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CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The review of literature is a collection of interrelated concepts, like a theory. Review of literature guides research, determining what things will be measured and statistical relationships of it. Review of literature are obviously critical, theory-testing sorts of studies. In those kinds of studies, the literature review must be very specific and well-thought out. Chapter two presented a broad view of the literature on Gender role, Communication Styles and Leadership styles of employees. This chapter presents a framework connecting the three independent variables such as gender role, and the dependent variable Communication Style and Leadership styles among organization employees.

2.1 Previous Study of Biological Sex

Gould's (1980) findings reveal the "scientific truth" women, like it or not, had smaller brains than men and therefore, could not equal them in intelligence." Not only were women's brains different; they were considered deficient too.

Doreen Kimura (1992), claim that "the effects of sex hormones on brain organisation is responsible for differently wired brains in girls and boys" and that different hormones are directly related to different potentials in almost every aspect of experience. Kimura (1992) says, "The hormonal effects are not limited to sexual or reproductive behaviors: they appear to extend to all known behaviors in which males and females differ."

Kimura (1992) speculates about social roles: The finding of consistent and, in some cases, quite substantial sex differences suggest that men and women may have different occupational interests and capabilities, independent of societal influences. Kimura has attributed these differences in career related factors such as occupational interests and capabilities to the difference in male and female representation in professions. From the
findings of Kimura, it can be inferred that lower representation of females in managerial profession may be due to the variation sex hormones. Several studies have established a clear link between environmental enrichment or impoverishment and brain development of traumatized children {Perry, 1995; Perry et ai, 1995; Perry and Pollard, 1997}. Orphans who are deprived of human touch later develop alarmingly smaller brains and lower intelligence than comparable infants who had normal nurturing (Blakeslee, 1995).

As researchers such as Perry and his colleagues have noted, the effect of the environment on young children is profound, both in the emotional and cognitive domains. These findings suggest that environmental and social factors are responsible for the development of the human brain.

Fausto-Sterling's studies (1985) revealed that there are no sex-related differences in spatial abilities in Eskimo males and females, possibly because Eskimo girls are allowed considerable autonomy. Men are different from women. This would seem to be self-evident. They are different in aptitude, skill and behavior, but then, so is every individual person. It does not seem unreasonable to suggest that the sexes are different because their brains are different, but then no two human brains are exactly the same. It is suggested that our culture is in trouble because many women have been brought up to believe they should be as good as men.

As per the findings of Fausto-Sterling (1993), differences between men and women can be divided into biological, or sex linked differences, on the one hand, and everything else, variously constructed as psychological social and / or cultural differences, on the other hand. Brain structure related research is still in the process of identifying relationship between brain difference, human behavior and individual difference. In the absence of a clearly established relationship between brain difference and behavioral variations, there is a very remote chance for a possible relationship between brain structure of an individual and formulation of gender roles. There is no specific study in such ways to eliminate possibilities of brain difference and gender difference. This leads to other factors that are responsible for gender wise variations. The second part of the difference, due to the interaction with the living world is the major subject matter of several researchers. The remaining part of literature search is focused on the gender-role
development, and its relationship with human behavior with special emphasis on executive performance.

Women are, overall, more expressive, tentative, and polite in conversation, while men are more assertive, and power-hungry (Basow & Rubenfield, 2003). Men and women also differ in their relations towards others in society: while women strive to be more social in their interactions with others, men value their independence (Chodorow, 1978; Dinnerstein, 1977; Eagly, 1987; Grilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976).

2.2 Previous Study of Gender Role

Throne (1983) has narrated that gender includes such aspects as personality traits but also involves psychological make up, attitudes, beliefs and value orientation and gender - role identify. Gender is constructed meaning that one's maleness of femaleness is more extensive than the fact of being born anatomically female or male. What is attached or related to that anatomy is taught through culture; virtually from the time one is born.

Thome and Henley (1993) explain, Gender is not a unitary, or natural fact but takes shape in concrete, historically changing social relationships. Culture with its involving customs, rules, and expectations for behavior, has the power to affect the perception of gender. That is the reason behind the difference between individuals who were raised in India and United States. The development of gender-role concepts is a factor having influence on individual behavior. This role concept development may be instrumental in human action (physical and psychological) in all walks of life, including communication and its goal.

External influence is largely responsible for the difference between males and females. The external influence consists in the interaction with other human beings. Societal stereotypes that women are less capable of leading groups than men are widespread. This may be a result of lingering status beliefs that remain prevalent in contemporary society despite increased inclusion of women in decision-making work groups. Status beliefs are widely held cultural beliefs that associate higher levels of social significance and general
competence with one category of a social distinction (for example, men or Whites) compared to another category (for example, women or African Americans; Berger, Fisek, Norman, & Zelditch, 1977). Shared status beliefs are likely to develop in groups whose members must regularly work together to achieve what they want or need (Glick & Fiske, 1999; Jackman, 1994; Ridgeway, Boyle, Kuipers, & Robinson, 1998), as is increasingly the case in organizations.

Berger and his colleagues (1977) claim that in the absence of any explicit demonstration of expertise, an individual will ascertain another individual’s competence regarding a given subject or task based on his or her preexisting stereotypes about what type of person is most proficient or intelligent in the context of that task (Berger et al., 1977). Therefore, the specific skills or knowledge one group member (who may belong to a given social group, e.g., White, male) attributes to another (who may be a member of a different social group, e.g., African American, female) reveals the history and nature of the two groups’ relationship with one another (Ridgeway, 2001). Expectation states research by Ridgeway and Walker (1995) suggests that when people interact to achieve collective goals, status beliefs shape the way social hierarchies are constructed within the group. Therefore, since men are generally seen as more competent than women (Ridgeway, 2001), it follows that group members (both male and female) generally hold lower performance expectations for women than men (Berger, Rosenholtz, & Zelditch, 1980; Lockheed & Hall, 1976; Meeker & Weitzel-O’Niel, 1977). Several implications arise out of the performance expectations gap between men and women. Specifically, examining small group behavior from an expectation states standpoint illustrates differences between men and women regarding leadership, power, and influence.

Unfortunately, low performance expectations for oneself can have self-fulfilling effects on an individual’s communicative behavior (Harris & Rosenthal, 1985; Miller & Turnbull, 1986). Low performance expectations for oneself can lead to less initiation of one’s own task suggestions, more requests for others’ suggestions, more positive evaluation of others’ ideas, and more acceptance of others’ influence (Ridgeway, 2001). By participating in these activities, those individuals who feel that their contributions are
not as valuable as their fellow group members’ contributions effectively take themselves out of the leadership race.

Women generally hold lower performance expectations for themselves than men (Lockheed & Hall, 1976; Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974; Meeker & Wietzel-O’Neil, 1977). Research reviewed by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) has indicated that in small mixed-sex groups, females tend to express less confidence in their own future task performance than males. Additionally, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) and Lockheed and Hall (1976) found females generally express less confidence in their own future performance with regard to tasks in which participants use their past performance as a standard, even those tasks that females have traditionally performed as well or better than males. masculine or feminine (Pavitt & Curtis, 1994), thus more suitable for either males or females. For example, in contemporary American society, male-typed due to the gender stereotype that males are stronger and more capable of performing physical work than females. In contrast, cooking a meal or taking care of children are typically seen as female-typed tasks due to the gender stereotype that females are more adept at performing domestic tasks than males. Though many tasks can be seen as innately masculine or feminine, some tasks may be considered gender-neutral, such as rearranging a jumbled group of letters to form a number of different words (see Gilbert & Thompson, 1999; Hackett & Campbell, 1987).

In their meta-analysis, Eagly and Johnson found that organizational level had little impact on the effect sizes of autocratic versus democratic, interpersonal versus task, and interpersonal styles. However, they did find a tendency for first-level male managers to be more task oriented than women, and for mid-level female managers to be more task oriented in comparison with men. Accordingly, we expect that men and women hold positions of different power that are related to the leadership styles they apply, but that organizational level in itself does not have a different impact on the leadership styles of male and female managers. Kanter (1977) argued that women who have a token status in a predominantly male organization might be treated and perceived differently because of their visibility, and change their style accordingly. Eagly and Johnson (1990) indeed found that, to the extent that men predominated among the leaders whose style was assessed, the tendencies for women to
be more interpersonal and more democratic weakened. The percentage of men among leaders’ subordinates also related significantly to the effect sizes for some of the styles in the organizational sample. In an environment with larger proportions of male subordinates, male leaders were more task oriented and less democratic than female leaders, but more interpersonally oriented on interpersonal versus task measures. We also expect that the sex ratio of both the management layer and the subordinate team moderates sex differences in leadership styles.

Sex Differences over Time. In the meta-analysis of Johnson and Eagly (1990), the more recent studies (within the period from 1961 to 1987) of interpersonal and task styles were more stereotypic. By contrast, studies of the democratic-autocratic dimensions and studies placing task oriented and interpersonal oriented styles on a single dimension became less stereotypic in time. Another time-related factor is age of the manager. Eagly and Johnson (1990) found that older leaders were more stereotypical in their interpersonal style but less stereotypic in their task style. No differences were found on the other styles. The authors cautioned that these results are limited because of large amounts of missing data and that results may have been confounded with other variables. In general, overviews of studies of sex differences in cognition demonstrate that these differences have become considerably smaller or have even vanished within the last 30 or 40 years (Feingold, 1988). On the other hand, sex stereotypes, which form an important factor in leadership behavior, are very persistent (Fiske and Stevens, 1993). Together with the mixed results of Eagly and Johnson (1990) this evidence makes us refrain from formulating an expectation on time dimensions.

2.3 Previous Study of Communication style

Following a literature review with regard to the influence of sex differences in the area of interpersonal relations, Montgomery and Norton (1981) concluded that a large but fragmented body of findings suggests that men and women differ significantly in the area of interpersonal communication. The difference lies in the area of perception, how the male and female perceive each other to be intellectual and aggressive. However, following the analysis of data from two samples, Montgomery and Norton (1981) stated "Men and women sampled for these studies differed relatively little in their perceptions of their own Communication Style." (Montgomery and Norton 1981).
Theorists have suggested that these gender differences in communication styles put women at a disadvantage when interacting with others because they speak more tentatively than men, who are known to speak more assertively, thus leaving the impression that men are more confident and capable as leaders (Lakoff, 1975). Overall, research has showed that, in general, women are more social emotional in their interactions with others, whereas men are more independent and unemotional or attached in conversations (Chodorow, 1978; Dinnerstein, 1977; Eagly, 1987; Grilligan, 1982; Miller, 1976). Communication researchers have sought to reveal relationships between communicative behavior and biological sex. Many researchers have claimed an interaction effect exists between biological sex of a speaker and his/her verbal style. For example, communication researchers have claimed that men and women differ verbally with regard to power assertion, politeness, and directness (Kim & Aune, 1997). Despite the long history of research claiming communication differences exist between men and women, more recent research has begun to abandon biological sex as a predictor of communicative behavior.

Men and women also differ in their communication style when they are faced with resolving a crisis or coming to a mutual conclusion. The most common communicative mistake made by both males and females occurs when talking about and resolving conflict. When attempting to resolve a problem, men follow their natural tendency to offer a solution while women seek empathy and understanding and are naturally inclined to offer unsolicited advice (Gray, 1992).

Canary and Hause (1993) claim that biological sex differences in social interaction are quite small and inconsistent, accounting for only 1% of the verbal differences between men and women. Similarly, Kim and Bresnahan (1996) state that the empowerment of women in contemporary society invalidates previous assumptions about communication differences between men and women, particularly with regard to power assertion. Additionally, males and females have been found to be relatively homogeneous in their self-perceptions of preferred conversational styles (Kim & Aune, 1997). Pearson (1985) claims that our simplified understanding of communication disparities in terms of biological sex is a result of our natural tendency to exaggerate verbal differences between
obviously different groups (i.e., men and women). To summarize, use of biological sex as the sole predictor may not be adequate in uncovering “gender differences” in cognition and communication. Since biological sex has been debunked as the sole predictor of communication style, researchers have begun focusing on psychological gender as a construct that may better explain differences that have previously thought to be biologically-sex based (Stephen & Harrison, 1985). An individual’s psychological gender refers to a set of stereotypical masculine or feminine behaviors internalized to that individual, regardless of biological sex (Greenblatt, Hasenauer, & Freimuth, 1980; Rancer & Dierks-Stewart, 1990). Put simply, an individual’s psychological gender is how masculine or feminine he/she believes him/herself to be. Since males and females can be either masculine or feminine in sex-role orientation, the construct of psychological gender rejects the dichotomization of individuals based on biological sex (Kim & Aune, 1997).

The biggest difference between men and women and their style of communication boils down to the fact that men and women view the purpose of conversations differently. Academic research on psychological gender differences has shown that while women use communication as a tool to enhance social connections and create relationships, men use language to exert dominance and achieve tangible outcomes (Leaper, 1991; Maltz & Borker, 1982; Wood, 1996; Mason, 1994).

Academic research on communication differences across gender has shown that men and women differ in their communication characteristics and traits. Women tend to be more expressive, tentative, polite, social, while men are, on average, more assertive and dominant when it comes to communication style (Basow & Rubenfield, 2003). Popular works by John Gray and Deborah Tannen show that while men view conversations as a way to establish and maintain status and dominance in relationships, women see the purpose of conversation to create and foster an intimate bond with the other party by talking about topical problems and issues they are communally facing (Gray, 1992; Tannen, 1990).
Research in gender differences across communication styles has come to the conclusion that men tend to be self-assertive and view conversations as a means towards tangible outcomes, such as obtaining power or dominance (Maltz & Borker, 1982; Wood, 1996; Mason, 1994). Women, on the other hand, value cooperation, this communal orientation “involves a concern with others, selflessness, and a desire to be at one with others” (Mason, 1994) Eagly (1991) coined socio-cultural factors with Gender-role Orientation and highlighted the relationship between Gender-role Orientation and behavior of individuals. When talking about culture, one might think about certain rules, customs, norms and lifestyle of a society, which shape them and draw the uniqueness about them. Besides thinking of the rules, customs, norms and lifestyle of that society, Communication Style also should be concerned. In fact, Communication Style is one of the aspects that are shaped by culture.

Communication is one of the mediums of interaction with other human beings. Over a period of time, males and females at birth will be transformed into masculine and feminine with specific Gender-role Orientations. (Fausto's -1993). Spender (1985) has mentioned the gender dimension of communication. The socio cultural factors that constitute Gender-role Orientation may have instrumental role in producing variations on Communication Style From the findings of Bansal (1982), Brenner (1982), Martin (1990) and Rhodes (1990), it can be derived that Biological and Social factors may have instrumental influence on Communication Style, Gender-role Orientation and Executive performance. These findings lead to think that there is a probable relationship between Biosocial Profile, Gender-role Orientation, Communication Style and Executive Performance.

It is evident that an individual’s communication style is at least somewhat dependent upon his/her psychological gender. Subsequently, an individual’s psychological gender influences how that person will interact in a group setting. However, given the socially-accepted predilection toward thinking of gender as a dichotomous concept (male vs. female), individuals working together are likely to have certain expectations about how
other group members should behave based on their perceptions of others as males or females, as explained by Berger’s Expectation States Theory.

2.4 Previous Study of Leadership Styles

Leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, leader behaviour, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, and influence on task culture. Leadership has been studied using both qualitative and quantitative method in variety of groups and organizations.

There appears considerable overlap between the role of leadership and management. Bennis and Nanus (1985) proposed that „managers are people who do things right and leaders are people who do the right thing”. Zaleznik (1977) proposed that managers are concerned about how things get done, and leaders are concerned with what things mean to people. Therefore, the studies discussed in the chapter focus on leadership as a process and the type of leadership executed by the managers in the organisation. Yukl (1989) advocated that when managers are involved in influencing a group to meet its goals, they are involved in leadership. When leaders are involved in planning, organizing, staffing and controlling, they are involved in management. Both processes involve influencing a group of individuals towards goal attainment.

Research on what motivates employees and the need for the leader to motivate subordinates to accomplish designated goals lead to the work of Evans (1970), House (1971), House and Dessler (1974), and House and Mitchell (1974) in form of Path-goal theory. It focused on the goal of leadership as a way to enhance employee performance and employee satisfaction by focusing on employee motivation. According to Indvik (1986), leaders try to enhance subordinates goal attainment by providing information or rewards in the work environment; they provide subordinates with the elements they think that their subordinates need to reach their goals.
According to Hunter et al., (2007) Leader behaviors effect subordinates actions and perceptions, ultimately resulting in some type of desired outcomes. Employees require leadership and the leadership impact each of them uniformly.

According to Yukl (2010) leadership is significantly about motivating people and gaining their commitment, crux that followers (employees) are influenced by leaders(managers) and their performance is directly affected by their behavior. Clear communication what, when and how the task and goals are attained is a necessity for better employee performance.

Goswami and Ghosh (1957) have made elaborate studies on the pattern of effective supervision and have brought out a number of papers and monographs. Ganguli (1964) has reported that 46.9 percent of the manager and 3.10 per cent of workers of a factory preferred autocratic organisational climate while only 12.30 percent of the managers preferred democratic climate. The existing environment was perceived to be autocratic by 51 per cent of the managers and 43.6 percent of the workers. Sequeira (1962 a, 1962 b) who worked with Ganguli, has outlined the characteristics of the effective supervision. He has come to the conclusion that effective supervisory practice is less ambiguous and less relative. The main criteria seem to be the level of supervisor in the hierarchy. Bhatt and Pathak (1962) found high intelligence and dependability as important perceived characteristics of effective supervision.

Indian management is generally believed to be autocratic with subordinates closely supervised by their superiors and only a limited degree of participation is allowed to the subordinates. Myers (1960) from his interview with industrialists, government officials, labor leaders, and managers in both Indian and foreign owned organizations, concludes that barring a few most Indian top managers are relatively authoritarian in their, relationships with lower management and labour. Similar result has also been highlighted by Ganguli (1964) in his study of leadership behaviour in a state-owned engineering company.
Hingar (1986) in her study on leadership style and job satisfaction among executives found the bureaucratic style was found to be significantly correlated with the efficiency of superior and the efficiency of the organization. The values of multiple correlations indicate that effectiveness of subordinates, efficiency of division and efficiency of the organisation are significantly influenced by the leadership styles. The authoritarian style was found to be negatively correlated with the 100 effectiveness of subordinates. Besides, its trend of correlation with other variables of effectiveness was found to be negative. Therefore, the study concluded that some of the variables of effectiveness viz. effectiveness of superior in terms of his administrative and other abilities, efficiency of division and positively influenced by bureaucratic, nurturant, participative and task-orientation styles of leadership, whereas the authoritarian style of leadership is having a negative impact on the different variables of effectiveness. Also no significant difference in leadership style was found when these were judged by thee leader himself and when these were judged by their subordinated.

According to Yuan & Lee (2011) Leadership is an important management function to maximize efficiency and achieve organizational goals. Organizational goals that are achieved with the help of its workforce. Leadership act as a driver, leading managers make all decisions in terms of what are organizational goals how employees work towards the achievement of those goals. Employee performance is widely affected by the leaders but the main point of focus is in between the lines that what are the factors that are affecting this relationship one of key component is communication ability of manager.

According to Hiller, DeChurch, Murase and Doty (2011) Leaders and leadership can affect emotions, most remarkably in followers, Thus it can be inferred that leaders can strongly influence employee performance and leaders communication ability is significant to the employees.

Hiller et al.( 2011) concluded after reviewing 25 years data on leadership and its outcomes that there is no doubt that subordinates view are critical to understanding
leadership. According to Amos & Ristow (2004) the effective management of individual performance is critical to the execution of strategy and the organization achieving its strategic objectives. If subordinates unable to understand leaders requirement regarding task and goal achievement, it can lead to inefficiency in organizations, aligning to research findings of Hartog et al., (2012) quality of communication is of key importance for better consideration of the task and goals and better outcomes.

Galanou Ekaterini (2010), The aim of this study is to report the findings of an empirical study exploring the relationship between four prominent models of leadership and the fundamental organizational features such as commitment, satisfaction, communication and effectiveness, regarding a variety of measures of variables such as the organizational structure (i.e. the type of branch) and the managers’ individual traits (i.e. the age, the education level). The results reveal that, the spectrum of four leadership styles containing basic characteristics, such as the type of branches, the age and educational level are inter-related with communication, commitment, satisfaction, and effectiveness.

D. D. Pradeep, N.R.V. Prabhu(2011), Found that the present study was a comparison between selected public and private sector enterprises and the data comprises of 43 middle level managers and 156 subordinates. subordinates from among various leadership styles recommended the transformational leadership style in both the public and in the private sector enterprises. The results of correlation and regression analysis suggests that the transformational leadership style has significant relationships with performance outcomes.

As researchers such as R. M. Ojokuku, T.Odetayo and A. Sajuyigbe(2012) have noted, impact of leadership style on organizational performance in selected Banks, in Ibadan Nigeria. The significant effect of leadership style dimensions on followers and performance. Findings showed positive and negative correlation between leadership style dimensions and organizational performance. It was also found that leadership style dimensions jointly predict organizational performance, which counted for 23% variance of performance. The study concluded that transformational and democratic leadership
style should be employed by the Banks’ management in order to wax stronger in a global competitive environment.

Nwafor S.O (2012), Studies identified the essential leadership styles of principal officers of 37 public universities in Nigeria. One hundred and forty eight out of 185 principal officers were randomly selected to participate in this study. It was found that there was a significant difference in the principal officers’ choice of the 9/1 – directive and 1/1 bureaucratic leadership styles. These styles also represented the essential leadership styles for administration of public universities in Nigeria. The principal officers were advised to encourage continued growth in development of leadership styles through membership in professional organizations, seminars and workshops.

Thisera (2013), studies revealed that the relationship between supervisor’s leadership and job performance of subordinates; compare immediate male and female supervisors’ leadership styles Data were gathered through a structured questionnaire from a sample of 138 females respondents working in operational level employees and the study was done in four selected apparel sector organizations. According to statistical results, researcher found that there is a strong relationship between leadership and job performance of subordinates. Mean value analysis revealed that male supervisors are more autocratic while appearing more democratic leadership style by female supervisors.

Bass (1981); Haire, Ghiselli and Porter (1966). Hofstede (1980) empirically established that compared to most other countries, India have high Power Distance Index. Power distance denotes society’s acceptance of the way power is distributed in organisation. In culture with high power distance, power is distributed unequally, with a powerful group at the top of the hierarchy making decisions that are highly centralised. Such system usually functions well because those at the lower levels of the hierarchy have a need to feel dependent on others for guidance and administration. It is also possible that in some cases according to Hoffstede, subordinates could go to the other stream and engage in counter dependent behaviour in high power distance situation.
Sinha (1976) found that authoritarian leadership is preferred by employees in Indian organisation. Such leadership depicts a strong task orientation and high personal involvement and effort by the leader. While 4 this may have been true in the past, the question that come to ones mind that whether such a leadership style will be functional in the context of the changing demography of the workforce. There is no dearth of leaders in India as evidenced by the industrial giants- Tatas, Birlas, Muffatlals, Mahindras, Ambanis, Modis, Singhanias to name a few- whose contributions to the success of the industry in India are remarkable. (Leader managers in India) the up and coming younger generation of leaders are expected to make significant contributions to India’s progress.

The above discussion makes it clear that tot of work has been done on leaders behaviour, styles and on best styles of leadership. But no study differences the leadership styles by the supervisors (top level) and the subordinates in Govt. department which is very much needed. This study is intended to fill this gap.

2.5 Theoretical Orientation of Study

2.5.1 Theoretical Back ground of Gender Role

Gender roles are based on the different expectations that individuals, groups, and societies have of individuals based on their sex and based on each society's values and beliefs about gender. Gender roles are the product of the interactions between individuals and their environments, and they give individuals cues about what sort of behavior is believed to be appropriate for what sex. Appropriate gender roles are defined according to a society's beliefs about differences between the sexes. Understanding the term "gender roles" requires an understanding of the term "gender" Gender role definition mention as below:

“Gender roles are socially and culturally defined prescriptions and beliefs about the behavior and emotions of men and women.”

(Anselmi & Law, 1998)
“Gender is built into social life by means of socialization, interactional processes, and institutional organization”

(Risman, 1998)

So we can say that “Gender” is a social term that is often confused with the term "sex:' Sex and gender are different concepts. Sex is a biological concept, determined on the basis of individuals' primary sex characteristics. Gender, on the other hand, refers to the meanings, values, and characteristics that people ascribe to different sexes. Ann Oakley (1972) was one the first social scientists to distinguish the concept of gender from the concept of sex. According to Oakley, gender parallels the biological division of sex into male and female, but it involves the division and social valuation of masculinity and femininity. In other words, gender is a concept that humans create socially, through their interactions with one another and their environments, yet it relies heavily upon biological differences between males and females. Because humans create the concept of gender socially, gender is referred to as a social construction. The social construction of gender is demonstrated by the fact that individuals, groups, and societies ascribe particular traits, statuses, or values to individuals purely because of their sex, yet these ascriptions differ across societies and cultures, and over time within the same society.

**Theoretical Framework of Gender Role**

Perry and Bussey (1984) defined gender-role development as "the process whereby children come to acquire the behaviors, attitudes, interests, emotional reactions, and motives that are culturally defined as appropriate for members of their sex" (p. 262). This definition suggests that gender roles include behavioral, attitudinal, and personality aspects. It also assumes that these gender aspects are closely related to each other because they are expected to be consistent.

Both Bem (1974) and Spence (Spence 1975) adopt the trait approach to measure an individual's masculinity and femininity. They also agree on the conception that
masculinity and femininity are two independent one-dimensional properties (Spence, 1984). However, with respect to the interrelatedness of gender phenomena, they have different perspectives. According to the gender schema theory (Bem, 1981), people's gender typing is the result of gender schematic processing. Gender-schematic persons tend to process information, including information about themselves, according to the culture's definitions of masculinity and femininity (Bem, 1985). The gender schema theory suggests the interrelatedness of gender-related phenomena: gender-personality type, gender attitudes, and gender-related behaviors.

On the other hand, Spence (1984) proposed the multi factorial model of gender identity; she suggested that gender-related personality, attitudes, and behaviors are relatively independent. She stated, "at the level of the individual these different kinds of gender-related attributes, attitudes, and behaviors do not necessarily have common developmental histories".

Thus, the two conflicting perspectives (i.e., Bem's schema theory and Spence's Multi factorial gender identity theory) have some empirical support. However, overall empirical support seems to be inclined toward Bem's theory. A majority of previous studies indicated that there was a certain degree of interrelatedness among gender phenomena. These studies suggest consistency between gender role identity and gender-related attitudes, although the magnitude of the cohesion might be weak.

Those who have studied gender schema theory and are concerned that divisions along gender lines are negative for children suggest that society would be a better place if children were raised to be astigmatic (Bem, 1981; Bern, 1983). Thus, the outcome for children within the gender schema theoretical framework is that children will recognize certain attitudes and behaviors as being gender related and will perpetuate gender stereotyped roles because society is structured that way. While each theory takes a different path in explaining the socialization of children, there are some similarities between the theories. For example, cognitive developmental theories are a stage theory, with children completing one stage of development before moving on to the next.
Social learning, symbolic interaction and gender schema theories offer the view that development is a continuous process, with information constantly being made available to children, who are steadily internalizing and making the information fit into their growing body of knowledge. Children are seen as active participants in the socialization process within cognitive developmental and gender schema theories because children construct knowledge, building on previously understood schemas, thus they have an active role in their own development.

Gender schema theory also has elements of social learning because children are observing gender related behaviors and imitating them, trying them on for size, so to speak. Symbolic interaction theory focuses on the learning of language and other symbols commonly used in society and developing a sense of self and a sense of how to get along in society based on these symbols. Children determine their self-concept by passively accepting the view of others and also by taking the role of others. This indicates that children are both passive receptors of their culture, and active participants in their socialization. The view of children as receivers of environmental stimuli rather than creators of knowledge is the perspective of psychoanalytic theory (Freud, 1969). Social learning theory describes children in a passive way ~ as observers and imitators of behavior (Bandura and Waiters, 1963). This would indicate that children act as receivers of information in order to come to understand their place in the society in which they live. However, as children are observing and imitating behaviors, attitudes, preferences, etc., they are also interpreting and making judgments about them, indicating an active involvement in learning. Thus, child development is a processes closely associated with the changes in the society.

Gender role socialization, which almost always includes some degree of gender role stereotyping, begins at birth. As children grow and develop, the gender stereotypes they are exposed to at home are reinforced by other things in their environment and are thus perpetuated throughout childhood (Martin, Wood, & Little, 1990). The child's burgeoning sense of self, or self-concept, is a result of the multitude of ideas, attitudes,
behaviors, and beliefs that he or she is exposed to. The information that surrounds the child and which the child internalizes comes to the child within the family arena through parent-child interactions, role modeling, reinforcement for desired behavior, and parental approval or disapproval (Santrock, 1994). As children move into the larger world of friends and school, many of their ideas and beliefs are reinforced by those around them.

A further reinforcement of acceptable and appropriate behavior is shown to children through the media. Through all these socialization agents, children learn gender stereotyped behavior.

As children develop, these gender stereotypes become firmly entrenched beliefs. It has been suggested that children develop gender stereotypes in two stages:

1. Learning what types of things are associated with each sex (i.e., boys play with cars, girls play with dolls). Learning associations for what is relevant to their own sex but not the opposite sex.

2. Learning the associations relevant to the opposite sex. (Martin, Wood, & Little, 1990). The learning of these associations is accompanied by a change in the quality of associations, as the child gets older, as indicated by more stereotypic judgments being made by older children.

- **Gender Role Orientation**

Gender-role Identity has been the central theme of a series of studies as one of the major dimensions of personality. There was considerable interest in the developmental correlates of gender-role identity, that is, an individual's basic sense of femininity and masculinity (Sem, 1974, 1981b; Cook, 1985; Hetherington, 1965; Huston, 1983; Lewis & Weinraub, 1979). Traditionally, femininity and masculinity were viewed dimensionally and thought to be inversely correlated (Sem, 1974; Spence, 1984). In 1974, a Stanford University psychologist, Sandra Bem, developed the concept of androgyny "Andro-"
means "man," and "gyn-" refers to "woman." Bem does not view femininity and masculinity at opposite poles of a continuum. In other words, if you are high in masculine traits, you are not automatically low in feminine traits. The androgynous person is high in both masculine and feminine traits. Androgynous people can be aggressive or yielding, forceful or gentle, sensitive or assertive-as the particular situation requires.

Bem (1974) challenged the assumption and beliefs of other researchers regarding masculinity and femininity. According to her, those who are relatively high in both masculine and feminine qualities will be referred to as androgynous, those who are high in masculine and low in feminine qualities as masculine and those low in masculine and high in feminine qualities as feminine, as those low in both sets of qualities as undifferentiated.

Bem has established a model for the classification of individuals in terms of four Gender-role orientations, namely masculinity, feminity, androgyny and undifferentiated orientations. With the development of an Inventory-Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), for the identification of four Gender-role Orientations, Bem (1974) has triggered a new era in gender-role research.

Bem's celebrity work on the development of androgyny as a gender-role ideal provided research impetus within a two-dimensional model postulating that individuals can manifest both feminine and masculine attributes (Bem, 1974). At that time an instrumental-expressive continuum was adopted to distinguish the concepts of femininity and masculinity since they were no longer construed as polar opposites. These constructs have come to be viewed as the complex interaction between biological, psychological, and situational determinants (Bem, 1981b; Deaux & Major, 1987; Spence, 1984). In order to provide a theoretical framework for gender-role research, Bem's (1981) gender schema theory posits that gender-role identity originates within a developing network of gender-related cognitive associations. As children perceive gender-related information they select and organize this information into a cognitive schema which then regulates
behavior in accordance with cultural definitions of femininity and masculinity (Bern, 1981).

According to Bem, androgyny is intended to represent the best of both the worlds; both highly valued feminine behaviors and highly valued masculine behaviors. In her studies, beyond the traditional beliefs, Bem analyzed the masculine behaviors in term of the presence of masculine qualities among females and vise versa. In her studies, Bem had identified the influence of opposite sex traits associated with males and females and the corresponding changes in behaviors. Androgyny was quickly assumed to be the ideal, since early findings were in support of greater flexibility, adaptability, social competence, and psychological adjustment (Lubinski et al., 1981; Orlofsky & Q'Heron, 1987; Spence et al., 1975). However, as researchers began to question the independent contributions of femininity and masculinity, masculinity consistently accounted for higher positive relationships (Bassoff & Glass, 1982; Markstrom-Adams, 1989; ). The assumption was that masculine behaviors were more socially desirable than feminine behaviors, and this phenomenon has been referred to as the "masculinity effect" (Taylor & Hall, 1982).

Generally, the female gender role has been that of homemaker and child care, and the male gender role has been that of income provider for the family. In society, the traits dominant in the roles prescribed for females primarily relate to and facilitate social concerns and interpersonal warmth, for females the traits are basically related to personal competence and achievement (Broverman et al 1972 Rosenkrantz et al 1968). Men are excepted to be self confident, independent and ambitions, women are supposed to be feminine men are supposed to be masculine in the way each sex roles prescribes (Donelson & Gullaboorn -1977)

Fausto (1993) defined sex characteristics as attributes of men and women that are created by their biological characteristics, and gender characteristics as attributes that the culturally associated with being male and female. Feminine persons look and act in ways that lead observers to classify them as women without directly observing their chromosome pattern, the same assumption is true for masculine persons. This
classification can vary across cultures, and there may be ambiguity in determining a person's gender while there is no ambiguity in determining his or her sex.

Sangamitra (1999) described that the process of sex role orientation describes the ways in which biological gender and associated cultural differentials are incorporated into an individual's self perception and behavior. In other words, it is the process by which the culture transforms male and female into masculine and feminine adults. The terms sex role and gender role can be used as synonyms though sex basically indicates biological differences whereas gender is socially constructed perception of an individuals based on expected behavior and specific roles assigned to him/her by the society.

From the above referred studies, it can be inferred that it will be difficult for an androgynous person (male/female) to perform his/her roles as per the societal expectations. As per the societal expectations, a female or male need to behave according to the socially agreed norms. The behavior of the androgynous person (male/female) may not match the societal norms.

Researchers have not reached a consensus in identifying an ideal Gender-role Orientation. It is desirable to identify Gender-role orientations with reference to the characteristics of different cultures.

2.5.2 Theoretical Back ground of Communication

Communicating is something we do naturally everyday therefore it is often thought of as part of humankind, not a skill. Yet, so many problems in one’s life whether it is with your husband or wife, child, co-worker, friend, or neighbor are often a result of ineffective communication. In this respect, learning the art of communication effectively is a useful and valuable skill to have. Learning communication skills will help you have your message heard and be understood which will result in making everyday interactions with people, either it be face-to-face, telephone, or internet easier. Communication definition mention below:
“Communication is the intercourse by words, letters or messages”

Fred G. Meyer

“Communication is the transmission of meaning from one person to another, either verbally or non-verbally”


Historically, communication researchers have sought to reveal relationships between communicative behavior and biological sex and gender. Good communication is always one of the most difficult skills to master and probably a great source of friction and problems in any organization. Situation, time, cultures and customs, and gender styles affect and complicate communication. Tannen writes that men and women have different, but equally valid styles of communication. She asserts men and women can interpret the same conversation differently, even when there is no apparent misunderstanding. Recognizing these gender differences frees individuals from the burden of individual pathology...If we recognize and understand the differences between us, we can take them into account, adjust to, and learn from each other’s styles. (D. Tannen, 1990). She believes gender communication is based upon key elements which differ for the sexes. According to Tannen, women’s communication is closely related to connectivity and men’s styles reflect status type goals. The key element guiding female communication is intimacy, whereas the key element in male conversation is independence. Intimacy is key in a world of connection where individuals negotiate complex networks of friendships, minimize differences, try to reach consensus, and avoid the appearance of superiority, which would highlight differences. In a world of status, independence is key because a primary means of establishing status is to tell others what to do, and taking orders is a marker or low status. Though all humans need intimacy and independence, women tend to focus on the first and men on the second.

The development of gender-role concepts is a factor having influence on individual behavior. This role concept development may be instrumental in human action (physical and psychological) in all walks of life, including communication and its goal. External influence is largely responsible for the difference between males and females. The
external influence consists in the interaction with other human beings. Communication is the medium through a human being interacts with the surrounding world. At the time of birth, the major difference between a male and a female child is predominantly genetical. In the case of adults, the structure of the difference is not exactly the same as that at the time of birth. That structural difference is due to the social and environmental conditioning during various stages of development. It is evident that there may be relationship between gender and Communication Style. This indicates that gender difference may reflect on Communication Style.

Following a literature review with regard to the influence of sex differences in the area of interpersonal relations, Montgomery and Norton (1981) concluded that a large but fragmented body of findings suggests that men and women differ significantly in the area of interpersonal communication. The difference lies in the area of perception, how the male and female perceive each other to be intellectual and aggressive. However, following the analysis of data from two samples, Montgomery and Norton (1981) stated "Men and women sampled for these studies differed relatively little in their perceptions of their own Communication Style." (Montgomery and Norton 1981).

Gender communication is a unique, fascinating subject of the larger phenomenon known as communication. Some of the researchers believe that gender is an all encompassing designation; communication cannot escape the effects of gender. In this view, all communication is gendered (Spender 1985). Gender communication is instructive because we are all interested in how we are perceived, how we communicative with other human beings, and how others respond to us. Diana (1994) described gender communication as communication about and between men and women. The first part of the statement on the 'about' aspect involves how the sexes are discussed, referred to, or depicted, both verbally and non verbally. The second part of the definition on the 'between' aspect is the interpersonal dimension of gender communication.

Gender communication is pervasive, meaning that interaction with women and men occurs frequently, every day, every hour. Because of the sheer number of contacts we
have with opposite sex, interest in the effects of gender on the communication process becomes heightened. When those contacts affect us in profound ways, such as in work relationships and career opportunities, or in committed, romantic relationships and the pervasiveness of our interactions with significant people further necessitates a greater understanding of gender communication. Diana (1994) narrated that racial, regional, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender and age adds a degree of complexity to communication. One of the most basic forms of diversity is gender, thus gender is a definite point of complication. Samter (1969) has analysed gender related variations in Communication Style and found that factors that vary with sex are responsible for the variation in human Communication Style and Gender-role Orientation is one of the factors that influence Communication Style. From the findings of Diana, it is clear that communication between individuals can have positive influence on behavioral actions especially in career related situations. Thus, it is possible to expect a relationship between socio cultural environment of individuals and communication. The above mentioned finding leads to think that factors like age, rural-urban backgrounds and Gender-role Orientation may affect one's communication ability and style.

Gender construction occurs against a backdrop of cultural practices, shared understandings, and language (Laird, 1998) Culture is the medium through which women and men understand their world and make sense of it (Hoechklin, 1995). Culture as a social construct is situational, flexible, and responsive to the pressing needs of the world that individuals confront (Laird, 1998). Thus, culture may be modified as collectivistic cultural norms intersect with time and societal changes. In collectivism, belonging to groups is an important factor. Group goals take precedence over individual goals. As collectivist norms evolve, however, collectivism is manifested in unique ways in each culture. In other collectivist cultures (e.g., India), members are also expected to fit into the group, but at the same time, they are allowed to try to stand out in the group (Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996).

Gender refers to psychological and emotional characteristics of individuals and sex, the biological and physiological characteristics that differentiates human beings as male or
female. Throne (1983) has narrated that gender includes such aspects as personality traits but also involves psychological make up, attitudes, beliefs and value orientation and gender - role identify. Gender is constructed meaning that one's maleness of femaleness is more extensive than the fact of being born anatomically female or male. What is attached or related to that anatomy is taught through culture; virtually from the time one is born. Thome and Henley (1993) explain, Gender is not a unitary, or natural fact but takes shape in concrete, historically changing social relationships. Culture with its involving customs, rules, and expectations for behavior, has the power to affect the perception of gender. That is the reason behind the difference between individuals who were raised in India and United States.

The development of gender-role concepts is a factor having influence on individual behavior. This role concept development may be instrumental in human action (physical and psychological) in all walks of life, including communication and its goal. External influence is largely responsible for the difference between males and females. The external influence consists in the interaction with other human beings. Communication is the medium through a human being interacts with the surrounding world. At the time of birth, the major difference between a male and a female child is predominantly genetically. In the case of adults, the structure of the difference is not exactly the same as that at the time of birth. That structural difference is due to the social and environmental conditioning during various stages of development. It is evident that there may be relationship between gender and Communication Style. This indicates that gender difference may reflect on Communication Style. Fausto's (1993) research demonstrated that an individuals interaction with the human beings can change his/her behavior and that determines his or her gender. Interaction with other human beings involves communication of ideas, messages or concepts with them.

Human beings spend 70 per cent of their awake time communicating and 30 percent of it is talking. Due to the interrelationship between communication and gender, individual's gender characteristics may influence the end product of communication - the objective to be fulfilled through communication. The above findings lead to think that there may be
relationship between Gender role Orientation and Communication Style As far as this study is concerned, communication between individuals in an organization is indented for the attainment of individual and organizational objectives. It is evident that, development of gender role identify of individuals may influence communication. Executives' need to communicate with subordinates, colleagues, and superiors in order to fulfill organizational objectives indicating that the differences in Communication Style may reflect on executive performance.

2.5.2.1 Communication Styles

Norton (1983) has indicated that an important aspect of communication process is the way individuals communicate with each other. This aspect of communicating is referred to as communicator style. Samovar and Porter (2001) had given more simple definition of Communication Style in which it is defined as the way in which people prefer to interact with one another. Communication Style is defined as the preferred way of individual for both communicating with and interpreting the communication from others (Centre for Educational Development and Assessment, 2002).

However, more specific and detailed definition had been given by Barker and Gaut (1996). To them, Communication Style is the way of an individual giving meaning through his or her verbal expression of words and delivery, it includes the choice of words, language, sentence structure and the characteristic of delivery.

In sum, it can be concluded that Communication Style is the preferable means or ways of an individual to interact with other people including the way he or she choose the words, language, sentence structure and the way the message is delivered which is influenced by the culture of the people. Patton (1977) described Communication Style as the mode of influencing others action or work by passing of information or instructions.

The concept of Communication Style has been defined by Robert Norton (1983) as the way one verbally, nonverbally, and verbally interacts to signal how literal meaning
should be taken, interpreted, filtered, or understood. Oas Gupta (1983) is of the view that, from the management point of view, communication is the means by which an executive gets his/her job done.

In this study Communication Style is operationalised as style exhibited by and executive as identified by Communication Style Inventory developed by Don (1981). According to Chartier (1974), there are five typical Communication Styles using different amounts of telling and asking (transmission of messages, ideas) for information.

### 2.5.2.1 Funnel Communication Style

Executives with this style are not aware of much about others, nor do others know much about them. This style is achieved by giving and asking for information in very small amounts. This style is labeled the funnel because the person directs the communications he receives from above to the proper people below, and in turn passes up information from employees to the proper people. He/she however adds very little of self to the communication. An executive with this style is often found to be operating with safety needs, delaying important decisions and avoiding people in sensitive situations. Withdrawal and avoidance are major dynamic forces associated with this style.

### 2.4.2.2 Autocrat Communication Style

This configuration does not represent executives who are not aware of much about others, nor do the others know much about them. This style is achieved by executives who tell a lot, always let others know what their opinions are, what their feelings are, but ask others very little. They tend to be insensitive to the feedback given to them in return to their communication. Either they may be poor listeners or they may respond to the information in such a way that others are reluctant to tell them anything. Consequently, they do not know how they are coming across, or what their impact on others. The result
of this one way communication is that they persist in behaving ineffectively executives of this type are often aware there is a problem somewhere in the organization, but because they do not solicit information, they are totally unaware that they are, at least in part, a cause of that problem.

2.4.2.3 Interviewer Communication Style

Executions with this style is characterized by asking questions to find out what others think and feel about various situations, but not to give information or feedback about what they are thinking or feeling. Since they do not commit themselves in the eyes of others, it is hard to know where they stand on issues. The low use of telling can be interpreted as a sign of basic mistrust of others.

2.4.2.4 Compromiser Communication Style

This style in often seen in relatively new managers who have not yet settled into a style. Executives with compromiser style usually give and ask information and ready to compromise on issues intended for promoting a harmonious work atmosphere. Executives with this style can easily get the support from colleagues and subordinates

2.4.2.5 Open Communicator Communication Style

It is generally considered the most effective executive Communication Style. Much of the executive's behavior straightforward to others with whom he Interacts. As a result, there are fewer tendencies for others to misinterpret or project different meaning to the executive's behavior.
2.5.3 Theoretical Background of Leadership Styles

Demand for great leaders is growing in modern times, as society and technology is becoming increasingly advanced. Organizational learning is among the most significant issues for corporations, both profit and not-for-profit, and for governmental institutions. "Throughout the world managers and other leaders are wrestling with the question of how to integrate experiences and goals among large groups of people working together in order to ensure that things happen in a learning mode" (Kline & Saunders, 1998). Leaders like Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Samrat Ashok built great empires. Leaders like Gandhi, inspire intense fervor and dedication from the mass. Statesman like Winston Churchill, Indira Gandhi shaped the future course of nation’s they belonged to. Much of the history describes the story of military, political, religious and social leaders. The changes in the new economic world stimulated by aggressive, capable competitors are redefining the empire in terms of market economies. The flatter, fleeter, and empowered organizations of today are breeding a generation of managers who embody the new paradigms of leaderships as team builders, facilitators and coaches.

Leader is making what you believe in happen. Efforts of courageous men and women making what they believed in happen under extremely challenging conditions is the essence of leadership. The discussion in this chapter initially describes the nature and definition of leadership. Leadership is then discussed in terms of traditional and new theories, culminating in a discussion of the move from the traditional to the new leadership approaches.

Definition of Leadership

Leadership has been around for as long as there have been people to lead. The history of the world abounds with great leaders, from Moses and David in the Old Testament to Napoleon in the 1700s and Nelson Mandela and Martin Luther King in the 1900s (Bass, 1997). Leadership is one of the least understood but most observed phenomena (Burns, 1978); yet, it is often regarded as the most critical factor in the success or failure of an
institution (Bass, 1990). Burns, in his landmark book, Leadership (1978) observed that leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth. Commenting on the subject of leadership, Northouse (2001) concluded that despite the abundance of writing on the topic, leadership has presented a major challenge to practitioners and researchers interested in understanding the nature of leadership. It is a highly valued phenomenon that is very complex. Yukl (2006) posited “Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives.” Senge (1996) asserted “Leaders are those people who „walk ahead,“ people who are genuinely committed to deep change in themselves and in their organizations. They lead through developing new skills, capabilities, and understandings. And they come from many places within an organization.” Our understanding of leadership has changed over the years, but the basic constructs have remained the same. Hellriegel, et al. (2004) define leadership as being “the ability to influence others to act toward the attainment of a goal”, while Mullins (1999) adds that it is “a relationship through which one person influences the behaviour of others”.

The definitions of leadership associate to the number of theories that exist, but it is clear from the definitions above that leadership can be viewed in terms of multiple perspectives, and that it can be represented as existing as an act, behaviour or process. It is also clear that each of these perspectives alone does not give a full explanation of what leadership is. Leadership is complex and encompasses all these aspects at varying degrees depending on the situation.

• **MANAGER AS LEADER**

The successful organization has one major attribute that is dynamic and effective leadership. Peter F. Drucker pointed out that managers (business leaders) are the basic and scarcest resource of any business enterprise. Effective management requires leadership. Therefore, it is not enough for the manager to utilize managerial and technical skills in performing his function. He must also apply leadership skills, since his
effectiveness depends directly on the human actions and reactions of his subordinates as pointed by Basil. In the midst of political, economic, social and technological revolutions, the domestic and international events are setting up new trends. These changes are inspired by leaders and need leaders to strategically reap best benefits out of these changes. As Michael Porter of Harvard University quoted in his book on Strategic Management that real leaders believe in change. They possess an insight into how to alter competition, and do not accept constraints in carrying it out. Leaders energize their organizations to meet competitive challenges, to serve demanding needs, and above all, to keep progressing. Leaders also think in international terms, not only in measuring their true competitive advantage, but in setting strategy to enhance and extent it.

The only new leadership groups to emerge after World War II period are managers. They command the resources of their organization through their competence. The shift from quantity to quality has increased the importance of leadership attribute among the managers. The manager is always in a leadership situation. Since, he must coordinate the work of men toward the attainment of an objective. But a great gap often exists between position of leadership and exercise of that leadership. Underlying the relationship between leader and follower or manager and subordinate are human interrelationships. The action of leader is both related to the group and to the individual. The manager has to deal with his environment, which is formed on one side by the organizational constraints which the managerial hierarchy place on him and on the other side by the group values and customs. The organization may grant authority to the manager, but only through the possession of power can he translate this authority into action. The skilful leader uses this authority and power to motivate his group towards attainment of organizational objectives.

2.5.3.1 Leadership Theories

Leadership has been accompanied throughout time by numerous theories that have been categorised into several historically distinct approaches that focus either on traits, behaviours, situational contingencies and transformational leadership. Theories of
leadership attempt to explain factors involved either in the development of leadership, or in the nature of leadership and its consequences (Bass, 1990a). These theories attempt to simulate reality and thereby show an interrelationship of the various factors that are perceived to be involved in the leadership process which takes place between leaders and followers.

In order to overcome the complexity inherent in leadership theories, Schilbach (1983) undertook an extensive leadership study and discussed a framework of basic approaches to leadership (in Gerber, et al., 1996). Robbins (1996) indicated that there are three broad approaches to leadership as well as a move to new approaches as shown in Table 2.1. This diagram in Table 2.1 is used as a basis for understanding the evolution of the concept of leadership and to demonstrate the move to new approaches in leadership theory. This section will review each approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>leadership theories</th>
<th>TRAIT APPROACH</th>
<th>BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH</th>
<th>CONTINGENCY APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stogdill (1948)</td>
<td>McGregor’s theory</td>
<td>Leadership Continuum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mann (1959)</td>
<td>Theory of Lewin, Liippit and White</td>
<td>Fiedler’s Contingency Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stogdill (1974)</td>
<td>Ohio State and University of Michigan Models</td>
<td>Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lord, DeVader &amp; Allinger (1986)</td>
<td>Managerial Grid</td>
<td>House’s Path-Goal Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kirkpatrick &amp; Locke (1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader-Member-Exchange Theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW APPROACHES</th>
<th>FULL RANGE LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: The Basic Leadership Approaches

2.5.3.1.1 Trait approach

In a comprehensive review of leadership theories (Stogdill, 1974), several different categories were identified that capture the essence of the study of leadership in the twentieth century. The first trend correlates leadership with the attributes of great leaders. Leadership was attributed to the supposedly innate qualities with which a person is born (Bernard, 1926). It was believed that if the traits that differentiated leaders from followers could be identified, successful leaders could be quickly assessed and put into positions of leadership. Researchers examined personality, physical and mental characteristics. The studies were based on the idea that leaders were born, not made, and the key to success was simply in identifying those people who were born to be great leaders. Though much research was done to identify the traits, researchers were unable to find traits that were consistently associated with great leadership.

These traits differentiate leaders from followers. Researchers, such as Bernard (1926) and Stogdill (1974), have investigated the role of traits in leadership behaviour. The main contribution of this approach was to provide evidence that certain characteristics intrinsic in individuals could result in effective leadership. This was essentially the first systematic attempt at a conceptual understanding of leadership. The trait approach tried to explain what made certain people great business, social, political and military leaders. The theory suggested that certain people were born with social traits that made them great leaders. Because the theory holds that leaders and non-leaders are differentiated by a universal set of traits, researchers were challenged to identify the definitive traits of leaders (Bass, 1990a). Table 2.2 shows a summary of the traits and characteristics that were identified by researchers from the trait approach according to Northouse (2001). This shows how difficult it is to select certain traits as definitive leadership traits.

This approach was heavily criticised, because it was not possible to define general leadership traits which fitted the situation. Stogdill (1948) suggested that no consistent set of traits differentiated leaders from non-leaders across a variety of situations. Tosi, Rizzo
and Carroll (1986) also suggested that the trait theory fails to clarify the relative importance of traits.

Further, the approach is too narrow in that it focuses exclusively on the leader and overlooks the need of the follower (Robbins, 1996). Stogdill (1974) also came to the conclusion that personality, behaviour and situation had to be included to explain the emergence of leadership. A further implication of the trait approach is that it assumes that leadership is basically inborn, meaning that selection would be the key to effective leadership in an organisation, rather than other factors such as training (Robbins, 1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TABLE 2.2</strong></th>
<th>Studies of leadership traits and characteristics (Northouse, 2001:18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alertness</td>
<td>Masculinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prersistence</td>
<td>Extroversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-confidence</td>
<td>Conservatism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several major studies questioned the basic premise of a unique set of traits that defines leadership, and shifted attention to organisational impact and the followers of a leader. Researchers began to study actions that occur between leaders and the context of work, instead of focusing on a leader’s traits (Riggio, Ciulla & Sorenson, 2003).
2.5.3.1.2 Behavioural approach

The next major shift in research into leadership dealt with examining the types of behaviours leaders exhibited in an effort to assess what makes effective leaders effective. This focus on people’s actions was quite different from the trait approach, which centered on a person’s physical and personality characteristics. This approach looked at leadership behaviours in an attempt to determine what successful leaders do, not how they look to others (Halpin & Winer, 1957). Researchers studying the behaviour approach, also referred to as the style approach, determined that leadership is composed essentially of two kinds of behaviours: task behaviours and relationship behaviours (Northouse, 2001). The behaviour approach attempted to explain how these two types of behaviours interface in a manner that allowed a leader to influence a group to reach a goal.

The approach emphasises behaviour of the leader (Fleishman & Hunt, 1973). Ivancevich and Matteson (1993) describe behavioural models of leadership, as those that focus on differences in the actions of effective and ineffective leaders. Hellriegel, Jackson, Slocum, Staude, Amos, Klopper, Louw and Oosthuizen (2004) stated that these models are based on what effective and ineffective leaders actually do, how they delegate tasks to subordinates, where and when they communicate to others and how they perform their roles. Bass (1990a) shows how the leader’s behaviour is a cue to evoke the subordinates’ task behaviour. The leader’s behaviour will determine how well tasks are accomplished by followers.

The main behavioural models are McGregor’s Theory X and Theory Y (1960), the Ohio State and University of Michigan Models (in Hellriegel et al., 2004) and the Managerial Grid Model of Blake and Mouton (1964). These will be explained below: McGregor’s (1960) Theory X and Theory Y model proposed two distinct theories of leadership behaviours: one negative labelled theory X and the other positive labelled theory Y. His theories contend that leadership behaviours are based on an assumption about employees. His Theory X assumption includes the belief that employees dislike work and will avoid it if possible. According to McGregor (1960), here managerial behaviours include
coercing employees, controlling their tasks and activities, and directing their behaviours. McGregor’s (1960) Theory Y assumption includes the belief that employees can view work as a positive experience given the right conditions. Here, managerial behaviours include providing encouragement, positive reinforcement and rewards.

The Ohio State and University of Michigan leadership studies identified two primary, independent factors which are consideration of structure (employee-oriented leadership) and initiation of structure (production-oriented leadership). The researchers focused on the behaviours that leaders enacted and how they treated followers. The impact of this approach dealt with the broadening of management’s focus to include people-oriented as well as task-oriented activities. Blake, Shepard and Mouton (1964) developed the managerial grid model and they identified a two-factor model of leadership behaviour similar to that found at Ohio State and University of Michigan Models. Blake, Shepard and Mouton (1964) called these factors “concern for people” and “concern for output”. They later added flexibility as a third variable. According to Blake, Shepard and Mouton (1964), leaders can only exhibit behaviours that fall into two primary categories (task-oriented or people-oriented). Depending on which category is most frequently shown, a leader could be placed along each of the two categories.

The behavioural approach looks at what effective and ineffective leaders actually do; how they delegate tasks to subordinates, where and when they communicate to others and how they perform their roles. Behavioural models made a great contribution to the understandings of leadership, as the focus shifted from who leaders are (traits) to what leaders do (behaviours). This approach demonstrated that unlike traits, behaviours can be seen and learned and also relate directly to the function being performed. This has important implications for management training in that effective behaviour, unlike traits, can be learnt. If training works, we could have an infinite supply of leaders (Robbins, 1996).

However, leadership behaviours that are appropriate in one situation aren’t necessarily appropriate in another. Because the behavioural models failed to uncover a leadership
style that were consistently appropriate to all situations, other leadership models were devised (Hellriegel, et al., 2004). Behaviour must, to some extent, be dictated to by the specific circumstances in which the leader operates (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1993). The next step in the evolution of knowledge about leadership was the creation of contingency models.

2.5.3.1.3 Contingency Approach

Contingency theory is a leader match theory that explains the match of leaders to appropriate situations. The contingency approach suggests that no single leadership style, specific leadership functions or particular leadership qualities are recommended as the best under all circumstances (Gerber, et al., 1996). The contingency approach represents a shift in leadership research from focusing on the leader to looking at the leader in conjunction with the situation in which the leader works (Fiedler, 1978). It suggests that a leader's effectiveness depends on how well the leader's style fits with the context. To understand the performance of leaders, it is essential to understand situations in which they lead. Effective leadership occurs when the leader accurately diagnoses the development level of the subordinates in a task situation and then uses a leadership style that matches the situation (Blanchard, Zigarmi & Nelson, 1993). Leadership effectiveness depends on the fit between a leader's behaviour and the characteristics of subordinates and the subordinates’ task (House, 1977).

The main contingency models are the Leadership Continuum of Tannenbaum and Schidt, Fiedlers Contingency Model, Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Leadership Model and House’s Path-Goal Model and the Leader-Member Exchange theory (Bass, 1990a). These will be discussed below: Fiedler’s (1967) contingency theory posited that effective group performance was dependent upon the appropriate match of the leader’s personality and the situation. Personality orientation of the leader is centered on a task or interpersonal style. Hellriegel and colleagues (2004) indicated that leadership depends on matching a leader’s style to a situation’s demand. Situational factors that influence leader effectiveness included leader-member relations, degree of task structure, and power
position of the leader. Leader-member relations referred to the quality of the relationship between the leader and member (Fiedler, 1967). The leader’s influence over the members was enhanced through a strong relationship. Hersey and Blanchard’s (1977) situational leadership theory proposed that leaders should vary their behaviours according to the member’s maturity and they classified leader behaviours along two dimensions: directive behaviour (similar to initiating structure and production-centred) and supportive behaviour (similar to consideration structure and employee-centred). Hersey and Blanchard (1977) also claimed that the levels of directive and supportive leader behaviour should be based on the level of readiness of the followers.

Directive behaviour, described one-way directional communication from the leader to the member. Supportive behaviour, described bidirectional communication from the leader when providing social-emotional support for the member. Member maturity or readiness referred to the ability and willingness of members to take responsibility for directing their own behaviour in relation to a specific task.

These behaviours are labeled as delegating, participating, selling, and telling. As an employee becomes mature (i.e. grows in capacity, ability, education, experience, motivation, self-esteem, confidence), the need for socio-emotional support increases, while the need for structure declines. Beyond a certain level of maturity, the need for both types of orientation decreases. Thus, as the employee matures, directing and supporting are replaced with negotiating and participating, and all are eventually terminated or applied only on an as needed basis.

The path-goal theory of leadership (House, 1971) postulated that the eventual performance and satisfaction of group members was highly influenced by the appropriateness of leader behaviours in relation to member’s needs and desires as well as the characteristics of the task. Therefore, the function of the leader was to provide coaching, guidance and personal support to members if necessary. The path-goal theory proposed that group members preferred a highly structured regime when presented with ambiguous, varied and interdependent tasks.
Initiating structure and close supervision from the leader helped clarify the path-goal relationship and increased the coordination, satisfaction and performance of the group members. Should the members not be able to make valid judgments about situational requirements because of their characteristics, the leader must take action and decide for the members.

The leader-member exchange theory addresses leadership as a process centered in the interaction between leaders and followers. Leader-Member Exchange theory (LMX) was developed by Danserau, Cashman and Hager (1975) as a response to Average Leadership Style (ALS), which assumed that leaders maintain similar relationships with all of their employees. They highlighted the ways leaders differentiate between their subordinates by creating in-groups and out-groups. Subordinates become ingroup members based on how well they get along with the leader and whether they are willing to expand their roles and responsibilities (Danserau, Cashman & Hager, 1975). In-group members receive extra opportunities and rewards, while out-group members receive only standard benefits. Thus, in-group members have high quality exchanges characterised by “mutual trust, respect, and obligation” (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995), whereas out-group members have low quality exchanges that have less trust, respect, and obligation.

The weakness of the contingency approach is that it failed to provide some universal principles of leadership (Bass, 1990a). The theory has not adequately explained the link between styles and situation (Rice, 1978). Principles such as integrity are not governed by any particular situation (Robbins, 1996). The basic approaches also do not pay enough attention to the needs of the follower and this is contrary to literature on motivational theories (Tosi et al, 1986). The contingency approach also assumes that leaders are merely shaped by their situation, when it might be possible that truly effective leaders can shape situations around them (Kotter, 1990). Yukl (2002) also stated that although situational leadership theories provide insights into reasons for effective leadership, conceptual weaknesses limit the approach’s usefulness. Thus, it is difficult to derive
specific testable propositions from the approach, with the approach not permitting strong
inferences about the direction of causality.

Each of these approaches (behavioural and contingency) has its advocates and each
attempts to identify the leader behaviours most appropriate for a variety of different
situations (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1993). The main contribution of the contingency was,
therefore, to demonstrate the importance of situational factors in leadership, resulting in
more systematic leadership research.

2.5.3.1.4 New Approaches

As can be seen from the previous sections, the trait, behavioural and contingency
approaches do not agree on how leaders can best influence followers. Furthermore, these
basic approaches lack rigour, generality and the opportunity to employ standard
measurements (Bass, 1990a). These approaches had not been rigidly tested in practice
and they were too specific either in defining leadership in terms of traits, behaviours or
situations. A need existed for leadership principles that included the needs of followers.
These principles could then be adapted to specific situations, thus not ignoring the
contingency approach. Until recently, most of the discussion on leadership has addressed
transactional leadership.

These leaders motivate subordinates to achieve expected levels of performance by
helping them to recognise task responsibilities, identify goals, develop confidence about
meeting desired performance levels and understand how their needs and the rewards they
desire are linked to goal achievement (Bass, 1990b). The leadership induces acceptable
behaviour and disciplines unacceptable behaviour. Bass (1990a) noted that the leadership
research over the years has proved that loyalty is more powerful than tangible
inducements. This was supported by Ulrich (2002) when he stated that employees’
commitment is a valuable and intangible asset which can produce tangible results.
Transformational leaders understand and adapt to higher order needs (self-actualisation
and esteem needs) and motives of the followers.
Globally, the environment has become more competitive and dynamic, so various leaders throughout the world have realised the need to make changes in their way of operating if their organisations are to survive (Kotter, 1990). Thus, many new leadership styles have taken place in recent years. Renowned leadership theorists such as Avolio, Waldman and Yammarino (1991), Bass (1990a), Bennis and Nanus (1985) and Burns (1978) to name but a few, have completed extensive leadership research. As a result a new theory, termed transformational leadership, has been identified as the most appropriate style of leadership in contemporary organisations.

The transformational leadership approach attempts to address the inherent limitations in previous leadership theories by providing a holistic view of leadership. Transformational leadership overcomes the inherent lack of generality in previous leadership theories. This is an encompassing approach that can be used to describe a wide range of leadership processes, from specific intentions to influence followers, on a one-to-one level, to a broad attempt to influence organisations and even entire cultures. Followers and leaders are inextricably bound together in the transformation process (Bass & Avolio, 1990b). It builds on the previous leadership approaches as contemporary organisations seek a universal approach in their leadership, as they compete more and more in a global market, which is not constrained by culture or political boundaries.

Figure 2.1 demonstrates that transformational leadership theory integrates the trait, behavioural and situational approaches. This transformational leadership theory recognises that there are certain traits inherent in leaders and followers and these can be observed, learnt and developed. Based on unique personality characteristics, the leader acts or behaves in certain ways to influence the followers to achieve objectives. The followers respond to the leader’s trait-based behaviour in either a positive or negative way. The leader-follower interaction is influenced by various situations. Central to transformational leadership is the fact that the behaviour exhibited by the leader focuses not only on tangible inducements, but more on developing the follower to transcend their own self interest for the good of the group (Bass, 1990a).
Figure 2.1 shows that integrating trait, behavioural and situational approaches results in a set of universal leadership principles. These are principles that are not constrained by culture or political boundaries. Transformational leaders are recognized as change agents who are good role models. They create and articulate a clear vision for the organisation; empower followers to achieve higher standards; act in ways that make others want to trust them; and give meaning to organisational life (Bass & Avolio, 1990b).

It should also be specifically noted that traits, behaviours and, particularly, needs of the follower, influence the leadership process more than a transaction between the leader and the follower. The transformational leadership approach is sometimes referred to as the full-range leadership approach as it is seen to develop leaders and followers to heightened levels of potential. This point will be further elaborated on in section 2.5. The theorists mentioned earlier in this section (sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.3), contend that these principles, if applied, should result in effective behaviour and effective organisations. In order to address the inherent limitations in previous leadership theories a holistic approach of leadership is needed (Amos & Ristow, 1999).
2.5.3.1.5 Full Range Leadership Approach

The Full Range Leadership (FRL) approach as developed by Bass and Avolio (1994; 1997) encompasses a range of leader behaviours. This model, as depicted in Figure 2.2, describes leaders as utilising a wide range of the different forms of leader behaviours. The range of behaviours starts with transformational leader behaviours to transactional leader behaviours reaching to the lowest leader interaction of laissez-faire leader behaviour (Bass & Avolio, 1994). These leadership styles have been described to have a direct effect on individual and organisational level outcomes (Bass, 1990a; Yukl & van Fleet, 1992).
Bass (1985a) based his descriptions of transformational and transactional leaders on Burns’s (1978) ideas. Burns (1978) proposed that one could differentiate ordinary from extraordinary leadership. He described transactional leaders as those leaders who influence Figure 2.2 A Model of the Full Range Leadership Development Theory (Bass and Avolio, 1994: 5) compliance by expected rewards. Transactional leadership is an exchange relationship that involves the reward of effort, productivity and loyalty. Transformational leaders emphasise higher motive development and arouse followers’ motivation and positive emotions by means of creating and representing an inspiring vision of the future (Bass, 1997).

Transformational leaders are those who motivate their followers to perform beyond expectation by raising the follower’s confidence levels and providing support for developing to higher levels. Followers feel a greater degree of respect and trust for the
leader. The “backbone” of this theory is that followers are more motivated to enhance their performance by transformational leadership rather than transactional leadership (Bass & Avolio, 1990b). The work of Bass and colleagues (Bass & Avolio, 1990a) expanded Burns’s factors of leadership to include a third leadership style called laissez-faire leadership style. Bass (1990a) described the laissez-faire leader as an extremely passive leader who is reluctant to influence subordinates considerable freedom, to the point of abdicating his/her responsibilities. In a sense, this extremely passive type of leadership indicates the absence of leadership.

2.5.3.1.6 Transformational Leadership Style

According to Burns (1978) transformational leaders are to ensure that followers are consciously aware of the importance of sharing organisational goals and values. They also find ways to ensure that followers know how to achieve these goals. Burns (1978) further states that transformational leaders motivate their followers to go beyond their own self interests and give effort on behalf of the organisation by appealing to the higher order needs of followers. Yukl (1989) defined transformational leadership as the process of influencing major changes in attitudes and assumptions of organisational members and building commitment for the organisational mission and objectives. Transformational leaders are said to appeal to higher ideals and moral values of followers, lighten their expectations and spur them to greater effort and performance on behalf of the organisation (Bass, 1990a; 1995; Bass & Avolio, 1990b). Bass and Avolio (1990b) suggest that transformational leaders inspire followers with a vision of what can be accomplished through extra personal effort, thus motivating followers to achieve more than they thought they would achieve.

The relationship between a transformational leader and followers is characterized by pride and respect (Bass & Avolio, 1990a). The employees often develop a high level of trust and confidence in such a leader. The employees are proud to identify themselves with the leader and develop a strong sense of loyalty to them. Transformational leaders encourage problem solving in followers rather than constantly providing solutions and
directions and a greater pool of knowledge (Buhler, 1995). Bass and Avolio (1994) suggest that a consequence of this behaviour is that followers develop the capacity to solve future problems which might be unforeseen by the leader. Dubinsky, Francis Yammarino, Jolson and William (1995) also suggest that leaders who are intellectually stimulating often possess a high level of risk-taking because of their capability to trust the abilities of their followers. Individuals who work for transformational leaders may willingly expand their job descriptions as they develop a greater conception of the organisation as a whole (Avolio, et al., 1991).

Bass and colleagues (Avolio, Bass & Jung, 1995; 1999; Bass, 1985a; 1997) have identified five factors which represent behavioural components of transformational leadership: 1) idealised influence (attributes); 2) idealised influence (behaviour); 3) inspirational motivation; 4) intellectual stimulation and 5) individualised consideration. Idealised influence attributes occur when followers identify with and emulate those leaders who are trusted and seen as having an attainable mission and vision. Idealised influence behaviour refers to leader behaviour which results in followers identifying with leaders and wanting to emulate them. Leaders demonstrating idealised influence or charisma instil pride in their subordinates and command respect (Bass, 1990a; Bass & Avolio, 1990a). Employees have a high level of trust and confidence in such leaders, tend to adopt their vision, seek to identify with them and develop a strong sense of loyalty to them. A charismatic leader does not derive authority from rules, position or tradition, but from the followers’ faith and trust. Idealised influence is coupled with an emotional attachment of the followers to identify with the leader.

Inspirational motivation implies that leaders behave in ways that motivate and inspire those around them by providing meaning and challenge to their followers’ tasks. Avolio, Waldman and Yarmmarino (1991) postulate that antecedents, such as past personal accomplishments, the development of communication skills and the role modeling of other leaders, create the potential to inspire others. This potential is realised in part by the interplay with individualised consideration and intellectual stimulation when the person is in a leadership role. Such behaviour strengthens the leader's inspirational appeal, because
it makes followers feel valued, self-confident and assured that their leader can overcome obstacles and help the group to meet new challenges and opportunities. A leader's level of inspirational motivation is further strengthened, if a vision, of where the group is heading, is shared by co-workers.

As other means of generating excitement and confidence, inspirational leaders often set an example of hard work, remain optimistic in times of crises and search to reduce an employee’s duties and workloads by using creative work methods. Intellectual stimulation occurs when leaders encourage their followers to be innovative and creative by questioning assumptions, reframing problems and approaching old situations in new ways. Intellectual stimulation also occurs when the leader prompts the followers to provide alternative solutions to the problems and challenges. Avolio and his colleagues (1991) argue that the most important benefit of transformational leadership is that followers do not resist self-development and frequently demonstrate an enhanced commitment to their job, co-workers and the organisation.

Individual consideration occurs when leaders relate to followers on a one-to-one basis in order to elevate goals and develop skills. Leaders who display individual consideration treat each employee as an individual and are attentive to the unique needs, capabilities and concerns of each individual (Bass, 1985a). Such leaders listen to and share an individual's concerns while simultaneously helping to build the individual's confidence. They also consider the individual’s developmental and growth needs. These leaders remove 'roadblocks' in the system, which inhibit both the development of the followers and their achieving optimum performance. They are able to diagnose and evaluate the needs of each follower and then elevate them as required for developing each follower to his optimum potential.

Leaders who demonstrate individual consideration often coach, mentor and counsel their subordinates. Leaders manifesting inspirational motivation articulate high expectation to subordinates (Bass, 1985a). They communicate important issues very simply and use various symbols to focus their efforts. They also demonstrate self-determination and
commitment to attaining objectives and present an optimistic and achievable view of the future.

A transformational leader provides intellectual stimulation to employees by encouraging them to try out new approaches in solving problems (Bass, 1985a). They challenge the status quo and encourage employees to explore new ways of achieving organisational goals and objectives. Subordinates under such leadership are not hesitant to offer their ideas, become critical in their problem solving and tend to have enhanced thought processes. An intellectually stimulating leader helps people to think about 'old' problems in new ways and to use reasoning and evidence to solve problems (Bass, 1985a; 1985b). Intellectual stimulation is also helpful when the leader is attempting to maintain excitement and a high level of motivation among an educated workforce that prefers to have their opinions at least considered by the leader.

Figure 2.3 demonstrates how the transformational leader motivates followers to work for transcendental goals instead of short-term interest. The leader is able to expand the follower’s portfolio of needs. As a result, the follower is not only concerned with the basic needs (such as physiological, safety (security) and social needs) according to Maslow’s Hierarchy, but is also concerned with higher order needs such as esteem and selfactualisation.

The leader builds confidence in the followers through employing the five components of the transformational leadership style, which along with the increased portfolio of needs, changes the culture of the organisation. As opposed to the purely transactional approach, followers now have a heightened view of the probability of success and value the designated outcomes to a greater extent. The followers’ heightened motivation to achieve the designated outcomes leads to performance which is often beyond expectations, as followers exhibit what Bass (1985a; 1990b) calls extra effort.
2.5.3.1.7 Transactional Leadership Style

Bass (1985b; 1990a; 1990b; 1999) referred to transactional leadership as an exchange relationship between leader and follower. Transactional leadership theory is grounded in the social learning and social exchange theories, which recognise the reciprocal nature of leadership (Deluga, 1990). It is based on the realisation that leadership does not
necessarily reside in the person or situation, but resides in the social interaction between the leader and the follower (Van Seters & Fields, 1989).

Bass (1985a) and Bass and Avolio (1997) described transactional leadership in terms of two characteristics: the use of contingent rewards and management by exception. They described contingent reward as the reward that the leader will bestow on the subordinate once the latter has achieved goals that were agreed to. Contingent reward is therefore the exchange of rewards for meeting agreed-on objectives. By making and fulfilling promises of recognition, pay increases and advancement for employees who perform well, the transactional leader is able to get things done. Bass (1985a) therefore argues that by providing contingent rewards, a transactional leader might inspire a reasonable degree of involvement, loyalty, commitment and performance from subordinates.

Transactional leaders may also rely on active management by exception which occurs when the leader monitors followers to ensure mistakes are not made, but otherwise, allows the status quo to exist without being addressed (Bass & Avolio, 1995). In passive management by exception, the leader intervenes only when things go wrong. In general, one can conclude that transactional leadership is an exchange relationship that involves the reward of effort, productivity and loyalty.

As can be seen in Figure 2.4, the leader helps the follower to identify what needs to be done to accomplish the desired results. The leader, however, only takes the follower’s basic needs into account. Therefore, as Bass (1985a) contends, transactional leadership uses satisfaction of lower order needs as the primary basis for motivation. The focus in transactional leadership is on role clarification. The leader helps the follower in understanding exactly what needs to be done in order to meet the organisation’s objectives and goals. A successful result of transactional leadership would be an expected outcome.
2.5.3.1.8 Laissez-Faire leadership style

Both the transformational and transactional leaders are described as leaders who actively intervene and try to prevent problems, although they use different approaches. When researching these two active forms of leadership, one finds that they are often contrasted with the third style of leadership, called laissez-faire leadership (Bass, 1990a). Deluga (1990) describes the laissez-faire leader as an extreme passive leader who is reluctant to
influence subordinates’ considerable freedom, to the point of abdicating his/her responsibilities. In a sense, this extremely passive type of leadership indicates the absence of leadership.

Laissez-faire style of leadership is also referred to as management-by-exception (Bass & Avolio, 1990a). Management-by-exception characterises how leaders monitor negative subordinates’ behaviour and exert corrective action only when subordinates fail to meet objectives. Leaders who manage by exception intervene only when procedures and standards for accomplishing tasks are not met. It can therefore be concluded that by ‘laissez-faire’, it is meant that the leader is not sufficiently motivated or adequately skilled to perform supervisory duties.

2.4.3.1.9 Integrating Transformational And Transactional Leadership Styles

In his reformulation of transformational leadership, Bass extended Burn’s concept and sees it as a separate dimension to that of transactional leadership (Bass, 1985a; 1998; 1999; Bass & Avolio, 1993). Hater and Bass (1988) point out that contrasting transactional and transformational leadership does not imply that the models are unrelated. Bass (1985a) viewed the transformational/transactional leadership paradigm as being comprised of complementary rather than polar constructs, with transformational leadership building on transactional leadership, but not vice versa. As mentioned previously Bass (1985a) integrated the transformational and transactional styles by recognising that both styles may be linked to the achievement of desired goals and objectives. This view proposes that the two styles are complementary in the sense that the transformational leadership style is ineffective in the total absence of a transactional relationship between leader and subordinate (Bass, Avolio & Goodheim, 1987).

Transformational leadership also has been linked to various criteria of effectiveness. In one study, Guzzo, Yost, Campbell and Shea (1993) suggested transactional and transformational leadership styles can positively affect group potency and effectiveness.
Transformational leadership, when compared to transactional and laissez-faire leaders has also been shown to have higher performing work groups as well as subordinates who reported greater satisfaction and members who exerted extra effort to complete the task (Bass, 1985a). In addition, transformational leadership is significantly related to other relevant outcome variables such as follower perceptions of role clarity, mission clarity, and openness of communication (Hinkin & Tracey, 1994).

Any particular leader might embody both forms of leadership, as these comprise independent behaviours. A leader may employ both styles at different times or in differing amounts at the same time. Considerable recent research provides evidence - garnered by both its main proponents and more independent researchers – that shows transformational leadership as eliciting extra effort and performance from followers, over and above that expected in an exchange relationship with a purely transactional leader (Bass, 1985a; Bass & Avolio, 1990a; House & Shamir, 1993).

**Limitation Of Transformational Leadership**

A major drawback of transformational leadership is that it has a potential to be abused as it involves changing people’s values and moving them to a new vision. Both styles of leadership, transformational and transactional, have strong philosophical and ethical components. Bass (1985a) acknowledged that transformational leaders can wear “white hats or black hats”. In addition, others have argued that both transformational and charismatic leaders can be self-centered and manipulative in the means they use to achieve their goals (Bass & Steidlmeier, 2003).

It has been suggested that transformational leadership lends itself to amoral puffery, since it encourages followers to go beyond their own self-interests for the good of the organisation. The irrational engagement of the followers through emotions in pursuit of self-interest is contrary to the followers’ best interests (Stevens, D’Intino & Victor, 1995). Bass and Steidlmeier (2003) distinguished between pseudo-transformational leaders, who are selfinterested and lack moral virtue, and “authentic” transformational
leaders, who are more clearly “moral” leaders. A second criticism is that transformational leadership is elitist and antidemocratic (Bass & Avolio, 1993). Related to this criticism is that transformational leadership suffers from a “heroic leadership” bias (Yukl, 1999). Transformational leadership stresses that it is the leader who moves followers to do exceptional things. By focusing primarily on the leader, researchers have failed to give attention to shared leadership or reciprocal influence. Followers can also influence leaders just as leaders can influence followers. More attention needs to be directed at how leaders can encourage followers to challenge the leader’s vision and share in the leadership process.

CONCLUSIONS

A broad overview of leadership has now been presented in this chapter. Various authors agree that leadership is a critical factor in the success or failure of an organisation; excellent organisations begin with excellent leadership and successful organisations reflect their leadership (Bass, 1994; 1997).

Leadership was defined and a comparison between management and leadership was presented. The three leadership theories that have been developed over time are trait theories, behavioural approaches and situational/contingency approaches. Each of these approaches describes different dimensions of leadership and their effects on the relationship between leaders and their followers. Furthermore, transactional and transformational leadership were discussed. The Full Range Leadership Development Model, developed by Bass and Avolio (1994), provides the development of transformational leadership from transactional leadership. This was supported by Pruijn and Boucher (1994) when they stated that transformational leadership is an extension of transactional leadership. According to them a leader may display various degrees of transactional or transformational leadership style depending on the situation. This model provides a theoretical framework for the purpose of this research.
The literature has shown that transactional and transformational can get results from subordinates that are beyond expectations (Bass, 1997). Leaders can contribute to an employee’s desire to remain committed to the organisation by inducing employee’s trust and confidence in them. Bass (1990a) noted that the leadership research over the years has proved that loyalty is more powerful than tangible inducements. Price (1997) further suggests that employees are far more likely to be committed to the organisation, if they have confidence in their leader. The literature has recognised the influence of leadership style on employee commitment. It is therefore appropriate at this stage that the next chapter will discuss the second variable within the research, organisational commitment.

2.5.3.2 Leadership Styles

2.5.3.2.1 Task-Oriented Leadership

Task-oriented leaders focus only on getting the job done and can be autocratic. They actively define the work and the roles required, put structures in place, and plan, organize, and monitor work. These leaders also perform other key tasks, such as creating and maintaining standards for performance.

The benefit of task-oriented leadership is that it ensures that deadlines are met, and it's especially useful for team members who don't manage their time well.

However, because task-oriented leaders don't tend to think much about their team's well-being, this approach can suffer many of the flaws of autocratic leadership, including causing motivation and retention problems.

2.5.3.2.2 Bureaucratic Leadership

Bureaucratic leaders work “by the book”, ensuring that their staff follow procedures exactly. They follow rules rigorously, and ensure that their people follow procedures precisely. This is an appropriate leadership style for work involving serious safety risks (such as working with machinery, with toxic substances, or at dangerous heights) or
where large sums of money are involved. (such as cash-handling). Bureaucratic leadership is also useful in organizations where employees do routine tasks (as in manufacturing).

The downside of this leadership style is that it's ineffective in teams and organizations that rely on flexibility, creativity, or innovation. Much of the time, bureaucratic leaders achieve their position because of their ability to conform to and uphold rules, not because of their qualifications or expertise. This can cause resentment when team members don't value their expertise or advice.

### 2.5.3.2.3 People-Oriented/Relations-Oriented Leadership

With people-oriented leadership, leaders are totally focused on organizing, supporting, and developing the people on their teams. This is a participatory style and tends to encourage good teamwork and creative collaboration. This is the opposite of task-oriented leadership.

People-oriented leaders treat everyone on the team equally. They're friendly and approachable, they pay attention to the welfare of everyone in the group, and they make themselves available whenever team members need help or advice.

The benefit of this leadership style is that people-oriented leaders create teams that everyone wants to be part of. Team members are often more productive and willing to take risks, because they know that the leader will provide support if they need it.

The downside is that some leaders can take this approach too far; they may put the development of their team above tasks or project directives.

Tip: In practice, most leaders use both task-oriented and people-oriented styles of leadership together. Our article on the Blake Mouton Managerial Grid explains how you can do this.
2.5.3.2.4 Authoritative Leadership

Autocratic leadership is an extreme form of transactional leadership, where leaders have complete power over their people. Staff and team members have little opportunity to make suggestions, even if these would be in the team's or the organization's best interest. The benefit of autocratic leadership is that it's incredibly efficient. Decisions are made quickly, and work gets done.

The downside is that most people resent being treated this way. Therefore, autocratic leadership often leads to high levels of absenteeism and high staff turnover. However, the style can be effective for some routine and unskilled jobs: in these situations, the advantages of control may outweigh the disadvantages.

Autocratic leadership is often best used in crises, when decisions must be made quickly and without dissent. For instance, the military often uses an autocratic leadership style; top commanders are responsible for quickly making complex decisions, which allows troops to focus their attention and energy on performing their allotted tasks and missions.

2.5.3.2.5 Nurturant Leadership Style

The Nurturant leader "cares for his (or her) subordinates, shows affection, takes personal interest in their wellbeing, and above all, is committed to their growth." The Nurturant leader is effective for those subordinates who want to maintain dependency, a personalized relationship, and a status differential. He/she helps his/her subordinates grow up, mature, and assume greater responsibility. Once the subordinates reach a reasonable level of maturity, they generate pressure on the leader to shift to the participative (P) style. However, makes Nurturant style as an alternative model suited to the Indian culture. Four typical expectations that Indian subordinates bring to their organizations led to the formulation of Nurturant. Indian subordinates tend to depend excessively on their superior with whom they want to cultivate a personalized rather than
contractual work relationship. They readily accept the authority of their superior and yield to his demands. Work is not valued in itself. Yet, the subordinates are willing to work even extra hard as a part of their efforts to maintain a personalized relationship with the superior.

2.5.3.2.6 A,P+N Leadership Style

The A,P+N style of leadership is the composite of three basic leadership styles; authoritarian leadership, Participative leadership and Nurturant task leadership. An authoritarian leadership style is being used when a leader who dictates policies and procedures, decides what goals are to be achieved, and directs and controls all activities without any meaningful participation by the subordinates. Whereas the Participative leaders invite and encourage the team members to play an important role in decision making process, though the ultimate decision making power rests with the leader. The leader guides the employees on what to perform and how to perform, while the employees communicate to the leader their experience and the suggestions if any. The advantages of this leadership style are that it leads to satisfied, motivated and more skilled employees. It leads to an optimistic work environment and also encourages creativity. The nurturant task leaders are considered providing physical and emotional care and nourishment. The leader following A,P+N leadership style has full control of the team leaving low autonomy within the group. The leader has a vision in mind and must be able to effectively motivate their group to finish the task. The group is expected to complete the tasks under very close supervision while unlimited authority is granted to the leader. Subordinate's responses to the orders given are either punished or rewarded. They sometimes, but not always, provide clear expectations for what needs to be done, when it should be done, and how it should be done. Authoritarian leaders make decisions independently with little or no input from the rest of the group. Authoritarian leadership is best applied to situations where there is little time for group discussion. In this leadership style the advantages and disadvantages of all the three types of leadership styles are to be accepted.