8.1 PROFILING

8.1.1 Leaders’ assessment of their leadership style

From the qualitative analysis of the data of leaders’ assessment of their leadership style, it was observed that in all the five organisations, S2 type of leadership style emerged to be the most prominent. According to Hersey and Blanchard, S2 is a Selling style, which is characterized by above average amount of both task and relationship behaviour. It is the most appropriate style for followers with low to moderate levels of readiness (R2).

8.1.2 Distribution of S2 style in various organisations (refer to Figure 7.13)

It is observed from Table 7.13 that the percentage of leaders using S2 style was highest (74.1%) in IT and lowest in the Private sector organisations (48.5%). IT organisations have to achieve maximum output in minimum time to prove their effectiveness. The leaders of these organisations have to get the things done as efficiently as they can without using coercion but tact which is a prominent characteristic of ‘Selling’ style according to Hersey and Blanchard. IT has continued its progress in leaps and bounds in the last decade because of its concern for ‘get the work done’ style.

In IT Organisations, the executives (leaders) have to bank solely on human resources. IT employees are basically ‘Knowledge workers’ (concept advocated by Peter Drucker) who are to be tactfully managed. This is possible by the execution of S2 style of leadership.
At the middle management level in IT, the jobs are mostly programmed. Hence, the managers have to be contented with using the S2 style of leadership to encourage their subordinates to take programmed decisions. IT, being the most competitive and challenging field today, one should normally expect the managers to use S3 style with their subordinates, but due to the nature of jobs/work that is still not very high on value chain, the managers are per force using S2 style.

In Private sector organisations 48.5% of leaders (managers) are using S2 style (Table 7.13). The respondents (leaders) of the Private sector are mostly from the manufacturing organisations. These respondents (leaders) are managing semi-skilled and skilled employees who are to a large extent manual worker. Hence, not only S2 style but also S1 style (18.2%) is preferred by the leaders.

8.1.3 Subordinates’ expectations of leadership style from their leaders

It is observed from Table 7.14 that the subordinates expect their leaders to use S2 style. This style comes closer to ‘Benevolent autocrat style’ suggested by Deshpande in his East Meets West model (Refer to Figure 3.6). This style uses an autocratic way of dealing with the subordinates but with a pat on the back for the desirable behaviour shown by the subordinates. This is explained by Blake and Mouton with a 5.9 style, 9 standing for high concern for task orientation (initiating structure) and 5 for moderate concern for people (consideration). S2 style becomes effective when reward power is used by the leader with the subordinates and hence S2 style of leadership is akin to the benevolent autocrat style, which is befitting for a subordinate with moderate level of readiness. The boss in this style becomes almost a custodian, who, while getting

---

the work done, uses a nurturing parent style in the transactional analysis terminology.

It is, therefore, quite natural that the subordinates expect their leaders to be ‘Nurturant Task Leaders’ as proposed by J.B.P. Sinha.

The middle level employees of NGOs are less educated as compared to those from IT Organisations. They expect a protective and a decision making boss (a ‘benevolent autocrat’), hence subordinates’ expectation of S2 style from their bosses in NGOs is well substantiated.

8.1.4 Comparison of Leadership style preferences

It is seen from figure 7.7 that leaders prefer to use S2 style. Subordinates also prefer that their bosses use S2 style of leadership (Fig 7.10). Whenever the leader’s self perception and subordinate’s expectations match, the organisation will show a progressive trend towards development. This is well supported by Chemer’s integrative theory of leadership. The third zone (see Figure 3.7, page 65,66) refers to the zone of team development. When the activities of the leaders and the followers are appropriate to the demands of the situation, the Organisation shows positive outcomes. In other words, when the leaders’ perceived leadership styles and their followers’ expectations from them match, both would work for a common goal, which will lead to increased productivity and efficiency.

8.1.5 Individual Unit Analysis

Individual unit (leader + two subordinates) analysis in diverse Organisations is done to examine match/mismatch between the leader’s self perception of his style and his subordinates expected leadership style. Though the overall results matched the leadership style preferences of leaders with those of subordinates, the individual case-wise analysis showed a different trend. From Table 7.16, it is seen that matching is
less than 50% in every Organisation.

### 8.1.6 Progressive and Regressive style preferences

Progressive means the leader is using a style lower than what the subordinates expect from him/her. Regressive is just the opposite i.e. the leader is using a style, higher than what the subordinates expect from him/her. Table 7.16 shows that the progressive trend in leadership is much more (approximately 36%) in the Public Sector than in others.

The Public sector is very much akin to a bureaucratic type of management. The bosses are rule-bound, always working in a rigid framework. With advances in technology, the subordinates have developed their knowledge and skills with the result, they expect that their bosses would allow them to participate in decision making and create a supportive climate in the organisation. In short, they expect S3, i.e. a participating style, from their bosses. If such a progressive trend is shown by their bosses, the organisation will show development. Contrary to this, the regressive expectation leads to a downward trend in the development of organisation. This is seen in NGOs. The mission of NGO is so lofty and almost unattainable, that the employees develop a feeling of complacency that they have done a lot for the community. This is one of the reasons why NGOs in India could not progress well as per the expectations of the community.

### 8.1.7 Analysis of Expectation of Subordinates from Bosses (ESFB)

The researcher was interested in analysing the expectations of subordinates from their bosses (leaders). She devised a questionnaire based on literature review and her own experience over a period of time. In designing a questionnaire, she used item analysis technique for selecting the relevant items and later tested the Cronbach Alpha value of reliability (0.77). The detailed procedure is described in methodology.
It is observed from Table 7.17 that the t-values of items range from 2 to 39. A higher t-value indicates that the item has a discriminatory value. The researcher classified the t-values into four clusters indicating high and low discriminatory values. Cluster 4, which has a range of t values from 20 to 38.9, refers to four factors viz. bureaucratic orientation, politically influential, control, and Commitment. Of these, the first three go with the characteristics of S2 leadership style. These findings corroborate very well with earlier findings of expectations of subordinates from their bosses.

8.2. NEO-FFM (Five Factor Model)

The recent trait model of personality assessment is the five factor model or more typically called ‘The Big Five’. Of late, an impressive body of research concluded that the five factors underlie the various activities which the individuals perform at their work places. The researcher has concentrated only on the three of FFM viz. Conscientiousness, Openness to experience, and Agreeableness. Hypotheses 2, 4 & 5 refer to these three factors.

8.2.1 Conscientiousness in Organisations

It is seen from the ANOVA results for conscientiousness presented in Table 7.3 that F-value of 5.94 is statistically significant (p > 0.001, df 4,70). This means that the leaders of different organisations differ significantly on conscientiousness. The leaders from the MNC (Table 7.4 pg 114) vary significantly from the public sector leaders and the NGO leaders.

For organisations to be effective, the leaders should have the conscientiousness factor built in them as remarked by Luthans. The leader’s role in an organisation is to achieve the organisation’s goal and mission. It is, therefore, essential that the leaders of any organisation, big or small, internally or externally focused, flexible or
structured, should have conscientiousness built in their personality. High conscientiousness scorers are scrupulous and reliable. It indicates that the leaders from the MNC are more purposeful, determined to get things done than the public sector leaders and the NGO leaders. This difference may be due to the profit motive in MNC whereas a social motive in the public sector and NGO

8.2.2 Openness to Experience in Organisations.

Hypothesis 4 refers to the comparison of leaders of NGOs with leaders from IT, MNC, Private and Public sector organisations on Openness to Experience. It is observed from Table 7.8, pg 119 that the leaders of NGOs differ significantly from the leaders of Public sector organisations on Openness to Experience (p > 0.05). If we look at Table 7.7, the mean value (29.6) of leaders of NGOs is higher than that of leaders of the Public sector Organisations (27). The leaders higher in openness to experience tend to be imaginative, broad-minded, big picture thinkers with external focus. NGOs are established basically to render service to the community. In order to be effective, therefore, they have to be more open, reaching out to the community to solve its problem. They are not bounded too much by the rules of the organisation. The nine dot problem nicely documents this (page 15). As against this, the leaders of the Public sector organisations focus on internal processes and they always operate within a close framework of the nine dots. They remain relatively closed, sometimes apathetic to the needs of the society. The alternative hypothesis No. 4d (page 118), therefore, gets support in this study. However, the other three hypotheses (4a, 4b, and 4c) comparing the NGO leaders with leaders from the other three Organisations viz. IT, MNC, and Private, do not get support in this study.

With the advances in technology and globalisation, the world has become a global village. In order to achieve a competitive advantage, any organisation nowadays has
to serve the interests of the community. They cannot survive without reaching out to the community. The severe competition prevailing in the global market is also forcing all organisations to develop a unique core competence which is essential for their survival and success. Globalisation has made all other resources easily available. This has shifted the focus of these, otherwise externally focused organisations, to develop their leaders to meet the challenges of the competitive world. In this rat race, the leaders of these organisations have become more internally focused to show their competitive advantage. The alternate hypotheses, 4a, 4b, and 4c are therefore, rejected.

A striking observation is revealed from Table 7.7. The mean values of MNC, IT and Private organisation on Openness to Experience are slightly lower than that of NGO (NGO-29.6, MNC-29.2, IT-29.1, and Private-28.7). This shows that the NGO leaders have slightly more external orientation than the leaders from the other three organisations.

8.2.3 Agreeableness in organisations

Almost similar findings are obtained with the factor of agreeableness. Agreeable people come across as charming, diplomatic, warm, empathetic and approachable. Hypotheses 5a, 5b, 5c and 5d (page 120) deal with the comparison of leaders from NGOs with the leaders of other organisations viz. IT, MNC, Private, and Public. The only difference we find is that the leaders of NGOs differ from those of Public sector organisations on agreeableness (Table 7.10, page 121). Hypothesis 5d is therefore supported. The other three alternate hypotheses are not supported by the data in this study.

Leaders from NGOs are self-motivated people. They opted for this career by choice. Their motto is to help the community and therefore they maintain very good
relations with people. As compared to this, the employees from the Public sector organisations have a long and well protected tenure of service. They can afford not to maintain a satisfactory relationship with the people. The stock criticism against the functioning of public sector Organisations by the common people bears a testimony to this. Hypothesis 4d therefore gets support. A striking finding from Table 7.9 is that leaders from the MNCs have a higher score on agreeableness than those from the NGOs. This contradicts Hypothesis 5b though the difference is not statistically significant. It is also seen from Table 7.9, 7.10 pg 121, that the Public sector leaders are having a significantly lower Agreeableness than the MNC and Private sector leaders too.

8.3. LEADERS’ ATTRIBUTION OF SUCCESS AND FAILURE TO INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL CAUSES

The finding that there is no difference between the leaders on internality and externality dimension of ‘Locus of Control’ needs explanation based upon the very functioning of the public sector organisation. As has been said earlier (refer chapter no. 2 Organisation: Prospects and Retrospect), the public sector organisation works like a government organisation. The employees are rule bound, typically bureaucratic, and with no self initiative on the part of the leaders and the employees. The leaders (bosses) and the followers are typically apathetic about what is going on around them, least concerned about the development of themselves or their organisation. They are more worried about their rights than their responsibilities. They blame their Organisation for their failure at work. ‘A bad workman quarrels with his tools’ is the adage which befits them.
The leaders in the public sector organisations develop this type of a fixed mindset because of a maximum security of service provided by their Organisation. A lucrative pension after the service tenure with a handsome gratuity and leave travel concession to enjoy at the cost of the organisation might be some of the causes for developing such a mental set toward the organisation. However, there are some exceptions who strike hard in such an atmosphere for their individual development. But such employees are the exception rather than the rule (Pareto Principle). When such exceptional leaders do not get recognition from the organisation, they also fall in line with others in due course of their service period.

In deep contrast with this fixed mind set, of the leaders in public sector, the leaders in NGOs and the private sector Organisations are committed (Growth mindset). Their goals are set and they are destined to achieve them. They are the ‘internals’ and will not blame the Organisation for their failure at work.

The researcher has come across a Sanskrit couplet in which the poet asks a question, ‘With all the efforts done, if the goal is still not attained, where does the fault lie?’ A common man may say that the fault is in his fate while the poet answers this question by saying that the fault lies in his efforts. This represents an internal locus of control which is reflected in NGOs and the Private sector Organisations.

It is very surprising to see that 93% of the leaders are internals and only 7% are externals (Figure 7.6). There is a natural tendency in the human being to take the credit for whatever is achieved by him. There is every likelihood of an error of
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15 20% of the employees do 80% of the organisational work.
response set in choosing the alternative in ASUFA. The leaders may have given socially desirable responses, which occur in many self report inventories when used for personality testing. Therefore, the researcher suggests a word of caution to take the finding of ASUFA with some reservation.

8.4 Emotional intelligence (EI) and Leadership

It is seen from Figure 7.1 that the mean values of EI of leaders from different types of organisations range from 205 to 241. The mean value of leaders from the NGO is highest (240.5) and that of the leaders from the Public sector is lowest (205.89, Table 7.1). The leaders from the different organisations differ significantly on emotional intelligence ($f$=4.913, $p>0.01$).

Five main elements of EI are Self awareness, Self-regulation, Motivation, Empathy, and Social skills. When emotional intelligence is used for work in Organisations, the more relevant concept to be considered is Emotional Competence. Emotional competence is a learned capability based on EI that results in outstanding performance at work. Post Hoc analysis shows that the NGO leaders have a significantly higher EI than the Public sector leaders. Daniel Goleman says,’ when there is a glaring gap between the espoused vision of an organisation and the actual reality, it may result in disparities in proclaimed organisational values and those it lives by’. An organisation’s mission may serve an emotional function of articulating the shared sense of goodness that allows us to feel that what we do is worthwhile. Working for a company that measures its success in the most meaningful ways-not just the bottom line- is itself a morale and energy raiser. All the above is true for NGO more than it is observed in the Public sector.
8.5 RESONANCE AND LEADERSHIP

Resonant leaders inspire their organisations and communities to reach their dreams. They chart paths through unfamiliar territory. They find new opportunities within today’s challenges, creating a hope in the face of despair and fear. However, in the face of changing times, for sustaining effectiveness and resonance, it is essential that they have a conducive operating philosophy to see the worth of the things around them which may benefit them and their Organisations. Pragmatic Value is an indicator of how much a person will tend to determine the worthiness of an activity in terms of its measurable utility toward desired ends or objectives. If the ends are not clear, or if their measurability is difficult, the activities will be less valued.

Table 7.5 (page 115) shows the mean scores of Pragmatic values of leaders for different organisations. The mean Pragmatic value of Public sector leaders and MNC leaders is significantly higher than that of leaders from the NGO (f=3.983, p > 0.005).

The central theme of pragmatic philosophy is the belief that usefulness determines the worth of an idea, effort, person, or organisation. People with this philosophy believe that they are largely responsible for the events in their lives, and often measure things to assess their value. Pragmatics rank high in self management. Unfortunately, their individualistic orientation often pulls them into a pace-setting style over a democratic, coaching, or affiliative style. The leader may sacrifice the few for the many. Pragmatic philosophy is based on philosophies of utilitarianism, pragmatism, or consequentialism. In Public Sector organisations, the bureaucratic style of functioning seems to match with the pacesetting style of Pragmatics. It is also worth noting here that in the NGO’s, the performance of the leaders decides their appraisal and growth but in the Public sector Organisations, the seniority or tenure of
the leaders/managers decides their appraisal and growth in the organisation. In such a case, the goal for which the leader is working may tend to be more personalised in Public sector Organisations, whereas in the NGOs, leaders’ goals will be very closely aligned with the organisational goals. Thus, leaders in Public sector Organisations are working towards desired ends of personalized objectives, while leaders in the NGO are working towards desired ends that are organisational goals. In such a scenario, Pragmatic value of leaders from the Public sector is very likely to be significantly higher than that of leaders from the NGOs. The leaders from the MNC also have a significantly higher resonance than the leaders from the NGOs. MNCs being ‘for profit’ organisations render their leaders responsible for the organisational events. Not so in the NGOs where the social cause, not the profits drive the leaders.