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4.1 INTRODUCTION

Leadership is a process of influencing the activities of a group or individuals in an effort to achieve certain set organisational goals. The various models of leadership focus upon the different dimensions of leader behaviour, yet it is not clear as to which dimensions of the leader behaviour are most important in a particular context. The results suggest that the subordinates' judgement of the leadership styles not only reflect the leader behaviour but also their view about the assumption of leadership theories (Eden and Leviathan, 1975; Mitchell, Larson and Green, 1977; Rusin, Thomas and Lord, 1977).

Many of the research studies, have been carried out the answer of the question: what makes a leader effective? Is his success due to his personality or his behaviour, or the types of followers he has or the situation in which he works, or a combination of all these? These researchers, however, could not give a satisfactory answer of the question. Instead these researchers have resulted in various theories and approaches on leadership, the prominent among these being trait theory, behavioural theory and situational theory. Each theory has its own contributions, limitations, assumptions and frame work of analysis. The three approaches are briefly reviewed, leading to examine the Reddin's 3-D Model.
4.2 BASIC APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP

Thinking concerning leadership has moved through three distinct as shown below:

**STUDY OF LEADERSHIP - APPROACHES**

1. Trait Approach
2. Behavioural Approach
   - (A) OHIO State Studies
   - (B) Managerial Grid
3. Situational Approach (Models)
   - (A) Fiedler's Contingency Model
   - (B) Path-Goal Theory of Leadership Model
   - (C) Reddins Three-Dimensional Leadership Model

4.2.1 TRAIT APPROACH

Early approaches to leadership, from the pre-christian era to the late 1940, emphasized the examination of leader characteristics in an attempt to identify a set of universal characteristics which would allow a leader to be effective in all situations. At first a few traits seemed to be universally important for successful.
Leaders, but subsequent research yield inconsistent results concerning these traits; in addition, research investigating a large number of other traits was generally discouraging. As a result of this accumulation of negative findings and of reviews of this evidence, such as that conducted by R.M. Stogdill, the tide of opinion about the importance of traits for leadership effectiveness began to change. In the late 1940s, leadership researchers began to move away from trait research contemporary opinion holds the trait approach in considerable disrepute and views the likelihood of uncovering a set of universal leadership effectiveness traits as essentially impossible.

4.2.2 THE BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH

With the fall of the trait approach, researchers considered alternative concepts, eventually settling on the examination of relationships between leader behaviours and subordinate satisfaction and performance. During the height of the behavioural phase, dating roughly from the late 1940s to the early 1960s, several large research programs were conducted, including the Ohio State University leadership studies, a program of research which has received considerable publicity over the years.

---


4.2.3 OHIO STATE LEADERSHIP STUDIES

The Ohio state studies started shortly after world war II and initially concentrated on leadership in military organisations. In one of these studies, a lengthy questionnaire was administered to B-52 bomber crews, and their answers were statistically analysed to identify the common dimensions underlying the answers\(^3\). This analysis discovered two dimensions which seemed most important in summarizing the nature of the crew's perceptions about their airplane commanders behaviour towards them.

**Consideration** was the stronger of the two factors, and it involved leader behaviour indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth. The second factor was **initiation** of structure, a concept involving leader behaviours indicating that the leader organizes and designs the relationship between self and subordinates\(^4\).

Two rather different methods have been developed for measuring these variables. The primary instrument is called Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) originally developed by Hemphill and Coons (1957) and subsequently modified for use in industrial organisations by Fleishman (1957). It is typically given subordinates who are asked to describe the behaviour of their superior. A related instrument called leader opinion questionnaire (LOQ)

---

\(^3\) A.W. Halpin and B.J. Winner, "A Factorial study of leader behaviour Descriptions", in R.M. Stogdill and A.E.Coons. eds., Leader Behaviour : Its Description and Measurement (Columbus; Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 1957).

\(^4\)Ibid, P.42.
has been developed by Fleishman. It also provides scores on consideration and initiating structure but is completed by superiors who are asked to describe how they think they should behave. Both instruments yield scores on these two dimensions viz. consideration and initiating structure. Four quadrants were developed to show various combinations initiating structure (task behaviour) and consideration (relationship behaviour) as illustrated in Chart 4.1

**CHART 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Consideration &amp; Low initiating structures</th>
<th>High initiating structure &amp; High Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Low) ← Initiating Structure → (High)

**CONSIDERATION AND INITIATING STRUCTURE DIMENSION OF LEADER BEHAVIOUR**

A large number of investigations have been concerned with the relations between consideration and initiating structure scores and criteria of leadership effectiveness. The major conclusions, can be summarised as follows:
(1) Leaders who are high on consideration tend to have subordinates who are more satisfied with their leader than those who are now in consideration.

(ii) The relationship between consideration and rated Leader effectiveness varies substantially with the population.

(iii) There is an indication from one study (Fleishman and Harris 1962) that consideration and initiating structure interact in determining both grievances and turnover rates.

In general, Low consideration and high initiating structure were found to be independently associated with high grievances and turnover. However, the positive relationship between initiating structure and turnover was more marked among those high in consideration. Similar results with respect to productivity have been reported by Cummins (1971). The fact that there are a few consistent finding that has led many scholar to the conclusion that attention must be given to the search for the structural variables which affect the relationship between consideration and initiating structure and criteria of organisational effectiveness (Fleishman, 1973; House, 1973; Kerr and Others 1974). The researches, therefore, clearly indicated that no single leadership style was universally effective, as the relationship of supervising behaviour to organisational performance, employee satisfaction changed from situation to situation. By the early 1960s this had become apparent to even the most ardent supporters of behavioural approach, and the orientation of leadership researchers began to change towards a situational treatment.
4.2.4 MANAGERIAL GRID THEORY

Industrial psychologists, Blake and Mouton developed the managerial grid basing on the Ohio state study. The managerial grid identifies a range of management behaviour based on the different ways how production/service-oriented and employee-oriented styles interact with each other. Five different styles of leadership are shown in the Chart 4.2.

**CHART 4.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Low) ← Concern for people → (High)</th>
<th>(High) ← Concern for Production → (Low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.9 (COUNTRY CLUB)</td>
<td>9.1 (Efficient Task)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtful attention to needs of</td>
<td>Efficiency results from arranging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people leads to a friendly and</td>
<td>work in such a way that human elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfortable organisation</td>
<td>have little effect. (Task)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atmosphere and work tempo.</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate performance through</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balance of work 5.5 (Middle Road)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirements and</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining satisfactory morale.</td>
<td>(Low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exertion of minimum effort is</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>required to get work done and</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustain organisation morale</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 (Impoverished)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TEAM 9.9)</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work accomplished is from</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committed people with</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interdependance through a</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common state in organisation</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purpose and with trust and</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect.</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Low) ← Concern for Production →</td>
<td>(High)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The style 1-1 is impoverished management - low concern for both people and production. The style is also called laissez-faire management. Style 1-9 management is country-club management - high concern for employees, but low concern for production.

Style 9-1 management is task or authoritarian - oriented - high concern for production and low concern for employees.

Style 5-5 is middle-of-the-road management - an intermediate amount of concern for both production and employees.

Style 9-9 management is team or democratic management - high concern for both production and employees. Blake and Mouton strongly argue that the 9-9 management style (democratic management) is the most effective type of leadership style.\(^5\)

Essentially, Ohio State Studies and Managerial Grid explain the leadership behaviour in the four quadrants as shown in the chart 4.3. One significant different between the two frameworks should be noted. ‘Concern for’ is a predisposition about something or an attitudinal dimension. Therefore, the managerial grid tends to be an attitudinal model that measures the predisposition of a manager, while the Ohio State framework tends to be a behavioural model that examines how leader’s actions are perceived by others.

---

According to Blake and Mouton, the 9,9 management style (democratic management) results in improved performance, low absenteeism and turnover, and high employee satisfaction. But other writers and researchers believe that situational factors do play a part in leader and group effectiveness.

CHART 4.3

(MERGING OF THE OHIO STATE AND MANAGERIAL GRID THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP)
4.2.5 SITUATIONAL APPROACH

The leadership ability cannot be identified by one single or pair of traits nor by behaviour dimension independently. Even the balancing done by various grids of Blake and Mouton (1964) and concern of the revisionists like Bennis (1961) do not help defining such a complex phenomenon of leadership.

According to situation theory, leadership ability is dependent upon the individual's adaptive ability - the feeling he may have for sensing, interpreting, and treating the specific situation. Hersey States (1967) the concept of adaptive leader behaviour as follows:

The more Managers / Leaders adapt their style of leader behaviour to meet the particular situation and the needs of their followers, the more effective they will tend to be in reaching personal and organisational goals. Symbolically the situational approach to leadership can be expressed as: $B = f(l,f,s)$. In other words, effective leadership equals the function of the leaders personality, the followers personality and the situation. The important three models of leadership effectiveness are discussed below:

---

4.2.6 FIEDLER'S CONTINGENCY MODEL

Current leadership research is almost entirely situational. This approach examines the interrelationships among leader and subordinate behaviours and the situations in which the parties find themselves. This can clearly be seen in the work of researcher - F.E. Fiedler, who outlined one of the first situational models.¹

According to this theory, three main leadership dimensions are specified because they are assumed to be situational factors that influence the leader effectiveness. These are:

i. Leader - Member Relations

ii. Task Structure

iii. Position Power

More convenient terms came into use for the two styles. Task-oriented leader as equivalent to one who initiates structure; and employee-oriented leader as one high in consideration. Also, new psychological measuring instruments were developed to rate leaders as predominantly task or employee-oriented. (the LPC - Least Preference Co-Works instruments)²

i. Leader-Member Relations

If the relationship between leader and member is positive one i.e. the leader gets along well with the rest of the groups, the group members respect the leader for his personality, character, or ability and if there prevails a negative relationship, the group members dislike or distrust the leader. The respect, distrust are the important factors that indicates what appropriate style should the leader follow.

ii. Task Structure

A structured task enhances the leader's authority whereas unstructured one diminishes such. In the same way, leadership style varies as the structure varies.

² LPC tested a leader's perception of his least preferred coworker. High LPC leader tend to the friendly, considerate and employee-oriented; Low LPC, are task-oriented, objective and impersonal. Fiedler, F.D., "A Theory of leadership effectiveness" MC Graw-Hill, 1967.
iii Position Power

The higher is the position power, the lesser will be the difficulty of the leader in influencing subordinates and vice versa.

These situational variables determine whether a given situation is favourable to leaders. Fiedler (1967) defines the favorableness of a situation as "the degree to which the situation enables the leader to exert his influence over his group". As can be seen in the bottom part of the Chart 4.4, there are eight possible combinations of variables in the work situation: leader-member relations can be good or bad, tasks may be structured or unstructured, and position power may be strong or weak. A leadership situation varies from high to low on all these variables and it falls into one of the eight combinations. The most favourable situation for leaders to influence their group is when they are liked by their group, have a powerful position and are directing a well-defined job. Similarly, a most-unfavourable situation is one in which they are disliked, have little position power, and face an unstructured task.

According to Fiedler's conclusion:

(i) Task-oriented leaders tend to perform best in group situation that are either very favourable or very unfavourable to the leader.

(ii) Relationship oriented leaders tend to perform best in situations that are intermediate in favorableness.
CHART 4.4

THE EFFECTIVE LEADER

GROUP SITUATION

DECREASING INFLUENCE OF LEADER

INCREASING EFFECTIVENESS OF LEADER

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLE AND GROUP PERFORMANCE

LEADER-MEMBER RELATIONS

TASKS STRUCTURE

LEADER POSITION POWER

FIEDLER'S SITUATIONAL VARIABLES AND EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP STYLES
Many research studies have been conducted to test the validity of Fiedler’s contingency theory. While some of them have supported the model, considerably significant number of studies questioned its validity. Contingency model lacks a theoretical orientation. Since it has been developed from research data rather than from theoretical framework, it has predictive power, but lacks explanatory power. It thus becomes less of a theory and more of an empirical generalization. Fiedler could not explain why one particular leadership trait is more desirable than others in a particular situation. Fiedler, further - more, could not explain why the same style appropriate and work equally well in both favourable and unfavourable situations.

4.2.7 PATH GOAL THEORY OF LEADERSHIP MODEL

This theory of leadership is developed by Martin Evans and Robert House ((1974)\(^1\) using contingency approach ceased on the expectancy theory of motivation. It is called "Path goal theory" because its main concern is how the leader influences the subordinate’s perceptions of his work goals, personal goals, and paths to goal attainment. This theory states that leaders can exercise four different kinds of styles viz. directive (giving directions),

---


supportive (friendly and approachable), achievement oriented (setting challenging goals) and participative leadership. It also states that the leader can use any of these styles depending on situational factors like subordinate characteristics (ability, internal locus of control) and attributes in the work-setting (task characteristics, formal authority system and primary work groups). A good fit between leadership style, situational factors will result in job satisfaction of subordinates accept and value the leader as a dispenser and will engage in motivational behaviour as shown in the chart 4.5.

**CHART 4.5**

**LEADERSHIP STYLE**
- Directive
- Supportive
- Achievement-Oriented
- Participative

**OUT COMES**
- Job-satisfaction
- Acceptance of Leader
- Motivational Behaviour

*Expectancy that*
- 1. Effort will lead to performance
- 2. Performance will lead to valued rewards

**SITUATIONAL FACTORS**
- Subordinates Attributes
  - Abilities
  - Internal or External
- Work Setting Attributes
  - Task
  - Formal Authority System
  - Primary Work Group

Path Goal Theory of Leadership
This theory proposes two contingency factors (i) personal characteristics of the subordinates, and (ii) the environmental pressures and demands with which subordinate must cope in order to accomplish his work goals and to satisfy his needs.

Some researchers report that workers on highly structured tasks have high job satisfaction when their leader uses a supportive style. Conversely, workers on highly unstructured tasks are more productive when the leader uses a directive style but do not necessarily report more satisfaction. Some researchers find the entire theory to be sketchy in nature, requiring further refinement. Research by scientists like Weed, Mitchel etc. do not conform some of the findings of House.

The path goal theory is incomplete in the sense that it does not explain the effect of leader behaviour on factors other than subordinates' acceptance, satisfaction and expectation. Rather, it provides a tentative explanation of the leadership style. Again the model does not consider the effects of personal traits that may constrain the selection of leader behaviour. In spite of these short comings, the path goal theory is definitely a viable approach when task oriented variables such as role ambiguity, task autonomy and task uncertainty are confronted by followers and leaders. Further, the pathgoal theory provides a heuristic framework for the new researchers in the field.

---

4.3 EVALUATION OF REDDIN’S THREE - DIMENSIONAL LEADERSHIP MODEL AND MODIFICATION

William J. Reddin conceptualised a three-dimensional and, also known as 3-D management, borrowing some of ideas from managerial grid developed by Blake and Mouton. He may be called the apostolic father of the three dimensional theory of leadership. Reddin is the first person, to introduce effectiveness dimension which has a pragmatically amorphous meaning so far. In his model, Reddin uses three dimensions of task orientation, relationship orientation, and the effectiveness. By adding an effectiveness dimension to the task oriented and relationship oriented behaviour dimension, Reddin has integrated the concepts of leadership styles with the situational dimension of a specific environment. Taking the Blake and Mouton’s managerial grid as a useful platform, Reddin went beyond this by adding effectiveness dimension. Reddin suggests that all the eight styles of leadership in the grid are effective or ineffective depending on the situations.

At the heart of the 3-D theory is a very simple idea. It was discovered in a long series of research studies conducted by psychologists in the united states. They discovered that the two main elements in managerial behaviour concerned the task to be done and the relationships with other people. Task orientation (T,O) can be defined as the extend to which a leader directs his subordinates’ efforts towards goal attainment. It is characterised by planning, organising, and controlling. Relationship orientation can be defined as the

---

1 L.M.Prasad, Professor, Department of Business Management, South Gujarat University, Surat, Sultan Chard & Sons News : 1989 p.530-533.
extend to which a leader has personal relationships. It is characterised by mutual trust, respect for subordinates’ idea and encouraging. As it happens, these two important dimensions of leader behaviour are rather independent of each other. A leader can be high on one and low on the other, high on both or low on both. This leads to the kind of diagram shown in the chart 4.6. As these two dimensions are independent one can derive four basic styles which mirror the four basic situational demands as shown in the chart 4.7.

**CHART 4.6**

---

**CHART 4.7**

---

**Task and relationships orientation**

**Four basic styles, or four basic, situational demands**

These four basic styles represent leaders who are separated from both task and relationships in their situations, others who are mainly related to others, others who are mainly dedicated to the job and others who have a major interest in integrating relationships and task.
The psychologists in the United States also found that leaders sometimes emphasised task orientation and sometimes emphasised relationship orientation and that the two elements of behaviour could be used in small or large amount. For instance, a leader could be very much task oriented or only a small amount. Also, both behaviours could be used together (the 3-D term is integrated style), task could be used alone (dedicated style), relationship could be used alone (related style) or each could be used to only a small degree (separated style). The four basic styles are arranged as shown in the chart 4.8.

**CHART 4.8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RO</th>
<th>RELATED</th>
<th>INTEGRATED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEPARATED</td>
<td>DEDICATED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---------TO--------

Four basic styles of LEADER BEHAVIOUR

(Adopted from W.J. Reddin)

The T.O. and R.O. along the sides stand for task orientation and relationships orientation respectively. The four basic styles represent four types of behaviour. A clear set of characteristics and indicators for each type has been developed which enables each style to be fully understood.
I. THE SEPARATED STYLE OF LEADER

Separated leader behaviour is characterised by both low task and low relationships orientation. The label is "separated" because it is separated from both people and task. The separated leader is really oriented to nothing changing, only to system maintenance.

CHART 4.9

The separated style. It has a low task orientation and low relationships orientation

Separated Leader Indicators

- Cautions/careful/conservative
- Prefers paper work
- Looks for established principles
- Accurate/Precise/Correct
- Steady/Delibrate/Patient
- Calm/Modest/Discreet
II. RELATED STYLE OF LEADER

Related managerial behaviour is characterised by low task orientation and high relationships orientation. It is called related because of its emphasis on relationships with people. The related manager tends to be accepting, friendly and creates a secure atmosphere for others to work in.

CHART 4.10

The related style. It has also low task orientation and a high relationships orientation.

Related Leader Indicators

People come first
Emphasises personal development
informal/quiet/unnoticed
Long conversations
Sympathetic/Accepting/Friendly
III. DEDICATED STYLE OF LEADER

Leader behaviour characterised by high task orientation but low relationships orientation is designated dedicated because of its emphasis on task completion. The dedicated leader tends to be hardworking, aggressive and independent.

CHART 4.11

The dedicated style, It has a high task orientation and a low relationships orientation.

Dedicated Leader Indicators

Determined / Aggressive / Confident
Busy / Driving / Initiating
Sets individual tasks and standards
Self-reliant / Independent / Ambitious uses rewards, punishments, controls Tasks come first.
IV. INTEGRATED STYLE OF LEADER

Leader behaviour characterised by both high task and high relationships orientation is called integrated because it combines both orientations. The integrated leader prefers shared objectives teamwork.

CHART 4.12

The integrated style. It has a high task orientation and a high relationships orientation

Integrated Leader Indicators

- Derives authority from aims and ideals
- Integrates individual with organisation
- Wants participation
- Prefers shared objectives
- Interested in motivational techniques
- Prefers teamwork
The integrated style is close to the IDEAL LEADERSHIP STYLE proposed by several university professors: MC Gregor's Theory Y, Likert's System 4, and Blake's 9.9.

The 3-D Style Model

The diagram of 3-D model is shown in the chart 4.13. The **middle plane** is the four basic styles of separated, related, dedicated and integrated composed of the absence or presence of the two underlying dimensions of task orientation or relationship orientation. The **rear plane** of more effectiveness gives the labels used to describe the more effective use of a basic style. The **front plane** gives the labels used to describe the less effective use of a basic style. In addition to task orientation and relationship orientation, a third dimension has been introduced. The third dimension obviously is effectiveness. The figure shows another way of linking effectiveness, situation and style.

Further researches conducted at several universities clearly established theory that any of these four basic styles of behaviour could be effective in certain situations are not effective in others. The effectiveness is defined as the extend to which a leader is successful in this position, when the style of a leader is **appropriate** to a given situation, it is termed as **effective**. When the style of a leader is **inappropriate** to a given situation, it is termed as **ineffective**. One of the four basic styles has a less effective equivalent and a more effective equivalent, resulting in eight leadership styles.
Styles are embedded in situations. Basic styles are used in situations which are inappropriate or appropriate to them.

For instance, when the high task orientation of the dedicated basic style is used inappropriately, the 3-D name is given to it is "Autocrat". When used appropriately, the name used instead is "Benevolent Autocrat".

The basic style becomes less effective or more effective depends on the situation in which the leader uses the basic style.
The eight leadership styles then are not eight additional kinds of behaviour. They are simply the names given to the four basic styles when used appropriately or inappropriately.

The less effective and more effective versions of the basic styles are shown in the following chart 4.14.

| Compromiser | Integrated | Democrat |
| Deserter    | Separated  | Bureaucrat |
| Autocrat    | Dedicated  | Benevolent |
| Missionary  | Related    | Autocrat   |

The less effective and more effective versions of the basic styles

As is evident from Chart 4.14 the separated style when used inappropriately is labelled deserter. When used appropriately, mainly concerned with system maintenance, the term bureaucrat is used.

The related style when used inappropriately is called missionary. The same style when used appropriately - because the object is developing people rather than simply being nice to them is called developer.

The dedicated style when used inappropriately is called autocrat and when used appropriately it is called benevolent autocrat.
The integrated style when used inappropriately is called compromiser and when used appropriately is called democrat.

These eight leadership styles can be arranged around the four basic styles by using the third dimension of effective as shown in the chart 4.15. The four basic styles are in the centre, the four less effective equivalents at the front and the four more effective equivalents are the rear.

**CHART 4.15**

Reddin's 3-D Model of Leadership Effectiveness
CHART 4.16

The 3-D leadership style model. The middle plane may be omitted once the basic style concept is understood.

Chart 4.16 is the usual way of showing the eight styles alone.
### Chart 4.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATED + (DEVELOPER)</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTEGRATED + (DEMOCRAT)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A leader who is using a high relationship orientation and a low task orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is therefore more effective</td>
<td>A leader who is using a high task orientation and a high relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is therefore more effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains open communication channels</td>
<td>Uses teamwork in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops talent of other/Coaches</td>
<td>Uses participation appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands others/Supports</td>
<td>Induces commitment to objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works well with others/Cooperates</td>
<td>Encourages higher performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trusted by others/trusts/Listens</td>
<td>Coordinates others in work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When responsible for planning, involves many others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEPARATED + (BUREAUCRAT)</th>
<th>DEDICATED + (BENEVOLENT AUTOCRAT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A leader who is using a low task orientation and a low relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is therefore more effective</td>
<td>A leader who is using a high task orientation and a low relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is therefore more effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicators:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows orders, rules, procedures</td>
<td>Decisive/Shows initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable/Dependable</td>
<td>Industrious/Energetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains system and going concern</td>
<td>Finisher/Committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watches details/Efficient</td>
<td>Evaluative of quantity, quality and time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational/Logical/Self-controlled</td>
<td>Costs, profits and sales conscious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/Just/Equitable</td>
<td>Obtains results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefers to write out communication with others</td>
<td>Both develops and proposes many new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responds to disagreement and conflict by referring to rules and procedures.</td>
<td>Shows that efficiency and productivity are valued.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Four basic styles when used appropriately.
Avoids conflict and is pleasant/warm.

Involvement/responsibility useful opinions or suggestions resolve conflict.

Narrow-minded others makes things difficult.

Cooperative little concern about errors and.

Four basic styles when used inappropriately.

Chart 4.17 and 4.18 contain the definitions and indicators in detail.
The eight leadership styles arise from a combination of task orientation, relationship orientation and effectiveness orientation. The four less effective styles are referred to as the deserter, missionary, autocrat, and compromiser, styles. The four more effective styles are referred to as the bureaucrat, developer, benevolent autocrat and democrat styles.

**DESCRIPTION OF THE EIGHT LEADERSHIP STYLES**

In brief, the eight leadership styles may be described as follows. The style definition, the indicators and the kind of things each style might say and what others say about the style taken together will give us a good sense of the eight styles. Based on the above analysis, we can think about our own leadership and also the leadership styles we would perceive in our subordinates.

The following are ineffective styles

**DESERTER (DES)**

The deserter is a leader who is using a low task orientation and a relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is inappropriate and who is therefore, input oriented. This leader perceived as uninvolved, passive or negative.

Deserter leader is a withdrawn leader. He avoids involvement, does not want to take responsibility and has low commitment to work. Such a leader is non-creative and narrow-minded. He believes in minimal output and works
to rules. He is non-co-operative and resists changes. He hinders the functioning of other people and makes things difficult for others. He has both low task and low people orientation and is thus completely alienated from organisational life.

**Deserter Indicators**

- Works to rules / minimum output / gives up
- Avoids involvement and responsibility
- Gives few useful opinions or suggestions
- Uncreative / unoriginal / narrow minded
- Hinders others / makes things difficult
- Resists change / uncooperative
- Shows little concern about errors and usually does little to correct or reduce them.

**Missionary (MIS)**

The missionary is a leader who is using high relationships orientation and a low task orientation in a situation where such behaviour is inappropriate and who is, therefore, input oriented. This leader is perceived as being primarily interested in harmony. A missionary leader is basically a relationship oriented man. He is pleasant, kind and warm. He is dependence prone and seeks acceptance. He believes in easy life, avoids conflicts, and does not take initiative. His entire objective is to keep his colleagues, subordinates and superiors happy.
Missionary Indicators

- Avoids conflicts
- Pleasant / kind / warm
- Seeks acceptance of self dependent
- Makes things easier
- Avoids initiations / passive / gives no direction
- Unconcerned with outputs and standards
- At first sign of conflict attempts to smooth things over

AUTOCRAT (AUT)

The autocrat is a leader who is using a high task orientation and low relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is inappropriate and who is, therefore, input oriented. The leader is perceived as having no confidence in others, as unpleasant and interested only in the immediate task. For him task is the first priority and people the last. All this decisions are unilateral and centralised. He believes in suppressing the conflicts. He demands obedience and defiance of authority is not tolerated by him. He believes in downward communication and does not involve subordinates in decisions. He believes that people and basically lazy, dislike work, and do not want to take responsibility. They need control, goading and strict supervision. He relies more on negative punishment for achieving the target.
**Autocrat Indicators**

- Critical / Threatening
- Makes decisions
- Demands obedience / suppresses conflict
- Wants action and results immediately
- Downward communication only
- Acts without consultation
- Feared / disliked
- More interested in day-to-day productivity than in long-run productivity
- Performance maintained through subtle threatening situation

**COMPROMISER (COM)**

The compromiser is a leader who is using high task orientation and high relationships orientation in a situation that requires a high orientation to only one or neither and who is, therefore, in-put oriented. This leader is perceived as being a poor decision maker, as one who allows various pressures to influence the situation too much and as avoiding or minimizing immediate pressures and problems rather than maximizing long term production.

**Compromiser Indicators**

- Over uses participation
- Yielding/Weak
- Avoids decisions
- Produces vague, acceptable, decisions
• Idealist / ambiguous
• Sometimes encourages new ideas but does not always follow up on them.

The following are the effective styles.

**BUREAUCRAT (BUR)**

The bureaucrat is a leader who is using a low task orientation and low relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is, therefore, output oriented. This leader is perceived as being primarily interested in rules and procedures for their own sake, as wanting to control the situation by their use and as conscionous.

The Bureaucrat leader has high orientation towards organisational rules and regulations. He wants to operate in a system because he considers the system as sacrosanct. The defiance of organisational frame work perturbs him. Such a leader is impersonal and less task and relationship oriented. Since he is a system and rule bound leader, he produces only few ideas, does not push for production, and does not take initiative.

**Bureaucrat indicators**

• Follows orders, rules, procedures
• Reliable / dependable
• Maintains system and going concerns
• Watches details / efficient
• Rational / Logical / Self-controlled
• Fair / Just / Equitable
• Prefers to write out communications with others
• Responds to disagreement and conflict by referring to rules and procedures

DEVELOPER (DEV)

The developer is a leader who is using a high relationships orientation and a low task orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is, therefore, output oriented. This leader is perceived as having implicit trust in people and as being primarily concerned with developing them as individuals. Delegation of authority and responsibility is high. The assumptions about human beings are: men want to exercise self-direction and self-control and they seek responsibility. Such a style is conducive to commitment to work because subordinates perceive their action as self-actions, openness, freedom to act, self-expression are encouraged.

Developer indicators
• Maintains open communication channels
• Develops talent of others / coaches
• Understands others / supports
• Works well with others / cooperates
• Trusted by others / trusts / listens
• When responsible for planning, involves many others
BENEVOLENT AUTOCRAT (BEN)

The benevolent autocrat is a leader who is using a high task orientation and low relationships orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is, therefore, output oriented. This leader is perceived as knowing what is wanted and how to get it without creating resentment. This leader has little sympathy with participation and believes in taking unilateral action. He basically adopts economics rewards for getting work done and follows feudalistic approach in managing the enterprise system.

Benevolent Autocrat indicators

- Decisive / shows initiative
- Industrious / energetic
- Finisher / committed
- Evaluative of quantity, quality and time
- Costs, profiles and sales conscious
- Obtains results
- Both develops and proposes many new ideas
- Shows that efficiently and productivity are valued

DEMOCRAT (DEM)

The democrat is a leader who is using a high task orientation and a high relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is, therefore, output oriented. Perceived as a good motivating force, who sets high standards, treats everyone somewhat differently and prefers team management. The style is oriented towards optimising the efforts of others
both in the short and the long run. In such a style, tasks and relationships are combined appropriately. Conflicts and disagreements are welcome. Team management is emphasised. The task is regarded as interdependent and interrelated. There is a basic belief that effective management can only be achieved through group action, in which all the individuals are involved in the managerial function: Planning, organisation, motivation and control. This style acts as a powerful motivational instrument.

**Democrat indicators**

- Uses teamwork in decision making
- Uses participation appropriately
- Induces commitment to objectives
- Encourages higher performance
- Co-ordinates others in work.

**MODIFICATION IN REDDIN’S 3-D MODEL**

Reddin maintains that no leadership style is good or bad in itself. It depends on the situation as to which leadership style is best or appropriate. If the basic style is used appropriately it becomes effective, otherwise ineffective.

Reddin’s model is appreciated on two accounts:

i. For introducing the effectiveness dimension to the earlier concepts of Blake and Mouton’s task orientation and relationship orientation.

ii. For integrating the behaviour of the leader with the situation.
Reddin has just tried to provide a variety of leadership styles that may be effective or ineffective depending on the situation. His 3-D approach incorporates all the three theoretical bases - leader, group and situation, and stresses that the leader should have an adaptive style that leads to effectiveness. Most readers are probably less familiar with the "3-D Theory" than with the Blake "Managerial Grid" because Reddin's model helps in indentifying a particular leadership style a leader is using, but could not explain how the leadership can be utilised in the transitional process of organisational situation accordingly to achieve the immediate goal (present) and the ultimate goal (future), leading to proactive organisation.

Reddin's model is based on only one variable viz. leadership task. But for a changing organisation it is not sufficient to concentrate only on task. The other variables like leadership vision - emphasising on both present and future; leadership goal - giving equal importance to the immediate goal and ultimate goal; leadership tools - structural setup of organisation. It is more important that "Task - relationship" should be the right combination for the operational nature of leadership. The basic research part of this present study is aimed at reducing the lacuna mentioned above by examining the 3-D model of W.J. Reddin and a new model has been reformulated. To cover the various aspects involved within single frame work of study, and to comprehend them, a leadership module - modified Reddin's 3-D model is constructed as shown in the chart 4.19.
During 50s and 60s, the organisations needed **ADMINISTRATORS** to build the set-up. 70s and 80s witnessed the era of **MANAGERS** to manage such establishments efficiently. Now, with "continuous upgradation" becoming the determinant factor for business success in 90s, it is the **LEADERS** who have occupied the centre stage of the corporate world to lead effectively. In order to cope with the imperatives of "change", organisations are posed with an all important challenge of providing an effective and dynamic leadership. The need for such a leadership has been demanding, more intensely than ever before, especially in the present situation of stiff competitive environment.

This module depicts discretely, the transitional process of organisational situations and the corresponding operational nature of leadership to effect these transitions. This is the lacunae which Reddin’s 3-D model does not explain in detail. The basic research of this study is an attempt to fill this gap by reformulating the 3-D model of W.J. Reddin and utilising according to the transitional process of organisational situation. To bring about a particular situational transition of the organisation, the operational nature of leadership should be a right combination of the following four variables:

1. Leadership Vision
2. Leadership Goals
3. Leadership Tasks
4. Leadership Tools
LEADERSHIP MODULE - MODIFIED REDDIN'S 3-D
Leadership should have a broad vision of the changes that they intend to see through in an organisation. The span of leadership vision should emphasize on the "present" targets, as achieving them successfully would lay a strong foundation for the future. A set of goals, tasks and the tools for this purpose must be employed accordingly. Once the organisations recover and sustain the turnarounds, the horizon of leadership vision should be extended beyond the "present" and must emphasize more on futuristic objectives.

The leadership tools that need to be utilized by the organisations can broadly be divided into two groups namely the hardware and software aspects. Those actions which would result in the much needed changes in physical and structural setup of an organisation, represent the hardware aspects of leadership tools. The 3-D model (task orientation, relationship orientation and effectiveness) of leadership styles developed by W.J. Reddin - apostolic father of the three dimensional theory of leadership, is made use of in the module to represent the software side of it. The hardware and software aspects mutually complementing each other, should provide effective tools for an organisation's leadership.

When an organisation suffers a set back, leadership through all formal and informal means at its disposal should make the employees (followers) realise that the organisation's recovery depends very much upon the individual employee putting in his/her best. Turning to the actual initiation of action, the leadership's top priority should be to set - in the crisis management package with a view to move towards the IMMEDIATE GOAL of recovering from the set back. Therefore, at this critical juncture, leadership's relation with
employees must be limited to an uni-directional "telling" to do a thing right (efficiently). Hence the message of "HIGH PRIORITY FOR TASK AND LOW PRIORITY FOR RELATIONSHIP" should emanate from the leadership and get disseminated clearly and convincingly to all the employees. In this context, the leader can adopt the DEDICATED basic style in the different situations of the organisation. When the high task and low relationship of dedicated basic style is used appropriately, the name given to it is "BENEVOLENT AUTOCRAT". When used inappropriately, the name used instead is "AUTOCRAT". These leadership styles should resort to structural revamping of the organisation such as down sizing of redundant manpower, reshuffling of key positions to ensure fitment of right persons at right places etc. Thus the efficiency driven crisis management package, with unified effect of high priority for task and restructuring arrangement, should cause a gradual recovery of organisation from set back. However, the recovery situation may still remain fragile unless immediate steps are followed for creating a turnaround.

Now the task before leadership is to consolidate the gains of recovery and set the appropriate tools in action to move towards the turnaround state. For successful consolidation and for gaining momentum towards turnaround, the leader, apart from setting "HIGH PRIORITY FOR TASK" has to give a "HIGH PRIORITY FOR RELATIONSHIP" with employees also, as by now the maturity and "realisation" level of employees would have come up. In this present condition of transitional process, the leader can follow the INTEGRATED basic style in various situations. When high task and low
relationship of integrated basic style is used appropriately, the name given to the leadership style is DEMOCRAT. When used inappropriately, the name used instead is "COMPROMISER" leadership style. At present, the communication between the leader and the employees can now take a bi-directional flow. Here the leader needs to "Selling" the decisions by taking employees into confidence. Also, it is time for the leader to concentrate on making hardwares (plant and machinery) and work force of the organisation capable of doing right things (effectiveness). Therefore, the organisation should focus on the optimisation of process, procedures etc. and leads to higher productivity in operations. In fact, this event makes the triggering of turnaround, the organisation's INDISPENSABLE GOAL. Organisations ought to keep in mind that achieving turnaround is not an end in itself but only a means to achieve the ULTIMATE GOAL of attaining excellence. Achieving "turnaround" and "excellence" in business context are to attaining "mere political freedom" and "real freedom" respectively as espoused in the DOCTRINE OF GANDHI, one of the greatest leaders of all times.

Sustaining turnaround and marching towards excellence is the next task before the organisation. Sustenance should be ensured by keeping up the consistent growth rate and employees attaining a higher level of awareness and maturity. Leadership style needs to be PARTICIPATIVE and hence "HIGH PRIORITY FOR RELATIONSHIP" with employees and "LOW PRIORITY FOR TASK" (as the employees will have already developed the ability and knowledge to perform tasks) should form the software aspects of leadership tools. In this context, leader can use the RELATED basic style in
the different situations of the organisation. When high relationship and low task of related basic style is used appropriately, the name given to this leadership style is "DEVELOPER". When used inappropriately the name used instead is "MISSIONARY". Here the leadership facilitates the accomplishment of tasks and involves the employees more intimately in its pursuit of developing futuristic vision for the organisation. On the hardware count, the leadership should go in for rapid modernisation by resorting to deployment of state of the art factor inputs such as latest technology, modern infrastructure and knowledgeable human resources into operation. Such well co-ordinated efforts should set the organisation sailing towards making a mark and carving a niche for itself. This marks the beginning of an organisation's attaining excellence status. Now for an organisation having entered the "excellence" phase in its long journey, the task before the leadership is to perpetuate the name, the organisation has gained and lead towards no less a goal than that of becoming a pro-active organisation. Since, at this stage employees are matured enough to know their tasks, the leadership can now afford to have a "LOW PRIORITY FOR BOTH TASK AND RELATIONSHIP" with employees. In this stage of transitional process, the leader can use the SEPARATED - basic style in the organisational situations. When the low task and low relationship of separated basic style is used appropriately, the name given to this type of leadership style is "BUREAUCRAT". When used inappropriately the name used instead "DESERTER". In order to realise the maximisation of employee potential, the leadership should go in for DELEGATION of jobs. At this point of time, the leadership can think of diversifying into related and new product/service lines. By doing so, extending
the need hierarchy postulate of Maslow here, the leader provides necessary opportunities to accomplish the self actualisation needs of the employees. Leaders must follow the Maslow's principle, "What employees can be. they must be". In the final analysis, attainment of pro-active organisational status should be the single most important aim of leadership. When such a situation is reached, the eight leadership styles, as depicted in the module, would take newer dimensions.

4.4 CONCLUSION

To put it in a nutshell, there is a connection between leadership style and effectiveness. Four leadership styles are input oriented and may be seen as serving one's own needs rather than situation needs. These four styles are that of the deserter, missionary, autocrat, and compromiser. Four styles are output oriented and therefore serve situation needs rather than personal needs. These four styles are bureaucrat, developer, benevolent autocrat and democrat. Any of the four more effective styles can be effective at times, depending upon the situation.

Leaders need to think about their situation and what they are trying to achieve in it and consider which one or more of the four more effective styles they might use. It might be if the situation has sufficiently diverse elements that they use all four more effective styles with different elements of the situation. The thrust of this research study, however, has been to show that there are four more effective styles, and the leader who wants to be effective should be aware of them and attempt to use them as appropriate.
It is an enigmatic question indeed. Frankly putting, searching for a single best style of leadership has been proved to be a futile boondoggle by the empiricists. For instance, after reviewing a half-dozen experimental studies related to supervisory leadership, Stephen sales found "no single style was consistently superior". Since LEADER BEHAVIOUR in one situation is effective and in other situation becomes ineffective, challenge becomes even greater for the researchers. Leadership is situational. The situation is not composed of a small number of fixed parts. The organisation and environment are dynamic. Leaders face a near-infinite set of situations and engage in near-infinite set of behaviours. Therefore, many different combinations of behaviours or styles may be effective in a given situation.

If the organisations can identify the styles of leadership which are most likely to be effective within their various departments, teams, and/at different levels in the organisation, and at the same time diagnose personal styles, this can well enable them to determine development and training needs that will assist for the transformational leadership and organisational success.