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I MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP

It has been accepted as a truism that good leadership is essential, not only to business, but also to the government, to the community and to the countless groups and organisations that shape the way in which we live, work and play. There can be little question that the success of an organisation or a group within an organisation, depends largely on the quality of its leadership. Successful leaders anticipate change, exploit opportunities, motivate their followers, correct poor performance, resulting in higher productivity, and leading the organisation towards its objectives.

Why is leadership so important to an organisation’s success? The answer lies in the need for coordination and control. Organisations exist to achieve objectives that are either impossible or extremely inefficient to achieve by individuals working independent of each other. Integration of various job activities, communication between groups and individuals, monitoring performance, managing rivalry and conflict, motivation of people, maintaining group morale, etc. — these activities would not be possible without a good leader.

A good leader? What makes a good leader? The tempting answer would be: good followers! While there is some truth in this statement, the issue is far more complex. One view is that leaders are born, not made. Whilst the other extreme viewpoint is that leaders are made, not born. However, the emerging viewpoint is that leaders often need to be flexible and to modify their behavior according to the prevailing task and situation. Thus, sensitivity to the environment seems to be key issue according to this point of view. However, this is too general a viewpoint. This led various researchers to conceptualise leadership in their terms as following section will make clear.
A. THE CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP

Their seems to be no clear consensus regarding exactly how the term 'Leadership' should be defined. Yukl (1981) who carried out a fairly recent comprehensive review of research, states that "Definitions of Leadership usually have as a common denominator, the common assumption that it is a group phenomenon involving the interaction between two or more people. In addition, most definitions of Leadership reflect the assumption that it involves an influence process whereby intentional influence is exerted by the leaders over the followers. The numerous definitions of Leadership that have been proposed appear to have little else in common." Some of these definitions are shown in Figure 1.
### Figure 1. Some Representative Definitions of Leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hemphill &amp; Coon</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Leadership is the behavior of an individual when he is directing the activities of a group toward a shared goal. (p.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tannenbaum et al</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Interpersonal influence exercised in a situation and directed through the communications toward the attainment of a specified goal or goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stodgill</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Leadership is the initiation and maintenance of a structure in expectation and interaction. (p. 411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Leadership is an interaction between persons in which one presents information of a sort and in such a manner that the other becomes convinced that his outcomes (cost - benefit ratio) will be improved if he behaves in the manner suggested or desired. (p. 232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janda</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Leadership is a particular type of power relationship characterised by a group member's perception that another group member has the right to prescribe behavior patterns for the former regarding his activity as a group member. (p. 358)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kochan, et al</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Leadership is an influence process whereby O's actions change P's behavior and P views the influence attempt as being consistent with P's goals. (p. 285)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katz &amp; Kahn</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Leadership is the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organisation. (p. 528)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general definition of leadership that emerges from a review of the above statements is that leadership is the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of goals. The source of this influence may be formal, such as that provided by the possession of managerial rank in an organisation. Since management positions come with some degree of formally designated authority, an individual may assume a leadership role as a result of the position he or she holds in the organisation. But not all leaders are managers, or for that matter, are all managers leaders. Just because an organisation provides its managers with certain rights, it is no assurance that they will be able to lead effectively. It is found that non-sanctioned leadership, that is, the ability to influence that arises outside of the formal structure of the organisation, is as important or more important than formal influence. In other words, leaders can emerge from within a group as well as be formally appointed.
B. THE THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP

The subject of leadership certainly does not lack for theories. Academic and organisational psychologists have been studying the nature of leadership for decades. Their goal is to determine the nature of leadership and the factors that cause some people to be effective leaders and others to be ineffective leaders.

1) Trait Theories

Initially the problem of delineating the various leadership characteristics seemed to be simple. After all, in most situations it is not difficult to determine which persons are good leaders and which persons are not. All that appeared necessary was for researchers to measure the traits of good leaders and poor leaders and see how they differed. This approach was labelled the 'trait approach' where the emphasis is on the personal characteristics or 'traits' of leaders. No consideration is given to the circumstances or the situation in which the leadership occurs. According to Schulz (1978) the exponents of this approach believed that leadership ability is a function of personal traits and the person possessing the right combination of traits will be a good leader.

The enormous volume of research available in this area was comprehensively reviewed by Stodgill (1948). More than 120 studies were reviewed, which used the trait approach to study leadership. A detailed discussion of these studies is beyond the scope of this discussion.

The trait approach to the study of leadership has generally proved unproductive since leadership characteristics vary greatly from one situation to another. Henry (1949) reported a list of 12 personality factors where a 'high drive for achievement' was the major
factor for effective leaders. The same characteristic was found to be critical for executive success by McClelland & Burnham (1976), Dunnette (1967), Ghiselli (1959).

In summary, looking at leadership as a trait of the leader has not been particularly effective as a means of understanding leadership. The ability to lead is apparently not an individual trait which some have and others lack. The conflicting results led researchers to look for patterns of behavior or leadership 'styles' that made effective leaders. This approach was later labelled the 'behavioral approach' and the various behavioral theories are discussed below.

2) Behavioral Theories

If leaders are not much alike in appearance and personality, are they at least alike in their behavior? What do leaders do that sets them apart from their followers? Are certain leadership 'styles' more effective than others? When various trait theories failed to accurately predict effectiveness of leaders, the researchers began to look for patterns of behavior and personality that would result in leader effectiveness. Thus different leadership styles were given different labels according to the ideology they subscribed to. Different distinct styles were identified such as Democratic, Autocratic, Participative, Bureaucratic, Laissez-faire and more recently in the Indian context, a Nurturant-Task style. Different theorists came up with various combinations of styles that could be used for managerial success. A brief run-down of the more recognised of these theories is essential in order to understand the ideologies and philosophies behind different leader behavior and also to give a historical perspective to the progress of intellectual thought in this subject.
(i) The Iowa Studies

The Iowa theorists focused on the decision-making component of the leaders behavior and classified leaders into three different types according to their style of handling decision making situations. Lewin, Lippit and White (1939) came up with three such styles of decision-making.

**Authoritarian**: The leader makes decisions alone and tells subordinates what they are to do in the light of the decisions made by the leader.

**Democratic**: The leader actively involves subordinates in the decision making process, sharing problems with them, soliciting their inputs, and sharing authority for arriving at decisions.

**Laissez-faire**: The leader avoids making a decision whenever possible and leaves it up to subordinates to make individual decisions on their own with little guidance or direction either from the leader or from the rest of the group.

Research on the effectiveness of these alternative styles suggests that the democratic leadership style appears most desirable (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939). Individuals under democratic leadership were more satisfied, had higher morale, were more creative, and had better relationships with their superiors. Individuals working under a democratic leader were more likely to continue working in the absence of the leader. However, the quantity of output produced by workers was highest under the autocratic leadership style, slightly lower under democratic leadership and lowest under laissez-faire leadership.
(ii) The Ohio State Studies

In the early 1950's, researchers at the Ohio State University abandoned the trait approach to leadership and adopted the behavioral approach. Fleishman (1967) describes their approach very adequately.

Focusing on the kinds of behavior engaged by the people in leadership roles, these investigators developed over 1800 items describing various leadership roles. Repeated use of these questions in a variety of leader-group situations showed that these items could be grouped into two or more basic dimensions of leader behavior. These were labelled 'Consideration' and 'Initiating Structure'.

Consideration: Includes behavior indicating mutual trust, respect and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. It seems to emphasise a deeper concern for group member needs, and includes such behavior as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication.

Initiating Structure: Includes behavior in which the supervisor organises and defines group task activities and his relation to the group. This dimension seems to emphasize overt attempts to achieve organisation goals. (Fleishman & Harris, 1962 p43-44)

The similarity between these two terms and other terms can be readily seen. Consideration is very much like 'employee-centered supervision' 'supportive' 'participative' and 'human relations oriented supervision'. Initiating Structure on the other hand is most similar in meaning to terms like 'job-centered', 'directive' and 'task - oriented' supervision.

A large number of studies questioned the generality of the assumptions regarding the effects of consideration and initiating structure. Researchers have begun to examine the conditions under which consideration is related to performance. Another way of saying the
same thing is that variables that moderate the relationship between leader behavior and organisational outcomes are being discovered. Kerr, Schriesheim, Murphy and Stogdill (1974) reviewed research on the Ohio State Studies and identified those variables that had been shown to affect the relationship between the independent variables of consideration and initiating structure, and the dependent variables of satisfaction, morale, and performance. These moderator variables were placed in one of three categories: characteristics of subordinates supervised, characteristics of the leaders' supervisor, and characteristics of the task(s) being performed. These variables are presented in Figure 2.

**Figure 2 : Variables found to moderate the Relationship between Leader Behavior and Outcome Variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBORDINATE CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>SUPERVISOR CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>TASK CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>Upward Influence</td>
<td>Time Urgency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Similarity of</td>
<td>Physical Danger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>attitude to those of</td>
<td>Permissible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Job</td>
<td>higher management</td>
<td>error rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Level</td>
<td>Similarity of behavior</td>
<td>External stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>to those of higher</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerning the leader</td>
<td>management</td>
<td>Job Scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Importance of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meaningfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kerr, Schreisheim & Murphy (1974)
In addition to the complexity suggested by the Kerr review, there has been some confusion concerning different versions of the actual scales used to measure consideration and initiating structure. This makes it difficult to compare the results of studies that have used different forms for measuring consideration and initiating structure. Schriesheim, House and Kerr (1976) report that 31 percent of recent leadership studies on consideration and initiating structure used a modified version of the Ohio State Scales.

To sum up, there is no 'Ohio State Theory' of leadership. There is simply an enormous pile of data and some suggested measuring instruments which are riddled with problems of moderator variables and non-standard measurement. The dimensions of consideration and initiating structure, at best remain a means of leader classification.

(iii) The University of Michigan Studies

At approximately the same time as the researchers at Ohio State University were developing the concepts of consideration and initiating structure, another group of scientists at the University of Michigan were also involved in research on leadership effectiveness. The approach adopted by the Michigan researchers (Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950, among others) was first to identify leaders who were acknowledged to be either effective or ineffective, and then to study the behavior of these leaders in search of patterns of behavior that might differentiate the effective and ineffective leaders.

The Michigan research also led to identification of two distinct dimensions of leader behavior, which bear a significant degree of similarity to the dimensions of consideration and initiating structure that came out of the Ohio State Research programme. The two dimensions identified were 'employee-oriented leadership' and 'production-oriented leadership'.
**Employee-oriented**: As its name implies, this kind of behavior is highly similar to leader behavior which is high on consideration. The employee-oriented leader is concerned with the welfare and development of subordinates, engages in two-way communication with subordinates, is supportive and non-punitive, and delegates responsibility and authority to subordinates. An employee-oriented leader is sometimes described as employing a 'general' style of supervision.

**Production-oriented**: The notion of a leader who is highly production-oriented is very similar to a leader who is high on initiating structure. Production-oriented leaders emphasise planning, goal setting, and meeting schedules. They are more likely to give subordinates explicit instructions, make use of power, evaluate subordinates, and generally stress the importance of production. Leaders who are highly production oriented are frequently described as employing a 'closed' style of supervision.

Initially it was thought that employee-oriented and production-oriented styles of leadership were opposite ends of a single continuum. In other words, it was thought that leaders were either one or the other and the more they tended to be employee-oriented, the less they tended to be production-oriented and vice-versa. Fortunately, research has disproved this assumption as Weissenberg & Kavanaugh (1972) have shown in their review on this subject. Thus, a leader may simultaneously be high or low on either or both dimensions.

A considerable amount of research was carried out examining the relationship between employee-oriented and production-oriented leadership styles and leadership effectiveness (eg. Katz et.al, 1950; Katz & Kahn, 1952, Mann & Dent, 1954; Morse & Reimer, 1956). The eventual conclusions drawn from this research regarding employee-oriented and production-oriented leadership are very similar to those drawn for consideration and initiating structure. There does appear to be some evidence that employee-oriented
leadership generates higher levels of employee satisfaction. However, the evidence relating either of the styles to productivity is not consistent.

(iv) The Managerial Grid Theory

A graphic portrayal of a two-dimensional view of leadership style has been developed by Blake & Mouton (1964). They propose a Managerial Grid based on the styles of 'Concern for People' and 'Concern for Production' which essentially are the same as the Ohio State dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure or the Michigan dimensions of Employee-oriented and Production-oriented.

The Grid represented in the figure has nine possible positions along each axis creating eighty-one different positions in which the leaders style may fall. The grid does not show results produced but, rather, the dominating factors in a leader’s thinking in regard to getting results.
Figure 3: The Managerial Grid [source Blake and Mouton, 1964]
9.9. Team Management

Work accomplishment is from committed people; interdependence through a 'common stake' in organisation purpose, leads to relationships of trust & respect.

9.1. Authority-obedience

Efficiency in operations, results from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.

1.9. Country Club Management

Thoughtful attention to needs of people for satisfying relationships leads to a comfortable friendly organisation atmosphere and work tempo.

5.5. Organisation Man Management

Adequate organisation performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out work with maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level.

1.1. Impoverished Management

Exertion of minimum work to get required work done is appropriate to sustain organisation membership.

Based on the findings of Blake and Mouton (1982), managers perform best under a 9,1. (Authority type) or the 1,9. (Country Club type) leader. Unfortunately, the grid offers a better framework for conceptualising leadership style that for presenting any tangible new information in clarifying the complexity of the leadership process since there is little substantive evidence to support the conclusion that a 9,9. style is effective in all situations. (Larson, Hunt, & Osborn, 1976; Nystrom, 1978)

(v) Contemporary Indian Perspectives on Leadership

In India too, it is found that many researchers were dissatisfied with the general applicability of Western theories in Indian culture whilst a democratic, consideration, or
people-oriented approach was highly recommended by Western Researchers as the most effective style, it was found to be not the most preferred style of Indian Managers. The two major Indian theorists in this field are S.Kakar and J.B.P.Sinha. Their views are discussed briefly in the following pages. In addition, a brief mention is made of C.N.Daftuar's Psycho-cultural Situational Model for Leadership Behavior and of Rao et. al.(1990) and their work on leadership styles in India.

(a) 'Ideologies of Authority' (Kakar, 1974)

Kakar (1974) has provided an extremely useful classification of Ideologies of Authority. Although it cannot be called a full-blown theory or model of leadership, his classification does provide some useful insights into the ideological basis of various leader behavior patterns especially in the Indian context. His categories are labelled Parental, Professional and Fraternal.

**Parental Ideologies**: The main features of which are the carry-over of pre-industrial elements of social relations into modern work organisations; the transformation of a society's historical legacy of parent-child, master-servant, teacher-student, relationships into an ideology of superior-subordinate relations in the work organisation. There can be two kinds of parental ideologies one, assertive (similar to authoritarian behavior) and the other, nurturant (a benevolent father-figure)

**Professional Ideologies**: Where both the superior and the subordinate are seen as rational human beings dominated by their economic self-interest which can best be realised by mutual cooperation.

**Fraternal Ideologies**: Where the ideal superior is the one who helps his subordinate satisfy his psychological needs and maintains his social bonds by facilitating the subordinates interaction with his peer group. Also known as 'human relations' 'democratic leadership' and 'participative management' (Kakar, 1974).
The various ideologies can be summarised as follows.

**Figure 4 Kakar’s Authority Ideologies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideology</th>
<th>Image of Superior</th>
<th>Superior behaviour towards subordinates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emotional Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental</td>
<td>a) Assertive</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Nurturant</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternal</td>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kakar (1974) also states that “parental ideologies in general and the assertive superior in particular dominate authority relations in Indian organisations, the main characteristics of which are:

a) The existence of a high degree of control of subordinate task performance by superior, and

b) The absence of a simple correspondence between authority patterns in traditional social institutions such as the family, and superior-subordinate relations in work organisations. The source of the latter seems to be more in recent history of modern work organisations in India, rather than in any indigenous organisational forms” (Kakar, 1974)
(b) The Nurturant-Task Leader Model

Sinha (1980) proposed a Nurturant-Task Leader model where styles of leadership were categorised into three basic styles, Authoritarian, Nurturant-Task, and Participative. In his own words Sinha (1980) describes the relationship between the styles as.......

"The three, if taken together reflect a crude continuum consisting of an Authoritarian style on one hand and a Participative on the other,...... The conceptual overlaps on the NT style seem to suggest that it is interpolated between the two styles..... The continuum of Authoritarian - NT - Participative styles reveals as a whole high effort investment..... The Bureaucratic-orientation runs perpendicular to the continuum which means that a particular leadership style may have varying degrees of Bureaucratic-orientation." Thus, the model is diagrammatically represented as:

![Diagram of the Nurturant-Task Leader Model](image)

**Figure 5: The Nurturant-Task Leader Model**
The Nurturant-Task style obviously has two components: concern for task, and nutritant-orientation. The NT style requires that the task must be completed and that the subordinates understand and accept the goals and normative structure of the group or organisation and cultivate commitment to them. The NT leader structures his and his subordinates roles cleverly 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. Responsibilities are pin-pointed and areas of decision-making are synchronised with them. He thus, creates a climate of purposiveness and goal-orientation.

"His task-orientation however, has a mix of 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 responsibility and spare the leader for other tasks like minding the boundary properties of the group of organisation."

"Thus, his task orientation and personal warmth and interest develop into a relationship of trust and understanding and commitment to productivity and subordinates growth... the NT style is flexible... and transitional in the sense that it gradually leads to fuller participation of his subordinates... In this sense, Nurturant-Task leadership is a fore-runner to Participative style of leadership which stands for full participation of subordinates, group decision making, and the role of the leader as 'one of us' " (Sinha, 1980 p.55-56)

All in all, the picture one gets is of a leader whose style, as stated by Mohan(1987), "appears to fit very closely to Blake and Mouton's style 9/9, and in terms of the model
developed by Hersey and Blanchard (discussed in the forthcoming pages) to the high task, high relationship quadrant

(c) Psycho-Cultural Situational Theory (Daftuar, 1985)

Daftuar (1985) argues that owing to cultural bias in the development of various Western theories, they are not suitable for Indian corporations. He proposes a model of leadership style which suits our culture. His model is called Psycho-cultural Situational Theory and is presented in the form of an equation as follows

\[ EWC = f(EL + (EP \times R)) \]

where

- \( EWC \) = Effective Work Climate
- \( EL \) = Effective Leadership
- \((EP \times R)\) = Effective Punishment and Reward Strategy

According to this theory, in the Indian context, Effective Leadership is defined as a combination of Authoritative style (A), small amount of Participation (P) and Nurturant (N) outlook.

(d) T.V. Rao's leadership & HRM Styles (Rao, et.al., 1990)

Rao, et.al. have developed an instrument called the Leadership Styles Questionnaire (LSQ) and have identified three types of leadership styles based on the beliefs a manager has about his subordinates, the way he sets goals for them or assigns tasks, the processes he uses in managing conflicts or mistakes, the way he shares or does not share information, takes decisions, the way he interacts with his subordinates and the way he treats them. When these issues are examined, they indicate consistent underlying belief patterns
that are indicative of three styles of leadership. These are: Benevolent, Critical and Developmental

**Benevolent Manager:** He is resourceful and competent. He enjoys personal loyalty and takes care of all those who are loyal to him. He is somewhat relationship oriented, sees himself as a giver and distributor of resources, protects subordinates, continuously guides them and keeps giving them directions and comes to their rescue whenever they are in trouble.

**Critical Manager:** He has low interpersonal trust, subscribes to Theory X, uses criticism, reprimand and punishment frequently, is rarely satisfied with the work done by staff, is autocratic and excessively task-oriented with little or no concern for people and interpersonal relationships.

**Developmental Manager:** He is sensitive to human process, long term goal-oriented works for strengthening or building departments rather than getting immediate tasks accomplished. He confides in his subordinates, treats them as mature individuals and is concerned about the growth and development of subordinates and attempts to create a supporting environment.

Rao, et.al. (1990) have also stated that no single style can be effective or desirable all the time and different subordinates may respond differently to different styles and managers need to develop resourcefulness to be able to shift with ease from one style to another depending on the individual and the situation.

**CONCLUSION OF BEHAVIORAL THEORIES**

The various behavioral theories discussed make two important contributions to the process of understanding managerial leadership. First, they helped focus attention on the patterns of behavior that leaders exhibit rather than on their traits. This was a critical shift in perspective since leadership effectiveness is obviously dependent more on what the
leader does rather than on what he is. Secondly, all these theories provide us with a convenient method of describing and categorising leadership behavior according to some underlying themes or dimensions in fact, as stated earlier, one of the striking aspects of these researchers was the similarity in the dimensions of leader behavior. Such similarities are highlighted in the following figure.

**Figure 6: Commonalities of Classification Between Different Behavioral Theories.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low People/ Low Task Orientation</th>
<th>High People/ Low Task Orientation</th>
<th>Low People/ High Task Orientation</th>
<th>High People/ High Task Orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Iowa State Studies</td>
<td>Laissez Faire</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II The Ohio State Studies</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>Initiating Structure</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III University of Michigan Studies</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Employee-Oriented</td>
<td>Production Oriented</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV The Managerial Grid</td>
<td>1,1. Impoverished</td>
<td>1,9. Country Club</td>
<td>9,1. Authority Obedience</td>
<td>9,9. Team Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Kakar's Authority Ideologies</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>Fraternal Parental</td>
<td>Assertive Parental</td>
<td>Nurturant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Nurturant-Task Model</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Nurturant</td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Participative Nurturant-task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Rao, et al. HRM Styles</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Benevolent</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, two dimensions of leadership were identified — **people-orientation** and **task-orientation**. Different leadership styles identified fall into one of four categories depending upon whether they are high or low on either or both of these dimensions.

The behavioral theories, at the same time failed to achieve the major goal of the researchers - that of identifying a consistent link between different leadership styles on the one hand, and subordinate productivity and satisfaction on the other. That is to say, the effectiveness of any particular style vis-a-vis achieving the twin organisational objectives of maximum productivity and maximum job satisfaction, was not firmly established. This major shortcoming led to criticisms on two major issues. First, it was argued that trying to categorise a leader as having a single leadership style may be incorrect. Hill (1973), Vroom and Yetton (1973) provided evidence that a leader may adjust his or her leadership style to the demands of the situation being faced. The second argument was that it is highly unlikely that there exists any leadership style that will be universally effective. Hence, attention was turned from trying to identify the effective leadership style, to trying to understand which different leadership styles are appropriate to different types of organisations, different types of tasks, different types of subordinates, and so on. In other words, the complexities involved in achieving a 'fit' between the leader’s behavior and the leadership demands of the situation needed to be understood. This approach was labelled as the 'situational' approach or the 'contingency' approach.

### 3) The Situational Theories

It is quite clear from the preceding narrative that the trait theories as well as the leadership 'style' theories proved wholly inadequate in predicting the 'success' or effectiveness of leaders. There was something more to good leader-follower relations than just a 'good' leadership style. Employee-oriented leadership was effective in some situa-
tions whilst production-oriented leadership was effective in others. Thus, investigators began examining the 'conditions' under which a particular leadership style was effective. This approach to studying the leadership phenomenon was called the 'situational' or 'contingency' approach, and was derived from the basic proposition that the most effective behavior for the leader to engage in is 'contingent' upon characteristics of the 'situation' in which leaders find themselves.

According to Feldman & Arnold (1983), the basic idea behind contingency theories is that leadership effectiveness depends upon the existence of a 'fit' between the leaders behavior and the demands of the situation as illustrated in the figure below:

**Figure 7: Leadership Behavior Fit. [Source: Feldman & Arnold (1983)]**

Various researchers attempted to isolate key situational variables and came up with varying results. Barrow (1977) carried out a review of such studies. He found that the
task being performed (i.e. complexity, type, technology, size of the project, etc.) was a significant moderating variable, but additionally uncovered studies that isolated situational factors such as style of the leader's immediate supervisor, group norms, span of control, external threat and stress, time demands, and organisational climate. Some theories of leadership were formulated on this approach. The most prominent among these will be discussed in this section.

(i) Fiedler’s Contingency Model

Fiedler (1967) formulated a contingency model of leadership which proposed that effective group performance depends upon a proper match between a leader’s style of interacting with his or her subordinates and the degree to which the situation gives control and influence to the leader.

Fiedler believes that the key factor in leadership success is an individual’s basic leadership style. He developed an instrument which he called the Least Preferred Co-worker (LPC) questionnaire that measures whether a person is task-oriented or relationship-oriented. He argues that a leader can be either task-oriented or relationship-oriented. It is not possible for a leader to be both. He argues that leadership style is innate to a person - you can’t change your style to fit the changing situation.

After an individual’s basic style has been assessed through the LPC, it is necessary to match the leader with the situation. The three contingency dimensions identified by Fiedler are:

**Leader-Member Relations**: the degree of confidence, trust and respect that subordinates have in their leader.

**Task Structure**: the degree to which the job assignments are procedurised (i.e. structured or unstructured).
Position Power: the degree of influence a leader has over power variables such as hiring, firing, discipline, promotions, and salary increases.

The next step is to evaluate the situation in terms of three contingency variables. Leader-member relations are either good or poor, task structure either high or low, and position power either strong or weak.

With knowledge of an individual’s LPC and an assessment of the three contingency variables, the Fiedler Model proposes matching them up to achieve maximum leader effectiveness. Based on Fiedler’s study of over twelve hundred groups, where he compared relationship-oriented versus task-oriented leadership styles in each of the eight situational categories, he concluded that task-oriented leaders tend to perform better in situations that were very favourable and in situations that were very unfavourable. Thus, when faced with a category I, II, III, VII or VIII situation, task-oriented leaders perform better. Relationship-oriented leaders performed better in moderately favourable situations falling in categories IV, V & VI.

According to Miner (1980) continued research strongly confirms that the Fiedler model predicts categories I and IV with relatively high consistency. Predictions for categories V & VII are conforming, but only at a moderate level and the model’s predictions appear irrelevant to categories II, III, VI & VII.

There are a number of weaknesses of this model (Schein, 1980; Kabanoff, 1981). First, the contingency variables are complex and difficult to assess. Second, the model gives little attention to the characteristics of the subordinates. Third, no attention is given to varying technical competencies of the leader or the subordinates. Fourth, the correlations that Fiedler presents in support of his model are relatively weak. Finally, the logic behind the LPC is not well understood and studies have shown that LPC scores of respondents are not stable. (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).
In spite of these criticisms, the Fiedler model continues to be a dominant input in the development of a contingency explanation of leadership effectiveness. Its greatest contribution however, may be in the direction it has taken leadership research rather than any definite answers that it provides.

(ii) The Vroom & Yetton Normative Model

The Leadership-Participation model proposed by Vroom and Yetton (1973) relates leadership behavior and participation to decision making. According to them, there are three critical components that influence the overall effectiveness of a decision: quality, acceptance, and time.

**Decision Quality:** refers to the extent to which a decision is 'good' or 'effective' in meeting the objective demands and requirements of the problem situation that initially required a decision to be made.

**Decision Acceptance:** refers to the extent to which subordinates will understand, accept and commit themselves to implementing a particular decision.

**Timeliness:** refers to the extent to which decisions need to be made quickly or according to a fixed schedule.

Vroom & Yetton (1973) identify and describe five alternate decision styles that may be adopted. These five different styles are summarised in the figure below. Style AI and AII are basically autocratic styles. Style CI and CII are consultative styles and style GII is a group-consensus style.
Figure 8. The Five Different Styles of the Vroom & Yetton Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>You solve the problem or make the decision yourself using available information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AII</td>
<td>You obtain necessary information from subordinates then decide on a solution. You may or may not tell subordinates the purpose of your questions or give information about the problem or decision you are working on. The input provided by them is clearly in response to your request for specific information. They do not play a role in the definition of the problem or in generating or evaluating alternative situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>You share the problem with the relevant subordinates individually, getting their ideas and suggestions bringing them together as a group. Then you make the decision. This decision may or may not reflect your subordinates’ influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CII</td>
<td>You share the problem with your subordinates in a group meeting. In this meeting you obtain ideas and suggestions. Then, you make the decision which may or may not reflect your subordinates’ influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII</td>
<td>You share the problem with your subordinates as a group. Together, you generate and evaluate alternatives and attempt to reach a consensus solution. Your role is like a chairman, coordinating the discussion, keeping it focused on the problem, and making sure that critical issues are discussed. You can provide the group with information or ideas that you have but you do not try to press them to adopt your solution and are willing to accept and implement any solution that has the support of the entire group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Vroom and Yetton (1973), the likelihood of an effective decision being made is heavily determined by the decision style adopted by the leader. The leader is highly flexible and capable of adjusting his or her leadership styles to the demands of the situation. Thus, different types of problem situations require different types of decision styles.

A decision tree flow-chart is provided, and the leader begins by asking himself the first of seven diagnostic questions. He then follows the lines on the flowchart according to his answers (yes or no) to each of the diagnostic questions. At the end of the process, a feasible set of decision styles is arrived at, and the leader selects one of these suitable styles to solve the problem.
This model constitutes an important contribution to leadership research and practice since it provides a basis for the leader to choose a decision style contingent upon the demands of the situation. Research that has been conducted on the validity of the model has generally been supportive (Jago and Vroom, 1980; Margerison & Glube, 1979 Vroom & Jago, 1978; Field, 1982). This model has also confirmed that leadership research should be directed at the situation rather than the person. It is probably better to talk about autocratic and participative 'situations' rather than about autocratic and participative 'leaders'.

(iii) Path-Goal Theory

The Path-Goal Theory is a contingency model of leadership that builds on the Ohio State leadership research dealing with Initiating Structure and Consideration (House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974; Evans, 1970 & 1974; House & Dessler, 1974). The basic idea behind the theory is that a leader can influence the satisfaction, motivation and performance of subordinates primarily by

1) providing subordinates with rewards,

2) making the attainment of these rewards contingent on the accomplishment of performance goals and,

3) helping subordinates obtain rewards by clarifying the paths to the goals (i.e. helping subordinates understand exactly what they must do to obtain rewards) and making these paths easier to travel (i.e. providing subordinates with coaching, direction and assistance when needed).

This theory identifies four distinct styles of leader behavior.

**Directive Leadership**: This style is characterised by a leader who lets subordinates know what is expected of them, gives specific guidance regarding what
is to be done and how it should be done and ensures that his or her role as a leader of the group is clearly understood.

**Supportive Leadership**: This refers to a style characterised by a friendly and approachable leader who shows concern for the needs, status and a general well-being of subordinates.

**Participative Leadership**: is characterised by a leader who, when faced with a decision, consults with subordinates, solicits their suggestions, and takes their ideas seriously in arriving at a decision.

**Achievement-Oriented Leadership**: Refers to a style of leadership that constantly emphasises excellence in performance and simultaneously displays a confidence that subordinates can and will achieve the high standards that are set.

The Path-Goal Theory assumes that any given leader can, at different times and under different circumstances engage in any one of these alternative styles of leadership. Like the Vroom-Yetton model, but unlike Fiedler’s Contingency theory, the Path-Goal Theory views leadership behavior as relatively flexible and adaptable.

The Path-Goal Theory argues that no single type of leader behavior will result in high levels of employee motivation and satisfaction. There are two classes of contingency variables influencing the effectiveness of efficient leadership styles. These are shown in the figure.

The basic ideas of Path-Goal Theory that leader behavior and contingency factors combine to cause subordinates attitudes and behavior are summarised below.
Figure 9: Summary of Path-Goal Relationships (Source: House & Mitchell, 1974)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADER BEHAVIOR</th>
<th>CONTINGENCY FACTORS</th>
<th>cause</th>
<th>SUBORDINATE ATTITUDES &amp; BEHAVIOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Job rewards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Locus of control</td>
<td>Acceptance of</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs &amp; Motives</td>
<td>Motivational behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement-oriented</td>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td>Effort-performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>Formal Authority</td>
<td>Performance-</td>
<td>rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary work group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Path-Goal Theory has sparked a considerable amount of interest among researchers (Filley, House & Kerr, 1976; Fulk & Wendler, 1982; House and Mitchell, 1974; Schriesheim & Schriesheim, 1980; Schriesheim & VonGlinow, 1977; Yukl, 1981; Greene, 1979; Poskadoff et.al, 1983). The strongest pattern of support for the theory tends to occur
for predictions regarding the effectiveness of the **Directive** and **Supportive** leadership styles. Numerous studies have found that Directive leadership will increase motivation and satisfaction for subordinates working on an ambiguous task, but leads to lower motivation and satisfaction when the task is clear cut (House, 1971; House & Dessler, 1974; Schriesheim & DeNisi, 1981; Szilagyi and Sims, 1974). Considerable evidence also indicates that supportive leader behavior has its most positive effect on satisfaction for subordinates working on stressful, frustrating or dissatisfying tasks (House, 1971; House & Dessler, 1974; Downey, Sheridan, & Solcum, 1975).

The Path-Goal theory provides a powerful framework for thinking about managerial leadership. This framework is useful both to the manager and to the researcher. For the manager, the theory helps draw attention not only to the existence of alternative leadership styles but also to a variety of characteristics of subordinates and leadership situations that will influence the effectiveness of any given style of leadership. For the researcher, the theory provides a rich framework to help guide future research and theorising.

**(iv) 3-D Management Style Theory**

In his 3-D Management style Theory, Reddin (1967) was the first to add an effectiveness dimension to the Task concern, and Relationship concern dimensions of earlier attitudinal models such as the Managerial Grid. This is diagrammatically portrayed as below:
Figure 10: Adding an Effectiveness Dimension

Here, effective styles were defined as those styles which were appropriate in a given situation, and ineffective styles were those inappropriate in a given situation.

The next section shall discuss how Hersey and Blanchard (1971) have picked up and expanded on this concept of effectiveness of leadership styles in their Situational Leadership Theory.

(v) The Situational Leadership Theory

In the leadership model developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1972) at the Centre for Leadership Studies, Ohio University, the terms 'task behavior' and 'relationship behavior' are used to describe concepts similar to Consideration and Initiating Structure of the Ohio State Studies. The four basic quadrants are labelled as:

Style 1: high task & low relationship (Telling)
**Style 2**: high task & high relationship (Selling)

**Style 3**: low task & high relationship (Participating)

**Style 4**: low task & low relationship (Delegating)

The four basic styles are depicted in the figure below.

**Figure 11: Basic Leader Behavior Styles of the Situational Leadership Theory.**

**Task Behavior**: The extent to which leaders are likely to organise and define the roles of the members of their group (followers); to explain what activities each is to do and when, where and how tasks are to be accomplished;
characterised by endeavouring to establish well-defined pattern of organisation, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs accomplished.

**Relationship behavior**: The extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships between themselves and members of their group by opening up channels of communication, providing socio-emotional support 'psychological strokes' and facilitating behaviors.

Recognising that the effectiveness of leaders depends on how their leadership style interrelates with the situation in which they operate, an effectiveness dimension is added to the model.

The four effective and four ineffective styles are, in essence, how appropriate a leader's 'basic style' is to a given situation as seen by his followers, superiors or associates. The figure 12 describes briefly one of many different ways each style might be perceived as effective or ineffective by others.
### Figure 12: How The Basic Leader Behavior Styles May Be Seen as Effective or Ineffective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC STYLES</th>
<th>EFFECTIVE</th>
<th>INEFFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style 1</strong></td>
<td>Seen as having well defined methods for accomplishing goals that are helpful to the followers.</td>
<td>Seen as imposing methods on others: sometimes seen as unpleasant and interested only in short run output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style 2</strong></td>
<td>Seen as satisfying the needs of the group for setting goals and organising work, but also providing high levels of socio-emotional support.</td>
<td>Seen as initiating more structure than is needed by the group and often appears not to be genuine in interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style 3</strong></td>
<td>Seen as having implicit trust in people and as being primarily concerned with facilitating their goal accomplishment.</td>
<td>Seen as primarily interested in harmony; in harmony; sometimes seen as unwilling to accomplish a task if it risks disrupting a relationship or losing a ‘good person’ image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style 4</strong></td>
<td>Seen as appropriately delegating to subordinates, decisions about how the work should be done and providing little socio-emotional support where little is needed by the group.</td>
<td>Seen as providing little structure or socio-emotional support when needed by the group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of research that support the argument that all the basic leader behavior styles may be effective or ineffective depending on the situation are readily available.
Korman (1966) conducted a review of these studies and gathered evidence that dispels the idea of a single best style of leader behavior. Thus, argue Hersey and Blanchard, a look at environmental variables that may help a leader or a manager to make effective decisions in problematic leadership situations, is a must. According to them, such environmental variables fall into three categories:

1) Job demands and time factor

2) Style
   - Leader’s style
   - Follower’s style
   - Superior’s style
   - Associate’s style
   - Organisation’s style

3) Expectations
   - Leader’s expectations
   - Follower’s expectations
   - Superior’s expectations
   - Associate’s expectations
   - Organisation’s expectations

The Situational Leadership Theory proposes, that for a leader to match his style to the environmental variables at hand, the leader must possess the sensitivity and diagnostic ability to be able to sense and appreciate these variables.

While giving due importance to all the environmental variables in the selection of leadership styles, the emphasis in the Situational Leadership Theory is on the behavior
of a leader in relation to the followers. Followers in any situation are vital not only because they accept or reject the leader, but because, as a group, they actually determine whatever personal power the leader may have.

The capacity of the followers to set high but attainable goals, willingness and ability to take on responsibility and education and/or experience of the followers as individuals or as a group are all the variables that go to make up the 'maturity' of the followers. These variables of maturity should be considered only in relation to a specific task to be performed.

In addition to assessing the level of maturity of individuals, a leader may have to assess the maturity of the group as a whole.

According to Situational Leadership Theory, as the level of maturity of the followers continues to increase in terms of accomplishing a specific task, leaders should begin to reduce their task behavior and increase their relationship behavior until the individual or group reaches a moderate level of maturity. As the individual or group begins to move into an above average level of maturity, it becomes appropriate for leaders to decrease not only task behavior but also relationship behavior. Now the group or individual is mature not only in terms of the performance of the task, but is also psychologically mature. Since the individual or group can provide their own 'strokes' and reinforcements, a great deal of socio-emotional support from the leader is no longer necessary. The individual or group at this maturity level sees a reduction of close supervision and an increase in delegation by the leader as a positive indication of trust and confidence. Thus, this theory focuses on the appropriateness or effectiveness of leadership styles according to the task-relevant maturity of the followers. This cycle is illustrated as the bell-shaped curve going through the four leadership quadrants of the effective portion of the model in the figure below.
What does the bell-shaped curve in the style-of-leader portion of the model mean? It means that as the maturity level of one’s follower(s) develops along the continuum below from immature to mature, the appropriate style of leadership moves accordingly along the curvilinear function.

To determine what leadership style is appropriate in a given situation, a leader must first determine the maturity level of the individual or group in relation to a specific task that the leader is attempting to accomplish through their efforts. Once this maturity level is identified the appropriate leadership style can be determined by constructing a right
angle from the point on the continuum that represents the maturity level of the follower(s) to a point where it intersects on the curvilinear function in the style-of-leader portion of the model. The quadrant in which this intersection takes place suggests the appropriate style to be used by the leader in that situation with the follower(s) of that maturity level.

If managers are currently using a style that is appropriate for the level of maturity of their group, one of the indicators that they can use in determining when and to what degree they should shift their style, is performance or results. If performance is increasing, it would be appropriate for managers to shift their style to the left along the curvilinear function of the model. This would indicate that task relevant maturity is increasing. If performance results are on the decline, it gives managers a clue that they may need to shift their leader behavior to the right along the curvilinear function.

Thus, the Situational Leadership Theory provides an excellent conceptual framework that is useful to practising managers. It is obvious that organisational structures and management behavior are going to have to respond to cultural and educational differences apparent in the work force. Mature, responsible workers need a loosely controlled, flexible organisation with general supervision to utilise their full potential. Immature, untrained workers need a structured organisation with more individual attention and personal interaction with supervision to develop their talents. Thus this theory is a vehicle to help people understand and share expectations in their environment so they can gradually learn to supervise their own behavior and become responsible, self-motivated individuals.
C. LEADER-LED: A MUTUAL INFLUENCE PROCESS

The very term 'Leadership' naturally serves to draw attention to the leaders themselves and tends to focus interest upon ways in which leaders influence followers. As a result a vast majority of studies on leadership have tried to understand how different types of leaders and different types of behaviors by leaders cause followers to react in different ways. In other words, researchers have treated leadership as the independent or casual factor, and the responses of the followers as the dependent factor determined by leadership.

An important contribution of recent research on leadership has been to point out the shortsightedness and inadequacy of this view of leader-followers relations. While it is no doubt true that leaders can and do influence their followers, it is also true that leaders and followers engage in interaction with one another, which necessarily implies the existence of mutual influence. In other words, not only is it true that leaders influence followers, but it is equally true that followers influence leaders.

The validity of this claim has been demonstrated in a variety of empirical investigations. Farris and Lim (1969) found that the performance of subordinates had a greater impact upon the way the leaders behaved towards them than the behavior of the leaders had upon the performance of the followers. In another investigation, Lewin & Craig (1969) set up a simulated organisation in which persons were hired to supervise the work of a number of followers. They found that the performance of the followers had a strong causal impact upon the behavior of the supervisors.

Further corroboration of the influence of subordinate performance on leader behavior is found in a field study by Greene (1979); Matsubara (1985) and in India by Sinha (1980).
Thus it is clear that when leadership is being studied, it is a mutual influence process wherein leaders influence followers and followers can also influence leaders (Ilgen et al., 1981; Zahn & Wolf, 1981). Any approach that views leadership as a one-way influence process whereby what the leader does causes subordinates to react in certain ways is of necessity incomplete and over simplified. It is essential to keep this point firmly in mind.

In studying leadership as a mutual influence process, an interplay of a number of different variables is seen. These are generally called Power, Authority and Influence. Just what are these variables and what is the role of Power Authority and Influence in the concept of leadership, will be discussed in the following pages:
D. POWER, AUTHORITY, INFLUENCE AND LEADERSHIP.

1) Power and Influence

Power has often been labelled as a 'dirty word'. It is not easy to get people to talk about it. Kanter (1979), in her work examining power dynamics in management says that "People who have it deny it; people who want it, try not to appear to be seeking it; and those who are good at getting it, are secretive about how they got it."

There has been a spate of recent research into power in corporations. (Kipnis, 1976; Bacharach & Lawler, 1980; Pfeffer, 1981; Mintzberg, 1983). Leaders use power as a means of attaining group goals. Leaders achieve goals, and power is a means of facilitating their achievement. Leadership implies some congruence between the goals of the leader and the led. Power, on the other hand, does not require goal compatibility.

Leadership focuses on the downward and reciprocal influence on one's subordinates. Power deals with influences in lateral, upward an all other directions. Leadership research, seeks answers to such questions as: "How supportive should a leader be? How much decision making should be shared with subordinates?" In contrast, research on power has tended to encompass a broader area and focus on tactics for gaining compliance. It has gone beyond the individual as an exerciser, because power can be used by groups as well as by individuals to control other individuals or groups.

2) Authority and Leadership

One question that pops in the mind is the use of terms like 'Power', 'Authority' and 'Leadership' is that are these terms referring to different concepts or are the differences
between them merely semantic? These terms are used very often by researchers, practitioners and theorists, but it becomes very difficult to arrive at a precise definition. This lack of precision and absence of a commonly shared meaning are noticeable even to the layman.

Recently, however, a few scientists have tried to distinguish between these terms. Weldon (1953) differentiates between 'power' and 'authority' by defining the exercise of authority in terms of force rightly or justly applied or as force applied 'with the general approval of those concerned'. However, according to Khan (1968), "the use of power or rational argument should be regarded as an abridgement of authority and not as a part of it."

Thus, it has been seen that different definitions are given by different scientist to these terms. However, it is clear that there is no exact, clear-cut differentiation between the terms as of date. The focus of attention will now be directed to the various factors in the superior-subordinate relationship.
CHAPTER ONE
MANAGERIAL LEADERSHIP & WORK MOTIVATION

E. FACTORS IN A SUPERIOR-SUBORDINATE SITUATION

It is now a well recognised fact that leadership is not simply a one-way influence process. Consequently, increased attention is being given to those factors that influence a leader’s behavior. Earlier in this work, it has been pointed out that a few studies have shown that one of the factors that has an important impact on leaders behavior is the performance and reactions of subordinates (Farris & Lim, 1969; Lowin & Craig, 1968; Greene, 1979; Ilgen, Mitchell & Frederickson, 1981; and Zahn & Wolf, 1981). Various other factors that will influence what leaders do have been identified by Reitz (1981) Ford (1981) and Feldman & Arnolds (1983). These generally fall into four categories, namely leader related, subordinate related, organisational, and task characteristics.

Leader Characteristics: The leader’s abilities and personal characteristics obviously influence and constrain what the leader does and how he or she behaves toward subordinates. On the ability side, task relevant knowledge and skill as well as supervisory skills and sensitivities will have an important impact. In regard to traits, personality characteristics such as assertiveness, dominance and self confidence all have an influence on leadership behavior (Hamblin, 1958)

Subordinate Characteristics: Leadership, as discussed earlier, is a mutual influence process. Studies cited earlier (Farris & Lim, 1969; Lowin & Craig, 1968; Greene, 1979; Ilgen, Mitchell and Frederickson, 1981 and Zahn & Wolf 1981) have given clear evidence that the performance of subordinates has a critical causal impact upon what a leader does and how he or she behaves towards followers (Sanford,1950; Tosi, 1971; Farris, 1969; Haythorn et.al., 1956). In addition to what subordinates do and how they perform, other identifiable traits or characteristics of subordinates may influence a leader’s behavior. For example, a leader may behave differently toward males and
females, older and younger people, those with a different or similar personal background from his and so on.

Organisational Factors: Peers, superiors, organisation policy and climate are some of the organisational factors in the leader-led situation. Peer pressure has a potent homogenising impact upon leadership behavior in an organisation. Superiors serve both as role models and as sources of rewards and punishment for the leadership behavior of individuals toward their own subordinates (Fleishman, 1953). Organisations with a participative climate and open policies will obviously influence a leader to behave in a participative manner.

Task Characteristics: The nature of the task that subordinates are performing also influences the behavior of leaders towards subordinates. A very vague and ambiguous task such as developing the design of a new product from scratch is bound to elicit different types of leader behavior than is a highly structured and routine task, such as producing a set number of units in an assembly line.

Thus it can be seen that there is a multitude of factors that operate to influence what leaders do and how they behave toward subordinates. It is obviously inadequate to view leaders as being unconstrained and free to behave exactly as they wish from one moment to the next.
The study of motivation is not exclusively the domain of the psychologist. It is in fact of such widespread concern as to be of importance to any individual who must deal with other people. The business manager is necessarily concerned with the factors that will motivate his employees to maximum productivity. The educator is concerned with the motivation of his students, the salesman and his marketing manager are extremely interested in consumer motivation. Our legal system is likewise concerned with the motives behind criminal behavior. These are only a few examples of the importance of gaining a knowledge of human motivation.
A. THE CONCEPT OF MOTIVATION

When a person asks “What motivates behavior?” he is asking to have identified, one of a combination of three kinds of things:

1) An environmental determinant which precipitates the behavior in question - The application of some irresistible force which, of necessity led to this action.

2) The internal urge, wish, feeling, emotion, drive, instinct, want, desire, demand, purpose, interest, aspiration, plan, need, or motive which gave rise to the action.

3) The incentive, goal or object value which attracted or repelled the organism. (Cofer & Appley, 1968).

Different models used to describe motivational processes vary considerably. They range from purely biogenic hypotheses in which behavior unfolds from a series of innate drives or instincts following the course prescribed by the set of built-in determinants forcing action upon the environment, to highly socio-genic theories which suggest the almost complete docility of behavior and its moldability into patterns determined by cultural forces. Motives may be seen to be conscious or unconscious, pushed inexorably by urges, drives and instincts or pulled inevitably by incentives, goals, purposes and values.

With what then, is this discussion dealing? Generally speaking different approaches to motivation have focused on the classification of individual needs and patterns of interplay between these various needs within the individual. In the forthcoming pages, the major aspects of the motivational process will be discussed and the history of various psychological and social theories of motivation will be briefly traced. Motivation of work behavior, which is a subject having a direct bearing upon this research will also be discussed.
B. PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES OF MOTIVATION

Most psychological theories of motivation, both early and contemporary have their roots to some extent in the principle of 'hedonism' which assumes that individuals tend to seek pleasure and avoid pain. However, it was the concept of 'instinct' that gave birth to early explanations of motivation in the form of psychoanalytic thought ardently advocated by Freud (1915). Beginning in the early 1920's, under the onslaught of the new behaviorism, the concept of 'instinct' came to be replaced by other explanatory notions like drive, reflex, habit and native response.

'Drive' theories like Thorndike's 'Law of Effect' (1917) worked on the assumption that learning has an influence on all subsequent behavior. Tolman (1932), Guthrie (1935), Hull (1936, 1937) and Skinner (1938) were the other theorists who used the concept of drive. Their research was however restricted to the study of animal behavior in laboratories.

A third major line of development in psychological approaches to motivation is the cognitive theories which claim that a major determinant of human behavior is the beliefs, expectations and anticipations individuals have concerning future events. Behaviour is thus seen as purposeful and goal directed and based on conscious intentions. The majority of these theories generally view motivational force as a multiplicative function of two key variables: Expectancies and Valences. When put in an equation form, such a formulation reads:

\[ \text{Effort} = \text{Expectancy} \times \text{Valence} \]
These theories spoke mainly about psychological motivation of human behaviour. In the present research, however, it is work motivation that has been studied. Theories of work motivation are numerous, and a few of the relevant ones will be discussed in the following section.
C. CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF WORK MOTIVATION.

In this section, the literature and research on the major contemporary theories of work motivation, will be reviewed and their implications for managers on the job will be discussed.

1) Theory X and Theory Y

Douglas McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y was first published in 1957. These two theories clearly distinguish traditional autocratic assumptions about people (Theory X) from more behaviorally based assumptions about people (Theory Y). The usefulness of these theories is in McGregor’s convincing argument that most management actions flow directly from whatever theory of human behavior managers hold, i.e., ‘philosophy controls practice’. Management’s personnel organisational design flow from assumptions about behavior. McGregor pointed out that Theory X was the set of assumptions held by most managers at that time. Even though they did not specifically or explicitly state their assumptions, they implicitly held them, because the kind of actions they took come from Theory X. These assumptions are summarised in Figure 14 below:-
Figure 14: McGregor’s THEORY X and THEORY Y: Alternate Assumptions About Employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY X</th>
<th>THEORY Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The typical person dislikes work and will avoid it if possible</td>
<td>Work is as natural as play or rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The typical person lacks responsibility, has little ambition and seeks</td>
<td>People are not inherently lazy they have become that way as a result of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security above all.</td>
<td>experience with organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People must be coerced, controlled and threatened with punishment to</td>
<td>People will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get them to work.</td>
<td>objectives to which they are committed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation occurs only at the physiological and safety levels.</td>
<td>Motivation occurs at the social, esteem and actualisation levels as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People have little capacity for creativity in solving organisational</td>
<td>as the physiological &amp; security level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The managerial role is to coerce and control employees</td>
<td>People have imagination, ingenuity and creativity that can be applied to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The managerial role is to develop the potential of employees and help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>release that potential toward common objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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McGregor's argument was that management had been ignoring the facts about people. It had been following an out-moded set of assumptions about people because it adhered to Theory X when the facts are that most people are closer to the Theory Y set of assumptions. There are important differences among people, so a few may come closer to Theory X, but nearly all employees have some Theory Y potential, for growth. Managers had failed to recognise this potential, consequently, their policies and practices failed to develop it. The result was that many people regarded work as a curse on human-kind instead of an opportunity for growth and fulfillment. Management needed to change to a whole new theory of working with people: Theory Y.

2) Motivation - Hygeine Theory

As people mature, such needs as esteem and self-actualisation seem to become more important. One of the most interesting series of studies that concentrates heavily on these areas has been undertaken by Herzeberg et. al. (1959) and Herzeberg (1966,1968). Out of these studies has developed a theory of work motivation that has broad implications for management and its efforts toward effective utilisation of human resources.

In analysing the results of his studies, Herzeberg concluded that people have two different categories of needs that are essentially independent of each other and affect behavior in different ways. He found that when people felt dissatisfied with their jobs, they were concerned with the environment they were working in. On the other hand, when people felt good about their jobs, it had to do with the work itself Herzeberg called the first category of needs 'hygeine' factors because they describe peoples' environment and serve the primary function of preventing job dissatisfaction. He called the second category of needs 'motivators' since they seemed to be effective in motivating people to superior performance.
Company policies and administration, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, money, status and security may be thought of as hygiene factors. These are not an intrinsic part of the job, but they relate to the conditions under which a job may be performed.

Satisfying factors that involve feelings of achievement, professional growth and recognition that one can experience in a job that offers challenge and scope are referred to as motivators.

A multitude of research studies on Herzeberg’s theory have been generated. Some of these strongly support Herzeberg’s position (Bockman, 1971; Whitsett & Winslow, 1967) while others seriously question the research methodology underlying the theory. (House & Wigdor, 1967; Vroom 1964; Hinton, 1968). A detailed review of these studies is beyond the scope and content of this discussion. However, Herzeberg’s theory of motivation has founded widespread interest in motivating people through job enrichment and job enlargement.

3) Maslow’s Need Hierarchy

Maslow has formulated a positive theory of motivation which is derived from facts: clinical, observational, and experimental. The basic needs can be grouped into five categories. These are:

I The physiological needs - such as hunger, sex, thirst.

II The safety needs - security, stability, dependency, protection, freedom from fear, from anxiety and chaos, need for structure, order, law etc.

III The belongingness and love needs or social needs.
IV The esteem needs - self respect, self esteem, esteem of others. The desire for strength, for achievement, for adequacy, for mastery and competence, for confidence in the face of the world and for independence and freedom.

V Need for self-actualisation - the desire for self-fulfillment, the tendency to become actualised in what one is potentially, to become everything that one is capable of becoming.

As a theory of motivation, Maslow postulated that these five needs are arranged hierarchically as shown below.

![Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs](image)

Figure 15: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

The two concepts of deprivation and gratification are used to provide the dynamic forces that link needs to general behavior. Maslow used the 'deprivation' concept to establish 'dominance' within his hierarchy of needs. He postulated that deprivation or
dissatisfaction of a need of high prepotency will lead to the domination of this need over the organism’s personality - this has been labelled the Deprivation/Domination Proposition. Following the satisfaction of a dominant need, the second element of the dynamic force in Maslow’s theory will take place. Relative gratification of a given need submerges it and ‘activates’ the next higher need in the hierarchy. The activated need then dominates and organises the individual’s personality and capacities so that instead of the individual’s being hunger obsessed, he now becomes safety obsessed - This has been labelled the Gratification/Activation Proposition.

This process of deprivation - domination - gratification - activation continues until the physiological, safety, affiliation, and esteem needs have all been satisfied and the self-actualisation need has been activated. In a later work, Maslow (1965) modified the Gratification/Activation idea by proposing that gratification of the self-actualising need causes an increase in its importance rather than a decrease. Maslow also acknowledged numerous exceptions to his theory. Notably, he pointed out that long deprivation of a given need may create a fixation for that need. Also, higher needs may emerge not after gratification but rather after long deprivation, renunciation or suppression of lower needs. Maslow emphasised that behavior is multi-determined and multi-motivated. Wahba & Bridwell (1975) have reviewed the research that attempted to test Maslow’s theory or parts of it. This review is divided into three related sections, each section dealing with one main element of Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory.

(i) The Neec Classification Scheme

Does factor analysis yield five factors that can be interpreted conceptually in terms of Maslow’s five need categories? The following conclusions are drawn from the results of the factor analytic studies conducted by Alderfer (1969); Lawler & Suttle (1972), Beer (1966) and Huizinga (1970)
1. None of the above studies has shown all of Maslow's five need categories as independent factors. Only Beer (1966) showed four independent factors reflecting four needs; the fifth need overlapped with an unrelated factor.

2. In some studies, lower-order needs and higher-order needs clustered together independently from each other.

3. Self-actualisation need emerged as an independent factor in some studies, and in other studies they overlapped with other need categories.

4. Two studies using two samples each showed no support for Maslow's Need categories.

Another type of evidence related to the test of Maslow's need classification scheme comes from studies that attempted to classify human needs empirically by factor analysis techniques without an a priori theoretical framework (Centers, 1948; Friedlander, 1963; Schaffer, 1953)

(ii) The Deprivation/Domination Proposition

The results of reviewing various studies (Alderfer, 1966; Aldefer, 1969; Alderfer, 1972; Hall & Nougaim, 1968; Huizinga, 1970; Lawler & Suttle, 1972; Trexler & Schuh, 1969; Friedlander, 1965; Locke, 1961; Dachler & Hulin, 1969) generally showed that the Deprivation/Domination Proposition is partially supported with regard to self-actualisation and autonomy needs; but the results do not show full support for the proposition with regard to security, social and esteem needs.

(iii) The Gratification/Activation Proposition

The Gratification/Activation Proposition has been operationalised in two ways

1. Need satisfaction should be generally decreasing going up in the Maslow Need Hierarchy
2. The higher the satisfaction with a given need, the lower the importance of the need and, the higher the importance of the need in the next level of the hierarchy.

The results indicate that either self-actualisation or security need are the least satisfied needs, and social needs are the most satisfied. The degree of satisfaction of other needs varies widely; it is difficult to determine their general pattern. Trexler & Schuh (1969) and Wofford (1971) produced findings opposite to Maslow's proposition while Alderfer (1969 & 1972), Miglani (1979) showed only partial support. Longitudinal studies by Hall & Nougaim (1968) and Lawler & Suttle (1972) indicate no support for Maslow's propositions.

The research on Maslow's Need Hierarchy is not free from weaknesses. The two major drawbacks lie in the interpretation and operationalisation of the theory and measurement problems. Various authors have interpreted and hypothesised in various ways. Maslow's theory is a clinically derived theory and its unit of analysis is the individual. Most of the research used the group as the unit of analysis. The theory is a dynamic theory while most of the research dealt with the theory as a static theory. Maslow's theory is based upon a causal logic while most of the studies were correlational.

Although Maslow's original concern centered around the development of a model which was generally descriptive of the relation between motivation and personality, he later focused his attention specifically on the motivational problems of employees in work settings (Maslow, 1965) when the need hierarchy concept was applied to work organisations, the implications for managerial actions became obvious. Managers had the responsibility, according to this line of reasoning, to create a 'proper climate' in which employees could develop to their fullest potential. This proper climate could include increasing the opportunities for greater autonomy, variety, responsibility, and so forth, so that employees could work toward higher-order need satisfaction. Failure to provide such a climate would
theoretically increase employee frustration, and could result in poorer performance, lower job satisfaction and increased withdrawal from the organisation.

4) Achievement Motivation Theory

In addition to Maslow’s need based theory of motivation, there is a second theory which uses the concept of human needs as the basic unit of analysis. This theory has been termed, 'Need Achievement Theory' or 'Achievement Motivation Theory', and it posits that a major portion of an individual’s will to perform can be explained or predicted by the intensity of his or her Need for Achievement.

This model has its origin in the early work of Murray (1938) where he argues that individuals could be classified according to the strength of various personality-need variables. These needs were believed to represent a central motivating force, both in terms of the intensity and the direction of goal-directed behavior. Murray (1938) stated that the “analysis of such needs was a hypothetical process, the occurrence of which is imagined in order to account for certain objective and subjective facts.” In other words one could only infer needs from observed behavior. Needs are viewed as largely learned behavior and could be manifest or latent. His list of needs is as follows:
Implicit in Murray's Scheme is the notion of a range of intensities of these motives. In one person n. Dominance is quite low; in another, it may be the main dynamic factor.

This conceptualisation based on multiple needs bears a strong resemblance to Maslow's theory in two respects:

1. Both posit the existence of a set of goals toward which behavior is directed.

2. Both are hypothetical constructs designed to describe behavior and are based on clinical observations, not empirical research. Murray (1938) does not, however suggest a hierarchy of needs such as Maslow's.

While Murray was concerned with an entire set of needs, most current research has focused on the specific need for achievement as related to performance in an organisational setting (McClelland, et al., 1953). The Achievement motive (n.Ach) is a relatively stable pre-disposition to strive for success. More specifically, n.Ach is defined as 'behavior toward competition with a standard of excellence'. The basis or reward for such a motive is posited to be the positive affect associated with successful performance.
What are some of the characteristics of people with a high n.Ach? According to McClelland (1962) a person with a strong need for achievement exhibits the following kind of behavior.

1. He likes situations in which he takes personal responsibility for finding solutions to problems.
2. He tends to set moderate goals and take calculated risks.
3. He wants concrete feedback on his performance.
4. He is more concerned with personal achievement than with the rewards of success.

Given all we know about the Need for Achievement, can this motive be taught and developed in people? McClelland is convinced that this can be done. He has developed training programmes for business people which have tremendous implications for training and developing human resources.

Achievement motivated people can be the backbone of most organisations, but what can we say about their potential as managers?

Hersey & Blanchard (1977) say that “people with a high n.Ach get ahead because as individuals they are producers, they get things done. However, when they are promoted to situations where their success depends not only on their own work, but on the activities of others, they may be less effective. Since, they are highly task-oriented and work to their capacity, they tend to expect others to do the same. As a result, they sometimes lack the human skills and patience necessary for being effective managers of people who are competent but have a higher need for affiliation than they do. In this situation, their high task/low relationship behavior frustrates and prohibits these people from maximizing their
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own potential. Thus, while achievement motivated people are needed in organisations, they
do not always make the best managers."

5) Expectancy Theory

Another approach to explaining motivation, and one that is believed to have great
potential for understanding and practice is generally termed as 'expectancy theory' or
'instrumentality theory and 'valence-instrumentality-expectancy (VIE) theory'. This theory
is basically a 'process' theory in contrast to the earlier two 'content' theories. That is to say,
it attempts to identify relationships among variables in a dynamic state as they affect
behavior. This orientation is in direct contrast to the content theories which have attempted
largely to specify correlates of motivated behavior. Here, it is the relationship among inputs
that is the basic focal points rather than the inputs themselves.

The essential element of this theory is that people will be motivated to do things
or to achieve some goal to the extent that they expect that certain actions on their part will
help them to achieve the goal (Vroom, 1964). He suggested that a person’s motivation
towards an action at any time would be determined by his or her anticipated values of all the
outcomes (both negative and positive) of the action multiplied by the strength of that
person’s expectancy that the outcome would yield the desired goal. Expressed in mathe-
matical terms, it may be stated as follows:

Force = Valence x expectancy

Where Force is the strength of a persons motivation, Valence is the strength of
an individual’s preference for an outcome, and Expectancy is the probability that a particular
action will lead to a desired outcome.
More recently, (Lawler, 1968, 1973; Hackman & Porter, 1968) the generalised concept of expectancy has been divided into two specific types. 'E-P' expectancy and 'P-O' expectancy. An E-P expectancy represents a belief that effort (E) will lead to desired performance, the greater the E-P expectancy. On the other hand, P-O expectancies are beliefs or anticipations that an individual has concerning the likelihood that performance will, in fact, lead to particular outcomes. The multiplicative combination of these two types of expectancies determines the 'expectancy' part of the expectancy/valence equation.

Mitchell & Biglan (1971) have reviewed a major portion of research on this theory, summarised the findings and suggested future research. Studies by Georgopoulos, Mahoney & Jones (1957), Porter & Lawler (1968), and Vroom (1964) strongly supported the major propositions of the expectancy/valence model. However, Galbraith & Cummings (1967) in their study, failed to find support for the model in general.

Broadly speaking, instrumentality was found to be an important factor in predicting the satisfaction and behavior of personnel in organisational settings. However organisational phenomena are extremely complex and less controllable as compared to individual psychological phenomena. Thus, a great deal of further research in this area would be required in order to make the theory more scientific and applicable to industrial settings.

6) The Porter-Lawler Model

Built in large part on expectancy theory, Porter and Lawler (1968) have derived a substantially more complete model of motivation and have applied it in their study primarily to managers.
Figure 17: The Porter-Lawler Model of Motivation.

As this model indicates 'effort' (the strength of motivation and energy exerted) depends on the 'value of a reward' plus the perceived energy a person believes is required and the probability of actually receiving a reward. The 'perceived effort' and 'probability of reward' are, in turn, also influenced by the record of actual 'performance'. It is clear that if people know they can do a job or have done it, they have a better appreciation of the effort required and know better the probability of rewards.

Actual performance in a job (the doing of tasks or the meeting of goals) is determined principally by effort expended. But it is also greatly influenced by an individual's 'ability' (knowledge and skills to do it) and his or her 'perception' of what the required task is (the extent to which goals, required activities and other elements of a task are understood).
Performance in turn is seen as leading to 'intrinsic rewards' (such as a sense of accomplishment or self-actualisation) and 'extrinsic rewards' (such as working conditions and status). These, as tempered by what the individual perceives as 'equitable rewards', lead to 'satisfaction'. But performance also influences perceived equitable rewards. As can be readily understood, what the individual perceives as a fair reward for effort will necessarily affect the satisfaction derived. (Porter and Lawler, 1968) Likewise, the actual value of rewards will be influenced by satisfaction.

The Porter and Lawler model of motivation, while more complex than other theories of motivation is almost certainly a more adequate portrayal of the system of motivation. In terms of administrative implications, it means that motivation is not a simple cause and effect matter. It means too, that managers should carefully assess their reward structures and that through careful planning, organisation development strategy, and a clear definition of rules and responsibilities by good organisation structuring, the effort-performance-reward-satisfaction system should be integrated into an entire system of managing.

7) Growth-Comfort Model

Bhagwatwar (1989) in his Growth-Comfort model conceives of people as being either growth-oriented (i.e. seeking job satisfaction through activation of growth related needs where such needs exist) or comfort-oriented (i.e. seeking happiness through fulfillment of comfort related needs where such needs exist).

The characteristics of Growth and Comfort-oriented individuals are summarised in the figure.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROWTH ORIENTED</th>
<th>COMFORT ORIENTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prefer challenging work</td>
<td>Prefer routine work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Objectiveness in attribution</td>
<td>Subjectivity in attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prefer shouldering responsibility</td>
<td>Avoid shouldering responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do not expect loyalty from others</td>
<td>Expect loyalty from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Motivation is high</td>
<td>Motivation is low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Derive satisfaction from higher-order needs</td>
<td>Provision for higher-order needs make them uncomfortable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do not rely on use of authority.</td>
<td>Rely on use of authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Doing ones best is the philosophy of life</td>
<td>Eat drink and be merry is the philosophy of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prefer multi-direction communication</td>
<td>Prefer uni-direction communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. High stress tolerance</td>
<td>Low stress tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Little concern for hygiene factors</td>
<td>High concern for hygiene factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Prefer self-direction in decision making</td>
<td>Prefer external control in decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Growth-Comfort Model conceptualises job satisfaction (JS) as a function of the interaction among three constituents viz, expectancy (E) factor availability (FA) and motivational orientation (MO). Thus,

\[ JS = f (E \times FA \times MO) \]
1. **Expectancy** is of two types (1) E-P where effort will lead to performance and (2) P-O which is the perceived probability that performance will be followed by the desired outcomes.

2. **Factor availability.** These are factors likely to be available in an organization. Three types of organizations are available:
   - High Growth, Low comfort factors
   - High Growth, High comfort factors
   - Low Growth, High comfort factors

3. **Motivational Orientation** - as described earlier, there are basically two types of such orientation. Growth orientation and comfort motivation.

Some research work in this model is in progress. This model may yet see some refinement before it is finalised as an empirical theory of job motivation.

**OVERVIEW OF WORK MOTIVATION**

The last few pages have touched upon the major theories of motivation briefly reviewing some of the major research on the validation or otherwise of these theories. It is fairly clear that there is no one scientifically validated theory which can be deemed to be comprehensive and accurate in explaining the complexities of motivation. In the words of Cofer & Appley (1968),.... “It is clear that a comprehensive, definitive psychology of motivation does not yet exist. Nor, for that matter, would it be reasonable to expect that one should. On the other hand, the vastness of the literature on motivational concepts and the large quantity of research on motivational phenomena have provided a foundation on which the psychology of motivation can conceivably be based.”

Controversies and differences in various theories exist because researchers and theorists have...
1) observed different species, strains, age groups, sexes etc.
2) used mutually exclusive observational methods.
3) observed different aspects of behavior.
4) employed different units or methods of measurement.
5) controlled different variables.
6) generalised from too few instances, or
7) inferred events to be occurring when they could not be observed directly.

Where hypothetical constructs or intervening variables have been employed, care has not always been taken to provide sufficient referents for others to clearly identify the variable intended. Loose defining and terms with surplus meaning, use of common terms in different contexts (eg. instincts) and arguments by analogy have all added to the profusion of language and the impression of conflict of ideas in motivation theory.

A detailed critique on this subject would be beyond the scope of this discussion. Thus now the focus of attention will be shifted to discussing need-fulfillment and deprivation at work, and how need satisfaction affects the motivation and morale of employees.
How do the two variables of 'managerial leadership' and 'work motivation' interact in any given situation? This research has tried to understand the answer to this question from two angles.

Firstly, how do need patterns correlate with manifest leadership styles of a person. Would it be correct to say that a person who is high in n Ach, would also, in all probability, exhibit a high task-oriented style or even an autocratic style? Would a person with a high n Aff be likely to be person-oriented in his leadership functioning? Unfortunately, most of the past research in the area of leadership and motivation has been largely devoted to either relating motivational patterns to executive success, or leadership styles to managerial effectiveness. The motivational correlates of different leadership styles as yet have not been through much in-depth research in any exclusive study.

The second angle with which this research has attempted to study the dynamics of leadership and motivation is an interpersonal one. In any given work situation logically speaking, an individual's need satisfaction and motivation is influenced, to a large extent, by his perception of the leadership climate created by his superior. If he perceives his leader to be an authoritarian, it could be hypothesised that his emotional and social needs would be deficient and hence, according to Maslow's Deprivation/Domination Proposition, would assume more importance. Similarly, if he perceives his boss to be participative in his style of functioning, it could be hypothesised that his esteem and autonomy needs would be
satisfied and hence, according to Maslow's Gratification/Activation Proposition, would activate the need in the next higher category.

What then, is this study dealing with? What are the objectives and what is the scope of this research? The answers to some of these questions will be discussed in the forthcoming chapter.