servant Leadership**

The focus of servant leadership is not on self but rather on others and the leader is first servant of others (Greenleaf, 1977). The servant leaders first and foremost activity is to serve and meet the needs of others (Russell & Stone, 2002). The philosophy of the servant leader as seen by Greenleaf (1977) is distinct to say the least. He said that the servant leader puts others first, trusts everyone unless they prove themselves untrustworthy.

While transformational leader’s focus is directed toward the organization, and his or her behavior builds follower commitment toward organizational objectives, the servant leader’s focus is on the followers, and the achievement of organizational objectives is a secondary outcome. The extent to which a leader is able to shift the primary focus of leadership from the organization to the follower is the distinguishing factor in classifying leader as either a transformational or a servant leader (Cardona 2000).
“The servant-leader is a servant first.... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then, conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. He is sharply different from the person who is a leader first perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive to acquire material possessions. For such persons, it will be a later choice to serve – after leadership is established. The leader-first and the servant-first are two extreme types. Between them there are shadings and blends that are part of the infinite variety of human nature.” (Greenleaf, 1977)

Servant leaders develop others, helping them to achieve follower goals (McMinn, 2001). Servant leaders articulate vision, behave in a manner to earn followers’ trust and credibility (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999). Real servant hood is a leadership style that relies upon the influence of self giving (McKenna, 1989).

Graham (1991) developed a servant leadership model that is both inspirational and moral, in contrast to transformational leadership. Buchen (1998) argued that the essential themes for a model of servant leadership should have self identity, capacity for reciprocity, relationship building, and preoccupation with the future. Spears (1998) emphasized the dimensions of listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment, and community building. This list of ten characteristics associated with the servant
leader was developed through Spears’ (1998) analysis of Greenleaf’s (1977) original writings. If Graham (1991) provided a list of the inspirational and moral aspects of servant leadership, Spears (1998) provided a broader range of concepts to consider as the components of servant leadership.

Farling et al. (1999) argued that the components vision, influence, credibility, trust, and service, become a theoretical foundation for moving onto empirical investigation of servant leadership. Of these five dimensions, three (vision, trust, and service) were adopted in Patterson’s (2003) model. Farling et al.’s work has become a regularly cited article in the field of servant leadership studies and has served as a theoretical basis for many of the theoretical and empirical works that have followed.

Russell (2001) argued for vision, credibility, trust, service, modeling, pioneering, appreciating others, and empowerment as distinguishable attributes of servant leaders. Russell’s (2001) observations flow out of his review of the literature surrounding personal and organizational values with a special focus on the aspects of trust, appreciation of others, and empowerment.

Patterson’s (2003) doctoral research has come up with a servant leadership model that includes seven behaviors as exhibited by a servant leader while interacting with his/her followers. These seven behaviors are agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service.
Matthew P. Earnhardt (2008) has empirically validated servant leadership construct developed by Patterson (2003). Since Patterson’s model is empirically validated this research uses Patterson’s model of servant leadership for the purpose of this study. The seven components can be explained as:

*Agapao Love:* As stated by Patterson (2003), “this love is shown by leaders who consider each person as a total person and one with needs, wants and desires.

*Humility:* According to Button, 2005 humility is to lower one’s status in relation to another and is related to one’s self understanding. Humility is not lack of self esteem, but rather recognition of one’s own standing, and is unassuming and humble (Bower, 1997).

*Altruism:* As per Patterson, 2003 Altruism is defined as “helping others just for the sake of helping”.

*Vision:* Vision is seen as a way to “inspire others, to motivate action and to move with hope toward the future” (Farling et. al, 1999).

*Trust:* As per Patterson, 2003 Trust is defined as the leader’s honesty and integrity including the follower’s confidence in the leader’s competence and belief that he or she will act in a fair, ethical, and predictable manner.

*Empowerment:* Patterson, 2003 states that empowerment is “letting people do their jobs by enabling them to learn, grow and progress and it
means allowing for self direction and freedom to fail and all of this multiplies the followers’ strengths and trust”.

*Service:* Service is defined as the leader serving the needs of his or her followers (Farling, et al., 1999). The servant leader is commanded to serve his/her employees and is committed to their well being. Spears (1995), comments “great leaders must first serve others, and this simple fact is central to his or her greatness”.

### 2.5.1 Summary of Servant Leadership

“The servant leader is a servant first.... It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first (Greenleaf, 1977)”. Patterson (2003) came up with a model for servant leadership which constituted seven components and these are agapao love, humility, altruism, vision, trust, empowerment, and service.

### 2.6 Transcendental Leadership

There exists an abundance of published materials on transformational leadership – including more than 650 dissertations in various disciplines that have the term “Transformational leadership” in the title (University Microfilm International, 2004), there is by comparison very little of published literature available on the transcendental leadership phenomenon (David Jordan, 2005)

Transcendental leadership addresses the weakness of transformational / charismatic leadership by providing the motives
behind a leader’s practices, that is, altruistic love, a sense of wholeness, harmony and well-being produced through care, concern, appreciation of both self and others and authentic selfless concern for people. Transcendental leaders help followers feel powerful and enabled to make decisions, accomplish work, and lead on their own (Fairholm, G.1996; Fry, 2003; Korac-Kakabadse et al., 2002). Transcendental leadership is a “visioning process”, an “ethical process that reflects requirements for legitimacy for both leader influence and follower empowerment to facilitate value congruence” (Fry 2003, Fry et al, 2005). Transcendental leadership, in essence, is both follower-centered and leader-centered process.

The transcendental leader generates a type of commitment among his colleagues based on personal trust and transcendent motivation. Team members are not only motivated by the intrinsic (learning, challenge) rewards and extrinsic (money, status), but also motivated by actions that transcend their own interest, such as the good of the organization and the good of the people who can get a benefit from their job. The people are personally committed to the leader to fulfill a worthwhile mission. They want to identify with a cause that is meaningful and makes a difference. They will follow not only the leaders’ demands but also what the leader does not ask for but they think it is important, even if it is difficult.
Burns (1978) suggests the following description for transcendental leadership: “Transcending leadership is dynamic leadership in the sense that the leaders throw themselves into a relationship with followers who will feel “elevated” by it and often become more active themselves, thereby creating new cadres of leaders. Transcending leadership is leadership engagé, which demands attention to a moral virtue where: leaders and followers have a relationship not only of power but also of mutual needs, aspirations, and values; leaders take responsibility for their conduct, character, and commitments; and leaders reach out to wider social collectivities and seek to establish higher and broader moral purposes”. While Burns suggests the idea of a transcending leadership, he does not fully incorporate it into a model of leadership theory.

Ronna (2000) says “The foundation of transcendental leadership lies in people”. It aims to work through people and work with people in order to achieve the organizational objectives as well as attain personal goals. Ronna describes the qualities of transcendental leaders as: “Doing the impossible, feeling the numbness, touching the untouchables, seeing the invisible, listening to the silence, smelling the scentless, understanding inarticulate needs, surfacing courage from fear, creating a positive future from fear, thinking the unthinkable”

SN Chary (2007), interviewed top-level industry leaders in India and deducted the behaviors of transcendental leaders as follows:
Transcendental Leaders “display sensitivity and superior vision; are the 'missionaries' in their task; are passionately committed to the goal; have unbreakable commitment; display spiritual aspects of leadership” These leaders give rise to a 'second' line of leaders. In fact, they encourage the formation of such a second line.

Building upon his ‘triarchic’ framework of exchange relationships (i.e., economic, work, and contribution exchanges), Cardona (2000) expands upon the typology of the full-range of leadership model (Avolio and Bass, 1991) and suggests the following definitions for what he refers to as “three types of relational leaderships”.

- **Transactional Leadership**: is the leadership defined by an economic based exchange relationship. In this relationship the leader promotes uniformity by providing extrinsic (positive or negative) rewards to the collaborators.

- **Transformational Leadership**: is the leadership defined by a work-based exchange relationship. In this relationship the leader promotes alignment by providing fair extrinsic rewards and appealing to the intrinsic motivations of the collaborators.

- **Transcendental Leadership**: is the leadership defined by a contribution based exchange relationship. In this relationship, the leader promotes unity by providing fair extrinsic rewards,
appealing to the intrinsic motivation of the collaborators, and developing their transcendent motivation.

Cardona (2000) describes a transcendental leader as: The leader as well as being interested in the results and in aligning the motivations of his or her collaborators with those of the organization, also tries to develop the transcendent motivation of these collaborators. The transcendental leader centers his or her managerial work on the needs of the collaborators, but not in a manipulative way. Instead the transcendental leader is concerned with the people themselves and tries to contribute to their personal development. Specifically, he or she tries to develop the collaborator’s transcendent motivation ‘the motivation to do things for others, the motivation to contribute’.

David Jordan, (2005) in his doctoral dissertation uses the method of ‘phenomenological study’ to develop a construct for transcendental leadership. His research results in providing the construct as the following:

- **Others’ interest**: A pronounced orientation to serve the legitimate needs and aspirations of others and broader social causes without retaliation. This desire to serve transcends self interest or mutuality of interest.
Behavioral attributes affiliated or associated with 'others’ interest include: Altruism, a consideration for others without self interest; Empathy, a heartfelt and genuine understanding for others’ feelings; Kindheartedness and benevolence on a social scale; Ability to “listen deeply” to others; Ability to effectively communicate and leading by example on moral behavior and ethical values.

- **Determined resolve**: A committed resolve to pursue goals intended to contribute to the well-being of others, of community, and of broader social purposes.

Attributes associated with ‘Determined resolve’ include: A fidelity and conviction of moral values and principles; A demonstrable passion toward accomplishing goals and purposes which serve the needs of others; An ability to confront injustice or inequity; Decisiveness in deeds; and courage in acting and articulating upon ethical values.

- **Aptitude consistent with and expansive of emotional intelligence**, a pronounced capacity for recognizing and effectively managing one’s feelings and relationships with others.

Attributes associated with key characteristic of ‘Emotional intelligence’ include: **Self Awareness**; Discernment (an ability to discriminate ethically ambiguous circumstances); Envisioning the broader perspective or context of a situation (capacity to see things as a
whole); the capacity to act ethically regardless of the perceived or real consequences to self; self reflection, humility, honesty, flexibility, humor, self improvement, and maintenance of a positive attitude. A point to note is that Self awareness is inclusive in transcendental leadership construct.

David Jordan (2005) also suggests based on his study that transactional, transformational and transcendental leaderships are in a Triarchic Model as described in figure 2.2. This model indicates that in leadership development, transactional leadership is at a lower end while transcendental leadership is at the high end in the continuum.

![Figure 2.2: Triarchic Model (David Jordon 2005)](image)

Source: David Jordan’s Ph.D. Thesis: Phenomenological study of transcendental leadership

Cardona’s (2000) treatment of transcendental leadership hints at the spiritual dimension of leadership by viewing the transcendental leader as “servant-leader”. However, his treatment only allows one to infer about the possible implications of ‘servant’ aspect for leader
effectiveness (Sanders et. al. 2003) and David Jordan’s (2005) construct of transcendental leadership, the spirituality dimension is lacking.

2.6.1 Spiritual Component of Transcendental Leadership

Fairholm (1996) suggested that transactional, transformational, and transcendental leadership are ranked along a continuum from managerial control to spiritual holism. Transcendental leadership is concerned about the whole person in a more holistic leadership that integrates the four essences of human existence, the body (physical), mind (logical/rational thought), heart (emotions, feelings), and spirit, whereas transactional and transformational leadership only address the former three, but no spirit (Fry, 2003).

As a leader develops along the transactional-transformational-transcendental hierarchical continuum, the leader’s spirituality in terms of consciousness, moral character, and faith become more developed. As the leader becomes more spiritually focused, she/he places greater importance on the immaterial as opposed to material and thus he tends to have higher internal locus of control (Sanders, Hopkins & Geroy, 2003). Transcendental leaders use values, attitudes, and behaviors (altruistic love, hope/faith, vision) to intrinsically motivate followers, and thus, increase the followers’ senses of spiritual calling (life has meaning, make a difference and the resulting positive organizational outcomes (Fry, 2003; Fry, et al, 2005).
Transcendental leadership taps into the fundamental needs of both leader and follower for spiritual survival and aims to improve the spiritual development of both the leader and followers (Fry, 2003; Sanders, Hopkins & Geroy, 2003).

Thompson (2000) indicated that transcendental accomplishment cannot occur without spirituality. Sanders et al (2003) captured the essence of transcendental leadership development by focusing on three core dimensions of spirituality: consciousness, moral character and faith. They incorporate this idea into a conceptual model that shows linkages among the theory of transcendental leadership, transactional and transformational theories along several continua, including spirituality.

**Figure 2.3: Transcendental Leadership and Spirituality (Sanders et al 2003)**

![Diagram of Transcendental Leadership and Spirituality](image)

Source: “From transactional to transcendental: Toward an integrated theory of leadership”. (Sanders et al 2003)

A, B and C are the intersections and overlap between the leadership styles.
The model described in figure 2.3 presents transactional, transformational, and transcendental theories of leadership being linked together along spirituality continuum. The lower positioning of transactional leadership theory on the spirituality continuum suggests that leadership at this level is likely to be associated with a relatively low sense of spiritual awareness. By the same token, the higher positioning of transcendental leadership theory over transformational leadership theory on the continuum suggests that leadership at this level is likely to be associated with a highly developed sense of spiritual awareness, a post conventional level of moral development, and faith in a higher / spiritual authority. Sanders et al (2003) view transcendental leadership as operating at the highest level of spirituality.

At the personal/individual level, the model bridges the gap between spirituality and leadership by stimulating practical and scholarly consideration about their relationship. Sanders et al., (2003) provides a model with an alternative way of characterizing spiritually oriented leaders, as they strive to integrate spirituality into all aspects of their life.

Transcendental leadership in essence refers to those aspects of leadership that emphasize issues such as legitimacy and trust, both at a personal and organizational level (Anton Verwey et al, 2008). Spirituality in this sense refers to deepest meanings, values, purposes and highest
motivations necessary for sustainable organizations and societies (Zohar & Marshall, 2004).

Fairholm (1998) states that spiritual leadership is a construct indicating that followers are desirous of behaviors that emerge from the leader’s inner spirit, he further says that ‘Integrating many components of one’s work and personal life into a comprehensive system for managing the workplace defines the holistic or spiritual leadership approach. It sees the transformation of self, others, and the team are important, and even critical’ Fairholm goes on to indicate that leaders spirituality is inseparable from his / her action, thus establishing a direct link between a sense of spirituality and the values and behaviors they exhibit in the workplace.

Giacalone and Jurkiewicz (2003) in their Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance, give reference to 14 different definitions of spirituality. They define workplace spirituality as “a framework of organizational values evidenced in the culture that promote employees’ experience of transcendence through the work process, facilitating their sense of being connected to others in a way that provides feelings of completeness and joy”. Gibbons (2001) defines spirituality at work as “the search for direction, meaning, inner wholeness and connectedness to others, to non-human creation and to a transcendent.”
Gilbert Tan (2006) says that “Spirituality at work nourishes the inner life of the employees. There will be a sense of fulfillment experienced by the employees as they see their work as a means to achieve a higher goal beyond material gain and a means to live out their values fully. There will be a sense of community in the organization and employees will feel that they are connected genuinely with each other”. The researcher uses Gilbert Tan (2006) understanding of spirituality in this study.

Based on the discussion in section 2.6, the integrated construct for transcendental leadership is proposed to include the components from David Jordan’s phenomenological study and the spirituality component as discussed in section 2.6.1.

2.6.2 Transcendental Leadership Summary

The research in transcendental leadership is in its nascent stage (David Jordan 2005). David Jordan 2005, suggested that transactional leadership, transformational leadership and transcendental leadership are in a Triarchic model indicating that in the leadership development, transaction leadership is at a lower end while transcendental leadership is at higher end. Sanders et. al. (2003) have indicated that transactional, transformational, and transcendental leadership are on a spirituality continuum with transactional leadership at lower end and transcendental leadership at higher end. The lists of components of transcendental leadership can be summarized as, “Determined Resolve”,...
“Other’s Interest”, “Emotional Intelligence” and “Spirituality”. Since Self awareness is a component of Emotional Intelligence and transcendental leadership is inclusive of Self awareness.

2.7 Components of Leadership Styles and Self Awareness reviewed so far

Table 2.3 gives components of Self awareness, four leadership styles and their components. These components are used to measure leadership in this research study.

Table 2.3: Components of leadership styles / self awareness reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Awareness</th>
<th>Transactional Leadership</th>
<th>Transformational Leadership</th>
<th>Servant Leadership</th>
<th>Transcendental Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Awareness</td>
<td>Contingent Reward</td>
<td>Leading and Developing Others</td>
<td>Agapao Love</td>
<td>Others Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Assessment</td>
<td>Management By Exception – Active</td>
<td>Leading the Organization</td>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Determined Resolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>Management By Exception – Passive</td>
<td>Personal Qualities</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Emotional Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8 Relationship between Leadership Styles

Craig L. Pearce, et.al (2003) in their research “Transactors, transformers and beyond” indicate that a leader who is high on transformational behaviors is likely to be high on transactional behavior as well. This means the leadership types are non-mutually exclusive.
Their analyses led to the conclusion that the various types of leadership are conceptually and empirically distinct, yet at the same time are highly related.

Transactional and transformational leadership appear to be in a continuum rather than being mutually exclusive (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Yammarino et al, 1993). Bass (1985) viewed transformational and transactional leadership as being complementary rather than constructs on either side of the spectrum. The transformational leadership style is complementary to the transactional style and likely to be ineffective in the total absence of a transactional relationship between leaders and followers (Bass & Avolio, 1990; Goodwin et al, 2001).

Most of all, these forms of leadership are not mutually exclusive, and a specific leader is not required to choose between being one leader vs. another. Indeed, a specific leader may actually use behaviors from more than one leadership style.

2.9 Leadership Styles and Demographics

A number of studies have been conducted which discussed the influence of demographic variables on leadership styles. Krishnan and Park (1998) noted that demographic variables have considerable influence on the leadership styles of top managers. Hambrick and Mason (1984) proposed that demographic variables such as age, tenure as a leader, functional area background (which line of business the leader is
working), and educational qualification are all important aspects of leadership that influence organizational success.

Differences in the leadership styles of men and women are one of the most well discussed aspects of leadership. In their meta-analysis, Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that women tend to use a more participative style while men tend to use a more directive style. This indicates that women use more transformational styles while men use more transactional styles. This conclusion is supported by other studies that found women are more likely to use transformational leadership than men and that men were more likely to use transactional leadership as their primary style (Druskat, 1994; Rosener, 1990).

Nithiya and Venkat (2010) in their recent research have empirically proved that Leader's femininity is positively related to transformational leadership. They said that “Femininity has to necessarily first enhance emotional intelligence in order to enhance transformational leadership”. This implies that leadership qualities are enhanced by emotional intelligence, which in turn is enhanced by femininity.

Several studies examining the relationship between age and leadership style have been conducted. Vroom and Pahl (1971) suggested that older managers within an organization may have a greater commitment to maintaining the status quo than younger managers and less favorable attitudes towards taking risks. Hambrick and Mason (1984) proposed that younger managers were more inclined to take risks
than older managers. Taking risks rather than maintaining the status quo is one of the characteristics of leaders who engage in the transformational leadership practice. This means that younger managers have higher transformational leadership than older managers.

Tenure has also been addressed from the perspective of how long an individual has served in a leadership position. Spotanski and Carter (1993) reported no significant difference in leadership levels of executive officers in agricultural education department when compared to years of experience in the leadership position.

Educational background is a variable that has received considerably less attention than other demographic variables within literature. Sykes (1995) reported that the type of degree, beyond a bachelor’s degree, had no significant influence on the self perceive leadership styles of the leaders in her study.

Tom Peters (1987) suggests that span of control has a direct bearing on the number of layers in an organization, which is a measure of the length of an organization's lines of communications. Diane et al., (2004) proposed that span of control has relationship with transformational leadership.

The leader’s gender (Bar-On, 2004; Stone et al., 2005) and age (Bar-On, 2004; Duncan, 2007) could impact emotional intelligence scores, in turn Self awareness (since self awareness is part of emotional intelligence). Additionally, organizational work experience is found to
have moderate relationship between emotional intelligence and some components of transformational leadership (Webb, 2005). Zani Dannhauser, Adré B Boshoff (2006) found that age, ethnic group, qualification, and gender have no relationship with servant leadership.

Based on the above literature review in this section, managerial hierarchy, organization type, gender, age, work experience, managerial experience, span of control, qualification, and lines of business were added as demographic variables for the present research. The question to study is does the extent of particular leadership style vary based on demographic variables?

2.10 Self Awareness and its relationship with Leadership

Cox, et al. 2008, said that transformational leadership begins with awareness – awareness of own thoughts and feelings, and how these thoughts affect actions. As awareness improves, one begins to see inner motivating forces like what drives individual - their passions and values - and how these affect their thoughts, feelings and actions, and that of others. They said that it is about leading with an integrity and authenticity that resonates with others, and inspires them to follow. Not only does it inspire others to follow, but to become leaders themselves (Cox, et al. 2008). Kombarakaran et al. (2008) stated that as Self awareness helps leaders overcome blind spots and identify their strengths and weaknesses, they are able to build stronger relationships, and build a culture (Abrahams, 2007) that will increase the likelihood of
follower success. Rath and Conchie (2008) pointed out that, the awareness leaders need to have about their own strengths and weaknesses is important for team-building. Serio and Epperly (2006) have said that through an increased understanding of strengths and weaknesses, self awareness provides opportunity for leaders to demonstrate self-management and increase their leadership capability (Gray, 2003; Schwartzman, 2003).

Church and Waclawski (2001) found that self awareness was a moderating variable of managerial effectiveness. Church (1997) indicates that high-performing leaders were significantly more Self aware than those performing less well. Schwandt (2005) added that self awareness causes leaders to review their actions, their style, and what they know. Rooke and Torbert (2005) stated that the commitment to the development and gain of self awareness will make a significant difference in determining the level of leadership attained in the effort to become a transformational leader.

Dering, Cunningham, & Whitby (2006) suggested that there exists a positive relationship between leader self awareness and the ability of leaders to adjust their behavior appropriately to respond to the situations. Individuals who are high on self awareness are thought to have higher levels of organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and ‘effective managers and leaders’ than individuals who are less aware (Atwater and Yammarino 1992, 1997). Subordinates of managers
who are high in self awareness will report higher levels of job satisfaction (Dan Moshavi et. al, 2003).

Dotlich, (2005) said that “High-performing leaders are aware of their strengths and understand their weaknesses, and see themselves as continuously learning, adapting and responding to both positive and negative circumstances”.

Michael J. McDonald (2009) in his doctoral dissertation has empirically established a relationship between self awareness (measured via self other rating gap) and Organizational engagement, implicit in it is a positive relationship with transformational leadership.

“The important point here is that as leaders become more self aware and understand their impact on others through their communication and behavior, they can develop a style that helps others around them grow and become more successful” (Nocks, 2007).

Jane T, Waddell (2009) in her doctoral dissertation provided empirical evidence for a positive correlation between servant leadership attribution and the leader’s emotional intelligence. She used Bar-On Emotional Intelligence questionnaire EQ-360 and Servant leadership inventory (Longbotham, 2007) to measure the relationship. Since self awareness is a component of emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1998), the relationship between self awareness and servant leadership is deemed to have a relationship and this needs to be empirically verified.
Awareness gained through self reflection helps leaders with self confidence (Kombarakaran et al., 2008) from which they can identify the correct action, get answers, challenge long standing philosophies, and encourage their team to higher performance (Nocks, 2007), and help develop leadership in others (Macaleer & Shannon, 2003). Increase in self awareness will increase capability to monitoring their behavior, and can adapt and effectively lead within a wider range of organizational conditions (Tsui & Ashford, 1994; Sosik, Potosky, & Jung, 2002).

McCall and Lombardo (1983) studied executive derailment, and their findings revealed gaps in leader’s self awareness they described as “blind spots,” which cause leaders to miss clues or responses to their performance that causes a negative effect on their team or organizational outcomes.

Suri and Prasad (2011) have empirically tested the relationship between self awareness and transformational leadership and understood that there is a positive relationship between self awareness and transformational leadership. The sample considered by them is small and it needed larger sample for authentication of the empirical result.

Interest in self awareness and its usefulness to organizations has now moved into the leadership arena (Dulewicz and Higgs 1999). This stream of work, combined with developments in leadership research, and increasing interest in the role of self awareness suggests that a potential relationship exists between self awareness and leadership. In a study by
Malcolm Higgs (2002), measuring the relationship between leadership and emotional intelligence, he clearly identifies a gap of a research body around relationship between self awareness and leadership.

Based on above discussion, it may be hypothesized that there exists a relationship between self awareness and leadership and it need to be tested empirically.

2.11 Gap in the literature as per the review of literature, research questions and the opportunity for contribution.

After reviewing the literature in sections 2.1 to 2.10, it was observed that:

- The literature reviewed could not find significant evidence of empirical relationship established between self awareness (measured via self rating questionnaire) and leadership styles (viz. transactional leadership, transformational leadership, and servant leadership).
  - Research Question: Is there a relationship between Self awareness and different leadership styles when measured empirically?
- Some discussions are quoted in literature survey on relationship between demographic variables and the leadership styles, but there appears to be very little empirical research on inferring
relationship between demographic variables and leadership styles / self awareness.

- Research Question: Is there a relationship between Demographic variables and leadership styles / self awareness when measured empirically?

- The literature reviewed above provides an opportunity to measure transcendental leadership.

- There were evidences of measuring leadership styles of transactional and transformational at a single occurrence and servant leadership as a separate occurrence, but no evidence of measuring four leadership styles in a single occurrence, providing an opportunity to measure all four leadership styles at a single occurrence.

From the above observations, table 2.4 below provides a schematic overview of the variables and the relationships between them to be researched in the present study.
Identified relationships as per table 2.4 are proposed to be empirically tested during this research work. To address the gaps and the research questions, hypotheses were formulated and are enlisted in section 3.1.1. Based on hypotheses, suitable research methodology was adopted and chapter III discusses the research methodology.