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1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Leadership refers to an extremely wide range of roles that have profound influence on the world. The range is so wide, in fact, that sometimes the term leadership seems to include almost everyone. Leadership can refer to any person at any level of an organization, in any field, living or dead, who significantly influences others, for good or ill, is so broad as to be of questionable utility. Burns observes: "Leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomena on earth" (Burns, 1978)\(^1\).

There is no clear description or definition of leadership that has been stated and accepted by everyone. In reality, almost everyone possesses leadership characteristics, and therefore everyone can improve their leadership effectiveness. However, there are no rules or structures that ensure that a leader will become effective. The question whether an effective leader equals with an ideal leader depends on how one defines the term of leadership effectiveness.

Leadership has been accepted to be the driving force that creates change in teams and organizations. The effectiveness of the leader has therefore, been of crucial interest to academicians and practitioners for a long time. Harris (1992)\(^2\) states that leadership is mostly about effectiveness, but also about efficiency. Many leaders believe today that if an organization is efficient, it will become effective. This is often based on the common belief that if you do the right thing, you can work on doing it right (Harris, 1992)\(^3\). One of the key elements for such success has been their belief that their actions lead to desirable results. One of the key sectors in India that is affected by change is higher education. The efficacy of a university’s leadership role is, therefore, of paramount importance, as it will determine the success of his efforts within the context of other situational factors.

Education in India has always been valued more than mere considering it as a means towards earning a good living. Right from pre-historic days, education, especially higher education has been given a predominant position in the Indian society. Ancient India considered knowledge as the third eye that gives insight into all affairs. Education was available in Gurukulas, Agrahars, Viharas and Madarasas, throughout the country. The great universities flourished in India when most of the western world was groping in the dark. Those were the halcyon days when India led
the world in scientific knowledge and philosophical speculations. Though the glimpses of the original Indian education is still felt yet the impact of colonial rule on India has or made the education system less innovative, non-creative and least original.

Higher Education sector has witnessed a tremendous increase in its institutional capacity in the years since Independence. The number of Universities/University-level institutions has increased 25 times from 27 in 1950 to 693 in 2014. The sector boasts of 45 Central universities, 325 State Universities, 195 State Private Universities, 128 Deemed University, 50 Institutes of National Importance (established under Acts of Parliament), five Institutions established under State legislation, 219 colleges with potential for excellence, 12 colleges of excellence, 374 autonomous colleges and 66 academic staff colleges. The number of colleges has also registered manifold increase with just 578 in 1950 growing to be more than 35,000 in 2014. The larger universities have many colleges affiliated to them. Numerically India has almost 24 million university graduates.4

In India, the spending per student has been going down over the years. The share of education in our five-year plan outlay has been falling. The first five-year plan gave education 7.86 per cent. By the fifth plan, the share of education was only 3.27 per cent of the outlay. Current spending on education in India is not more than 3.5 per cent of GDP. The Center itself concedes that the minimum should be 6 per cent. Again, out of the amount spent, very less is being envisaged to be spent on higher education. It is not even 3-4% of GDP. This compares unfavorably with the international reference level, especially with countries such as South Africa, which invests 8 per cent of GNP on education. A near doubling of investments in education is the soundest policy for increasing the country’s GDP per capita by many fold. Therefore, there is a need to evolve policy through which Private/non-governmental resources is mobilized. Now there is a question as to how to build self-sustaining models of institutions critical for autonomy and long–term viability and student-support.5

During the last decade, the education sector has dominated economic planning. Despite many new national missions/programs and reforms agenda, by both the central and state governments with private sector intervention, the higher
education sector is in a state of complete flux. While India has tremendously enhanced capacity, it lag in quality, given inadequate autonomy to our Universities. Centralized control and a standardized approach remains at the heart of regulations. In the 21st century, countries like China, Korea and Singapore, transform from developing to advanced economies in a decade due to strategic planning and a larger vision that correlated economic development to transformation in the education sector, in particular higher education and research, to become globally competitive.6

The role of the government in higher education and university governance deserves a serious examination. At present, the role of the government in the case of state universities is significant and the higher education department of the state government is deeply involved in every aspect from the creation of the university to granting of approvals and permissions that need to be obtained for administering the university. This poses serious problems for university governance. The existing framework for the establishment of a university (public and private) in India requires legislation passed in the state legislative assembly or the national Parliament or through a decision of the University Grants Commission (UGC) and the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

World-class universities are not developed through government departments exercising powers over institutions; they are nurtured only when faculty members, students, staff and other stakeholders of the university are able to take decisions about the university in an independent and transparent manner. As a result, a good deal of the time of the vice-chancellors and registrars of Indian universities is devoted to ensuring that they are in compliance with these rules and regulations. Indian regulatory bodies tend to exercise enormous powers, often in an arbitrary manner. Arbitrariness in the exercise of regulatory powers of higher education regulators has adversely affected the public image and reputation of these bodies. Their role and responsibilities have been challenged, primarily because of the lack of trust in the ability of regulatory bodies to perform the tasks of a facilitator.

There is an urgent need in Indian universities to reflect upon the crisis of leadership and its inability to seek reforms relating to institution building. Leadership is central not only for providing an institutional vision that will garner and galvanize academic consciousness among faculty and students to fulfil the goals and aspirations
of the university, but also to reflect upon the larger role and responsibilities of the Indian university that connects it with the professions, government, intergovernmental organizations, think tanks and NGOs. Leadership is also about taking responsibility and being accountable for one’s decisions. Unfortunately, the existing model of governance of Indian university system does not recognize leadership as a critical aspect of building institutions of excellence.

1.2 RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

In recent years, the term leadership effectiveness has received much attention as a set of abilities that is potentially useful in understanding and predicting individual performance at work. Non-cognitive factors like those comprising emotional intelligence are important determinants of work behaviour, especially in a rapidly changing environment in institutions of higher education. It has also been proven to account for the success of the effective business leaders. Leadership effectiveness constructs can therefore increase our understanding of leadership performance. Since leaders are responsible for creating adaptive change in organisations, it would be relevant to understand how their effectiveness and role efficacy are affected by emotional intelligence. The locus of control construct has been found to be an important personality attribute affecting the performance of people. Like emotional intelligence, it has also been found to be related to success in different forms of human activity such as education and health. However, there appear to have been no studies covering its relationship with the role efficacy of the leader. It would be useful to determine the effect of locus of control on the effectiveness of leaders and their role efficacy.

The twenty-first century promises to be most turbulent and chaotic for mankind. Much of the organisational success will be determined by the effectiveness of the leader under conditions of extreme stress and change. The understanding of relationships between emotional intelligence and locus of control on the leader effectiveness and the efficacy of its role could have positive and useful implications for the identification, development and placement of prospective and current managers as leaders in organisations, in particular, and for their human resource systems, in general.7
1.3 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1.3.1 Leadership in General

There is an extremely large and continuously growing literature on leaders and leadership. Bass’s Handbook of Leadership (Bass, 1981)\(^8\) references over 4,500 studies of leadership as of the 1981 date of that book, and Rost (1991)\(^9\) reviewed over 312 books and chapters on the topic produced in the 1980-89 interval alone and the rate of output has surely increased in the interim. Indeed, a search of Amazon.com for “leadership” yields 191,530 hits. Ross (1997)\(^{10}\) writes leadership scholars and practitioners have no definition of leadership to hold on to. The scholars do not know what it is that they are studying, and the practitioners do not know what it is that they are doing. Many scholars have studied leaders and leadership over the years, but there is still no clear idea of what “leadership” is or who leaders are.

With some exceptions Ross’s statements remain true today. The best of the literature tends to focus on the psychological, personal and other characteristics that can make one person a more effective leader than another, including managerial mind sets and managerial roles. In addition, the outstanding books by Bennis (2006)\(^{11}\) and Bennis and Nanus (1985)\(^{12}\) deal with the essential competencies and characteristics of a leader as well as key aspects of leadership and its functions. The leading books by Heifitz and Linsky (2002, 2003, 2009)\(^{13}\) deal with the challenges of leadership and how they can be met. They focus on how to create a vision that will call people into action and continue to motivate them in the face of the obstacles they encounter. Heifitz and Linsky (2002)\(^{14}\) describe how to effectively deal with the inherent risk and dangers of leadership.

Leadership involves persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of a group. Leadership is persuasion, not domination; persons who can require others to do their bidding because of their power are not leaders. Leadership only occurs when others willingly adopt, for a period of time, the goals of a group as their own. Thus, leadership concerns building cohesive and goal-oriented teams; there is a causal and definitional link between leadership and team performance.
Beginning with the Ohio State studies in the 1940s and 1950s, several taxonomies of leadership behaviours have been proposed, including those by Borman and Brush (1993), Davis, Skube, Hellervik, Gebelein, and Sheard (1992), and Yukl, Wall, and Lepsinger (1990). They differ primarily in terms of their specificity. Yukl et al.’s list is the broadest; it identifies 14 categories of leader behaviour, including planning and organizing, problem solving, clarifying, informing, monitoring, motivating, consulting, recognizing, supporting, managing conflict and team building, networking, delegating, developing and mentoring, and rewarding. Although these actions are required by persons ranging from first-line supervisors to CEOs, their relative importance differs by organizational level.

These taxonomies tell us what people in leadership positions typically do. However, there is little published research concerning what effective leaders actually do. Effectiveness concerns judgments about a leader's impact on an organization's bottom line (i.e., the profitability of a business unit, the quality of services rendered, market share gained, or the win—loss record of a team). Indices of effectiveness are often hard to specify and frequently affected by factors beyond a leader's control. Nevertheless, effectiveness is the standard by which leaders should be judged; focusing on typical behaviours and ignoring effectiveness is an overarching problem in leadership research.

There are many definitions of leadership and many theorists who try to define the term. The similarities in each definition about leadership bring up goals, goals achievements, groups or organizations, structure and processes (Andersen, 2000). Some of leadership qualities are: 'Ambition, Energy, Desire to lead, Honesty and Integrity, Self-Confidence, Intelligence, High Self-Monitoring, Relevant Knowledge' (Trait theory of Leadership - Patrick and Locke (1991), Zaccaro (1983), Gardner (1990), Kenny, (1983), Robbins, (2001); 'Extroversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, Openness to Experience' (Big five Factor Model-Luthans (2002); 'Initiating Structure and Consideration' (Behavioural theory - Ohio University studies- Schermerhorn et al, (2003); 'Employee Orientation and Production Orientation' (University of Michigan Studies- Robbins (1997), Kahn and Katz, 1927); Leader - Member relationship, Task structure and Control (Contingency Theory Schermerhorn et al, (2003); Personal ability, Self-confidence, Confidence of the subordinates, ideological issues, use of personal example, vision,
articulation, personal work, environmental sensitivity, Sensitivity to followers needs, unconventional behaviour (Charismatic Theory of Leadership-Luthans, (2002); 'Charisma, Inspiration, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized consideration' (Transformational Leadership Theory- Luthans (2002); Positive Psychological capabilities, Greater self-awareness, self-regulated, Positive Behavior, Confident, Hopeful, Optimistic, resilient, Transparent, Moral, Future Orientation, Giving priority for developing Associates' (Authentic Leadership Theory- Luthans (2003); 'Leadership wedded to Ethical Behavior' (Ethical Leadership Theory- Hollander (1961); Robbins, (1997); 'Guiding, and Motivating' (On-Line Leadership Theory – Robbins (1997); 'Never Failing, Courage, Magnanimity, Intelligence, Enthusiasm, Promptness, Education, and Bravery, Pride of Ethical Behavior, Nice-talk, Justness, Impartiality, Mercilessness in disciplining, Tolerance, Ethical Behavior and avoidance of ethical behavior, Rewarding, People Orientation, Protecting the follower, Giving grants, Good Governance, Care for the Welfare of the People (Chendroyaperumal and Meena, 2007). The doer of all good acts, Lovable, Independent, Competent, Giver of happiness to others, Grant power to others (delegating), Heroic, invincible, Powerful to subdue foes, Powerful like a lion, Afford protection to his people, Shouldering responsibility of managing, Bearing burden, Strong, protective, Straight and just, Intellect and honour, Sharp and brilliant, Lustrous, Quick, Internally pure, Believing in progress, Active and valorous, Knowledgeable (Chendroyaperumal and Lazuli, 2008.)

Gary Yukl (Yukl, 2006) points out that definitions of leadership reflect the assumption that it involves a process, in which planned activities is used by one person over other people to guide, structure and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization. Bass (1999) has grouped a bunch of definitions of leadership into 12 categories. Leadership is according to him defined as (1) a central for group processes, (2) personalities and their effects, (3) knowledge of creating indulgence, (4) practice of affects, (5) action or behavior, (6) a type of persuasion, (7) power relationship, (8) an instrument for achieving goals, (9) a developed result from an interaction, (10) a differentiated, special role, (11) establishment of structures, and (12) a combination of effects. Every organization has its own leadership, and it is always connected to groups in the organizations. Harris (1998) defines leadership as taking the responsibility and guiding the action necessary for achieve desired goals.
John Kotter (1995) of the Harvard Business School maintains that leaders create vision, shared values and strategies by keeping their eyes on the horizon. Bennis (2006a) concurs with the statement that leadership deals with vision, with keeping the mission in sight while Kouzes and Posner (1995) maintain that effectiveness is doing the right things. Leaders who are inspirational motivators appeal to followers' basic values with enthusiasm and a compelling vision. Intellectual stimulation means inspiring people to think differently or creatively by suggesting new ways of looking at things. Hersey and Blanchard (1977) identified a three-dimensional approach for assessing leadership effectiveness which includes task behavior and relationship behavior, leadership style and its correlation to the situation at hand, and readiness of followers.

From a study of 1854 air force officers Hunsicker (1978) found, the skills that most contribute to success as: communication, human relations, general management ability, technical competence, leadership knowledge and experience. Prentice, (1984) found, from a study of 230 executives in manufacturing and service organizations, the skills required for managing organizations as: listening, communication, leadership, problem solving, time management, ability to change, formal presentations, and stress management. Magerion et al (1984) found, from a study of 721 chief executive officers in United States Corporations, the management skills to develop in others to help them become senior executives as: human relations, communication, planning, goal setting, people skill and leadership, decision-making, financial management, entrepreneurial skills, delegating, broad experience and teamwork. Whetten et al (1998) had found, from a study of 401 effective managers as identified by both peers and superiors, the most frequently cited skills of effective managers as: verbal communication and listening, managing time and stress, managing individual decision, problem solving, motivating and influencing others, setting goals and articulating a vision, team building and managing conflict.

Critical leadership skills suggested for success in the global economy (Luthans, 2002) include the following: "cultural flexibility, communication skills, human resource development skills (developing a learning climate, designing training programs, transmitting information and experience, assessing results, providing career counseling, creating organizational change, and adapting learning material), creativity (problem solving and innovation), self-management of learning.” Results of various
research studies were combined into the following four categories of effective leadership skills: (1) Participative and human relations (2) competitiveness and control; (3) innovativeness and entrepreneurship; (4) maintaining order and rationality.

According to Wheatley (1992) "Successful leaders share many important interpersonal skills. It takes more than a knowledge of your particular industry to run a thriving and efficient business. The qualities of leadership that separate the wheat from the chaff can be learned and perfected. A good manager inspires others and makes working for them exhilarating, educational, and fulfilling. An effective leader works with employees to attain a common goal, inspires by example and deals with problems in a decisive but compassionate way. Anyone can manage a company or department, but it truly takes a special skill set to lead. Some effective leadership qualities include: (1) Clear, flexible communication skills; (2) Ability to focus on making decisions quickly and then follow through; (3) Empathy for others so that you can understand where they're coming from; (4) Ability to project a great passion for your work and inspire others to share it; (5) An unwavering sense of honesty and integrity in your leadership skills; and (6) Drive to sharpen leadership qualities and skills on a regular basis."


Boas & Galit (2005) has identified the leadership skills and classified them as the following: (1) Interpersonal Business Skills (Assertiveness Skills, Business Networking Skills, Communication Skills Training, Conflict Management, Personal Impact, Stress Management, Work Life Balance); (2) Management Training (Managing Change, Facilitation Skills, Influencing Skills Training, Negotiation Skills Training, Performance Management and Appraisals, Project Management Training, Quicker Better Meetings); (3) Corporate Communications (Media Skills, Presentation Skills, Advanced Presentation Skills, Public Speaking, Presenting with PowerPoint); (4) Leadership Development (Creativity and Innovation, Leadership Development,


Jensen & Luthans (2006)\textsuperscript{54} has identified 10 Essential Business Leadership Skills such as, "(1) Lead By Example, (2) Passion, (3) Be Organized, (4) Delegate, (5) Take Ownership and responsibility, (6) Communicate Effectively, (7) Be Brave and Honest, (8) Great Listener, (9) Know Your People, (10) Be a Follower.

\subsection*{1.3.2 Leader Effectiveness}

There has been no consensus over what leadership is, even after almost nine decades of documented research (Stogdill, 1974)\textsuperscript{55}. Bennis and Nanus (1985)\textsuperscript{56} claimed that there had been over 350 definitions for leadership. Leadership has been an ageless topic that has fascinated both management researchers and psychologists for generations (Kotter, 1990;\textsuperscript{57} Hackman & Johnson, 1996)\textsuperscript{58}. Rost (1991)\textsuperscript{59} further confirmed the confusion over the issue of leadership. He reviewed 587 books, book chapters and journal articles published during the period 1900-1990, only to find that 366 authors had not provided any definition of leadership. Yet, despite voluminous literature on the topic of leadership, its definition has been open to question (Verma and Jain, 2000)\textsuperscript{60}, while some organisational behaviour theorists have continued to ignore leadership. Many attempts have been made to define it in terms of individual traits, leader behaviour, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals and influence on organisational culture. Nicholls (2002)\textsuperscript{61} offered the bold view that leadership was merely an
abstraction, and not an activity. All these findings contrasted with the literature review of DuBrin (1995)\textsuperscript{62}, who found various definitions of leadership to suggest that it was:

- Interpersonal influence directed through communication toward goal attainment
- Influential increment over and above mechanical compliance of rules
- An act that influences others to act or respond in a shared direction
- The art of influencing people by persuasion or example to follow a line of action
- The principal dynamic force that motivates and co-ordinates the organisation in the accomplishment of its objectives

Robbins (1983)\textsuperscript{63} defined leadership as the ability to influence a group toward the achievement of its goals. The most common characteristic of the leader was therefore to inspire and stimulate his or her followers into action to achieve the goals of the group. Bass (1990)\textsuperscript{64} defined leadership in terms of influence, group processes, persuasion, power, goal achievement, interaction, role differentiation, initiation of structure, and the combination of two or more of these elements. He quoted the best definition of leadership from Kim and Mauborgne (1992)\textsuperscript{65} to be the ability to inspire confidence and support among the people who are needed to achieve organisational goals. Gardner (1995)\textsuperscript{66} defined leadership as the ability to influence – either directly or indirectly – the behaviour, thoughts and actions of a significant number of individuals. The ability of the leader to influence individuals into some deliberate and meaningful action manifested a power for that leader over those individuals, who become his followers (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1996)\textsuperscript{67}. The highest agreement has been on the conceptualisation that leadership is the ability of an individual to influence a group of people towards organisational goals. Ultimately, leadership was seen to be an influence process, and therefore, its significance for groups and organisations has been undisputed.

The key elements of leadership were a function of the leader himself, his followers and the situational variables, and its central process was that of influence (Hersey and Blanchard, 1969)\textsuperscript{68}. Therefore, anyone who was attempting to influence another towards a common goal could exhibit leadership. This implied that leadership did not necessarily vest in an individual or in his position at the top of the organisation or group, but could be visible in the influence applied by people for the attainment of
common goals and at any level of the hierarchy. Bennis and Nanus (1985)\(^6\) declared that the first core task of a leader was to create a vision of what the organisation ought to be. The second task was to articulate this vision to the followers. The third task was to help develop a strategy for the achievement of that vision, through structuring, selecting and training, motivating, managing information, team building, and promoting change and innovation. Leadership or its absence has been identified as one of the leading causes of failures in implementing a team-based work system (Sinclair, 1992;\(^7\) Stewart and Manz, 1994;\(^8\) Katzenbach, 1997).\(^9\)

Burns (1978)\(^1\) proposed the transformational leadership theory, where leaders motivated followers using the latter’s self-actualisation needs. Bass (1985)\(^2\) later suggested that the leader would develop a closer relationship with his followers through trust and commitment rather than on contractual agreements. He helps his followers to see the importance of transcending their own self-interest for the sake of the mission and vision of the group or organisation. There have been several theories about transformational- and inspiring leadership. Bass (1990)\(^3\) focusing on this with the focus on transformational- and transactional leadership, described these two types in terms of how followers are being influenced by the leader and the leader's affects on the followers. The two leadership behaviors are described in terms of broad categories of behavior, each with specific subcategories. These sub categories were identified by a questionnaire called the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire –MLQ (Yukl, 2006),\(^4\) which tries to capture the transforming and charismatic quality of the leadership Gardner et al. (2004).\(^5\) The original formulation of the questionnaire contained three types of transformational behavior and two types of transactional behavior, but one sub category were later added to each behavior (Yukl, 2006).\(^6\)

Some researchers have argued that high moral development was related to the greater use of transformational leadership behaviours (Kuhnert and Lewis, 1987;\(^7\) Lichtenstein et al, 1995;\(^8\) Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999)\(^9\). Kotter (1990)\(^1\) said that the first central aspect of leadership was direction setting, which produced vision and strategies, and not merely plans. The second aspect of leadership was alignment, a process that was a communications challenge that gets people to understand, accept, and line up in the chosen direction. The third aspect of leadership, motivation with inspiration helped overcome political, bureaucratic and resource barriers to change. In
reality, it may be too much, too difficult and too time-consuming for any one person to provide leadership in a complex organisation.

Transformational leadership is characterized by followers who feel trust, admiration, loyalty and respect toward the leader (Yukl, 2006), and in addition they are often motivated to perform more than they thought were possible. Transformational leaders try to convert their followers into leaders, i.e. they seek to develop their followers to the point where they are able to take on the leadership role and perform beyond the established standards (Bas and Avolio, 1994). By using one or more of the four categories under transformational behavior, the leader seeks to achieve superior results Avolio and Gardner (2005).

The transactional leadership behavior depends on contingent support, either positive or negative (Yukl, 2006). Avolio (2001) writes that the transactional leadership behavior occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines a follower depending on the sufficiency of the follower's performance. It involves an ex-change, which includes that the leaders discusses with her or his colleagues and followers about what is expected. This might result in follower compliance but is not likely to generate enthusiasm and commitment to task objectives (Yukl, 2006).

Leader-member exchange theory was first proposed by Graen and his colleagues (Graen and Cashman, 1975; Graen, 1976; Graen et al, 1982; Graen and Scandura, 1987; Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). It covers the study of hypothesized linkages between leadership processes and outcomes (Dansereau et al, 1973; Dansereau et al, 1975), especially the dyadic relationship between a leader and a member. It differs from other leadership studies that focus only on his traits and other personal characteristics, situational features or an interaction between the two. Leader-member exchange theory suggests that the quality of the developing relationship between the leader and his follower was predictive of outcomes at the individual, group and organisational levels of analysis. Powers to influence that could not be clearly explained by logical means were called charismatic. Charismatic leaders used an idealised vision, and shared it with their followers (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1996). This type of leader was an entrepreneur, who transformed the followers by sharing with them the gains of the radical changes that were achieved. Such leadership would be effective only when current knowledge, resources and
procedures were inadequate to cope with contemporary demands or strategic imperatives. Such leaders would be unconstrained by conventions, and may express unrealistic or unethical visions.

Other researchers created inspiring profiles of ethical or moral leaders who were celebrated for their actions in commerce and history (Coles, 2000). This was corroborated by Turner et al (2002), who found that leaders exhibiting higher moral-reasoning levels would display greater transformational leadership behaviours than those with lower levels of such behaviours. In terms of transactional leadership, leaders with differing levels of moral reasoning were perceived no differently from each other. Nicholls (2002) argues that leadership is a rich and exciting word with a multitude of meanings. Because it is nothing but outstandingly effective management, he suggests the use of the expression High-Profile Management, instead. High-Profile Managers have E3 qualities, such as Edge (sharpness and eagerness to do what needs to be done), emotions (strength of character and internal fortitude to make the effort), and Energy (persistence to carry on, despite opposition).

Leader effectiveness is synonymous with leadership effectiveness, and the conceptualisation of leader effectiveness has been just as difficult as leadership. Most researchers evaluate it in terms of the consequences of the leader’s actions for his followers and other stakeholders using different types of outcomes. Leader effectiveness refers to the leader’s performance in influencing and guiding the activities of his or her unit toward achievement of its goals (Stogdill, 1948, 1950). Leader effectiveness assessments usually consist of ratings made by the leader’s supervisor, peer, or subordinate (or some combination of these three). Such ratings can be criticized as potentially contaminated. Because such ratings represent individuals’ perceptions of leader effectiveness, rather than objectively measured performance outcomes (e.g., team performance), they may be influenced by raters’ implicit leadership theories (Lord et al, 1984).

Leader effectiveness can be direct and indirect. Direct effect refers to leader decisions and actions that have an immediate impact on what is done, how it is done, and how efficiently it is done. Indirect effect refers to leader decisions and actions that are mediated by more intervening variables in the causal chain. Indirect effects are slower to be felt, but they are often more durable (Hunt, 1991). The attitude of his
followers towards him is another significant indicator of leader effectiveness that is related to satisfying the needs and expectations of followers, the respect and admiration of the followers for the leader and commitment of the followers. Various objective measures of behaviour such as absenteeism, voluntary turnover, grievances, complaints to higher management, requests for transfer, work slowdowns and deliberate sabotage of equipment serve as indirect indicators of followers’ dissatisfaction and hostility towards him. Leader effectiveness is occasionally measured in terms of the leader’s contribution to quality of group processes, group cohesiveness, increasing co-operation and motivation, lowering conflict between members and improving the speed and quality of decisions. Hogan et al (1994) suggest that leader effectiveness should be measured in terms of team, group or organizational effectiveness. However, whether leader effectiveness ratings are biased by implicit leadership theories, selective recall or halo, there is evidence that such ratings converge with objective measures of work group performance (Hogan and Hogan, 1995), providing support for the use of supervisor and subordinate ratings as measures of leader effectiveness.

The effectiveness of the leader depends on his ability to motivate his followers along a path towards his vision. Maslow (1954) suggested a hierarchy of needs to explain the motivation process of the individual. Starting from the bottom, as one need was satisfied, the next higher need would become important to the individual. This was a conveniently short list of needs that attracted instant appeal. McClelland (1961) proposed that the individual’s needs for achievement (nAch), for power (nPow) and for affiliation (nAff) had many implications for understanding motivation in organisations. High achievers differentiated themselves from others by their drive to do things better. High power seekers sought control over others in order to be ‘in charge’. High affiliation seekers wanted to be liked, and were seen to be co-operative. Consequently, he argued that the best managers had high needs for power and low needs for affiliation. Therefore, managers could be groomed to learn attributes of nAch so that such learning led to their high performance within the organisation.

Motivating behaviours such as emphasising the importance of work, inspiring task commitment and role modelling were reported to be related to leader effectiveness (Yukl and Van Fleet, 1982; Van Fleet and Yukl, 1986; Yukl et al, 1990). However, Robbins (1983) said that there was no empirical substantiation
for Maslow’s theory, and several studies had not validated or supported it. The issue of work versus people has attracted the attention of management researchers for many years. Lewin and Lippitt (1938)\textsuperscript{112} had suggested that leadership behaviour could be classified in terms of the involvement of leaders into people-related issues in comparison to work-related issues. Participative leadership involves power sharing, and influences on leader effectiveness (Lewin et al, 1939;\textsuperscript{113} Coch and French, 1948)\textsuperscript{114}.

Situational leadership theories evolved to replace the weaknesses in the trait and behavioural theories. The theories suggested that the leader effectiveness might depend on the fit between the personality, task, power, attitudes and perceptions. Fiedler (1967)\textsuperscript{115} suggested a contingency model with three factors to determine the environment of leadership. In leader-member relations, he referred to the degree of trust and confidence that the followers have in their leader. Task structure referred to the decisions, clarity and complexity of the tasks to be performed. He defined position power as the ability of the leader to exercise authority over his followers. Although the meanings of some of the variables were not fully clear, and the reliability of the final results was low, this model set a new path for further research into leadership. Situational aspects such as the nature of the task, the work environment and subordinates’ attributes determine the optimal amount of each type of leader behaviour for improving subordinate satisfaction and performance (Evans, 1970;\textsuperscript{116} Greenleaf 1971).\textsuperscript{117}

By far, the clearest and the most accurate explanation of individual motivation came from the expectation theory (Robbins, 1983).\textsuperscript{118} The theory states that the strength of an individual’s tendency to act in some way is dependent on the strength of the expectation that the act would be followed by a stated outcome and on the attractiveness of that outcome to the individual. The simplified expectancy model would suggest that if the individual expects to gain from his efforts, he was likely to commit himself to such efforts. Another situational leadership theory that appealed to many managers was the model by Hersey-Blanchard (1969).\textsuperscript{119} Based on maturity (or readiness) as the ability and willingness of followers to take responsibility for directing their own behaviour, four leadership styles took shape:

- \textit{Telling}: where the leader instructs his followers
- \textit{Selling}: where he complements his instructions with assistance and advice
• Participating: where both he and his followers make decisions jointly
• Delegating: where his followers rarely need support from the leader

Yukl (1990)\textsuperscript{120} suggested a relationship between the leader’s influence, power and skills and the outcomes of the leadership, or his performance. Amongst the most desirable outcomes was commitment, where the follower would be enthusiastic about executing his role. Compliance indicated a modest effort whereas resistance was a failure of the leadership action, where the target either refused to carry out his job or did it badly. The trait approach attributed leader effectiveness to his extraordinary abilities including high energy level, stress tolerance, integrity, emotional maturity and self-confidence (Bass, 1990).\textsuperscript{121} In addition to traits, he would need considerable skills to be effective since the skills required for carrying out his duties and responsibilities would be the predictors of leader effectiveness. The expression, trait, refers to capacities, motives and patterns of behaviour. Skill has a narrower meaning than a trait, and involves a specific capacity for actions such as decision making, problem solving and performance appraisal (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991).\textsuperscript{122}

Bennis and Nanus (1985)\textsuperscript{123} argued that leading was a personal business, and in order to be effective, leaders must continue to work at their weaknesses and talents. They must learn to learn in an organisational setting. Successful leaders must develop a new set of skills representing new competence, such as:

• Acknowledging and sharing uncertainty
• Embracing error
• Responding to the future
• Becoming interpersonally competent
• Gaining self-knowledge

Taffinder (1995)\textsuperscript{124} hypothesised that the success (measured in terms of profitability and a range of other performance indicators) of individual business units or profit centers in a large corporation was consistently linked to the personal effectiveness of its leadership. Therefore, leadership was not just a more effective form of management: leaders must do different things. Heifetz and Laurie (1997)\textsuperscript{125} assert that getting people to do adaptive work was the mark of leadership in a
competitive world. All adaptive situations are not amenable to solutions provided by leaders, as adaptive solutions needed employees to take responsibility for their solutions. The toughest task for leaders in effecting change was to mobilise people throughout the organisation to do adaptive work. This is because people must forsake old behaviour, which is a distressing process, and adopt new roles, relationships, values and approaches to work. A leader must get the employees to confront tough trade-offs in values, procedures, operating styles and power. To raise questions that may indicate an impending challenge, he must rely on and provide cover especially to employees who point to the internal contradictions of the enterprise, such as whistleblowers or creative deviants.

Self-confidence has been often cited as an essential characteristic for leader effectiveness (Yukl and Van Fleet, 1982; Bass, 1990; Locke, 1991; House and Aditya, 1997; Northouse, 2001). Because it is a trait, and not a part of any established theory of human performance, it can be used to predict behaviour. Bennis and Nanus (1985) had remarked that it was not clear how the trait of self-confidence was acquired. In the sports psychology field, self-confidence is one of the most frequently cited psychological factors thought to affect athletic performance (Feltz, 1988). Bass (1990) declared that self-efficacy was closely allied with self-confidence. Self-efficacy theory is the most extensively used theory for investigating self-confidence in sports settings (Weinberg and Gould, 1995), due to the seeming conceptual similarity of the two constructs (Brockner, 1988; Hollenbeck, 1991). One of the latest leadership findings came from Goleman (1998), who declared that while intelligence and technical skills were important, emotional intelligence could be the crux of successful leadership. He found that the star performers and most outstanding leaders showed emotional intelligence skills of a higher order than technical or cognitive skills. He packaged emotional intelligence across five components called self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skills. Broadly, these skills required that the leader, as an individual, manage his emotions, and his relationships with others to be persuasive, to lead change and build teams, in a sequential manner.

Chemer’s (1997) integrative leadership theory contends that the leader’s self-confidence partially determines his self-efficacy beliefs, which in turn impact his behaviour intentions. Therefore, the trait of self-confidence impacts leadership
performance through the mediating mechanism of leadership self-efficacy, a person's confidence in his or her ability to successfully lead. Self-confidence refers to the person’s self-judgement of his capabilities and skills, or his perceived competence to deal successfully with the demands of a variety of situations (Shrauger and Schohn, 1995)\textsuperscript{139}. The leader is a causal agent who acts on the leadership situation rather than simply responding to it (Yukl and Van Fleet, 1982)\textsuperscript{140}. Contemporary leadership literature has described the effective leader as being persistent, self-confident, energetic, alert to the environment, adaptable to the situation, assertive and goal-directed (Bass, 1990;\textsuperscript{141} Zacarro et al\textsuperscript{142}, 1991; Yukl, 1994)\textsuperscript{143}. In addition, various taxonomies of effective leader behaviours have included activities such as monitoring operational processes and the task environment, goal setting, planning, problem solving, and diagnosing individual and group needs (Van Fleet and Yukl, 1986;\textsuperscript{144} Mumford et al, 1993)\textsuperscript{145}.

Viewed from the social cognitive perspective, what leadership researchers have been describing for years is a person engaged in self-regulation in a complex and ever-changing task setting, the leadership situation. Through his behaviours, the individual in the leadership role actively attempts to influence the processes of the task-performing group and the larger social context in which the group must function (i.e., a company, a school, a community) in order to facilitate group success. Cognitive processes and other personal resources underlie the actions selected and the proficiency with which they are executed (Wood and Bandura, 1989;\textsuperscript{146} Mumford et al, 1993)\textsuperscript{147}. In short, leaders are efficacious individuals who "gather information, plan action, take action, and monitor group progress towards goals" (Kane, 1995).\textsuperscript{148} Bales (1954)\textsuperscript{149} suggested co-leadership as a beneficial group process that allocated the task and leadership roles to different individuals. Some researchers have stated that leadership need not be in the hands of an individual, alone. Researchers such as Bowers and Seashore (1966)\textsuperscript{150} and Astin and Astin (1996)\textsuperscript{151} characterised leadership as representing a collective influence process. As a social influence process, Avolio and Bass (1995)\textsuperscript{152} argued that leadership went beyond a single leader when observed at multiple levels and could be vested either in an individual or a group.

House and Aditya (1997)\textsuperscript{153} described collective leadership as a collection of specific leader behaviours distributed throughout and enacted by members the entire work unit, contemporaneously. Because activity was usually a shared effort (Heenan
and Bennis, 1999)\textsuperscript{154}, leadership was as much an institutional trait, as it is an individual effort (O’Toole, 2001)\textsuperscript{155}. Leadership need not be a solo act (O’Connell et al, 2002)\textsuperscript{156}. Sivasubramaniam et al (2002)\textsuperscript{157} defined team leadership as the collective influence of team members on each other in the form of within-team behaviours that enabled them to identify with and be motivated by the team. Delving into history, Sally (2002)\textsuperscript{158} found that the Roman republic was managed with a system that sustained Co-Leadership for more than four decades. The organizational structure of the Republic was complex, and included at least two leaders in more or less the same role. They had two consuls (CEOs), two censors (CFOs), two praetors (COOs), four aediles (Senior Vice Presidents of production and operations), four quaestors (comptrollers) and numerous provincial governors (regional VPs). Co-leadership would be important to many companies, today, due to the changes and forces of job-sharing arrangements, team structures, family structures and compositions, the advancement of science and technology, and mergers.

It is important to be aware of what leadership effectiveness is before one can determine its effects in an organization. Many organizations seek to explain the organization's use of limited resources in terms of effectiveness, i.e. the effectiveness is described as the organization's profitability (Andersen, 1995)\textsuperscript{159}. Effective leaders create results, attain goal, realize vision, and other objectives more quickly and at a higher level of quality than ineffective leaders.

Everything we do, individually as well as in teams, are directed toward effectiveness. The term effectiveness aims to create a value that is higher than the consumption of the resources for creating this value (Karlöf, 2001)\textsuperscript{160}. Leadership today is much more about creating an environment where people can succeed, than it is about decision making or individual work. The leadership challenge is to find ways to develop associates, because development relates to allowing individuals to grow in skills, knowledge and abilities to perform at their highest possible levels now and in the future (.Topping, 2002)\textsuperscript{161}.

Since the early 1900\textsuperscript{th} century a more comprehensive view of leadership began to grow and interaction between the task, the leader and relationships with followers was taking into account. Before this, the "great man theory", which implied that leaders where born, not made, was the dominating leadership scholar (Topping,
Being an effective, vital leader demands skills and knowledge in critical areas such as coaching and reinforcing, building strong relationships, developing organizational talent, encouraging initiative, and delegating and sharing responsibility and authority. The effectiveness also depends on specific communication skills and relationship behaviors that will motivate people to do their best, support them through difficult situations, build mutual trust and inspire commitment to organizational objectives.

These leaders make people feel important, valued, and respected. They inspire full commitment by practicing the key principles of maintaining or enhancing self-esteem, listening and responding with empathy, asking for help and encouraging innovation, sharing thoughts, feelings and rationale, and providing support without removing responsibility.

1.3.3 Measurements for Leadership Effectiveness

As written by Yukl (2006), leader effectiveness is often measured in terms of the leader's contribution to the quality of group processes, as it is perceived by followers and by outside observers. But there are several measurements and indications on leadership effectiveness. How the followers perceive the leader is also an important indicator. Another indicator is to view to which extent the leader's organizational unit performs its task successfully and attains its goals. Since there are so many alternative measures of effectiveness, it is difficult to evaluate how effective a leader really is. In addition, people have different values and perceive effectiveness in different way, and therefore there are several factors that need to be taken into consideration when defining leadership effectiveness. However, multiple definitions of leadership, as well as of leadership effectiveness, help us to broaden our perspectives and enlarge our understanding.

The literature on leadership effectiveness can be organized in terms of five categories of studies. In the first category, leaders are evaluated in terms of the actual performance of their team or organizational unit. Examples include studies by Chidester et al. (1991), Curphy (1993), House et al. (1991), and Smith et al. (1984).
In the second category, subordinates', peers', or supervisors' ratings are used to evaluate leaders. Examples include studies by Bass and Yammarino (1991), Bray (1982), Harris and Schaubroeck (1988), Hazucha(1991), and Nilsen and Campbell (1993). One implication of this research is that subordinates are often in a unique position to evaluate leadership effectiveness. Sweetland's (1978) review of managerial productivity concluded that effective leadership and increased group output were a function of the interaction between managers and their subordinates. Murphy and Cleveland (1991) noted that the evaluation of a manager's performance depends, in part, on the relationships that the person has established with his or her subordinates. Hegarty (1974) found that university department chairs who received feedback from subordinates improved their performance, both as judged by subordinates and in comparison with control participants who received no subordinate evaluations. Similarly, Bernardin and Kiatt (1985) found that managers who were involved in multirater appraisal systems received significantly higher mean effectiveness ratings than those who received no subordinate feedback. McEvoy and Beatty (1989) compared the predictive validity of subordinate evaluations with assessment center ratings and concluded that subordinate ratings were as effective (and less expensive) as assessment center data in forecasting managerial performance seven years later.

Because subordinates are in a unique position to judge leadership effectiveness, what leadership characteristics do they feel are most important? Research by D. P. Campbell (1991), Harris and Hogan (1992), Lombardo, Ruderman, and McCauley (1988) indicates that a leader's credibility or trustworthiness may be the single most important factor in subordinates' judgments of his or her effectiveness. For example, Harris and Hogan asked subordinates (N = 301) to evaluate their managers (N = 49) using a 55-item questionnaire that assessed growth versus stagnation, interpersonal competence, managerial values, and technical competence. Subordinates also rated their managers for overall effectiveness. Each manager and his or her boss completed a parallel questionnaire. Subordinates' and bosses' evaluations of a target manager's performance were reasonably consistent (rs>.50). In addition, managers' self-ratings were uncorrelated with the ratings provided by the other groups; this is consistent with the meta-analytic results of Harris and Schaubroeck (1988). Perhaps most important, bosses' ratings of a manager's
overall effectiveness were largely influenced by judgments of his or her technical competence (e.g., "Supervisor is a flexible and far-sighted problem solver"), whereas subordinates' ratings of a manager's overall effectiveness were largely influenced by judgments of integrity (e.g., "My supervisor has earned my trust"). Thus, although subordinates and bosses tend to agree in their evaluation of a manager's overall effectiveness, they also evaluate rather different aspects of that performance. Although subordinates' ratings will be to some degree contaminated by rating errors, research shows that these ratings also reflect some knowledge of a person's actual performance in a leadership role. For example, Shipper and Wilson (1991)\textsuperscript{183}, using data provided by managers and their subordinates from 68 subunits of a large southwestern hospital, showed that subordinates' ratings of managerial effectiveness were correlated (rs between .22 and .46) with engineered standards of productivity. These findings provide strong support for the use of subordinates' evaluations of managerial effectiveness.

A third category of studies evaluates the leadership potential of strangers on the basis of their performance in interviews, simulations, assessment centres, or leaderless group discussions. Examples include studies by Al bright, Kenny, and Malloy (1988)\textsuperscript{184}, Howard and Bray (1990)\textsuperscript{185}, and Lord, DeVader, and Allinger (1986)\textsuperscript{186}. The leaderless group research provides virtually no information about effectiveness; rather, it tells us about what a person must do in order to be perceived, in the short term, as leader like. On the other hand, assessment centre research often uses organizational advancement as a criterion, and it tells us about the characteristics related to getting ahead in large, complex organizations. In the AT&T Managerial Assessment Project, for example, subsequent management level was best predicted by assessment center ratings for need for advancement, general mental ability, written communication skills, overall communications skills, flexibility, creativity, and organizing and planning (Howard & Bray, 1990).\textsuperscript{187}

Fourth, self-ratings of leadership have also been used as evaluative criteria (Farh & Dobbins, 1989)\textsuperscript{188}. The evidence is clear, however, that self-ratings tell us little about leader effectiveness. But there is a kind of manager who routinely over evaluates his or her performance, and that tendency is associated with poor leadership (Atwater & Yammarino, 1992;\textsuperscript{189} Nilsen & Campbell, 1993;\textsuperscript{190} Van Velsor, Taylor, & Leslie, 1992)\textsuperscript{191}.
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In the fifth category of research, effectiveness is defined by the low end of the continuum—by persons whose careers are in jeopardy or who have derailed. The fact that a person has been passed over for promotion or fired reflects an evaluation of his or her performance in a negative direction. Early research on derailment includes articles by Lombardo et al. (1988)\textsuperscript{192} and McCall and Lombardo (1983)\textsuperscript{193}. Hellervik, Hazucha, and Schneider (1992)\textsuperscript{194}, Peterson (1993)\textsuperscript{195}, and Peterson and Hicks (1993)\textsuperscript{196} studied managers whose careers were in trouble, using a wide variety of assessment techniques, such as multirater assessment instruments and psychological tests, to identify different jeopardy and derailment factors. This research reveals managerial incompetence to be associated with untrustworthiness, over control, exploitation, micro-management, irritability, unwillingness to use discipline, and an inability to make good staffing or business decisions (or both).

The answer to the question "How leaders should be evaluated?" is "In terms of the performance of their teams." Realistically, the data needed to make this evaluation are often difficult to obtain or badly contaminated by external factors. Perhaps the best alternative is to ask subordinates, peers, and superiors to evaluate a leader. The empirical literature suggests that these sources of information are correlated; that the respondents tend to key on different aspects of a leader's performance; and that, taken together, these evaluations are moderately but significantly related to team performance (Campbell, 1991;\textsuperscript{197} Harris & Hogan, 1992).\textsuperscript{198} Finally, because subordinates', peers', or bosses' ratings involve judgments about the frequency of certain behaviours, researchers typically find stronger links between personality and these ratings than between personality and indices of effectiveness.

Two sets of studies illustrate the link between personality and team performance. The first concerns charismatic leadership. House (1977)\textsuperscript{199} used biographical materials to identify three themes in the careers of charismatic leaders. First, they have a vision that others find compelling; second, they are able to recruit a group of people who share that vision, and these people resemble a team; and third, by virtue of the relationships they develop with the team members, such leaders are able to persuade them to work for and to support the vision.

Charismatic leaders can be quite effective; relative to non-charismatic leaders, they have substantially higher (a) promotion recommendations or performance
appraisal ratings from superiors; (b) satisfaction, morale, or approval ratings from subordinates; (c) historians' ratings of greatness; or (d) levels of team performance (Avolio, Waldman, & Einstein, 1988; Bass, 1985; Bass, Avolio, & Goodheim, 1987; Bass & Yammarino, 1991; Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Curphy, 1991, 1993; House et al., 1991; Howell & Frost, 1988).

House et al. (1991) reported that charismatic U.S. presidents have strong needs for power and high energy levels and they are socially assertive (these themes resemble surgency) and achievement oriented (i.e., conscientiousness). Using self-ratings from the Adjective Checklist (Gough & Heilbrun, 1983) and subordinates' ratings for charisma, Ross and Offermann (1991) reported that charisma ratings are positively correlated with self-confidence and personal adjustment (i.e., emotional stability), feminine attributes and nurturance (i.e., agreeableness), and the need for change (i.e., intellect).

Foushee, Chidester, Helmreich, and their associates studied the personality measures that influence team performance—in this case, the performance of commercial airline flight crews (cf. Chidester et al., 1991; Foushee & Helmreich, 1988). This research is important because breakdowns in team performance are the primary cause of air transport accidents (Cooper, White, & Lauber, 1979). Chidester et al. showed that flight crew performance—defined in terms of the number and severity of the errors made by the crew—is significantly correlated with the personality of the captain. Crews with captains who were warm, friendly, self-confident, and able to stand up to pressure (i.e., agreeableness and emotional stability) made the fewest errors. Conversely, crews with captains who were arrogant, hostile, boastful, egotistical, passive aggressive, or dictatorial made the most errors. Despite these results, Chidester et al. (1991) pointed out that personality is not taken into account in the process of airline pilot selection.

Evaluating leadership is a challenging pursuit that often results in differing outcomes depending upon the person who is being evaluated or the person performing the evaluation. In order to understand what constitutes an effective leadership, five initial components of the leadership effectiveness dimensions are personal effectiveness, interpersonal relationship effectiveness, managerial effectiveness, operational effectiveness, and societal effectiveness (Covey, 1990; Crosby, 1992;
1996;\textsuperscript{218} Manz & Sims Jr., 1990;\textsuperscript{219} McIntosh & Rima, 1997;\textsuperscript{220} Peters & Waterman Jr., 1982;\textsuperscript{221} Quinn, 2005;\textsuperscript{221a} Tichy & Sherman, 1994;\textsuperscript{222} Waterman Jr., 1987)\textsuperscript{223}.

Personal Effectiveness Dimension: The personal effectiveness dimension includes several important attributes and behaviors that must be prevalent within the leader's attributes and behavior to ensure positive outcomes. Successful leaders must develop and enhance personal attributes and behaviors that include individual trustworthiness, strong ethical system, tough mindedness, personal optimism, self-motivated, goal oriented, focused on important issues, works toward self-improvement, sets priorities setting, and uses effective time management (Covey, 1990;\textsuperscript{224} Crosby, 1992;\textsuperscript{225} Quinn, 1996;\textsuperscript{226} Tichy & Sherman, 1994;\textsuperscript{227} Waterman Jr., 1987)\textsuperscript{228}. Each of these attributes and behavioral characteristics is essential for a leader's long-term success. Under the natural and open systems perspective, these behaviors and attributes can be instilled over time and will emerge as organization meaning to impact positive personal outcomes. In addition, manifestation of these positive virtues by the leader allows the shared meaning to emerge throughout the organizational structure and synthesize into the organization's culture (Arbnor & Bjerke, 1997;\textsuperscript{229} Chakraborty et al., 2004;\textsuperscript{230} Scott, 2003;\textsuperscript{231} Sharma & Talwar, 2005;\textsuperscript{232} Whitmore, 2004)\textsuperscript{233}.

Interpersonal Relationship Effectiveness Dimension: A second dimension of importance for leadership success is the interpersonal relationship effectiveness level. The attributes and behaviors in this dimension as they relate to other people include trust, compassion, empathy, fairness, objectivity, encouragement, guiding, and motivating (Covey, 1990;\textsuperscript{234} Crosby, 1992;\textsuperscript{235} Manz & Sims Jr., 1990;\textsuperscript{236} Quinn, 2005;\textsuperscript{237} Tichy & Sherman, 1994;\textsuperscript{238} Waterman Jr., 1987).\textsuperscript{239} Individuals who demonstrate these personal attributes and behaviors tend to become transformational leaders who are often perceived as charismatic and influential (Hofmann & Jones, 2005;\textsuperscript{240} Roussin, 2006;\textsuperscript{241} Srivastava, Bartol, & Locke, 2006;\textsuperscript{242} Takala, 2005)\textsuperscript{243}. In addition, leaders who score high in this dimension have the enormous potential to influence others and impact their behavior. Hence, the leader's enormous influence can be used for either positive or negative personal gain (McIntosh & Rima, 1997;\textsuperscript{244} Takala, 2005).\textsuperscript{245} When evaluating a leader's interpersonal relationship effectiveness, the researcher may discover significant irregularities at this dimension concerning the potential for dark leadership behavior. In addition, under the natural and open
systems paradigm, there is tremendous potential for either positively or negatively influencing the organization at this dimension of leadership performance.

Managerial Effectiveness Dimension: A third dimension of effective leadership occurs at the managerial level. Specific individual attributes and behaviors associated with this dimension include team spirit, achieves productivity through people, delegates authority, empowers others, communication at all organizational dimensions, demonstrates candor, seeks continual organizational improvement, maintains a bias for organizational action, and emulates high organizational values (Covey, 1990; Crosby, 1992; Manz & Sims Jr., 1990; Quinn, 2005; Tichy & Sherman, 1994; Waterman Jr., 1987). The managerial dimension of leadership evaluation determines how well the leader operates within their central sphere of control while carrying out their particular job.

Operational Effectiveness Dimension: Fourth, the leader is evaluated based upon operational effectiveness dimension. This evaluation level is perhaps very important to all organizational stakeholders and related directly to overall organizational productivity. Important resulting outcomes in this dimension include quantitative measures like net profit, return on assets, return on equity, and earnings per share. However, these outcomes occur as a result of specific leadership attributes and behaviors including relationship building, understanding customer needs, instilling organizational vision, organizational stability, stakeholder satisfaction levels, and workforce satisfaction levels. In essence, based on the natural and open systems perspective, these attributes and behaviors emerge over time and hinge on a leader's ability to align structure and strategy within the context of a dynamic and complex external environment. In addition, the successful leader is able to maintain consistent earnings and returns to shareholders.

Societal Effectiveness Dimension: Lastly, an effective leader maintains attributes and behaviors that have a positive impact at the societal effectiveness dimension. This dimension of evaluation determines if the leader or their organization positively impacted external stakeholders including the environment, communities, governments, suppliers, or consumers. The attributes and behaviors associated with this dimension address the leader's level of focus on environmental issues, community involvement, public relations, and environmental stewardship.
1.3.4 Leadership Behaviors

Andersen (1997) describes Consideration as it reflects the extent to which the leader shows concern for others in the group. The leader behavior is characterized by interpersonal relationships, friendship, trust and human warmth. This includes showing concern for the subordinates’ feelings and needs, and act in a supportive manner. Examples of leaders who use the consideration behavior is that they do personal favors for their followers, listens carefully and consult on important matters. An important aspect is to treat all the subordinates equally and accept suggestions from them. According to Yukl (2006), initiating structure describes to which extent the leader initiates activities in the group and organizes the work that ought to be performed. The leadership behavior insists on achieving standards and decides in detail what needs to be done and how it should be done. The leader show great concern for accomplishing the task and every role is defined in order to attain tasks and goals.

After studies made on the consideration- and initiating structure behaviors two questionnaires were constructed and developed to measure the behaviors; the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) and the Supervisory Behavior Description (SBD). The two questionnaires are very similar, and often threaten equal, but there is a difference in the content of the behavior scales. Later a third questionnaire was constructed in order to measure leader attitudes, called the Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). Researchers at the Ohio-State University then developed a fourth questionnaire called the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire, Form XII (LBDQ XII). In this questionnaire 10 additional scales were added since consideration and initiating structure seemed too narrow. The new scales concerned leadership behavior (like representation and integration), traits (like uncertainty and tolerance) and skills (like analytical accuracy and persuasiveness). Even though these new scales were added and widened the perspective many researchers continued to use the scale of consideration and initiating structure.

The questionnaires and their modified versions have been used in a number of studies by many different researchers and theorists, but the results have been weak and inconsistent for most criteria of leadership effectiveness (Yukl 2006). In addition, there has been several studies claiming that consideration and initiating
structure can be considered as central dimensions in a leader's behavior. However, there is evidence from other studies that these dimensions are not mutually exclusive behavior patterns (Andersen, 1995). In fact, Yukl (2006) state that they are relatively independent, i.e. the use of one behavior is not necessarily the same as the use of the other. The statement suggests that there are two dimensions in each leader's behavior (Andersen, 1995).

The studies found it hard to prove any clear connection between leader behavior and the followers' attitudes and performance. However, one consistent finding was a positive correlation between consideration and the follower satisfaction. Subordinates are normally more satisfied when they have a leader who shows concern for them. One thing that many researchers have complained concerning the studies is that the instruments used with the studies did not have a high validity or reliability (Andersen, 1995). In some studies the followers were more satisfied and performed better with a structured leader, while in other studies the opposite relationship were shown or even no relationship at all (Yukl, 2006). Still, the Ohio-State Studies had many characteristics that came to dominate the leadership research during many years (Andersen, 1995).

There have been several theories about transformational- and inspiring leadership. According to Yukl (2006), Bass has, more than anyone else, done empirical researches in 1995 and 1996 on this with the focus on transformational- and transactional leadership. The transformational- and transactional leadership behaviors is similar to the two behaviors in the Ohio-State Studies, consideration and initiating structure, and it is suggested that this theory is built upon the Ohio-State Studies (Yukl, 2006).

Transformational leadership is characterized by followers who feel trust, admiration, loyalty and respect toward the leader, and in addition they are often motivated to perform more than they thought were possible. Transformational leaders try to convert their followers into leaders (Avolio, 2001), i.e. they seek to develop their followers to the point where they are able to take on the leadership role and perform beyond the established standards (Bass and Avolio, 1994). By using one or more of the four categories under transformational behavior, the leader seeks to achieve superior results.
The transactional leadership behavior depends on contingent support, either positive or negative (Yukl, 2006). Avolio (2001) writes that the transactional leadership behavior occurs when the leader rewards or disciplines a follower depending on the sufficiency of the follower's performance. It involves an ex-change, which includes that the leaders discusses with her or his colleagues and followers about what is expected. This might result in follower compliance but is not likely to generate enthusiasm and commitment to task objectives (Yukl, 2006). A third behavior were later included, the laissez-faire leadership, which is much about ignoring problems and subordinates' needs. It can be described as the lack of effective leadership. Avolio points out that this leadership behavior is the most inactive and ineffective form of leadership. Under this behavior nothing is managed.

The transformational leadership generates more follower motivation and performance than the transactional leadership, but the two different types are not mutually exclusive. In addition, effective leaders often use a combination of the two (Avolio, 2001). However, it has been shown in researches since the 1980s that transformational leadership behavior is more effective than the transactional. The most ineffective and dissatisfying behavior have shown to be laissez-faire leadership (Yukl, 2006). According to Yukl (2006), some theorists have tried to make analyses in differences between the two types of leadership behavior, but even though the distinction between the two was supported the results were different from study to study. The two categories are much inter-co-related and therefore it is difficult to clearly determine their separate effects. This is also shown in the fact that transactional leadership behavior can provide higher motivation, innovation and satisfaction, if it is increased by transformational leadership behavior (Avolio, 2001). Current assessments of transformational and transactional leadership commonly make use of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ), developed by Bass and Avolio in 1990 and revised in 1995. It measures five dimensions of transformational leadership:

1. idealized influence - attributions
2. idealized influence - behaviors
3. inspirational motivation
4. individualized consideration
5. intellectual stimulation
The three dimensions of transactional leadership measured by the MLQ cover:

1. contingent reward
2. management by exception (active)
3. management by exception (passive)

The functional leadership model conceives leadership as a set of behaviors that helps a group perform a task, reach their goal, or perform their function. In this model, effective leaders encourage functional behaviors and discourage dysfunctional ones.

An effective leader resembles an orchestra conductor in some ways. He/she has to somehow get a group of potentially diverse and talented people - many of whom have strong personalities - to work together toward a common output. More recently, many authors and theorists have begun to study the term leadership as a set of behaviors that helps a group perform a task, reach their goal, or perform their function. In this model, effective leaders encourage functional behaviors and discourage dysfunctional ones.

An effective leader resembles an orchestra conductor in some ways. He/she has to somehow get a group of potentially diverse and talented people - many of whom have strong personalities - to work together toward a common output. More recently, many authors and theorists have begun to study the term leadership as charismatic influence, where leaders use vision and force of personality to inspire and empower their subordinates (Peterson, 2004). Charisma is seen as an acknowledgment made by the subordinates, based on what they observe of the leader's behaviors (Harris, 2002). Charismatic leadership is described by some researchers as transformational leadership, since the leader tries to transform a subordinate's values into the leader's values (Stashefsky, 2006). Robert House introduced the theory of charismatic leadership in 1977 but then renamed it to value-based leadership in 1997. However, the original term "charismatic leadership" or "charisma" describes this kind of leadership in the best way, which also indicates that the leader's power to influence followers is extraordinary since it provides a special type of leader-follower relationship (Stashefsky, 2006). According to Bass, charismatic leaders show great self-confidence and have the ability to articulate goals and ideas to the followers. It is common that followers of a charismatic leader seek to identify themselves with the leader (Pettigrew, 2013). Examples of charismatic leadership have shown to be "a product of communication" (Harris, 2002).

Many theorists have investigated the effects of charismatic leadership during the past 20 years (Stashefsky, 2006). It started in the 1980s and 1990s with a move
towards charismatic leadership, regarded as a way of understanding transformation and innovation (Pettigrew, 2013). Mostly the effects of charismatic leadership are shown in two categories; leader-focused variables and follower-focused variables. Satisfaction with the leader is one of the most common aspects among the leader-focused variables. Leaders can extensively improve subordinate satisfaction by emphasizing meaningful goals, show example of good behavior and provide empowerment approaches. When it comes to follower-focused variables, the most often explored variables are extra effort to work. It is of great importance that the leader brings up the meaning of the work and explains the connection between the organization's mission and goals with ideological values. In this way the followers feel more motivated and make easier self-sacrifices and extend their effort (Stashevsky, 2006). It has been found that subordinates who have worked for charismatic leaders performed significantly better and indicated more flexibility and creativity (Pfeffer, 1997). In addition, charismatic leadership tends to emerge under more uncertain and ambiguous conditions, i.e. when the performance cannot be easily measured or when it is difficult to link rewards to individual achievement (Pfeffer, 1997). The results from hundreds of empirical studies show that charismatic leadership has a positive effect on the subordinates and on the organization (Stashevsky, 2006). Many researches also show that leaders who have sacrificed in some way are viewed more charismatic than those who benefit. When leaders are perceived as charismatic and the subordinates feel trust it is easier for the leader to gain even more influence over the followers.

Many authors have noted that charismatic leaders put emphasis on changing the subordinates' needs, values and goals. According to House, these leaders show symbolic and meaningful behaviors to facilitate effective and cognitive consequences among subordinates. The reason for why charismatic leaders have such an influence on their followers depends on the fact that the leaders use a special type of leadership in relation to specific and observable behaviors. Through this the leader is able to stimulate internal change among their subordinates (Stashevsky, 2006). These subordinates also seem to have a better relationship with their charismatic leader than with a non-charismatic leader (Pfeffer, 1997). In similarity with the transformational leadership behavior, the followers often perform more than they thought were possible (Stasevsky, 2006).
Charismatic leaders differ from other leaders but not only in their behaviors, also in their personal characteristics. In particular, it has been shown in studies made by House that charismatic leaders have more dominance, self-confidence, need for influence or power and strong belief in the morality of their ideas (Pfeffer, 1997). There is also a dark side of charisma, which shows that critical weaknesses can easily be overlooked by the attractiveness of the charismatic leader (Harris, 2002). If the identification between leaders and followers are not that strong, a weaker form of charismatic leadership can be described as inspirational leadership. In this form, the followers are motivated by the goals and purposes of the leader rather than the leader itself (Pettigrew, 2013).

1.3.5 Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Effectiveness

Emotions are triggered by specific stimuli that may be either internal or external to the person, demand his attention, and interrupt his cognitive processes and behaviours (Simon, 1982; Forgas, 1992). They feed moods, because once the intensity of the emotion has run its course and subsided because the individual has cognitively or behaviourally dealt with its cause, the emotion lingers on as a less intense feeling, which is the mood. While emotions are high intensity feelings, moods are pervasive and generalised feeling states that are separate from events and circumstances, which may have caused the mood in the first place (Morris, 1989). Emotions belong to the affective part of the mind and include functions such as emotions, moods, evaluations and other feeling states including fatigue and energy (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). They appear to be common to mammalian species, and are basically signals and responses to changes in the relationships between an individual and his environment. Both moods and emotions are feelings that affect cognitive processes and behaviour, but what distinguishes moods from emotions is their intensity (George, 2000). Emotions track changes in relationships of a person to memories, events or persons in the external world, and therefore, convey meaning about such relationships (Mayer et al, 2000; Caruso et al, 2000). They coordinate his psychological subsystems such as responses, cognition, and conscious awareness.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) put forth one of the earliest explicit formulations of emotional intelligence. They defined emotional intelligence as the ability to
appraise, express, and regulate emotions (in self and others), and the ability to utilise emotions (e.g., to harness emotions to solve problems). Quoting partially from and combining the results of previous studies, Mayer and Salovey (1997) concluded that intelligence pertained to abilities such as the power to combine and separate concepts, to judge and to reason, and to engage in abstract thought. They also differentiated intelligence from adaptation, and argued that many organisms (such as ants) have been adaptive, without being intelligent. Intelligence was the cognitive aspect of the human mind whose functions included memory, reasoning, judgement, and abstract thought. Arguing that emotional intelligence meant that the presence and use of emotions made thinking more intelligent, and that emotions needed to be intelligently thought of, they felt that emotional intelligence represented the core aptitude or ability to reason with emotions. Taking into account the attention that emotional intelligence received in various publications at that time, they offered a more comprehensive definition.

Emotional intelligence is ‘the ability to perceive emotions accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and / or generate feelings when they facilitate thoughts; the ability of understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth’ (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). Cooper and Sawaf (1997) defined emotional intelligence as the ability to sense, understand and effectively apply the power and acumen of emotions as a source of human energy, information, trust, creativity, connection and influence. Mayer et al (2000) called emotional intelligence a ‘hot’ intelligence, because it involved the processing of self-related and emotional data, and formed a part of an emerging group of potential hot intelligences such as social intelligence, practical intelligence, personal intelligence, non-verbal skills, and emotional creativity. There was considerable overlap between each other’s concept domains. Like emotion, cognition is another one of its fundamental classes of mental operations (Mayer et al, 2000). It allows the organism to learn from its environment and to solve problems in novel situations. The objective is either to satisfy motives (another mental operation that directs the organism to carry out simple acts in order to satisfy survival and reproductive needs) or to keep emotions positive. It includes learning, memory and problem solving, through the means of deliberate information
processing based on learning and memory. The interaction of emotion and cognition gives rise to emotional intelligence.

In the mid-nineteenth century, Wechsler’s (1958) intelligence scales measured just two sub-groups of intelligence, verbal-propositional and spatial-performance (Mayer and Salovey, 1997). The verbal-propositional intelligence included measures of vocabulary, verbal fluency, and the ability to perceive similarities and to think logically. The spatial-performance intelligence included abilities of assembling objects and recognising and constructing designs and patterns. Cattell (1967, 1980) recorded two kinds of intelligence: fluid and crystallized. Fluid intelligence was represented by components of reasoning, memory and information processing capabilities. In contrast, crystallized intelligence was composed of information, skills and strategies learned through experience and applicable for solving problems. Guildford and Hoepfner (1971) had proposed the existence of 120 forms of intelligence, basing their conclusions on the number of combinations of basic mental processes. Although the model was potentially useful, the theory lacked support because of the difficulty of testing the large number of intelligences under the correlational method. A number of researchers have attempted to develop self-report measures of emotional intelligence or emotional intelligence-related constructs (Salovey and Mayer, 1990; Goleman, 1995; Bar-On, 1997).

While the definitions of emotional intelligence were often varied, they nevertheless tended to be complementary rather than contradictory. In general, the various measures covered, to more or less extent, four distinct areas: emotion perception, regulation, understanding, and utilisation. Numerous theorists and cognitive psychologists defined intelligence in pluralistic, incremental and more dynamic terms. They postulated its existence as a much broader intellectual spectrum, and that it involved many ‘varieties of thinking’, and is therefore exemplified in many diverse and multiple ways. Gardner (1993) proposed the Multiple Intelligences Model with 8 forms of intelligence: linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, interpersonal, intrapersonal and naturalist. He also argued for the existence of a ninth form, existential intelligence (Chabris, 2010).
1.3.6 Locus of Control and Leadership Effectiveness

Locus of control first emerged out of the Social Learning Theory developed by Rotter (1966). According to this theory, an individual learnt on the basis of his history of reinforcement, due to which he developed General and Specific Expectancies. A Specific Expectancy was the individual’s belief that a certain behaviour at a certain time and place would lead to a specific result. The Generalised Expectancy explained his belief that anything he did was likely to make a difference. Reinforcements act to strengthen such expectancies that a behaviour or event would be followed by the same reinforcements in the future, too. He referred to the Generalised Expectancy as the locus of control, and defined the latter as the learned belief by people about the effect of their actions. The concept was developed to explain the tendency in individuals to ignore reinforcement contingencies (Phares, 1976). This failure to respond to rewards and punishment in expected directions was attributed to their expectations that their own efforts would not lead to attainment of rewards or avoidance of punishment. An individual’s expectancy for some behaviour was his belief, or subjective probability about how likely he thinks that behaviour would help him attain his goal (Funder, 2001). As such expectancy was only a belief, it could be either right or wrong. However, irrespective of whether an action was likely to succeed or not, he would make an attempt merely on the strength of that belief that such success was possible.

Rotter’s Social Learning Theory (1966) focused on what people believed the rewards and punishments in the environment were likely to be. Individuals developed the belief that outcomes were a result either of their own actions (Internal) or of forces independent of their actions (External). Seligman (1975) explained the concept of control, explicitly. An event was controllable if a person’s voluntary responses to a situation have an impact on the consequences of the event. In an uncontrollable event, the voluntary responses do not create the desired impact. There is a loss of control when there is a lack of contingency between behaviours and outcomes. This loss of control leads to motivational, emotional and cognitive deficits and a state of learned helplessness similar to the state of depression. Externals believe that what happens to them is related to external events, powerful others and chance events, and thus, beyond their control (Lefcourt, 1983). On the contrary, Internals were characterised by their belief that what happens to them was a consequence of
their own actions, and is within their control. They tended to have more adaptive behaviours, take a more active interest in their healthcare, experience more positive outcomes (less depressed and anxious), and enjoy better physical health than those with Externals (Oberle, 1991)\textsuperscript{323}.

The self-judgement and self-beliefs of the individual (the assembly of all his opinions about himself or self-concept) transcend specific domains. They affect his mood, and often determine what he would do or attempt to do (Funder, 2001).\textsuperscript{324} Personality was the manner in which a person affected others through his appearance and behaviour, awareness of himself as a unique being with a distinct set of attitudes and values, and a pattern of measurable traits that characterised his behaviour. Robbins (2001)\textsuperscript{325} described locus of control as a personality attribute that had the potential for predicting behaviour in organisations. He defined it as the degree to which people believe they are masters of their own fate. While some people believed that they controlled their own fate (Internal locus of control, i.e. Internals), others believed that forces beyond their control (External locus of control, i.e. Externals) controlled their life. Internals made a greater attempt to control their environment than the Externals, while Externals were more willing to follow directions. Internals took up initiative easily, whereas Externals were more compliant, and succeed in structured and routine environments. Internals were better able to engage in political behaviour leading to favourable outcomes such as rewards and averted punishments, while Externals were likely to be more passive and defensive.

In order to assess individuals’ attributions about influences on health and illness, Wallston and Wallston (1981)\textsuperscript{326} developed a three-dimensional scale. Called the multidimensional health locus of control, it was based on Rotter’s two-dimensional scale of 1966.\textsuperscript{327} The trait of locus of control has many implications for managerial behaviour and performance. Work persistence was a major component of work personality, and it predicted a more internalised locus of control. Persistence was defined at staying ability without prompting, steady work, and working at routine jobs without resistance (Bolton and Roesslet, 1986).\textsuperscript{328} Because locus of control was implicated in many career and vocational behaviours, Spector (1988) developed the work locus of control scale to measure the generalised control in work settings. Work personality develops during a person’s pre-school years, and is his self-concept as a worker that includes his work-related needs and values. Work personality interacts
with work competencies and work goals to produce work adjustment, which is a product of the person and his environment (Hershenson, 1996a, 1996b, Szymanski and Hershenson, 1998). Work personality was a significant predictor of locus of control and job readiness self-efficacy (Strauser, 2002).

Externals with high Chance orientation scores believe that the world is unpredictable, and attribute events to luck and fate, not to people to control their outcomes in life. They may engage in compensating behaviours or denial to deal with work-related stress. If they remain in their jobs despite career dissatisfaction, and due to limited alternatives for their job pursuits, their helplessness may force them into alcohol abuse (Levenson, 1974). Validity of studies between locus of control and health-related behaviours have been questioned because an individual could have a tendency toward internality in some life areas, while having an external belief with regard to that particular health-related behaviour in question. Therefore, Paulhus (1983) has argued that the locus of control construct is multi-dimensional, and that a scale that measured perceived control in different domains in life would be a better measure than Rotter’s single scale. According to Biggs (1985), students uninterested in critical thinking skills and not characterised by an intrinsic motivation or curiosity were likely to have an External locus of control. These findings were supported by Rose et al (1996) who suggested that students with a deep approach to learning, and who often reflect on their learning, tended to have an internal locus of control. On the contrary, Externals with Powerful Others orientation may exhibit only avoidance and resignation, when they experience higher levels of stress, as they do not believe that they can cause any change in their environment to reduce their difficulties (Turben and Dougherty, 1994).

1.3.7 Role Efficacy and Leadership Effectiveness

It was Mintzberg (1973), who first proposed three generic categories for describing ten roles of managers: (i) interpersonal (figurehead, leader, and liaison); (ii) informational (monitor, disseminator, and spokesman); and (iii) decisional (entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator). In his effectiveness model, managers could be effective in different ways at different times, depending on the combination of different roles at each job level. Along with norms
and status, the role is a concept that is the foundation to explain and predict group behaviour (Robbins, 1985). A group is defined as two or more individuals, interacting and interdependent, who come together, formally or otherwise, to achieve particular objectives. Specific attitudes and actual behaviours consistent with a role create an identity for the role. The behaviour of the role occupant is based on his perception of expected behaviour. Role expectations are influenced by the belief for desirable action in that role. The role is the position occupied by someone in a social system, as defined by the functions he performed in response to the expectations of the significant members of the social system, and his own expectations from that position or office (Pareek, 1987).

It was further differentiated from the office, which was a relational concept related to power, while role was an obligational concept. The role comprised not only of the set of expectations (functions) of the person in a position in office (or organisation) and other important members of that organisation from his position, but also included his responses to such expectations.

The effectiveness of an organisational member would be dependent on his own potential effectiveness, the potential effectiveness of the role, and the organisational climate. The potential effectiveness might be called efficacy, and therefore, role efficacy would be the potential effectiveness of an individual occupying a specific role in his organisation (Pareek, 1987). It would be the psychological factor underlying the effectiveness of the role. His model attempted to integrate the individual’s needs with those of the role within his organisation. He identified ten aspects of role efficacy that must be present for the employee to reach maximum efficiency in his organisation: centrality, integration, pro-activity, creativity, inter-role linkage, helping relationships, super-ordination, influence, personal growth and confrontation. He grouped these aspects into three dimensions: role making concerned attitudes and responses to others’ expectations. Role centering concerned the power and importance of the role. Role linking referred to its relationship with other roles. The roles that a person performs are centered around the self (Klinefelter, 1993). Therefore, the optimal goal for effectiveness would be to have a close relationship between the role of the person in an organisation and the concept of self.
1.3.8 Leader Effectiveness and the Role of the Leader

Modern organizations have become extremely complex because of the necessity to adapt to dynamic environmental factors. Thus, a primary organizational task is to identify and develop effective leaders who can create, implement, and control effective change strategies that align the organization's structure with its strategies. An effective leader is one who can hold a group together coherently and achieve its goal effectively. A good leader knows how to make use of the strength of each member complement those of other members.

Current educational reform places a great premium upon the relationship between effective leadership and education delivery improvement. Connection between leadership and university improvement have increasingly been studied (Sergiovanni & Starrat, 1998). The university manager is encouraged to work with teachers, empower them (Blasé & Blasé, 1994), get them involved in developing wholeness, connectedness at work, deeper values (Gibbons, 2000), initiative, and team spirit in a way which benefits the university as a whole (Robbins, 2005).

It is difficult to provide a definition of leadership. However, after comprehensive review of available literature on leadership, Nahavandi (2003) and Northouse (2007) found elements common to the phenomenon of leadership, no matter where or how the leadership is exercised. Nahavandi and Northouse listed three common elements: (a) leadership involves interaction with a group, (b) leadership involves the exercise of influence, and (c) leadership involves the attainment of a goal.

Once a reasonable precise definition of leadership is established, it becomes necessary to define effective leadership. Northouse (2007) stated that leadership effectiveness is measured by the attainment of goals or objectives within a leadership context. Hartman (1999) contends that leadership effectiveness is defined both objectively and subjectively. Subjective measures are usually based on ratings obtained from leader's superiors, peers, or subordinates. Examples of objective measure of performance or goal attainment can include profits, profit margin, test scores, graduation rates, sales increase, market share, or profitability (Hartman 1999).
Leadership Effectiveness in a university setup is about helping other academicians and administrators develop the leadership skills required to drive their change efforts. Evolve works with senior executives in a highly personal, challenging, and exciting way to instil confidence and optimism, clarify responsibilities and accountabilities, and increase collaborative skills.

A chronological review of the American educational system demonstrates that today’s high-stakes educational system requires leadership that can promote and sustain the learning of both students and teachers ensuring that all stakeholders have leadership responsibilities (Thompson et al., 2004.352 In an extensive review of leadership theory and research to gather evidentiary data regarding the nature, causes, and outcomes for institutions of higher education and students with successful leadership, Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris, and Hopkins (2006),353 noted five types of typical leadership studies: (a) qualitative case study conducted in exceptional university settings, (b) large-scale quantitative studies of overall leader effects, (c) large-scale quantitative studies of specific leadership effects, (d) studies on leadership effects on adult learning community engagement, and (e) studies focusing on vice chancellor succession and its effect on university outcomes.

According to Hargreaves and Fink (2004)354 university leaders are also motivated to create sustainable changes in their organizations. These sustainable changes involve multiple feedback loops, employing flexibility, demonstrating dynamic balance, and synergizing the partnerships between energy and resources. Leaders who are supporting sustainability must make lasting change and be inclusive. Leaders concerned with sustainability are about deep learning, sustaining others in deep learning, and sustaining themselves. Important to leadership sustainability is distributed leadership where collective intelligence is tapped into and put into action, thereby multiplying the capacity of the system. Contributing to the sustainability of leadership are the interrelationship behaviors and connections that are vital to generating and regenerating learning and therefore the enthusiasm to renew the organization’s energy and focus.

The pace of today’s complex university learning environments requires multifaceted leadership to address the multitude of university conditions present on university campuses nationwide. Leaders who are quick to adapt are able to ascertain
and evaluate the challenges faced by them as leaders as well as help mediate the challenges faced by their followers (Bass, Avolio, Jung, & Berson, 2003). According to Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004), leadership is the catalyst for institution’s effectiveness and change. Without an effective instructional leader, successful reform implementation lacked significant organizational change over time. Additional researchers have noted that the leadership style of vice chancellors and other administrators can have a profound affect on the development and ongoing positive performance of a professional learning community (Boyd & Hord, 1994; DuFour and Eaker, 2008; Graham, 2007; Morrissey, 2000; Thompson et al., 2004).

Leadership is a skill that is both necessary and desirable because it helps to cope with tasks that one individual could not singly undertake and accomplish without the assistance of others (Fielder, 1967). Leadership alone has the capacity to create a social architecture capable of generating intellectual capital in the form of ideas, know-how, knowledge, expertise and innovation. As the degree of influence is a central component of the leadership process, the leader’s outcomes are expected to depend heavily on his ability to wield such influence. To deal with resistance to organisation change, Kotter (1979) had suggested the use of tactics such as education and communication, participation, facilitation and support, negotiation, manipulation and coercion. Bennis and Townsend (1995) distinguished the manager from the leader, stating that leaders conquered the volatile, turbulent and ambiguous surroundings while managers surrendered to it. Today’s dynamic business climate may see large changes in technology, demographic diversity and globalisation. Therefore, new leaders would need to be more articulate, energetic and empowering than ever before.

As a result of the competitive nature of the business environment, organizations of all sizes need the right kind of leadership in order to survive. Effective leadership within an organization is often viewed as the foundation of organizational performance and growth (Kartz & Khan, 1978; Yukl, 2006; Vardinaan, Houghton & Jinkerson, 2006) hence, organizations that fail to have effective leadership may likely fail to meet performance expectation. It is evident from previous research that leadership (at individual, group or organizational levels) is very important in helping an individual, group or organization to achieve the goals.
Lawal and Chukwuebuka (2007) observed that the extent to which several members of the organization put in their influence and ability in their disposal for the effective utilization of their scarce resources, depends to a large extent on the ability of the leaders and how they (leaders) understand and perform their managerial jobs. Thus the impact people have in leadership position is undoubtedly great as their actions and effective managerial performance usually goes a long way in determining the organizations performance to some larger extent (Giesner et al., 2009). Yukl (2008) observed that, effective performance of today’s organizations depends on the ability of an organization to perform its stated objectives and mission, so as to maintain its favorable earnings and sustain the value of its assets. The leader is now expected to play a crucial role to achieve this (Lawal & Chukwuebuka, 2007).

Consequently however, leaders in various organisations around the world are today facing numerous challenges as they are regularly struggling to adapt to the accelerating changes in their organisations which is both internally and externally embedded in the environment (Avolio & Luthans, 2006; Hooijberg, Hunt, & Dodge, 1997; Lord & Hall, 2005; Hannah, Avolio, Luthans & Harms 2008). In this period of economic realities, most organizational leaders were left in dilemma as they are engaged in handling the realities of today’s business environment (Luthans, Wyk & Wulumbwa, 2004). This situation not only challenges the leaders’ ability, their skills or knowledge but even questions their capabilities of leading their organisation or the psychological resources needed in meeting the ever accelerating demands of their managerial roles. Tsui and Ashford (1994) pointed out that organisations and managers working in them are faced with several daunting realities. These realities sometimes direct organisations into the idea of downsizing, restructuring, mergers and retooling, with striking frequency, in response to the more turbulent, competitive and rapid advancements in the global market place.

Yorges et al (1999) found that leaders who appeared willing to endure hardship for the expression of their beliefs (sacrifice) gained greater influence over their members. In contrast, where the leader earned external rewards or where his motives were seen to be self-serving, his influence would decrease accordingly. Such cases undermined his ability to articulate a collective vision for his organisation in a manner that is acceptable to his employees. The core purpose of leadership was to make fundamental changes in how business is conducted in order to help cope with a
new, more challenging market environment. Leadership commitment and support are essential for the success of change programmes (Rodgers and Hunter, 1991)\textsuperscript{377} and of cultural change within the organisations (Schein, 1990;\textsuperscript{378} Kanter, 1991).\textsuperscript{379} Because they are responsible for the creation of policy, the existence or absence of their commitment can outweigh the absence or existence of all other contextual factors. Leadership processes cannot be understood apart from the dynamics of the social system in which they are embedded (Dachler, 1988).\textsuperscript{380}

Leaders’ efforts take many shapes: total quality management, reengineering, right sizing, restructuring, cultural change, and turnaround. Kotter (1995)\textsuperscript{381} states that successful cases go through a change process with a series of phases that require a lot of time. A changing environment will need to redefine the role of the leader. The forces of technology, competition, and increasing complexity of tasks may force a leader to share many of his formal functions with others in his group or organization (Pareek, 1997).\textsuperscript{382} The leader’s traditional role with a large element of control and hands-on supervision might need to change in order to be effective. Not only did this mean that leaders must focus more sharply on critical issues, it also implied that adaptation to changing situations and assumption of new roles would be unavoidable. Ghoshal et al (2000)\textsuperscript{383} had observed that today’s leaders would be expected to develop their people, creating contexts in which each individual could become the best in his organisation. In large organisations, leadership will involve reciprocal influence processes among multiple individuals at different levels in different sub-units and within executive teams.

It was Zaleznik (1977)\textsuperscript{384} who first differentiated managers from leaders. Smith et al (1989)\textsuperscript{385} uncovered comparative research that different types of leader behaviour were considered appropriate in different cultures. Kotter (1990)\textsuperscript{386} considered that the contemporary world had more volatility and competition than ever before, and compared the roles of the leader and the Manager. Stating that more change demanded more leadership, organisations needed more people to handle their leadership challenges. Management differed from leadership in terms of their primary function. While management produced order and consistency, leadership produced movement. The essential function of leadership was to produce constructive, adaptive or useful change. Strong management discouraged risk-taking. Although these
differences in function and form created potential for conflict, both managers and leaders would need to co-exist, if the organisation was to prosper.

"Good" or productive leadership seems to be expressed from the known formula of management science referred to the productivity of management/leadership efforts: effectiveness (degree of achieving goals) to efficiency (degree of exploitation of the entered information). This means that variables that impact to higher levels of efficiency impacts directly to the productivity of the leadership efforts (through the higher degree of achieving goals).

Leadership is not about hierarchy or title or status. It is about having influence and mastering change. Leadership is not about bragging rights or battles or even the accumulation of wealth; it's about connecting and engaging at multiple levels. It's about challenging minds and capturing hearts. Leadership in this new era is about empowering others to decide for themselves. Leadership is about empowering others to reach their full potential. Leaders can no longer view strategy and execution as abstract concepts, but must realize that both elements are ultimately about people (Abraham, 1997). Conscious decision-making as the main characteristic of successful leaders (Kouzes and Posner 1995; Kilpatrick and Locke, 1991; Stogdill, 1974) has been part of the human faculty since man began to think and be self-aware. Many decisions have to take place under conditions of lack of information and uncertainty of the outcome. In the early history of mankind, decision makers turned for help to the supernatural or to priesthood’s of one sort or another. However as time evolved an understanding of the processes of nature – in statistical and probability analysis – began to create the basis for a more rational approach to decision-making.

The Enlightened Transformation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformation Effectiveness</td>
<td>High-Performance Management Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Process Performance Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation &amp; Programme Management</td>
<td>Change Implementation &amp; Programme Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bass (1999) found leaders are usually more highly correlated with outcomes and effectiveness and subordinates satisfaction. Transformational leadership style is those who stimulate and inspire follower to achieve extraordinary outcome and develop their own leadership capacity. It helps follower growth and develops into leader through empowering and inspiring follower commitment to a shared vision and goal. Leaders can move follower exceed expected performance with high level of satisfaction and commitment to the group and organization Avolio et al. (2004). On the contrary, transactional leader practices contingent reinforcement of followers but could not provide job satisfaction. It refers to the exchange relationship between leader and follower to meet their own self-interests. Whereas, transformational leaders support morale, motivation, and morals to their follower (Bass, 1990). Daft (2005) stated that transformational leadership is characterized by the ability of leaders to bring about significant change. Transformational leaders lead changes to the organization’ vision, strategy and culture as well as promote innovation in products and technologies.

On the contrary, definition of transactional leadership is based in contingency, in that reward or punishment is contingent upon performance. Transactional leader works through creating clear structures whereby it is clear what is required of their subordinates, and the rewards that they get for following orders. Transactional Leadership is the idea that effective leadership is based on a reciprocal exchange between leaders and followers. Transactional leadership involves giving employees something in return for their compliance and acceptance of authority, usually in the form of incentives such as pay raises or an increase in status.

Burns (1978) described transactional leadership as motivating followers primarily through exchanges based on contingent-rewards. Harter et al. (2003) had categorised the manager to be a transactional leader, because the work that he performed was administrative. Managers, as transactional leaders, did not question the goals of their organisation, but worked their way through intrigue, control and compromise. Their relationship with their followers was on the basis of an exchange process, which would be either explicit (pay for performance), or implicit (unstated). Transactional leadership involves contingent reinforcement, where both the leader and the follower agree on what should be done by the follower to earn rewards or avoid being punished (Bass, 1985). The main focus of this leader would be to set goals,
clarify the link between performance and rewards, and provide constructive feedback to followers on tasks. The transactional leader would be most effective when the company was mature, stable or at the peak of growth of its life cycle (Taffinder, 1995). 

Assumptions of transactional leadership indicate that people are motivated by reward and punishment, social systems work best with a clear chain of command. When people have agreed to do a job, a part of the deal is that they yield all authority to their manager. The basic principle purpose of a subordinate is to do what their manager tells them to do. On the other hand, transformational leaders are constantly looking into the future for new possibilities, shares vision to reality along with organizational mission, creators of new organizational capabilities to the organization unique. Leaders are working to encourage their subordinates more self-managing and inspire others to reach their potential in the context of the work that needs to be done to achieve the organization’s vision and mission.

The new leadership paradigm concerning transformational leaders involve employees in problem solving and decision-making. Transformational leadership style tend to individualize influence, i.e., that leaders identify their mission and vision of the organization and raise their performance to a higher level. Successful transformational leadership enhances employee commitment, involvement, cohesion, and believed in oneself. It is the most powerful leadership component in successful entrepreneurial companies and is empirically linked to financial performance. Transformational leadership style is a leaders who influence and lead change that focuses on initiating and managing personal and organizational transitions. Leaders are also compelling visionaries who accurately predict the future and create it. Great leaders have a clear vision through which they inspire and motivate others.

Such leaders would have high degree of intellectual simulation, i.e., the degree to which the leader challenges assumptions, takes risks and solicits followers' ideas. Leaders with this trait stimulate and encourage creativity in their followers. Transformation leader attempt building teamwork with high-performance that successful team combines a diversity of all people in organization to achieve excellence performance. Coaching & mentoring are also a level of empowerment. Their subordinates will understand the importance and benefits of a coaching style of
leadership as a means of providing instruction, direction, feedback, and support for performance improvement. Leaders recognize and articulate an employee’s strengths, needs, and blind spots to increase employee performance.

Leaders articulate a vision that is appealing and inspiring to followers. Leaders with inspirational motivation challenge followers with high standards, communicate optimism about future goals, and provide meaning for the task at hand. Followers need to have a strong sense of purpose if they are to be motivated to act. Purpose and meaning provide the energy that drives a group forward. It is also important that this visionary aspect of leadership be supported by communication skills that allow the leader to articulate his or her vision with precision and power in a compelling and persuasive way. Transformational leadership requires the ability to engage the hearts and minds of people with different wants, needs and expectations. A successful leader is one who can genuinely understand what it is like to walk in the shoes of others. He acts as a mentor or coach to the follower and listens to the follower’s concerns and needs. This also encompasses the need to respect and celebrate the individual contribution that each follower can make to the team.

Yukl (2006)\(^{399}\) mentioned that transformational leadership refers to the process of building commitment to the organizational objectives and empowering followers to accomplish organizational objectives. Many researches concerning transformational leadership was conducted by Barnett et al. (2001).\(^{400}\) They found the relationship between transformational leadership and transactional leadership style with subordinates outcome. Their studies found transformational leadership style rated higher relationship on subordinates outcome and more job satisfaction. Furthermore, Whittington (1997)\(^{401}\) examined the relationships between transformational leadership and organisational outcomes by using field surveys found effective outcomes from subordinates.

Barnett et al (2001)\(^{402}\) investigated the relationship between transformational and transactional leadership behaviour by using factor analysis to support a leadership model of transactional and transformational factors. The multiple regression analysis was used to examine four dimensions of leadership as independent variables. He found transformational leadership associated with subordinates outcomes, satisfaction, extra effort and perception of leader effectiveness. In addition, Tucker et
al (2004)\textsuperscript{403} studies focused on how transformational leaders influence organizations. They found transformational leaders provide change and movement to their organizations. They found that such leaders seek to alter the existing structure and influence people into a new vision and new possibilities.

Excellent transformational leaders use authority and power to inspire and motivate people trust and follow their performance. Ingram (1997)\textsuperscript{404} and Ross and Offerman (1997)\textsuperscript{405} studied the relationship between transformational leadership and transactional leadership. They analysed whether leadership behaviour tends to be more transformational or more transactional leadership with subordinates’ job satisfaction. The result indicated leaders, as perceived by subordinates, exhibit more transformational leadership than transactional leadership. Subordinates tend to be more highly job satisfaction under a leaders who is perceived to be more transformational than transactional leadership. From many studies mentioned above, transformational leadership tended to be more highly able to affect subordinates job satisfaction and organizational outcome (Abshire, 2001).\textsuperscript{405a} Another study on changing environment, Regina, et al (1999)\textsuperscript{406} investigated transformational leadership in the context of organizational change. They identified that change management success relate to transformational leadership style. They mentioned an importance of leadership to the change management process. The success of change management depends on leaders (Regina et al., 1999).\textsuperscript{407}

According to Quinn (1996),\textsuperscript{408} transformational leaders are internally driven visionaries who are able to see beyond technical competence and political exchange. Also, Quinn clearly states that the transformational leader focuses from a paradigm where the first priority is vision realization and behaves within a construct of a formal moral system, attains power from a core set of values, provides behavioral integrity, is self-authoring, communicates symbolically with cohorts, is action-learning driven, and whose strategies are highly complex. The transformational leader is also able to continually realign their perspective or paradigm to adapt to the dynamics of an ever-changing environment. These behavioral characteristics are perceived as a tremendous strength by outside observers who often become followers. Several different sub-dimensions of transformational leadership have been identified and significant unique relationships with a number of outcome measures have been demonstrated (Rafferty
& Griffin, 2004). Both transformational and transactional forms of leadership seem to be affected by moral and personal development.

The transformational leader exercised a strong influence on his followers’ levels of identification, motivation, and goal achievement by building their self-confidence, self-efficacy and self-esteem (Shamir et al, 1993; Klein and House, 1995; Gardner and Avolio, 1998). He persuaded followers to work hard to achieve the goals envisioned and for employee rewards that are internal (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1996). Whereas they adjusted goals, direction and mission for practical reasons, they would change the firm or unit’s mission, business processes, and human resources management to achieve the vision. They would recreate the entire philosophy, system, and culture of an organisation. They could play the role of teacher, mentor, coach, reformer, or revolutionary. Dvir et al (2002) found that transformational leaders had a more positive impact on their followers’ performances than managers. Kraatz and Moore (2002) argued that leaders were the actual bearers of institutionalised assumptions and understandings. Large institutionalised forces converge on their leaders, and ultimately affect those organisations through those leaders.

However, Bass and Steidlmeier (1999) point out that we need to distinguish the authentic transformational leadership from one that is pseudo-transformational. The distinction may be done by referring to four components that characterize transformational leadership: idealized influence (or charisma), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration.

In terms of idealized influence and inspirational motivation, the difference between the authentic and pseudo-transformational leaders lies in the values for which they are idealized. "The true and authentic are inwardly and outwardly concerned about the good that can be achieved for the group, organization, or society for which they feel responsible" (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). The pseudo-transformational leaders only pretend to be like the transformational leaders, but privately they are only concerned with the good they can achieve for themselves. While the authentic transformational leaders "persuade others on the merits of the issues" (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999), the pseudo-transformational leaders are only concerned with controlling others for their own benefits. Finally, "while the true
transformational leaders are concerned about developing their followers into leaders, the pseudo-transformational leaders are more concerned about maintaining the dependence of their followers” (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999). Transformational leaders are those “who motivate followers to do more than they originally expected to do. Transformational leaders broaden and change the interests of their followers, and generate awareness and acceptance of the purposes and mission of the group. They stir their followers to look beyond their self-interest for the good of the group” (Krishnan, 2005). In the long run, it is the authentic transformational leaders who will be truly effective. The pseudo-transformational leaders can only deceive for a while.

Krishnan (2005) examines the relationship between transformational leadership and perceived effectiveness of leaders and work units, follower satisfaction with leader, follower's motivation to put in extra effort, and follower's intention to quit the organization. He found that transformational leadership is positively related to all the above. However, we must not lose sight of the importance of other processes such as communication and conflict resolution of the group. All transformational leaders need to understand these processes if their leadership is to remain effective.

Charisma was found to be one of the most important characteristics of the transformational leader, but not sufficient for an effective transformation. Although effective leadership styles for top management positions were harder to establish, Bass (1985) identified five factors to describe transformational leadership:

1. Charisma: the ability to instil a sense of value, respect and pride, and to articulate a vision
2. Individual attention to followers’ needs, and assignation of projects that helped them grow
3. Intellectual simulation, helping followers to be creative and rethink situations
4. Contingent rewards for followers, and informing them how to achieve them
5. Management by exception, not intervening, unless goals were not accomplished in time and on budgeted cost.

The fundamental proposition of Bass (1985) that transformational leadership augments transactional leadership in predicting leader effectiveness has
empirical support (Waldman et al, 1987; Seltzer and Bass, 1990; Hater and Bass, 1998) found that leader-member exchange was related positively to transformational and contingent reward leadership, and negatively to management-by-exception. They also found that leader-member exchange and active management-by-exception positively predicted follower performance. Research on the topic was still relatively abstract and ambiguous, and Howell and Hall-Merenda (1999) found that leader-member exchange was related positively to transformational and contingent reward leadership, and negatively to management-by-exception. Howells and Hall-Merenda (1999) found that leader-member exchange was related positively to transformational and contingent reward leadership, and negatively to management-by-exception. They also found that leader-member exchange and active management-by-exception positively predicted follower performance. Research on the topic was still relatively abstract and ambiguous, and Judge and Bono (2000) claimed that the origins of the behaviours of transformational leadership remained unclear. Its facets, such as charisma, were either traits, or at least, were influenced by traits. There was little research to determine and confirm whether such leaders were born or made.

The era of managing by dictates is being replaced by an era of management by inspiration (Conger, 1990). An important way to inspire others would be to articulate a highly emotional message. He further observed major rhetorical techniques of inspirational leaders, the use of metaphors that appealed to the intellect, imagination and values, and the ability to gear language to different audiences choosing the level of language to suit the audiences. Leaders would foster the teamwork through behaviours and attitudes. Heifetz and Linsky (2002) contended that leadership was a challenging and thrilling experience of inspiring people to come up with creative solutions to transform organisations for the better. The essence of leadership was to move people to respond positively to disturbing news and difficult news, and to make a positive difference to the lives of others. However, far from the power that such positions appeared to promise, the experience resulted in rewards, joys, pains, perils and frustrations for the leader.

Interest and, therefore, the study of leadership in complex organisations is characterised by the parallel development of two different perspectives (Howell and Hall-Merenda, 1999). One viewpoint is focused on the leader, where some perspectives include transformational, charismatic and value based theories of leadership (House et al, 1997). The other viewpoint, called leader-member exchange, focuses on explicit one-on-one developing relationships between the leader and his follower. A causal link may be seen between follower performance and the quality and level of mutual trust, respect, and influence within those relationships. The performance and growth of the leader and of his group or organization, his retention of a high status in the group and advancement to higher positions of
authority in that organisation, the level of preparedness to deal with challenges or crisis, his followers’ satisfaction with him, their commitment to the group objectives, and their psychological well-being and development were outcomes of leader effectiveness (Dhar and Mishra, 2001). The most commonly used measure of leader effectiveness is the extent to which the leader’s organizational unit performs its task successfully and attains its goals. In some cases, objective measures of performance or goal attainment are available, such as profits, profit margin, sales increase, market share, sales relative to targeted sales, return on investment, productivity, cost per unit of output, cost in relation to budgeted expenditure. In some cases, subjective ratings of effectiveness are obtained from his superiors, peers or subordinates.

1.3.9 Leader Effectiveness and Leadership Process

Psychologist Herzberg (1968) found that removing dissatisfying characteristics from the job did not make it satisfying. His research found that factors that motivated were different from those that merely removed dissatisfaction at the workplace, which he called hygiene factors. Herzberg determined that company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions and salary were all hygiene factors that did not actually satisfy or motivate for better performance. Factors like the nature of work, achievement, recognition, growth and responsibility were the true motivators. Hersey-Blanchard’s (1969) model built on other explanations of leadership that emphasised both task and relationship behaviour. As it was intuitively appealing, it became a basis for leadership training. Some researchers viewed these sets of behaviour (task and people oriented) as mutually exclusive and necessary for effectiveness (Larson et al, 1976; Nystrom, 1978). Other researchers viewed task and people orientation as values rather than as distinct types of leader behaviour (Blake and Mouton, 1982). Decades of research on performance oriented (task) and relationship oriented (people) behaviour showed consistent evidence that both the dimensions of behaviour were necessary for leader effectiveness (Misumi, 1985).

On the other hand, various descriptive case studies of leaders have been consistently supportive of the benefits of participative leadership. Effective leaders
used a significant amount of consultation and delegation to empower subordinates and give them a sense of ownership for activities and decisions. The effectiveness of power sharing and delegation found more support from the research findings on self-managed groups (Kanter, 1983; Bradford and Cohen, 1984; Peters and Austin, 1985; Kouzes and Posner, 1987; Manz and Sims, 1987, 1989). However, DuBrin (1995) opined that the categories and guidelines were not so clear-cut, and it was doubtful that the prescriptions for leadership would work every time. Leadership styles and decision styles affect their entrepreneurial behaviour. In a study of entrepreneurs of Taiwan’s Silicon Valley, Hsin-Chu Science-based Industrial Park, Wu and Lin (1998) found that the founders’ nAch (need for achievement) was related to their task-oriented leadership styles, and that their locus of control differed according to their various decision styles.

Sinha (1980, 1983) argued that a particular leadership style (the behaviour of the leader towards the members of the group) could not be universally adopted due to cultural, individual and situation-specific considerations. His model of leadership styles comprised of three approaches: authoritarian, nurturing-task and participative. He suggested that the use of task-oriented, discipline-minded, tough and personalized leadership style, which he called the nurturing-task style, would be the most effective under Indian conditions. The nurturing-task leader would care for his members, show affection, take personal interest in their well-being, and be committed to their growth. Once the members achieve a reasonable level of maturity, they generate pressure on their leader, and demand a shift to the participative style. The same leadership style could be perceived differently and could have different effects on motivation and performance for followers from different cultural groups (Jung and Avolio, 1999). Their results illustrated that transactional and transformational leadership affected followers’ performance differently. They suggested that long-term perspectives in line with real-world requirements be considered to measure leader effectiveness for effective managerial leadership.

After an analysis of competency models across 188 companies, Goleman (1998) identified personal capabilities that drove outstanding performance and grouped them into three categories: technical skills (like accounting and planning), cognitive skills (analytical reasoning), and emotional intelligence. He concluded that emotional intelligence was twice as important as other skills and for jobs at all levels.
Other researchers, such as David McClelland (1999), had also confirmed that emotional intelligence not only distinguished outstanding leaders, but was also linked to strong performance. Emotional intelligence could be learned, but the process would not be easy, as it would take time and commitment. To adapt to changes, leaders would need to master their emotions. When leaders employ social skills, they can move people into the desired direction with friendliness. He identified the components of emotional intelligence, at the workplace, to be self-awareness, self-regulation, motivation, empathy and social skill.

From a literature survey, Balaraman (1989) found that many independent studies on Indian leadership styles came to a variety of conclusions. Indian managers adopted bureaucratic, consultative, nurturant-oriented, or between benevolent authoritarian and consultative styles. Her own studies identified only three styles that were predictive of managerial effectiveness or ineffectiveness: authoritative / autocratic, independent / initiator and dependent / conformist. Of these, the authoritative / autocratic style was the strongest predictor of ineffectiveness. The independent / initiator and dependent / conformist styles predicted effectiveness, but weakly. They also predicted a single criterion of effectiveness: communication skill or ability. Ultimately, managers tended to use all five styles, showing no special preference for any one ‘best’ leadership style. Adopting the styling conceived by Rao (1981), Venkatapathy (1990) found that public sector executives adopted styles that were significantly different from those in the private sector in the critical and developmental scales. Significant differences in the organisational climates (dependent, incompetent and dissatisfaction, self-confident, and interdependent) were also seen in all the three leadership styles viz., benevolent, critical and developmental. In both sectors, the developmental, benevolent and critical styles were most effective in that order. This may suggest that organisational climate and leadership styles affect each other in order to produce desirable results.

Schaeffer (2002) effectively employed three different leadership styles – the autocrat, the participant and the reformer – to meet the challenges of the organisations he headed across a 30-year career. While the demands of the marketplace shaped his leadership journey, it had not been easy to put on a different leadership cap or alter his perception of a business situation. Success was achieved by paying attention to processes and aligning teams to the fulfilment of goals. Most of the research has
looked for skills that are universally relevant for leader effectiveness, and it has been concluded that technical skills, conceptual skills and interpersonal skills were necessary in most of the managerial positions (Mann, 1965; Katz and Kahn, 1978; Boyatzis, 1982; Jacobs and Jacques, 1987). High energy level and stress tolerance helped people cope with the hectic pace and unrelenting demands of most managerial jobs, the frequent role conflicts and the pressures to make important decisions without adequate information.

Leaders with high emotional maturity and integrity would be more likely to maintain cooperative relationships with subordinates, peers and superiors (Yukl, 2008; Bass, 1990; Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) found traits such as intelligence, personality (alertness, originality, personal integrity and self-confidence) and supervisory ability - physical characteristics - to be associated with effective leadership. George (2000) surveyed recent syntheses of the leadership literature and contemporary theories and research (Locke, 1991; Yukl, 2008; Conger and Kanungo, 1998), and identified some elements of effective leadership. She found that emotional intelligence contributed to leader effectiveness in multiple ways by focusing on five essential elements: development of collective goals and objectives; instilling in others an appreciation of the importance of work activities; generating and maintaining enthusiasm, confidence, optimism, cooperation and trust; encouraging flexibility in decision making and change; and establishing and maintaining a meaningful identity for an organization.

The effectiveness of the leader arose, in part, due to his behaviour. There have been many attempts to identify the clues to his behaviour in the form of traits or skills. Stogdill (1974) found that intelligence, dominance, self-confidence, high energy level and task-relevant knowledge showed positive correlations with leadership, and could be interpreted as definitive predictors. What set of specific traits make up the effective leader has not yet been identified. It was therefore difficult to predict leadership potential in terms of traits, alone. Traits merely endowed people with the potential for leadership. Traits remained a pre-condition, although not sufficient for effective business leadership. Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) identified six traits that could differentiate leaders from non-Leaders:

1. Drive: achievement, ambition, energy, tenacity and initiative
2. Leadership motivation
3. Honesty and integrity
4. Self-confidence and emotional stability
5. Cognitive ability: intelligent, but not necessarily brilliant
6. Business knowledge

Under the universal theory of leadership, the traits of the leader contributed to his effectiveness, provided his style (behaviour) fitted the situation. From earlier studies, DuBrin (1995)\(^{467}\) stated that the most common personality traits of the leader were honesty, integrity, credibility, initiative, flexibility and adaptability. Ivancevich and Matteson (1996)\(^{468}\) suggested the leader’s traits and skills would influence his behaviour to interact with people variables and achieve organisational and team goals. Avolio et al (1999)\(^{469}\) studied the use of humour by leaders, and found that transformational leadership was significantly and positively related to its use and to individual and unit performance. Factors constituting leader effectiveness depend on the context of business. Dhar and Mishra (2001)\(^{470}\) studied middle level leadership, and extracted nine ability factors that were characteristic of leader effectiveness in manufacturing industry, and seven similar factors in service industry. Only three ability factors, facilitation, influence and accountability were common to both industrial sectors.

1.3.10 Leadership Effectiveness and Leader Behaviour

Personality factors have been found to be relevant to many aspects of life, such as longevity (Friedman et al, 1995)\(^{471}\) and even subjective well-being (DeNeve and Cooper, 1998).\(^{472}\) One of the most popular applications of the five-factor model of personality has been to the area of job performance, where eight meta-analyses have been conducted (Barrick and Mount, 1991;\(^{473}\) Tett et al, 1991;\(^{474}\) Robertson and Kinder, 1993;\(^{475}\) Salgado, 1997, 1998;\(^{476}\) Anderson and Viswesvaran, 1998;\(^{477}\) Hough 1992;\(^{478}\) Hurtz and Donovan, 2000).\(^{479}\) In reviewing the literature on the relationship between personality and job performance, Barrick and Mount (1991)\(^{480}\) observed that the overall conclusion was that the validity of personality as a predictor of job performance was quite low. Judge and Bono (2000)\(^{481}\) studied the link of the 5-factor
model of personality to transformational leadership behaviour. The researchers found that such behaviour significantly predicted the outcomes of subordinate satisfaction with leader, subordinate organisational commitment, subordinate work motivation, and leader effectiveness. Although agreeableness was the strongest and most consistent predictor of such behaviour, the presence of such personality traits did little to affect the relationship of transformational leadership to the outcomes.

Silverthorne (2001) explored the effect of personality factors as pre-requisite rather than as a predictor of leader effectiveness in a cross-cultural context. Using the big five factors, he found that effective US leaders scored differently from ineffective US leaders. They were more emotionally stable, more extraverted, more open to experience, more agreeable and more conscientious than leaders who were not perceived to be effective by their peers. However, the Republic of China showed statistically significant results for neuroticism, extraversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness factors, but not for the openness factor of personality. In Thailand, similar results were obtained only for neuroticism and extraversion factors of personality, but not for the other scales. This study identified narrower variables, such as culture and language, and the probability of their situational impact on leader effectiveness. The Big Five model of personality is composed of broad personality constructs manifested in the form of specific traits: neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness and conscientiousness. Neuroticism represents the tendency to exhibit poor emotional adjustment and experience negative affects such as anxiety, insecurity, and hostility. Extraversion represents the tendency to be sociable, assertive, active, and to experience positive affects such as energy and zeal. Openness to experience is the disposition to be imaginative, nonconforming, unconventional, and autonomous. Agreeableness is the tendency to be trusting, compliant, caring, and gentle. Conscientiousness is comprised of two related facets, achievement and dependability (Judge et al, 2002).

Goodstein and Boeker (1991) placed the values, cognitions and political interests of the leaders at the very core of the constellation of factors affecting institutional change. The role of leaders was so important and strong that they either produced or prevented institutional change through the abandonment or transformation of institutional practices (Oliver, 1992; Greenwood and Hinings, 1996; Hirsh and Lounsbury, 1997). Georgiades and Macdonell (1998) quoted
McCall (1993) who provided a valuable critique of leadership thinking, which was later echoed by other researchers. Effective leadership had six key requirements: setting direction, alignment, values, temperament, self-awareness and growth. O’Toole et al (2002) cited examples to show that while co-leadership apparently failed, there were many successful combinations that rejected the conventional wisdom of individual leadership. Success would therefore depend upon a particular combination of leaders. Joint selection, complimentary skills and emotional orientations, and mechanisms for co-ordinations were key factors.

The objectives of leadership could be better achieved through a process of distributed leadership, argued Samson and Challis (1999). Distributed leadership was based on individuals - not teams - as the building blocks for success, because the individual was the true source of energy and ideas, and not the team. This concept of distributed leadership would be much more than the concept of empowerment, which merely enabled distributed leadership, but did not assure it. Organisations with distributed leadership would have widespread responsibility and accountability. Their senior managers could withdraw from operations to focus on strategy. Their employees would have the potential to improve processes, and would:

- be emancipated by change and discontinuity, and would enjoy the challenge of change
- be empowered by knowledge
- share values and direction of the organisation, and be rewarded for their efforts
- have tasks with clear objectives and goals

There has been no agreement on the universality of skills related to leader effectiveness. However, some empirical evidences have supported the view that within the broad categories of technical, interpersonal, conceptual and administrative skills, some specific leader effectiveness skills include analytical ability, persuasiveness, communicating ability, memory for details, empathy and tact. The relative importance of these specific skills varies across situations (Mann, 1965; Boyatzis 1982; Hosking and Morley, 1988). The manager’s level of authority and type of organisation appear to influence skill requirements, such as technical expertise, in different situations. Even for the same type of organisation, the optimal
pattern of skills may vary depending on the prevailing business strategy (Shetty and Perry, 1976; Katz and Kahn, 1978; Gupta and Govindrajan, 1984; Jacobs and Jacques, 1987).

Concluding from case studies of successful leaders, Bennis and Thomas (2002) listed four essential skills that were characteristic of people who could find meaning from debilitating experiences. These skills were the abilities to engage others in shared meaning, to have a distinctive and compelling voice, and to have a sense of integrity and values. The most important skill would be to have an adaptive capacity to transcend adversity, and to emerge stronger than before from stressful experiences. The self-regulation model of Bandura (1997) posits that high self-efficacy would lead individuals to set challenging goals, persist in the face of obstacles, work harder on tasks, direct cognitive and behavioural resources toward goal relevant actions, and actively search for effective task strategies. The model has been tested in both applied and experimental settings, and has been successfully used to predict and explain performance for both simple and complex tasks. Interestingly enough, although characteristics like persistence, effort, goal-directedness, and problem solving have been associated with successful leadership, the model would explain the relationship between self-confidence and leader effectiveness.

On the basis of meta-analytic research, Gerstner and Day (1997) concluded that there were significant relationships between leader-member exchange and job performance, satisfaction with supervision, overall satisfaction, commitment, role conflict and clarity, member competence, and turnover intentions. Reviewing past literature on leadership, self-efficacy and personality psychology, McCormick (2001) made four propositions: (i) that variations in leader cognition, leader behaviours, and leader environment are necessary and sufficient to account for variations in leader effectiveness; (ii) Leadership efficacy is a necessary, though not sufficient, factor contributing to leader effectiveness; (iii) Leader cognitions and other personal resources underlie the leader behaviours chosen and the skill with which they are executed; (iv) Leader cognitions include, but are not limited to leadership self-efficacy beliefs, beliefs about others and the performance context, goals, knowledge structures and diagnostic and evaluation processes. His social cognitive model of leadership would explain how leaders would select higher goals and deploy their
skills and efforts more effectively, if they were confident of their leadership capabilities, than if they were beset by self-doubt.

In the final analysis, the observed effects of the leader’s actions on organisational outcomes may be small for at least three reasons, warned Pfeffer (1977). First, leadership positions are selected, and his limited behavioural styles are chosen. Second, his behaviour is constrained due to the demands of a particular role. Third, leaders can affect only a few of the variables that impact organisational performance. Therefore, a leader’s success or failure may be partly affected due to circumstances unique to the organisation, but outside his control, and by environmental forces outside the organisation. This was evident from Chakravorthy et. al (2004), who reported that six chairmen of State Bank of India held charge for 118 continuous months for a mean tenure of less than 20 months. Despite these short tenures of the chairmen, its profits grew at a compounded annual growth rate (CAGR) of 52 per cent per annum from Rs 8.32 billion in 1995-96 to Rs 18.61 billion in 1997-98. The direction and contribution of leadership under controlled or strong external environments may need to be restated, in such situations. This largely confirms the conclusions of Day and Lord (1988), who concluded that the consistent effect of leadership explained only 20 per cent to 45 per cent of the variance of relevant organisational outcomes.

1.3.11 Role Efficacy and its Implications for Leadership

Role efficacy had a positive and significant contribution in explaining job behaviour (Das, 1985). The concept of role efficacy essentially highlighted some elements that could be infused in a role while designing that role. His findings suggested that such elements were present mostly in the roles occupied by members at the higher level of the organisation. He suggested that more experimentation would be required to learn how different roles, irrespective of the levels in the organisational hierarchy associated with them, could be designed by incorporating role efficacy dimensions. Conducting a study amongst Indian male managers in a variety of industries and using multiple methods, Das and Manimala (1993) concluded that the leader, monitor and the entrepreneur roles were most frequently in evidence, while those of spokesman, figurehead and negotiator were found to be least important. The
Indian manager was also engaged in the nurturing role, especially in the private sector and at middle management levels. Managerial roles differed across hierarchical levels and organisations. They argued that their findings underscored the importance of cross-validating established management models before their application to alien settings characterised by differing cultural norms and economic realities.

While self-confidence and self-efficacy are not exactly identical concepts, they are closely associated. Therefore, social cognitive theory inspired by the seminal work of Bandura (1982) and Bandura's (1986) self-efficacy concept could be extended to the academic study of leadership and explain the leader’s role, as self-efficacy is the central integrative variable in the model. The theory portrays human functioning as a dynamic system comprised of reciprocal relationships among three categories of determinants: (1) the individual's cognitions and other personal factors, (2) individual behaviour, and (3) his performance environment. As the individual the most important leader cognition would be his self-efficacy for the leadership task. Leadership is a complex cognitive and behavioural task that takes place in a dynamic social context. Effective leadership will use social influence processes to organize, direct and motivate the actions of others. It requires persistent task-directed effort, effective task strategies, and the artful application of various conceptual, technical, and interpersonal skills (House and Aditya, 1997; Yukl and Van Fleet, 1982).

The purpose of leadership is to facilitate the attainment of group goals by establishing and maintaining a favourable environment for group performance (Hackman and Walton, 1986). Because group goal achievement is the result of the coordinated effort of group members, an individual's effectiveness in a leadership role is a socially mediated outcome. Leader effort alone does not guarantee attainment of a collective goal. No change ever succeeded without talented leadership at any level in the organisation (Robbins and Finley, 1997). This changemaker could be the chief executive officer, manager, team leader or member. They were individuals who could not only champion an idea but also steward it through the organisational ranks, with their powers of commitment, integrity and consideration. The changemaker must assume roles of pathmaker, integrator, negotiator, game player, confessor and salesperson.
Jayashree and Sadri (1999) studied a variety of businesses that differed in terms of sector, ownership, structure, organisation culture and management styles. The executives rated themselves to be effective on an overall role efficacy index, which indicated, the researchers warned, a high level of complacency and stagnation under lower levels of productivity and efficiency. The high role efficacy score also reflected the high trust factor in a close-knit group, where mutual trust was the order of the day. They argued that roles caused different responses such as anxiety, tension, stress and conflict in some people (which tended to reduce their effectiveness), and a sense of elevation in others in meeting their organisational role expectations. As environment and organisations became more complex, leaders in great companies tended to devolve their responsibility and accountability to individuals and work teams below, with increased decision making authority within agreed envelopes of control (Samson and Challis, 1999). The latter, usually senior managers, retreat from short term, operational decision areas to those long term areas delegated to them by the top managers, viz., leaders. They become strategists and change agents.

The role efficacy of an organizational member refers to his/her potential effectiveness in a role in an organization. In other words, it is a psychological construct underlying role effectiveness (Pareek, 1997). The superior performance of any organizational member in his/her role depends on his/her expertise in technical, conceptual and human relation aspects of management as well as the perceived organizational support system, structure and processes involved to get the assigned work done efficiently and effectively. This could mean that both personal and organizational resources should be made available to any role occupant so as to make the organisation and its members healthy, productive and effective, etc.

Research in this area is of great importance and has unearthed many more desired personal and organizational ingredients helping a role occupant to be effective in whatever kind of job he/she is assigned to do. It has been found that people with high role efficacy seem to experience less role stress, anxiety and work related tension (Sen, 1982); rely on their own strengths to cope with problems that come their way (Sen, 1982); are generally active and interact with the people and the environment (Surti, 1983); persist in solving problems mostly by themselves and sometimes by taking the help of other people (Shingala 1985); show growth orientation and attitudinal commitment and feel satisfied with life and with their jobs and roles in the
organisational members to be role effective, they need to indulge in and display attitudes related to proactivity, growth orientation, approach behaviours, etc. Thus, for an organisational member to be role effective, he/she should be helped to shed his/her dysfunctional attitudes, be active from within, become involved in searching opportunities for growth, helping others around whenever they need help, etc.

Furthermore, the potential effectiveness in a role in an organisation has been found to be related to types of roles, location of the workplace, length of employment and age (Moran, 1986). Such research findings suggest the role of many variables to influence the effectiveness of people in their respective roles in the organisation. To take it one step further, it can be said that the role efficacy/effectiveness of any role occupant in the organisation is not a static entity but a dynamic one.

With regard to the organizational aspects in a participative climate, employees who have higher job satisfaction, it has been found to be associated with role efficacy. Moreover, an organizational climate promoting concern for excellence, use of expertise, and concern for the larger issues contributes to role efficacy. On the other hand, a climate characterised by control and affiliation seems to lower employees' role efficacy (Brahman & Pareek, 1982). Innovation fostering climate was found to be a strong predictor of role efficacy (Deo, 1993). Role efficacy has also been reported as a strong moderator or a mediating variable, showing the dramatic influence of role efficacy in predicting or enhancing the effect on organizational climate (Sayeed, 1992). These research literatures directly convey that to bring and maintain the desired level of role effectiveness of each employee in the organization, it is necessary to create an organizational climate that should be perceived fairly favourably by the organizational members.

Role efficacy had a positive and significant contribution in explaining job behaviour (Das, 1985). The concept of role efficacy essentially highlighted some elements that could be infused in a role while designing that role. His findings suggested that such elements were present mostly in the roles occupied by members at the higher level of the organisation. He suggested that more experimentation would be required to learn how different roles, irrespective of the levels in the organizational hierarchy associated with them, could be designed by incorporating role efficacy
dimensions. Klinefelter (1993) showed that nurses employed in higher level positions in the organisational hierarchy reported higher role efficacy scores than those employed in junior level positions. Therefore, nurses in higher levels experience greater sense of job satisfaction than those below. She argued that this might be possible because those nurses at the higher levels had a broader perspective of the organisation because they had more opportunity to interact with other units in the hospital, while those in lower levels had a less defined communication channel to accomplish their goals. Nurses reporting higher levels of feedback from nursing supervisors, physicians and hospital supervisors reported higher role efficacy scores.

Demands for work flexibility are the source of inter-role conflict as defined by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985). Parasuraman et al (1992) found work and family conflict to be positively associated with overall life stress. According to a national study, work-life balance was among the three most important factors considered by job applicants in accepting a new position (Galinsky et al, 1993). This was attributed to the growing number of dual career and single parent families (Parasuraman and Greenhaus, 1997; Bond et al, 1998) and the increase in hours by many workers (Schor, 1991). In his study of rail engine drivers of the Indian Railways, Pandey (1995) found that role efficacy was negatively related with role stress, and that education was negatively related with role efficacy. Most conclusive was the fact that helping relationships, one of the aspects of role efficacy, was significantly and negatively correlated with all the aspects of role stress. Age showed negative but in-significant relationships with seven aspects of role efficacy, and with role efficacy as a composite factor.

Offering flexible work arrangements has been one of the most prevalent responses of organisations to the changing needs of the workforce. These arrangements were predicted to be one of the most important issues of concern for the Human Resources profession in the future (Kemske, 1998). Employers believe that flexible work arrangements would give applicants increased flexibility of spatial (where work is done) and temporal (when work is done) boundaries of work enabling the workers to handle competing demands from work and personal interests (Bohl, 1996; Scott, 1996). Frone et al (1997) found conflicts arising from work and interfering with family life to be associated with parental overload and decreased family performance such as inability to fulfill family responsibilities, and conflicts
arising from family life interfering with work to be associated with work overload and reduced job performance. Inter-role conflict has been found to negatively affect several forms of work and personal outcomes. Conflicts arising from work and interfering with family life and family life interfering with work were negatively related to job and life satisfaction, in a meta-analytical review by Kossek and Ozeki (1998) \(^{537a}\).

Greater role integration means that boundaries tend to be more flexible and roles are less contrasted. Over time, roles influence and contaminate one another, and tend to converge into each other. This reduces the difficulty and magnitude of inter-role transitions, and associated costs. Integrated roles have highly permeable boundaries (domains of activity for the role holder), and result in greater role blurring. Integration decreases out-of-role interruptions (Nippert-Eng, 1996a \(^{538}\), 1996b) \(^{539}\). Inter-role conflict is affected by the costs associated with maintaining and transitioning between roles (Ashforth et al, 2000) \(^{540}\). These costs arise because transitions are too easy (giving rise to confusion as to which role is more salient) or too difficult (inability to fulfill one role because of the rigidity of the boundary of another role). The intent of flexible work arrangements is to alleviate the scarcity of time and energy, and therefore, to reduce inter-role conflict. Flexitime arrangements have looser temporal boundaries than standard work arrangements, as they enable workers to adjust their work timing to better accommodate additional life roles.

Although full time telecommuting arrangements exist, the most productive of such arrangements tend to be restricted to a portion of the work arrangement, such as two or three days work at home Campbell (1999). \(^{541}\) Telecommuting refers to the substitution of information technology for the commute to and from work (Nilles, 1997) \(^{542}\). As individuals experiencing high levels of role conflict were likely to find flexible work arrangements attractive, Feldman and Gainey (1997) \(^{543}\) proposed that married workers and workers with kinship responsibilities were more likely to initiate telecommuting arrangements than single workers. Kurland and Bailey (1999) \(^{544}\) warned that telecommuting may result in strained family relationships when children and spouses did not respect the boundaries of a home workers’ office. Research showed that flexitime and telecommuting arrangements have had a positive association with job satisfaction, productivity and retention (Hill et al, 1998; \(^{545}\) Baltes et al, 1999;) \(^{546}\). However, Boston College Center for Work and Family (2000) \(^{547}\)
found that telecommuting might increase role stress for those who could not separate their work-selves from their family-selves. Arguing that individuals with high levels of role conflict would find flexible work arrangements attractive, Rau and Hyland (2002) demonstrated that role conflict moderates the impact of the attractiveness of flexible work arrangement policies. They found that workers with high levels of all types of role conflicts expressed greater attraction to organizations that offered flexitime options. On the contrary, those with low levels of role conflict reported more attraction to organizations offering telecommuting options.

1.3.12 Emotional Intelligence and its correlations with Leadership Effectiveness

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002) have argued that emotional intelligence is a critical component of leadership effectiveness, particularly as leaders deal with teams. Emotionally intelligent leaders serve as a benefit to teams in two ways. Leaders motivate team members to work together toward team goals. Leaders also serve as a transformational influence over team members. In this manner, leaders challenge the members of the team to work toward increasing team effectiveness and performance, facilitate team member interaction dynamics, build interpersonal trust, and inspire team members to implement the articulated vision.

George (2000) listed four aspects of emotional intelligence, which provide leaders the ability to motivate and transform team members. The first is the ability to accurately appraise others' emotions as well as effectively portray personal emotion. This ability is related to the individual-level focus on self-awareness. Awareness of one's own and others' emotional states allows individuals to establish and maintain supportive relationships with others.

The second aspect identified by George (2000) states that the leader must have a thorough knowledge about emotions, meaning the leader is able to predict emotional reactions in various scenarios. For instance, emotionally intelligent leaders expect associates to be of good cheer when they are given a raise, or to suffer dissatisfaction and anxiety when given a bad performance appraisal. This knowledge aids the leader in the activity of emotion regulation and management of team members.
The third aspect involves the use of emotion whereby emotionally intelligent leaders recognize that emotions are useful in the influence of the behavior and cognition of others. Regulation of emotion, as discussed at the individual level, is useful to maintain social roles. As well, effective emotional regulation has a positive effect on performance and general interactions. For example, a positive emotion or mood can facilitate innovative thinking, contribute to a supportive environment, or simply assist one in the priority of attention through clearer or more positive thinking (Staw, Sut-tون, & Pelled, 1994; Jones & George, 1998; George, 2000).

George (2000) identified the management of emotions as the fourth and final aspect of importance in the concept of emotionally intelligent leaders. The management of emotions facet brings the three previous aspects together to be used in ultimately directing one's own as well as others' interaction processes and emotional responses. It is the leader's job to manage emotions toward the creation of more effective teams.

As a result of reviewing the emotional intelligence literature, Goleman (1995) identified several aspects of emotional intelligence that are important to effective relationship management. Those aspects include self-awareness, self-motivation, empathy, and emotional management. These characteristics are deemed necessary to establish strong emotional relationships (Sosik & Megerian, 1999). In order to be a benefit to the team, leaders must be able to establish strong emotional relationships with team members and be able to effectively manage those relationships (Sosik & Megerian, 1999; George, 2000). The greater leaders' emotional intelligence, the better leaders are at managing strong relationships using emotion, and the better able they are to demonstrate effective performance (Goleman, 1998; Lewis, 2000). The importance of strong relationships among team members, and the characteristics that allow these relationships to be built, are discussed later in the analysis of the emotionally intelligent team.

Gardner and Stough (2002) examined the utility of emotional intelligence in predicting effective leaders. They employed the Swinburne University Emotional Intelligence Test (SUEIT) for measuring emotional intelligence and the MLQ to assess leadership style. Researchers found a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and all components of transformational leadership. The
relationship was further supported for all five emotional intelligence factors from the SUEIT, as well as with contingent rewards (part of the transactional leadership style). A strong negative relationship was found between for laissez-faire leadership and total emotional intelligence score. The outcomes of leadership (extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction) were all found to be significantly correlated with components of emotional intelligence as well as total emotional intelligence. They also recommended for a 360-degree measure of emotional intelligence to complement the self-report measures of emotional intelligence.

Goleman, Boyatzis and McKee (2002), concluded that the fundamental task of leaders was to prime good feelings in those they lead. Goleman et al. assert that it is the level of a leader’s understanding of the powerful role emotions play in the workplace that separates the best leaders from the rest.

Sivanathan and Fekken (2002), studied the relationship of emotional intelligence and moral reasoning to leadership styles and effectiveness. This study was conducted among 58 residence staff of Ontario University. 232 subordinates and 12 supervisors of residence staff rated on leadership behaviour and effectiveness. The researchers used four questionnaires in this study, Bar on EQi, The Defining Issues Test (DIT), the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x), and two external criterion to minimize the effect of mono-method bias. Transformational leadership positively correlated to emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. It was also found that transactional leadership was positively correlated with superior rating of don effectiveness and leaders displaying greater moral reasoning were not found to display rater transformational leadership behavior.

Mandell and Pherwani (2003), conducted a small study consisting of 13 male and 19 female managers in mid- to large-size companies. The goal of the study was to examine the gender differences in the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. Emotional intelligence was measured using the EQ-I and leadership was measured with the MLQ (5x-Rev.). The study found that females were significantly higher in emotional intelligence than males, but there were no gender differences when comparing the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. There was an overall significant positive
relationship between the total emotional intelligence scores and transformational leadership scores of the managers.

Duckett and Macfarlane (2003),\textsuperscript{566} examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership relationships in a UK based retailing organization. 13 store managers participated in the study. The results showed a strong connection between the theory of EQ and transformational leadership.

Weinberger (2003)\textsuperscript{567} investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership styles and perceived leadership effectiveness in a single US based manufacturing organization. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) was used to measure emotional intelligence and the multifactor leadership questionnaire, was used to assess leadership styles and leadership outcomes. MSCEIT was administered to 138 top managers of the organization and MLQ 5x was administered to subordinates of the 138 managers. No significant correlations were found between emotional intelligence and leadership styles. In addition, no significant relationships were found between emotional intelligence and leadership outcomes.

Prati et al. (2003),\textsuperscript{568} proposed that the emotionally intelligent team leader will induce collective motivation in team members and the emotionally intelligent leader uses charismatic authority and transformational influence in order to improve team performance. They formulated 10 propositions. They proposed that emotional intelligence is particularly essential to effective team interaction and productivity. The leader serves as a motivator towards collective action and relationship among team members. Antonakis J (2004), wrote a critique of the article by Prati et al. He concludes that excitement over the use of EI in the workplace is premature. He underlines contradictions and inconsistencies which may cast doubt on the necessity of EI for understanding and predicting leadership effectiveness.

Leban & Zulauf (2004),\textsuperscript{569} studied 24 project managers and their associated projects in six organizations from varied industries to link emotional intelligence and transformational leadership styles. The Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Ability Test (MSCEIT) and the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5x instruments were used for data collection. Project managers completed the emotional intelligence ability test (MSCEIT) during project planning. Team members and
stakeholders responded to questions addressing the project manager’s leadership style between four to nine months after project activities began and at the designated end of a project phase.

The results of the study found that there are a number of linkages between emotional intelligence abilities and transformational leadership style. The ability to understand emotions and overall emotional intelligence were significantly related with the inspirational motivation component of transformational leadership. Emotional intelligence was found to relate significantly with the idealized influence and individual consideration components of transformational leadership. Management-by-exception component of transactional leadership and laissez-faire or non-leadership were found to have a significant negative relationship with the strategic emotional intelligence and understanding emotions component of emotional intelligence. The study recognizes that transformational project leader behavior has a positive impact on actual project performance, and emotional intelligence ability contributes to transformational project leader behavior and also to subsequent actual project performance.

Burbach (2004),\textsuperscript{570} examined the effect of emotional intelligence on full-range leadership. The moderating effects of leaders' cognitive style and direction of self-concept (internal vs. external) on the relationship of emotional intelligence and full-range leadership were also examined. 146 self-identified leaders and their 649 raters participated in the study. Emotional intelligence was measured with Mayer-Salovey Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT), full range leadership was assessed with The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x), and The Myers Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) measured cognitive style.

A significant relationship was found between emotional intelligence and all the full-range leadership from leaders' perceptions. Significant variance to the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership and outcomes of leadership from leaders' perceptions was added by Cognitive style. This indicated that the combined extraversion and intuitive cognitive style is related with transformational leadership over and above emotional intelligence. The leader's direction of self-concept added significant variance to the relationship between EI and transformational, management by exception (MBE) and laissez-faire leadership from
leaders' perceptions. This showed that internal self-concept is associated with transformational leadership over and above EI and external self-concept is associated with management by exception and laissez-faire leadership over and above emotional intelligence. No significant relationship was found between cognitive style or direction of self-concept and emotional intelligence while predicting full-range leadership style from leaders' perceptions. A significant predictive association was found between emotional intelligence and laissez-faire leadership and outcomes of leadership from raters' perceptions. Significant interaction was found between direction of self-concept and EI while predicting transformational leadership, contingent reward leadership (a component of transactional leadership style) and outcomes of leadership from raters' perceptions. This showed that the leader's internal self-concept moderates the relationship between EI and transformational leadership, contingent reward leadership (a component of transactional leadership style) and leadership outcomes (extra efforts, effectiveness, satisfaction) from raters' perceptions.

Higgs (2004), 571 explored the association of emotional intelligence and performance ratings of call center agents. This study used EIQ measure developed by Dulewicz and Higgs, and ratings of their performance. 289 agents from three organizations participated in this study. He suggested an array of both skills and characteristic relationships be present within the framework of effective performance. The results suggested a robust relationship between emotional intelligence and individual performance. There was also exploratory evidence suggesting that organizations can achieve overall improved performance if the emotional intelligence elements (self-awareness, motivation, interpersonal sensitivity, emotional resilience, and conscientiousness) are included in their selection criteria.

Rahim and Psenicka (2005), 572 carried out a comprehensive international study involving participants from the United States, Greece, Bangladesh, and China. Their hypothesis was that empathy would mediate between social skills and effective leadership. Participants were 1182 dyads, consisting of MBA students designated as target leaders, and a peer in their MBA program. Researchers employed a self-developed instrument, which specifically measured subordinates’ perception of their supervisor’s empathy and social skills. They also used a subscale of McCall & Sergist instrument to measure leadership effectiveness, which was also completed by the
subordinates. The authors found a positive association between social skills and leadership effectiveness in each of the four countries. They also found that there was a positive association between Empathy and social skills in each country. Finally, they controlled for social skills and found that there was a positive association between empathy and leadership effectiveness in all of the countries except China. The relationship between empathy and leadership was strongest among the U.S. leaders (MBA students), moderate among leaders in Bangladesh and Greece, and non-existent in China. The study’s weakness was in not having true subordinates for the rating process.

Rosete and Ciarrochi (2005), 573 conducted a study to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence (EI), personality, cognitive intelligence and leadership effectiveness in a large Australian public service Organisation. The sample consisted of 41 executives who volunteered to participate in a career development center. They were administered Mayer-Salovey Caruso emotional intelligence test Version 2.0 an ability measure of Emotional intelligence, a measure of personality test 16 PF, and a measure of cognitive ability – The Wechsler abbreviated scale of intelligence (WASI). Leadership effectiveness was assessed using an objective measure of performance and a 360- degree assessment involving each leader’s subordinates and direct manager (n=149).

The results from the investigation revealed that EI was related to a leader’s effectiveness in being able to achieve organizational goals. Higher emotional intelligence was associated with higher leadership effectiveness, and emotional intelligence also explained variance not explained by either personality or IQ. The ability to perceive emotion and understand emotion of a leader had an impact on core leadership behavior. Perceiving emotion was the strongest predictor of “how” measures leadership effectiveness. Dominance – a personality factor is the strongest predictor of the ‘what’ measure of leadership effectiveness. There is no significant co-relation between total emotional intelligence and any of the 16 personality factors. Vigilance; a personality factor co-related significantly with perceiving emotion. There was significant relationship between total emotional intelligence score and verbal IQ, performance IQ, full scale IQ. The findings suggest that executives higher on emotional intelligence are more likely to achieve business outcomes and be considered as effective leaders by their subordinates and direct manager.
Kerr, Garvin, Heaton, and Boyle (2006), conducted their study in a single organization with a sample size of 38 supervisors (37 males and 1 female) and 1,258 employees. The Supervisors took the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT) an ability-based test, which measures overall EI and four branches. And the measure of leadership effectiveness was a 24-item Likert scale constructed by a third party consultancy specifically for this organization, of which nine of the items related to rating supervisory leadership. The MSCEIT scores were stratified into three factor levels. The correlation results yielded significant relationships between MSCEIT scores and supervisor ratings for only two of the EI branches: perceiving emotions and using emotions.

Butler and Chinowsky (2006), extended the research of Gardner and Stough by examining 132 leaders in the construction industry. This research investigated emotional intelligence and leadership behavior profiles of leaders in the construction industry. The Bar- On EQ-i test was used to measure of EI and the MLQ 5x was used to measure transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership. It was found that five of the fifteen subscales of emotional intelligence were related to transformational leadership behavior at a statistically significant level. The construction leaders, as a group, viewed themselves as transformational leaders who sometimes behaved as transactional leaders, with laissez-faire leadership behaviors seldom used. Inspirational leadership was reported as the most commonly employed transformational behavior and employing contingent reward behavior was viewed as the most frequently used transactional leadership behavior.

Vrba (2007), conducted a research in a South African insurance company to study the relationship between emotional intelligence skills and leadership behaviors. The sample consisted of 60 first line managers and 314 close associates of these managers. The Emotional Intelligence Appraisal (EIA) survey was used to measure EI Skills of the managers. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x) was used to assess managers’ leadership profiles. The study showed a positive correlation between all the EI skills and all the transformational styles. EI skills also had a positive correlation with contingent reward; a component of transactional style. All the EI skills also had a positive correlation with the outcomes of leadership (extra effort, effectiveness, and satisfaction). A negative correlation was found between EI skills and laissez-faire style.
Sunindigo (2007), studied the benefits of emotional intelligence to project management. They investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership style in Thailand. They interviewed project managers and engineers. The results of the study showed that emotional intelligence affected leadership behavior of project leaders. Project leaders with higher emotional intelligence tend to use open communication and proactive leadership styles. It was also found that EI generated delegating, open communication, and proactive behavior, which could bring positive outcomes to the organization.

Koman and Wolff (2008), conducted a study in military organizations. The objective of this study was to assess the relationship between individual emotional intelligence competencies, team level emotional intelligence, and team effectiveness. 70 team leaders and 73 managers (team leaders’ supervisors) rated team leaders’ emotional intelligence. A total of 349 aircrew and maintenance team members participated representing 81 aircrew and maintenance teams. To assess team leader emotional intelligence, the emotional competence inventory (ECI-2) was administered. Each team leader had 2-14 raters rate their behaviors, with an average of 4.34 ratings completed for every team leader, excluding the self-rating. Team level emotional intelligence was assessed using the Group Emotional Intelligence measure developed by Druskat and Wolff and later refined based on work by Hamme. Team member participants self-rated their team’s behavior according to each of the nine emotionally competent group norms measured by the instrument. The objective performance rating was calculated from the percentage of goals attained by each team on measures used in respective military organization. Subjective performance measures were gathered from upper level officers who had observed multiple teams within the command over time. This study showed that a team leader’s emotional intelligence affects team level emotional competence and team performance through the development of emotionally competent group norms. Team leader emotional intelligence levels were significantly related to performance.

Williams (2008), studied the leadership characteristics of urban principals that were identified as outstanding. Twelve outstanding and eight typical principals were identified by nominations by peers, supervisors’ nominations and teachers’ ratings. Data from behavioral event incident interviews (BEI) were used as the major source for exploring the study. The BEI, is designed to get the participant to vividly
and accurately describe real experiences in his/her job, is a well-established qualitative research method for assessing individual competencies. Each incident was analyzed using a code derived directly from a model of emotional and social intelligence competencies that has been widely used and its validity and reliability well documented.

Outstanding principals demonstrated a broad and deep repertoire of competencies related to emotional and social intelligence. Williams discovered emotional and social intelligence competencies that significantly differentiated outstanding principals from typical principals. The competencies were (a) self-confidence, (b) self-control, (c) conscientiousness, (d) achievement orientation, (e) initiative, (f) organizational awareness, (g) developing others, (h) influence, (i) analytical thinker, (j) leadership, (k) teamwork/collaboration influence, (l) change catalyst, and (m) conflict management.

Ramo, Saris, and Boyatzis (2009) studied Spanish executives. The data were collected from three medium sized Spanish organizations with (n=223). Emotional Competence Inventory a 360-degree instrument was used to measure emotional intelligence, Personality was measured with the NEO-FFI, a shortened version of the Revised NEO. Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). Nominations from subordinates, peers, and bosses or nominations in concert with other output measures were used to measure performance effectiveness. In the study, it was found that emotional competencies and personality traits are valuable predictors of job performance. In addition, competencies were found to be more powerful predictors of performance than global personality traits.

Mills (2009) conducted a meta-analysis of relationship between emotional intelligence and effective leadership. The results of his study suggest that emotional intelligence may now need to be considered as a component of leadership effectiveness and as such, changes need to be considered in the preparation for and practice of educational leadership. Developing skills associated with emotional intelligence, and implementing a leadership style in practice that is reflective of emotional intelligence may support greater levels of effectiveness.

Cote et al (2010) reported findings from two studies of examining the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership emergence in small
groups. Overall emotional intelligence and some of its dimensions were associated with leadership emergence over and above cognitive intelligence, personality traits, and gender. Among the dimensions of emotional intelligence, the ability to understand emotions was most consistently associated with leadership emergence.

Tang at el. (2010), explored the relationship between the emotional intelligence and transformational leadership practices of academic leaders in Taiwan and the USA. The objective of the study was to investigate whether cross-cultural differences exist in academic leaders’ EI, leadership practices, and the relationship between them. Emotional intelligence and Leadership effectiveness were measured with Nelson and Low’s Emotional Skills Assessment Process (ESAP) and Kouzes and Posner’s Leadership Practices Inventory-Self (LPI-Self).

The study employed a casual-comparative approach to draw cross-cultural comparisons. Convenience samples of 50 academic leaders in Taiwan and 50 in the USA were selected as two comparison sample groups in these two different cultures. Results of the correlation analyses indicated that the Taiwanese participants’ overall EI was found to have a positive significant correlation with all five areas of leadership practices. The US participants were also found to have statistically significant positive relationships between overall emotional intelligence and all areas of leadership practices except challenging the process, and inspiring a shared vision.

Hebert, E B (2011), conducted a study with school principals. The research sample as composed of 30 elementary, middle, and high school principals and five to seven teachers who worked with each principal from schools in the United States. An emotional intelligence score for the principals was obtained by administering the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). Teachers who worked with each principal completed the rater form of the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ-5X) also. Correlations were analyzed to conclude that there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. A positive correlational relationship between effectiveness and emotional intelligence was found. Analyzing the relationship between emotional intelligence and different non-transformational leadership styles yielded mixed results. Findings also indicated a relationship exists between emotional intelligence and contingent reward leadership, while no significant relationship was found between emotional intelligence and other
leadership styles. It was concluded from the study that principals and future principals could better develop effective leadership skills by becoming more aware of their strengths and weaknesses in the area of emotional intelligence, along with improving their transformational leadership behaviors.

Jordan and Troth (2011),\textsuperscript{585} conducted a study to examine the mediating effect of leader member exchange (LMX) on the relationship between followers’ emotional intelligence and the outcomes of turnover intention and job satisfaction. They used a longitudinal design. Survey data were collected from 579 employees within a private pathology company. Measures of emotional intelligence and LMX were collected at Time 1 and employee turnover intentions and job satisfaction were collected at Time 2. Turnover intention was measured with three items developed by Colarelli (1984).\textsuperscript{586} Job satisfaction was measured using three items developed by Caplan et al. (1975).\textsuperscript{587}

Emotional intelligence was assessed using the self-report Workgroup Emotional Intelligence. LMX was assessed using a scale developed by Liden and Maslyn.\textsuperscript{588} Negative affect was assessed using ten items from Watson et al.’s PANAS scale. The results of this study showed that followers’ emotional intelligence was related to employee turnover intentions, was linked to higher levels of job satisfaction, and was related to higher levels of quality LMXs. Their underlying premise was that these relationships occur as a consequence of the higher quality relationships more likely to be formed by employees with higher emotional intelligence abilities.

Boyatzis et al. (2012),\textsuperscript{589} conducted a study to assess the role of the behavioral level of emotional and social competencies on leader performance. The objective of the study was to test how emotional & social competencies, cognitive intelligence (g), and personality would affect sales leadership. 60 divisional executive (leaders) participated in the study. Performance of the leaders was measured through recruitment of financial consultants by these participating leaders. “G” The Ravens Advanced Progressive Matrices (APM) was used to measure cognitive intelligence. The NEO Personality Inventory–Revised was used to measure personality traits. The emotional & social competencies demonstrated by each subject were assessed with the Emotional and Social Competency Inventory (ESCI) and the “others” feedback was used in analysis. The findings of the study showed that emotional & social
competencies significantly predicted leader performance (i.e., recruitment) whereas measures of generalized intelligence and personality did not. Adaptability and influence were two competencies distinctively predicting sales leadership performance.

Stanescu and Cicei (2012), conducted a study by taking 101 Romanian Public Managers to explore the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership styles and between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness. Emotional intelligence of managers was assessed using Bar-On EQ-i and leadership styles were assessed using MLQ-5x. It was found that there are significant positive correlations between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence and between leadership effectiveness and emotional intelligence. Transactional leadership was also found correlated with EI score, and with the Adaptability and Interpersonal scale of EQ-i. Total EQ-i score and the EQ-i subscales were found negatively significantly correlated with Passive/Avoidant leadership. Interpersonal, Stress Management and General Mood scales of EQ-i predicted 47.5% of the total variance of transformational leadership and Interpersonal and Stress Management scales of EQ-I predicted 38.2% of the total variance of leadership effectiveness. The results offered a clearer perspective on the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership styles, and leadership effectiveness.

Zhang and Fan (2013), studied the relationship between project manager’s emotional intelligence and project performance. They used a modified Boyatzis Goleman model of emotional intelligence for measuring emotional intelligence score of the project managers. Project performance was assessed using a 13 point criteria. 112 project managers participated in the study. The participants rated themselves on both the scales. The findings of the study showed a positive relationship between total EI and project performance. Six factors of emotional intelligence were found significantly correlated with project performance.

Boyatzis et al. concluded in a recent publication in 2013 that emotional and social intelligence competencies have been shown to predict effectiveness in leadership, management and professional jobs in many countries of the world. To be an effective leader, manager or professional, a person needs to understand and
skillfully manage his emotions appropriately based on each person or situation and understand the emotional cues of others in order to effectively interact with others.

1.3.13 Emotional Intelligence and Leadership- Indian Studies

Srivsastava and Bhamanaikar (2004),\textsuperscript{593} examined leadership effectiveness with a unique population of 291 Indian army officers. EI was measured using a self-report measure, the Work Profile Questionnaire Emotional Intelligence version (WPQei) and Leadership styles were measured by the 5x-short version of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x). Perceived success of the leaders was measured by a questionnaire developed by Pareek and Rao and job satisfaction was measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Spector. MLQ 5x was completed by subordinates allowing subordinates to determine the extent that transformational and transactional leadership style was displayed in the leaders. The results significantly supported the connection between leader’s EI and all of the components of the transformational leadership style. Higher emotional intelligence scores were also found for the contingent reward component of transactional style. Emotional intelligence was not related to job satisfaction, but was related to perceived success. Emotional intelligence was not related to job satisfaction, but was related to perceived success. There was a strong relationship between transformational leadership behaviors and the leader’s self-reports of being innovative, intuitive, self-aware, motivated, socially adept, empathic, and managing emotions. The army officers who rated themselves high on emotional intelligence also perceived themselves to be more successful in their careers.

Sinha & Jain (2004),\textsuperscript{594} studied emotional intelligence and organizational relevant outcomes in two-wheeler automobile manufacturing organizations. The sample consisted of 250 male middle level executives. Emotional intelligence was measured through a questionnaire adapted from the writings of Bar On\textsuperscript{595}. Job satisfaction was measured through a questionnaire consisting of three items adapted from the work of Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Flesh\textsuperscript{596}. Personal effectiveness was measured through a questionnaire consisting of four items based on work of Sutton and Ford\textsuperscript{597}. Organizational commitment was measured through a questionnaire adapted from the writing of Meyer and Allen\textsuperscript{598}. Reputational
Effectiveness was measured through three items taken from the writing of Tsui.\textsuperscript{599} The general health (lack of strain) was measured through the General Health Questionnaire–12 (GHQ-12) variant of General Health Questionnaire by Goldberg\textsuperscript{600} consisting of 12 items. Trust questionnaire was taken from the work of Gabarro and Athos\textsuperscript{601} consisting of seven items. The 3-item scale from Cammann, Fichman, Jenkins, and Klesh\textsuperscript{602} was used to measure turnover intention. Organizational effectiveness was measured through a 22 items questionnaire taken from Sinha\textsuperscript{603} and based on the work of Sutton and Ford\textsuperscript{604}. Organizational productivity was measured through five items scale based on the work of Spreitzer and Mishra\textsuperscript{605}.

Results showed that the dimensions of emotional intelligence turned out to be significant predictors of the organizationally relevant individual level, and organizational level outcome variables. Job Satisfaction was predicted by one dimension (of emotional intelligence), Personal Effectiveness was by two dimensions, Organizational Commitment aspects by two dimensions, General Health by two, Vertical Trust by three, Turnover Intention by one, dimensions of Organizational Effectiveness by two, and Organizational Productivity by one dimension of EI respectively. The results showed that the construct of emotional intelligence may be taken as meaningfully related to the organizationally relevant outcome variables\textsuperscript{606}.

Singh (2007),\textsuperscript{607} studied 210 males and 130 females in an Indian software organization. Emotional Intelligence was measured by Emotional Competency Inventory – V2 (Self Version) and leadership styles and leadership effectiveness were measured by Organizational Leadership Questionnaire\textsuperscript{608}. All the dimensions of emotional intelligence have been found to be positively associated with leadership styles as well as effectiveness of the male software professionals. Emotional intelligence of the male software professionals is significantly as well as positively related with their supportive and delegating styles of leadership, but their overall leadership effectiveness has been found to be significantly as well as positively associated with all the dimensions of emotional intelligence and total emotional intelligence. Results also depicted positive relationships of emotional intelligence with leadership styles and effectiveness of the female software professionals. But here the supporting and the consulting styles of leadership as well as overall leadership effectiveness that obtained positive relationships with EI have been found to be significant.
Modassir and Singh (2008) studied Relationship of Emotional Intelligence with Transformational Leadership and Organizational Citizenship in Different industries in Goa and Daman, India, with a sample of 57 managers 57 subordinates. EQ scale developed by Schutte et al. (SSEIT Self rater) was used to measure emotional intelligence, The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5x rater form) was used to measure transformational leadership style, and a scale devised by Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter was used to measure Organizational Citizenship behavior. The study supported no relation between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership style.

Mishra and Mohapatra (2010) studied Relevance of Emotional Intelligence for Effective Job Performance in Various Organizations in Delhi NCR having a sample of 90 executives. They used emotional intelligence Test by Chadha & Singh (Self rating) for measuring emotional intelligence and Formal Appraisals of executives’ job performance. Emotional intelligence was found to be a predictor of job performance. Through personal interviews and discussion with these executives, it was realized that role plays, simulations, games, and cognitive exercises are more appropriate than lectures when dealing with emotional learning. It was also recommended to carry out studies in various organizations using emotional intelligence measure and performance appraisal instruments of high technical standards and also using “others” feedback.

Raina & Sharma (2013) conducted a study to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership with entrepreneurs in Rajasthan in India. The research sample was composed of 47 entrepreneurs. An emotional intelligence score for the each entrepreneur was obtained by administering the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) was used to measure the leadership of entrepreneurs and each entrepreneur completed a self-form of MLQ 5x.

Correlations were analyzed to conclude that there is a positive relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. A positive relationship was found between effectiveness and both emotional intelligence and transformational leadership. Analyzing the relationship between emotional intelligence and different non-transformational leadership styles yielded mixed
results. Findings indicated a positive relationship exists between emotional intelligence and contingent reward leadership, while no significant relationship was evident between emotional intelligence and other leadership styles. Using the results of the study, it was concluded that entrepreneurs and future entrepreneurs could better develop effective leadership skills by becoming more aware of their strengths and weakness in the area of emotional intelligence, along with improving their transformational leadership behaviors.

Srivastava, Sibia, & Misra\textsuperscript{614} Conclude that the study of EI in India has taken off with a good start and it will be premature to draw any conclusion at this juncture. Mishra and Mohapatra also recommended to carry out studies in various organizations using emotional intelligence measure and performance appraisal instruments of high technical standards and also using “others” feedback. There are a few published studies in India which have used the variables of emotional intelligence and leadership styles and leadership effectiveness. The present study can add in to the existing knowledge of the relationship between the variables. Mills also offered several directions for future research in his Meta-analysis of relationship between emotional intelligence and effective leadership. Given the availability of several models of emotional intelligence in the literature, studies of the effectiveness of specific models and their impact on leadership effectiveness should be conducted. Studies focusing on emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness that examine these outcomes incorporating different methodological should be conducted.

1.3.14 Leadership Effectiveness and its Correlates

Emotional intelligence is "the subset of social intelligence that involves the ability to monitor one's own and other's feelings and emotions, to discriminate among them and to use this information to guide one's thinking and actions" (Salovey and Mayer (1990)\textsuperscript{615} p. 189). As indicated in the definition, emotional regulation is of primary importance to emotionally intelligent individuals. Emotional regulation is the restraint of unacceptable emotional impulses from public view (Thoits, 1989).\textsuperscript{616} Regulatory actions are derived from the individuals' own social beliefs about their roles in society, and the expectations others have of them in those roles (Averill, 1980).\textsuperscript{617} In other words, emotionally intelligent individuals are self-aware. They
understand that there are social rules with regard to emotional display, and they regulate their actions according to those rules. These abilities guide how they order priorities, practice discretion in their actions, and fit in as group and organizational members.

Ashforth and Humphrey (1995)\textsuperscript{618} argued that emotion is inseparable from the organizational work setting. However, the organization favors the more rational approach to interaction. Social rules or norms of rationality are established to dictate the allowable levels of emotional display, and any emotional display that goes beyond the determined limit of social norms is unacceptable. Ashforth and Humphrey juxtaposed the characteristics of rationality in group interaction processes with the characteristics of the emotionality of the individual member.

Goleman, Boyatzis, and McKee (2002)\textsuperscript{619} have argued that emotional intelligence is a critical component of leadership effectiveness, particularly as leaders deal with teams. Emotionally intelligent leaders serve as a benefit to teams in two ways. Leaders motivate team members to work together toward team goals. Leaders also serve as a transformational influence over team members. In this manner, leaders challenge the members of the team to work toward increasing team effectiveness and performance, facilitate team member interaction dynamics, build interpersonal trust, and inspire team members to implement the articulated vision.

George (2000)\textsuperscript{620} listed four aspects of emotional intelligence, which provide leaders the ability to motivate and transform team members. The first is the ability to accurately appraise others' emotions as well as effectively portray personal emotion. This ability is related to the individual-level focus on self-awareness. Awareness of one's own and others' emotional states allows individuals to establish and maintain supportive relationships with others.

The second aspect identified by George (2000)\textsuperscript{621} states that the leader must have a thorough knowledge about emotions, meaning the leader is able to predict emotional reactions in various scenarios. For instance, emotionally intelligent leaders expect associates to be of good cheer when they are given a raise, or to suffer dissatisfaction and anxiety when given a bad performance appraisal. This knowledge aids the leader in the activity of emotion regulation and management of team members.
The third aspect involves the use of emotion whereby emotionally intelligent leaders recognize that emotions are useful in the influence of the behavior and cognition of others. Regulation of emotion, as discussed at the individual level, is useful to maintain social roles. As well, effective emotional regulation has a positive effect on performance and general interactions. For example, a positive emotion or mood can facilitate innovative thinking, contribute to a supportive environment, or simply assist one in the priority of attention through clearer or more positive thinking (Staw, Sut-ton, & Pelled, 1994; Jones & George, 1998; George, 2000).

George (2000) identified the management of emotions as the fourth and final aspect of importance in the concept of emotionally intelligent leaders. The management of emotions facet brings the three previous aspects together to be used in ultimately directing one's own as well as others' interaction processes and emotional responses. It is the leader's job to manage emotions toward the creation of more effective teams.

As a result of reviewing the emotional intelligence literature, Goleman (1995) identified several aspects of emotional intelligence that are important to effective relationship management. Those aspects include self-awareness, self-motivation, empathy, and emotional management. These characteristics are deemed necessary to establish strong emotional relationships. In order to be a benefit to the team, leaders must be able to establish strong emotional relationships with team members, and be able to effectively manage those relationships (Sosik & Megerian, 1999). The greater leaders' emotional intelligence, the better leaders are at managing strong relationships using emotion, and the better able they are to demonstrate effective performance (Goleman, 1998; Lewis, 2000).

Sosik and Megerian (1999) stated that emotional intelligence has an influence on self-motivation. They claimed emotionally intelligent individuals who are self-motivated feel more secure in their ability to control and influence life events. Accordingly, emotionally intelligent leaders, with a great deal of personal efficacy, are more motivated to face situations with confidence. The authors also indicated personal efficacy is necessary for team leaders to attract and motivate followers.

In addition to personal efficacy, the positive affect of team leaders has been argued to attract and motivate team members (Lewis, 2000). Positive emotions,
such as enthusiasm or cheerfulness, are considered to be emotionally contagious in various ways. Researchers have not as yet discovered how emotional contagion occurs. Followers might simply mimic the leader's emotions, or followers could develop similar emotions to the leader through empathy, hi any event, the positive emotion of the leader elevates the team's emotional state, and inspires members to perform with more enthusiasm (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995).

Conversely, it has been asserted this same emotional contagion might prove detrimental to team effectiveness if emotions such as anger or sadness are expressed by the team leader. Wasielewski (1985) indicated, from prior research, that there are rules that frame situationally-appropriate emotional expression. If a team leader violates this established norm of emotional control, team members might perceive the leader as vulnerable, weak, or ineffective (Heise, 1989).

With regard to the motivation of others, Sosik and Megerian (1999) stated that emotionally intelligent leaders provide the impetus for individuals to collectively perform. Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) would contend that this motivation for team members to perform collectively comes from the leader's use of symbolic management techniques. According to the authors, symbolic management techniques such as the use of stories, inspirational speech, and rituals will effectively arouse individuals in order to inspire them to perform according to team values and defined goal behaviors. A leader must have a high level of emotional intelligence in order to gauge the reactions of team members and perform accordingly in order to achieve the desired affective arousal of those members (George, 2000). The leader uses this affective arousal to persuade team members to invest themselves in the team. This affective commitment has been shown to increase the motivation of members (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995).

Not only do emotionally intelligent leaders evaluate team members’ emotional situations in order to motivate, but also they do so to discourage detrimental interactions. By managing conflict and encouraging supportive member interactions, the leader creates a supportive environment for members. Such an environment provides team members with a certain amount of emotional safety, and provides the basis for coordinated effort (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). By constructively
resolving conflicts and establishing a relationship of cooperation and trust between members, the leader contributes to the collective motivation of team members.

Barling, Slater, and Kelloway (2000) found that emotional intelligence was associated with idealized influence, individualized focus, and inspirational motivation, three attributes of transformational leadership. The transformational leader's overall charisma, motivational influence, intellectual stimulation, and individualized attention to team members creates an atmosphere of empowerment. Koberg, Boss, Senjem, and Goodman (1999) stated that an approachable team leader who encourages intragroup trust and mutual influence of all members fosters feelings of empowerment in team members. In line with this, Koberg et al. reported that the empowerment of team members can be linked to increased intrinsic value of work team outcomes, increased job satisfaction of team members, as well as decreased intent to quit and overall increased team effectiveness and performance. Interestingly, DeCremer and van Knippenberg (2002) reported that leader charisma, a principal characteristic of the transformational leader, was primarily responsible for engendering a feeling of cooperation among team members. Furthermore, they reported that leader charisma is more important than subordinate perceptions of procedural fairness in the context of cooperation and performance (i.e., the presence of charisma overrides the presence or absence of other important leader characteristics).

The influence of transformational leadership promotes dramatic changes in team effectiveness and productivity. It is reasoned that the emotionally intelligent leader can accurately assess others' emotions and constructively influence those emotions so that team members will embrace change. She explained that the transformational leader's influence mainly involves the use of emotional appeals to idealize team identity and establish team pride.

Emotional intelligence provides team members with the ability to set team goals as priorities (Abraham, 1999; George, 2000). Furthermore, these priorities overshadow the affective conflict experienced by the team, which prevents mental energy from being wasted on inconsequential emotional conflicts. In addition, emotional intelligence aids in the effective consensus of team decision making, and fosters a relationship between team members in which cognitive conflict is functional.
in enhancing team decision making (Amason, 1996). In such a relationship, members are comfortable in voicing opposing opinions, because they know other team members will hear the opinions with sincere consideration. Thus, a higher degree of team members' emotional intelligence allows for consideration of many alternatives and, as a result, a more thorough decision-making process.

Abraham (1999) proposed that emotional intelligence is directly related to performance, and this is especially so in the case of team performance. The previous sections describing the emotionally intelligent team and team processes provides a great deal of supporting information to demonstrate the effect of emotional intelligence on team performance through role identification, work team cohesion, trust, creativity, decision-making ability, and reduced social loafing. The following is a discussion of some additional effects of team member emotional intelligence levels on team performance.

Several characteristics of the emotionally intelligent team have been known to contribute to team effectiveness, such as team coordination and cohesion, established norms and creativity (Janz, Colquitt, & Noe, 1997; Spreitzer, Cohen, & Ledford, 1999). Interpersonal communication was found by Spreitzer et al. to contribute to better coordination of activities, and as a result, increased team performance. Ashkanasy and Hooper (1999) reasoned that affective commitment to others is necessary for positive communication. Therefore, the more cohesive a work team is, the more positive and beneficial will be team communication efforts. Further, Wong, and Law (2002) found that positive communication is necessary to success in the work environment. In other words, effective communication contributes to improved coordination efforts, which enhances team performance.

In the description of rationality, the emotional being (i.e., the person) fills a defined organizational role whereby individuals' level of performance takes precedence over their satisfaction. Employees who follow these norms of rationality are cognizant of the emotions felt, and of how to deal with those feelings in a socially acceptable manner. This description of rational organization and team members offers many characteristics similar in nature to emotionally intelligent individuals.

Emotional intelligence would confer an advantage in any domain in life, whether in romance and intimate relationships or picking up the unspoken rules that
govern success in organisational politics (Goleman, 1995). He made strong claims about the contribution of emotional intelligence to individual and society. He also claimed the predictive validity of his mixed model, assuring that emotional intelligence would account for success at home, at school, and at work. He stated that it could be the best predictor of success in life, redefining what it means to be smart. Some publications have seen emotional intelligence as a combination of science and human potential, while others claimed that it accounted for performance gains over and above those attributable to general intelligence (Cooper and Sawaf, 1997; Salovey and Sluyter, 1997; Weisinger, 1997). The use of emotions as a basis for thinking, and thinking with emotions may be related to important social competencies and adaptive behaviour (Mayer and Salovey, 1997).

Feelings affect the judgements made by people, the material recalled from memory, the attributions for success and failure, and inductive and deductive reasoning. Positive moods are believed to lead to favourable perceptions and evaluations. The person is more self-assured, and more prone to remember positive information, is more likely to take credit for successes and avoid blame for failures, and be more helpful to others (Isen et al, 1976; Cunningham et al, 1980; Rosenhan et al, 1981). Positive moods enhance flexibility on categorisation tasks, and facilitate creativity and inductive reasoning (Isen et al, 1985). On the contrary, the negative mood induces more critical and comprehensive evaluations, and deductive reasoning (Sinclair and Mark, 1992). When there is emotional involvement in tasks, it reflects the highest level of motivation and results in high performance. Such personal engagement results in peak performance, because emotions are not just contained or channeled, they are energised and aligned towards the task (Kahn, 1990 and 1992).

An alternative view is that when emotions are intertwined with role, performance or both, they tend to interfere with task accomplishment. What may be truer would be that specific emotions are experienced and then, their interpretation and regulation – and not the emotions, per se – cause problems for task performance. This could be countered by resorting to an emotional control mechanism called buffering, which would encapsulate and segregate undesirable emotions and prevent them from interfering with the task on hand (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1995). While a ‘rational’ decision maker may be one who can set aside his personal feelings
to calculate the best course of action to deal with opportunity or problems, Damasio (1994)\textsuperscript{664} argue that feelings are necessary to make good decisions. While reduced emotions would constitute an important source of irrational behaviour, very intense emotions interfere with effective decision making, just as much. Feelings therefore help make choices and decide among options.

The identification and measurement of intelligence and its forms has attracted the attention of researchers and psychologists for a long time. The measurement of behaviour that was assumed to demonstrate intelligence is presumed to have begun with Binet and Simon (1916)\textsuperscript{665}. People differ in the degree to which they are aware of their emotions, in their ability to appraise emotions – whether their own or others’, and to express their emotions (Campbell et al, 1971;\textsuperscript{666} Buck, 1984)\textsuperscript{667}. One of the most important skills in understanding and experiencing another’s feelings and emotions would be empathy (Mehrabian and Epstein, 1972;\textsuperscript{668} Wispe, 1986)\textsuperscript{669}. It facilitates the maintenance of positive interpersonal relationships and provision of useful social support. In acknowledgement of the complexity of identification and measurement of intelligence, Gardner (1998)\textsuperscript{670} referred to the concept in the plural. Intelligences must be assessed in terms of abilities, talents, skills, gifts and competences. Some people are reluctant or ambivalent to express their emotions (King and Emmons, 1991;\textsuperscript{671} Emmons and Colby, 1995)\textsuperscript{672}. Such behaviour prevents them from developing gainful interpersonal relationships in life. Intelligence has remained a significant indicator – perhaps, even a determinant – of important outcomes in life, such as educational and occupational attainment and job performance (Gottfredson, 1986;\textsuperscript{673} Schmidt et al, 1992;\textsuperscript{674} O’Reilly and Chatman, 1994)\textsuperscript{675}.

Despite its importance in daily life and considerable attention paid by researchers since early twentieth century, there is little agreement among theorists on the nature and definition of intelligence (Caroll, 1992,\textsuperscript{676} 1993)\textsuperscript{677}. The existence of a single measure of intellectual ability - as general intelligence - is orthodoxy both amongst psychologist and the general public. General intelligence was the ability to acquire basic knowledge and use it in novel situations. Underlying the theory of general intelligence are two basic assumptions (Gottfredson, 1998);\textsuperscript{678} that people were born with a fixed, potential intelligence and that such intelligence could be measured. Morris (1989)\textsuperscript{679} concluded that there was a wide gulf between what many
believed to be intelligence, and the current level of theory amongst cognitive
developmental scientists. The scientists have asserted that the manner in which people
store material in memory and use that material to solve intellectual tasks provides the
most accurate measure of intelligence. He hypothesised that current interests, skills
and abilities were highly correlated and therefore, a strong predictor of a person’s
most dominant current intelligences. He warned that no single assessment instrument,
whether standardised or not, would be fully accurate.

At one end of the intelligence dimension was a unitary and traditional view of
the single general intelligence (called g, in short). This view depicted intelligence as
the product more of genetics and nature, than of nurturance (environmental
influences). This general factor of mental ability (also called g-factor) was thought to
underline performance on every aspect of intelligence, and would be measured by
tests of intelligence at that time (Spearman, 1927)\(^{680}\). Cognitive psychologists
examine the processes involved in producing behaviour, without focusing on the
structure of intelligence or on its underlying content or dimensions (Sternberg,
1990;\(^{681}\) Fagan, 1992;\(^{682}\) Fagan and Detterman, 1992)\(^{683}\). Recent approaches to
intelligence have tended to focus on the contextual aspect of intelligence (Sternberg
and Wagner, 1986)\(^{684}\). Applying the cognitive theory to intelligence, they developed a
triarchic theory of intelligence that suggested three major aspects of intelligence:
componential, experimental and contextual. It was accepted that whatever the forms
and components of intelligence, none of them operated in isolation. Normally, any
human behaviour or activity must encompass several kinds of intelligence working
together. Even the Multifactor Emotional Intelligence Scale (MEIS: Mayer et al,
1991)\(^{685}\) that was used to measure emotional intelligence appeared to have limitations.

Intelligence was once considered a single mental entity, composed of
linguistic / verbal, and logical / mathematical reasoning abilities that would be
captured in the form of normalised and standardised IQ (Intelligence Quotient) tests.
The measurement of general intelligence consists of the completion of number series,
pattern recognition, and analogies designed to capture mathematical reasoning, verbal
and spatial visualisation abilities. Such a test would be the single most effective
predictor known of individual performance at school and on the job (Gottfredson,
1998)\(^{686}\). He stated that emotional intelligence was the \textit{sine qua non} of leadership, and
that effective leaders were alike with a high degree of emotional intelligence. Lost in
all the excitement was the fact that many of the emotional intelligence measures may be neither reliable nor different from other well-established measures (Ciarrochi et al, 2001).

Emotional intelligence has often been conceptualised as more than just ability in popular literature. The works of Goleman (1995) and Bar-On (1997) have used such constructs like motivation, non-ability dispositions and traits, and global personal and social functioning, self-regard, problem-solving, reality-testing and independence. In clarifying the components of emotional intelligence, Mayer and Salovey (1997) distinguished between analogous terms. Intelligence was an aptitude, while achievement was an accomplishment (result). Accordingly, competency indicated that an achievement had met a particular standard. Their model included 25 competencies grouped into five categories called components of emotional intelligence. Self-awareness had emotional awareness, accurate self-assessment and self-confidence. Self-regulation had self-control, trustworthiness, conscientiousness, adaptability and innovation. Motivation had achievement, commitment, initiative and optimism. Empathy included understanding others, developing others, service orientation, diversity and political awareness. Social skills had influence, communication, conflict management, leadership, change catalyst, building bonds, collaboration / cooperation and team capabilities. However, the model contained both the emotional abilities and the product of those abilities, repeating the measurement of some variables, quite unnecessarily. These mixed models have diluted the utility of the terms under consideration, and attracted criticism and adverse comments from purists (Morris, 1989; Mayer et al, 2000).

Although emotional intelligence is a relatively new construct, its roots are in other constructs such as social intelligence (Walker and Foley, 1973; Ford and Tisak, 1983; Sternberg and Smith, 1985). Emotional intelligence assumes a proactive dimension regarding feelings, that of the management of one’s own and other people’s moods and emotions. For this purpose, people deliberately strive to maintain positive moods and alleviate negative moods (Isen and Levin, 1972; Mischel et al, 1973; Clark and Isen, 1982; Morris and Reilly, 1987). Such management must rely on the knowledge and consideration of the determinants, appropriateness and malleability of moods and emotions, and would include the regulation in the form of a reflective process.
emotional intelligence would be applied to excite, enthuse or influence other people, or make them cautious and wary (Wasielewski, 1985). The concept of emotional intelligence has caught the attention of both researchers and practitioners, especially in the recent past. One of the fundamental reasons for such interest could have been its claimed ability to predict success in career and personal lives. Mishra and Dhar (2000)\(^ {698}\) found that gender affected emotional intelligence, and females showed higher emotional intelligence than males. Due to their inherent characteristics, females displayed more empathy and social skills than males.

Mayer et al. (2000)\(^ {699}\) first attempted to measure and operationalize EI. The four components of the EI ability model are (a) emotions perception, (b) facilitation, (c) understanding, and (d) management, which are measured via the self-report Mayer-Salovey-Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT). Goleman (1995, 1998) popularized EI and defined emotional intelligence as “the capacity for recognizing our own feelings and those of others, for motivating ourselves and for managing emotions well in ourselves and in our relationships”.

Mayer et al (2000)\(^ {700}\) set down three stringent criteria for the identification of intelligence. The first, a conceptual criterion stated that intelligence must reflect mental performance, not just a preferred way of behaviour, or a person’s self-esteem, or non-intellectual attainments. The second, a correlational criterion laid down that intelligence should describe a set of closely related abilities similar to each other, but distinct from mental abilities already established earlier. The third, a developmental criterion stated that intelligence developed with age and experience, and was based on the results of ground breaking work in the beginning of the last century. Studying right brain and left brain orientation with respect to emotional intelligence, Mishra and Dhar (2001) found conceptual similarity between emotional intelligence and thinking orientation. The right brain is deemed to be the driver of intuitive, emotive and creative aspects of human thinking, and the left brain is the driver of analytical and quantitative aspect of human thinking. They concluded that emotional intelligence was the function of whole brain thinking, as both hemispheres work together on a problem or a situation. By blending the skills of both the parts of the brain, individuals enhance their chances for success, by developing a holistic approach, where neither the emotional nor the rational approach takes up a dominating position.
Druskat and Wolff (2001)\textsuperscript{701} stated that the concept of emotional intelligence had real impact, and held the potential for positive change. They argued that emotional intelligence had been viewed only as an individual competency, although teams did most of the work in organisations. Teams can show more creativity, productivity and effectiveness, if they achieved high levels of participation, cooperation, commitment to goals, and collaboration among its members. These interactive behaviours could occur only under three basic, emotionally driven conditions. There must be mutual trust amongst members, a sense of group identity of belonging to a worthwhile group, and a sense of group efficacy (the belief that the team can perform well and the members are more effective when working together than when apart). Their research suggested that emotional interaction operated at three levels: the individual, within the group and outside the group. For high levels of effectiveness, the team must create emotionally intelligent norms for attitudes and behaviours (that would eventually become habits) for building the three basic conditions of trust, group identity and efficacy, through the awareness and regulation of emotions within the team. Lam and Kirby (2002)\textsuperscript{702} explored the impact of emotional intelligence on individual performance. Overall emotional intelligence and two other components of emotional intelligence viz., emotional perception and emotional regulation uniquely explained the individual cognitive-based performance over and beyond the level attributable to general intelligence. However, they warned that the performance that was measured could not be equated with team performance and other social tasks.

Salovey and Mayer (1990)\textsuperscript{703} indicated certain abilities in their definition of the term emotional intelligence. According to this definition, using feedback in social situations, self-awareness, and self-regulation are all abilities fundamental to the emotional intelligence construct. One who is emotionally intelligent is well skilled in these abilities.

\textit{Social identification and feedback:} We identify ourselves with the communities in which we operate. These communities establish certain norms and expectations by which individuals are to model their actions (Fisher & Chon, 1989;\textsuperscript{704} Short, 1979)\textsuperscript{705}. According to those norms and expectations, society labels us through our observable actions (Heise & Thomas, 1989)\textsuperscript{706}. Individuals adept in the activity of
self-monitoring will use available feedback to monitor and gauge reactions to their behavior, which is negatively received (e.g., Graziano & Waschull, 1995).

Miller and Leary (1992) provided an example of this monitoring activity in their discussion of embarrassment. They stated that embarrassment serves as emotional feedback causing the individual to monitor reactions of others more closely in order to define the embarrassing act, remedy that act, and adjust future behaviors accordingly. These steps are taken to avoid risking any more actions that could similarly jeopardize the individual's social identity. This example leads us to the idea that emotionally intelligent individuals are aware of how their actions are received in social settings. Accordingly, these individuals are more capable of establishing, maintaining, or redefining their social identity.

_Self-awareness:_ Emotionally intelligent individuals maintain an awareness of the way they behave, and of the labels that are placed upon them (Averill, 1980). Scheff (1983) described emotions as being culturally specific, where individuals are required to interpret and appraise the cultural expectations of certain emotional displays, and act accordingly. Individuals who are self-aware understand the role they must portray, a role that is assigned by the community in which they interact. This self-awareness guides individuals so they can operate within the norms established for each particular role (Averill, 1980).

Self-awareness allows individuals to set priorities of concerns such that inconsequential problems are set aside and more pressing or deeper issues are addressed (Abraham, 1999), and this is most applicable to the interaction processes of teams. If individuals maintain a high level of self-awareness in team interactions, more important issues to the team are likely to be addressed. Minor conflicts are easily swept aside by emotionally intelligent individuals so that project issues can take precedence.

In addition, self-aware individuals also might have the ability to alter other team members' responses to their actions (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992). In this manner, emotionally intelligent individuals possess the ability to actually guide interactions to meet desired goals (Miller & Leary, 1992). In order to tap this ability, individuals must understand how to self-regulate emotional responses in a...
rational manner. Application of this ability in the team leader and member interaction process is further explored later in the discussion of transformational leaders.

Self-regulation: Self-regulation of emotion provides that individuals understand social expectations of their actions, and exercise discretion in the manifestation of emotions. The social expectations of the organization are prescribed in the form of interactional norms and roles. The groups in which we interact define individual members' roles in which these norms are included, and we tend to employ coping mechanisms that regulate the display of emotional behavior in order to fit the social role expected of us (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992). As well, this ability to adapt to the social context through self-regulation allows emotionally intelligent individuals to remain functional team members, even when faced with membership turnover, member conflicts, or other situations that might prove detrimental to overall team organization and effectiveness. Individuals likely will be less stressed, and react to problematic situations in a controlled and constructive manner (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992).

Poole, Gray, and Gioia (1990) took this idea of role definition and team member role acceptance further in suggesting the idea that certain organizational activities are normalized into scripts. These scripts are effectively standardized organizational expectations of how certain activities should be performed, and how team members should act in those scenarios. The benefit of such scripts is coordinated behavior, and these scripts aid emotionally intelligent individuals in self-regulation activity. As well, scripts provide the team a method of reducing opportunity for conflict, and increase organizational cohesion by establishing mutually patterned scenarios for members to follow in team activities.

Some researchers have claimed that internals tend to be more intelligent and more success-oriented than externals. Research has shown that having an internal locus of control is related to higher academic achievement. An extensive body of literature supported the premise that students with internal locus of control showed higher achievement motivation than students with External locus of control (Parsons, 1983). In the elementary grades, children with an internal locus of control have been found to earn higher grades, although there are conflicting reports about whether there is a relationship between college grades and locus of control. Findley and
Cooper (1983) concluded that internals earned somewhat better grades and worked harder, because they spent more time on homework and studied longer for tests. If someone believed that hard work would pay off, then he would be more likely to work hard. Developing an External locus of control makes it easier to excuse poor performance without hurting the individual’s self-esteem (Basgall and Snyder, 1988). By attributing their failure to fate, chance, or to the fault of someone else, they are able to escape the potential damage that may come from attributing it to personal flaws or lack of ability. Chance and Powerful Other orientations were more likely to be present amongst highly stressed college students (Gadzella, 1994).

Locus of control has been linked to several other variables such as academic achievement, health and psychological adjustment (Haidt and Rodin, 1999). Internals tended to perform better than externals on academic tasks, and had better coping strategies leading to better psychological adjustment and reduction of negative health effects associated with high stress (Davis and Palladino, 2000). Evers et al. (2000) found that higher externality scores of workers were linked to their career dissatisfaction and illness. Female students who identified with role models had stronger internal locus of control than the subjects who did not identify role models. Teglasi (1978) found that internal of control was a significant factor in females’ achievement motivation. Howard (1995) also found that locus of control was a changeable variable, that it increased over the first year of college in the role model group (positive effect), and that it decreased over the first year of college in the group that had no role model (negative effect). Externals were more likely to respond to failure by giving up hope and not trying harder, whereas internals were likely to respond to failure by trying harder to improve.

Anderman and Midgeley (1997) noted that students who believed that their poor performance was caused by factors out of their control were unlikely to see any reason to hope for improvement. In contrast, if students attributed their poor performance to their lack of important skills or to poor study habits, they were more likely to persist in the future. In a study of undergraduate students, they found that internals were more responsible than Externals in order to ensure reinforcement and to avoid relying on outside forces to determine their successes and failures. They also found that the construct of locus of control was related to responsibility, self-monitoring and motivation. Senior students were found to be more internal than those
younger in the study. The results suggested that the Generalised Expectancy of their reinforcement was related to the level of academic programme. They supported the belief that the more internal the student’s orientation, the higher his achievement. Females were more apt to take responsibility for success, and less apt to do so in case of failure, and were more internal for success than for failure. The results supported the notion that the relationship of locus of control to sex was not consistent.

Educational methods could be modified using the locus of control research findings. A study (Bendell et al, 1980)\textsuperscript{727} evaluated the effectiveness of two types of teaching strategies, high and low structured, to learning disabled students. They found that externals performed better under high structure conditions and internals in low structure conditions. They suggest that testing such students for locus of control may lead to more effective teaching methods, and a better fit between methods and student. Learning disabled youth felt less in control of their own lives than do non-disabled youth (Gregory et al, 1986)\textsuperscript{728}. It was possible that their locus of control orientation may only serve to either escalate the problems or to make it more difficult to help them. Learning disabled students are affected by deficits in self-regulation of strategic behaviour, and characteristics such as learned helplessness and an External locus of control (Harris et al, 1992)\textsuperscript{729}. Learning disabled children and adolescents were found to be more Externally oriented than those who were not (Huntington and Bender, 1993)\textsuperscript{730}.

Externals have low motivation, and this is even truer for learning disabled students. They would have been told repeatedly by the school system of their failure, and their External orientation could be a survival mechanism. Class participation from these Externals is very little, even if they knew the answers to posed questions (Bender, 1995)\textsuperscript{731}. Feeling that the school system would still brand them a failure, they avoid the effort. Smith et al (1997)\textsuperscript{732} found a general consensus that learning disabled children tended to operate from an external locus of control as they often viewed their lives to be controlled by external forces. They gave up responsibility for their actions, especially academic ones. The motivational problems of learning disabled students stemmed from three inter-related areas: External locus of control, negative attributions and learned helplessness. Learning disabled persons were more likely to have an External locus of control than those without such disabilities (Hallahan et al, 1999)\textsuperscript{733}. Mamlin (2001)\textsuperscript{734} conducted a methodological analysis of
22 comparative and descriptive studies of locus of control among learning disabled students between 1982 and 1999. She found fault with the measurement and methods adopted in those studies, and disagreed with earlier findings that learning disabled students have an External locus of control.

In a study of elementary students, when praise given to Externals for an intrinsically motivated activity was stopped, their motivation declined. After participating in a self-chosen and intrinsically motivated task, students received positive verbal feedback (Lonky and Reihman, 1980). When they were given the opportunity to participate in the same task again, internals spent more time, whereas Externals spent less time at their respective tasks. This suggested that locus of control differences dictated their responses to positive verbal feedback. Noel et al (1987) found that students’ grades could rise, if they were taught to have a more hopeful attitude and develop an internal locus of control. In school, an external locus of control may develop out of a repeated failure in spite of continued attempts at school tasks (Bender, 1995). A high external locus of control, in turn, led to a lack of motivation for study and school in general. Such persons may feel that working hard would be futile because their efforts only brought disappointment. Ultimately, they may perceive failure as being their destiny. For example, Blau (2001) found that Externals perceived limited occupational alternatives for themselves.

In their study of locus of control and attitudes toward physical fitness, Sonstroem and Walker (1973) found that internals showed more favourable attitudes toward physical activity, obtained significantly better scores, and engaged in greater amounts of voluntary physical exercise than did externals. There have been findings that an internal locus of control may be beneficial in weight loss control (Balch and Ross, 1975) and the successful stoppage of smoking (James et al, 1965; Best and Stuffy, 1975). People who had only one disease or none during the registration period of 3 years scored higher on internal locus, and lower on External locus than people who had two or more co-occurring diseases (Wallston and Wallston, 1981). The presence of background variables such as age and sex, education and profession, family situation and coping styles changed magnitude but not the presence of these relationships.
While Rotter (1971)\textsuperscript{744} dichotomised control as merely internal and external, Levenson (1974)\textsuperscript{745} went further and constructed a tripartite dimension. He created two more constructs, where some non-Internals with chance orientations believed that the world was unordered, while other non-Internals believed that the world was ordered but Powerful Others were in control. Consequently, this led to the generation of his I-P-C (Internal-Powerful Others-Chance) scales, as against the Rotter I-E (Internal-External) scale (Levenson, 1981)\textsuperscript{746}. Persons with high chance orientation scores believe that the world is unpredictable, and attribute events to luck and fate, not to people to control their outcomes in life. They may engage in compensating behaviours or denial to deal with work-related stress. If they remain in their jobs despite career dissatisfaction, their helplessness would force them into alcohol abuse.

Hambrick and Finkelstein (1987)\textsuperscript{747} who conceptualised the CEO locus of control argued that the CEO’s internal locus of control contributed to the managerial discretion or latitude of his managerial action. This was because internality was associated with higher levels of concern, involvement and vitality in general (Boone et al, 1996)\textsuperscript{748}. Due to the higher levels of authority in some organisations and at some levels of the hierarchy, internal CEOs were able to prevent relatively unprofitable firms from becoming bankrupt, while External CEOs quit the firms, earlier than internal CEOs. However, Boone and de Brabander (1993)\textsuperscript{749} found no relationship between CEO locus of control and the age and size of the firm, or its financial performance. Work locus of control has been found to act a strong mediating variable in job stress and strain (Spector and O’Connell, 1994)\textsuperscript{750}.

Some parental behavioural patterns such as being excessively strict, critical and demanding conformity have been found in low socio-economic status households. These patterns may be assumed to have been caused by parents’ occupational and other life experiences, and are characteristic of low control and insecurity (Sennett and Cobb, 1973;\textsuperscript{751} Rubin, 1976)\textsuperscript{752}. Similarly, if an adult experiences stressful and low control jobs, his personality would develop accordingly (Kohn and Schooner, 1982)\textsuperscript{753}. Lefcourt (1982)\textsuperscript{754} pointed out that locus of control was positively associated with access to opportunity. Locus of control has tended to resemble the construct of self-efficacy, and has often been used interchangeably with each other. Persons with high self-efficacy tend to exert more and are more persistent than those with low self-efficacy (Phillips and Gully, 1997)\textsuperscript{755}. But the two terms are
not equivalent. While locus of control is about the perception of control, self-efficacy is about the perception of ability to act competently and effectively (Bandura, 1997)\textsuperscript{756}. Self-efficacy has two components in the form of expectations, efficacy and outcomes. The concept of self-efficacy is situation-specific, and circumstances in the form of specific situations, tasks and behaviour will dictate a range of both high and low expectations (Sadri and Robertson, 1993)\textsuperscript{757}.

Some of the determinants of locus of control may be found in factors that shape personality development in childhood. Bosma et al (1998)\textsuperscript{758} found that higher childhood socio-economic status resulted in higher locus of control (which they called ‘perceived control’) in adulthood. Locus of control was an important mediator of the association of socio-economic status with later mortality. Literature review has shown that internals differed from externals in several ways, particularly in terms of their cognitive activity and environmental mastery. Extreme internals may not be flexible enough to cope with some situations. Because they are more perceptive of their situations, internals seem to exert more control on their lives and circumstances because of the knowledge of their environments (Lefcourt, 1976)\textsuperscript{759}. Even when apparently not relevant, internals seem to be more willing to acquire and use information that is relevant to their goal (Phares, 1976)\textsuperscript{760}. Research investigations have suggested that people classified as internal in locus of control display more information-seeking behaviour and make better use of this information than people classified as external in locus of control (Weinier, 1979)\textsuperscript{761}.

Kren (1992)\textsuperscript{762} found that the attribution theory of locus of control had relevance in explaining leadership behaviour, the performance and satisfaction of organisation members. It also moderated the relationship between motivation and incentives for the individual. Externals needed more explicit cues to contingencies, but when cues were implicit and when information signals were not obvious, internals outperformed externals. This was so even in cases of incidentally acquired and seemingly trivial knowledge that was remotely connected to the respondent students’ success. Internals therefore exhibited more readiness, more aggression and more risk taking ability to work for their success on lesser and weaker chances of such success. Links have been found between locus of control and behaviour patterns in a number of different areas. Locus of control and cognitive ability are positively related (Fry, 1975)\textsuperscript{763}. People with an internal locus of control were inclined to take responsibility
for their actions, are not easily influenced by the opinions of others, and tend to do better at tasks when they can work at their own pace. By comparison, people with an external locus of control tend to blame outside circumstances for their mistakes and credit their successes to luck rather than to their own efforts. They are readily influenced by the opinions of others and are more likely to pay attention to the status of the opinion-holder, while people with an internal locus of control pay more attention to the content of the opinion regardless of who holds it.

Stone and Jackson (1975)\textsuperscript{764} found a positive relationship between locus of control and motivation. Although people can be classified comparatively as internals or externals, chronological development within each individual generally proceeds in the direction of an internal locus of control. As infants and children grow older, they would feel increasingly competent to control events in their lives. Consequently, they move from being more externally focused to a more internal locus. There is also a relationship between a child’s locus of control and his or her ability to delay gratification (to forgo an immediate pleasure or desire in order to be rewarded with a more substantial one later). In middle childhood, children with an internal locus of control are relatively successful in the delay of gratification. However, children with an external locus of control would be likely to make less of an effort to exert self-control in the present because they doubted their ability to influence events in the future. Strain (1993)\textsuperscript{765} found that internal locus of control had a positive relationship with persistence, and with achievement.

A person’s locus of control has an impact on his responses to success and failure. According to Spector (1982)\textsuperscript{766}, Internals attempt control in the following areas: work flow, task accomplishment, operating procedures, work assignments, relationships with supervisors and subordinates, working conditions, goal setting, work scheduling, and organisational policy. But he found that its moderating role in the relation between perceptions of the job and effective responses to it were unclear. Those who made an internal attribution performed better on the same task than on a different task when tested again, whereas those who made an external attribution performed better on a different task than on the same task (Kernis, 1984)\textsuperscript{767}. This suggested that internals were more likely to continue working at a task that they have succeeded at, while externals were likely to stop working on the successful task and move on to a different task.
In work-related behaviour, based on the meta-analysis undertaken by Spector (1986)\textsuperscript{768}, it was found that high internality was related to high levels of job-satisfaction, commitment, involvement and performance. Nair (1997)\textsuperscript{769} found many associations between locus of control and various job characteristics. Internal locus of control was positively related to the perceptions of skill variety, task identity and significance, autonomy and feedback. It was positively related to the motivating potential of the jobs of the respondents (mostly supervisory), their critical psychological states, and their general satisfaction and internal work motivation. Later, Nair and Yuvaraj (2000)\textsuperscript{770} also found that internals scored higher than externals on an overall scale of self-perceived managerial effectiveness. Although internals exhibited behaviour patterns that should lead to better employee performance, especially among managers, Robbins (2001)\textsuperscript{771} suggested that such behaviour might not be ideal for every situation.

1.4 CONCEPTUALIZATION

Leadership can be defined as the ability to inspire other people to accomplish things. A leader teaches by example and motivates others to follow their actions. A leader looks for new opportunities and is willing to change their status quo. A leader has the ability to make people feel good about what they are doing and helps people feel like the work they are accomplishing is working towards the larger goal of the corporation. A leader challenges someone to go beyond his or her base level of operation and work to their highest potential; they strive to get the best out of their employees. A leader is someone who recognizes accomplishment and properly rewards for accomplishments. One of the most important aspects of a leader is they treat mistakes as learning experiences.

The problem is that there are many meanings, interpretations and definitions, for example: “The art of creating and channeling human energy, emotions and vision” – “You manage tasks and things but you lead people” – Steven Covey;\textsuperscript{772} “The real role of leadership is to manage the values of an organization” – Tom Peters and Bob Waterman;\textsuperscript{773} “Leadership is influence. That’s it. Nothing more; nothing less … he who thinketh he leadeth and hath no one following him/her is only taking a walk” – John Maxwell; “Remove for a moment the moral issues behind it, and there is only
one definition: Leadership is the ability to obtain followers.” James C Georges, ParTraining Corporation.

All these findings contrasted with the literature review of DuBrin (1995), who found various definitions of leadership to suggest that it was:

- Interpersonal influence directed through communication toward goal attainment
- Influential increment over and above mechanical compliance of rules
- An act that influences others to act or respond in a shared direction
- The art of influencing people by persuasion or example to follow a line of action
- The principal dynamic force that motivates and co-ordinates the organisation in the accomplishment of its objectives

Bass (1999) defined leadership in terms of influence, group processes, persuasion, power, goal achievement, interaction, role differentiation, initiation of structure, and the combination of two or more of these elements. He quoted the best definition of leadership from Kim and Mauborgne (1992) to be the ability to inspire confidence and support among the people who are needed to achieve organisational goals. Gardner (1998) defined leadership as the ability to influence – either directly or indirectly – the behaviour, thoughts and actions of a significant number of individuals. The ability of the leader to influence individuals into some deliberate and meaningful action manifested a power for that leader over those individuals, who become his followers (Ivancevich and Matteson, 1996). The highest agreement has been on the conceptualization that leadership is the ability of an individual to influence a group of people towards organizational goals. Ultimately, leadership was seen to be an influence process, and therefore, its significance for groups and organizations has been undisputed.

1.5 OPERATIONALIZATION OF THE CONCEPT

Contemporary leadership literature has described the effective leader as being persistent, self-confident, energetic, alert to the environment, adaptable to the situation, assertive and goal-directed (Bass, 1990; Zacarro et al, 1991; Yukl, 1994). In
addition, various taxonomies of effective leader behaviours have included activities such as monitoring operational processes and the task environment, goal setting, planning, problem solving, and diagnosing individual and group needs. DuBrin (1995) suggested that there could be two kinds of situations, where the impact of leadership may not be felt in the organization.

(i) **Endogenous Conditions:** The leader's role may be almost superfluous, where the work environment factors were overpowering, as in the following cases:

- Highly trained members built into a cohesive team
- High satisfaction levels of the team members
- Information technology (IT) was used, extensively
- Professional norms were in evidence

(ii) **Exogenous Factors:** leadership may be irrelevant, if situational factors outside the leader's control had a larger impact on business outcomes than do leadership actions. Top management leaders have a limited span of control on organizational resources, and are limited by obligations to various stakeholder groups.

In short, leaders are efficacious individuals who gather information, plan action, take action, and monitor group progress towards goals.

### 1.6 FOCUS OF STUDY

A paradigm shift in education in India in the last two decades has resulted both in threats and opportunities. Also, it has brought new challenges and an opportunity for higher education. Globalization and privatization are imposing new challenges as a result of which, higher education in India is undergoing rapid changes and therefor, the governance of the Indian Higher education sector is changing. Since the Indian economy underwent a liberalizing in the 1990s, the education system has gradually being opened up for change and decentralization. The Central and State governments are gradually giving higher education institutions more decision and spending power. This represents a move away from detailed government control over spending, teaching, and curriculum decisions, which required frequent approval from federal or state government officials.
Leadership of institutions of higher education is a magic version which creates mission and vision that is noble, aspirational and inspirational making people to be enthusiastic and energetic towards goal-orientation of the institution. Academic leadership is something special as it is to create intellectuals and in turn it is a foundation for the “knowledge-society”. There is a shift in academic leadership paradigm in creating and innovating specialized skills and knowledge to the global society as it abundantly requires. In Indian education, most of the traditional entrepreneurs have been engaged as educationists with usual care and conventional type of management, which is highly mismatching to the new environment. Academic leadership is doing the fundamental job of transferring knowledge and skills and creating values to the human capital. India has good old heritage of Christian mission education due to the British rule in India. However, after independence, there has been a nitty-gritty situation to concentrate more on educational socialistic pattern. The constraints of resources have made Indian society to become a slow mover in education-front. The present trend is a growing opportunity and greater amount of challenges are demanding academic leadership from many folds. The growing body of work on academic leadership was discussed by many authors (Mintzberg, 1998; Knight & Trowler, 2001; Martin et.al. 2003). Academic leader is defined for the purpose of the study as ‘an academic or administrative member of staff who are teaching or administrating academic programs. The academic roles varies according to the responsibility and capability as teaching faculty, head of the department, principal, professor, director, registrar, vice-chancellor etc. Due to the rapid change, environmental complexity and huge demand for skilled and knowledgeable workforce, the scope of academic leadership gets wider and wider. In the western and European system, education has been considered as a priority area and even private colleges are running with highest quality and accountability. The job of students’ development is a core system exclusively depends on the capacity of the academic leaders. Now days, the student is more diverse with heterogeneous characters in terms of age, sex, religious association, communal identity, socio-economic status etc.

There has been limited research on academic leadership in India. It is beyond arguments that development of leadership skills and knowledge will bring personal as well as organizational benefits and it will be an indication for growth potential for the
growing and prospective leaders in the higher education. The literature identifies large number of benefits to the faculties and higher education institutions

There is a sea-change academic environment in the global research and development front. Competitive advantage is a mantra like word echoing in all spheres of human life as it is LPG (Liberalisation, Privatisation and Globalisation) era. Even socialistic and communist countries have been breaking their iron curtain to look into their future prosperities through effective implementation of higher education strategy with private sector participation. The socio-economic and political polices are put into vibrant changes. ICT (Information and Computer Technology) has brought revolutionary impact in the process of global business. At par with other business, education is also being converted as a profitable business since it requires huge investment facility on long run basis. There is a tremendous changes taking place in the management of higher education institutions and the scope of Indian academic leadership since Indian higher education industry is fragmenting and loosening its institutional boundaries. The new economic policy has started encouraging privatization and globalization in higher education. Education is a service that results in transformation of knowledge and skill; it is a foundation for all other industries. Education is creating knowledge management for future organization, a total dedication and devotion is required for leaders of the higher educational institutions. Competitive advantage is echoing everywhere and Indian higher education industry is not exempted from the competition. Academic leadership is being converted into business management role in many of the Asian countries, for example, Singapore, Malaysia Saudi Arabia and Russia. The importance of transformational leadership to extend service quality delivery was discussed by Jabnoun & Rasasi, (2005) and customer relationship building was emphasized by Liao & Chuang, (2007). School reforms were strongly projected by Geijsel et al., (2003). Clark et al. (2009) defined commitment to service quality as the “dedication of employees to render service quality and the willingness to go beyond what is expected of them”. Since the growing concern is on service quality and other stake holders, the responsibility of academic leadership is enhanced further.

In recent years, leadership effectiveness has received much attention as a set of abilities that is potentially useful in understanding and predicting individual performance at work. Non-cognitive factors like those comprising emotional
intelligence are important determinants of work behaviour, especially in a rapidly changing work environment. It has also been proven to account for the success of the effective business leaders. Since leaders are responsible for creating adaptive change in organisations, it would be relevant to understand how statutes creating public sector institutions of higher learning affect the effectiveness and role efficacy of the chief executive officers of these institutions. Similarly, in respect of privately managed institutions, the role the board of governors on the working of the leaders is worth study. There appear to have been no studies covering this aspect of the efficacy of the leader. It would be useful to determine the effectiveness of leaders and their role efficacy in an educational institution of higher learning.

1.7 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The twenty-first century promises to be most turbulent and chaotic for mankind. Much of the organisational success will be determined by the effectiveness of the leader under conditions of extreme stress and change. The understanding of the leader effectiveness and the efficacy of its role could have positive and useful implications for the identification, development and placement of prospective and current managers as leaders in organisations, in particular, and for their human resource systems, in general. The objectives of the present study are:

- To examine the systems of control in State funded and privately owned universities in India.
- To explore the constituent factors of leader effectiveness in education sector.
- To measure the leadership effectiveness.

The present investigation was carried out with the following objectives:

- To study the effect of emotional intelligence on leader effectiveness and role efficacy
- To study the effect of locus of control on leader effectiveness and role efficacy
- To study the effect of type of university on leader effectiveness and role efficacy
To study the interactive effect of emotional intelligence and locus of control on leader effectiveness and role efficacy

To study the interactive effect of emotional intelligence and type of university on leader effectiveness and role efficacy

To study the interactive effect of locus of control and type of university on leader effectiveness and role efficacy

To study the interactive effect of emotional intelligence, locus of control and type of university on leader effectiveness and role efficacy

To explore the factorial constitution of leader effectiveness in higher education sector

To open up new vistas of research

1.8 HYPOTHESIS

The purpose with this thesis is to find an ideal leader that would be perceived as effective in state funded or privately owned universities in India. Due to the globalization and privatization of higher education in India, an effective manager must have skills that are perceived as effective by many different people, despite ownership differences.

In order to find as to what constitutes an effective leader within the two types of universities and to determine what effectiveness means in each set-up, the following research problems are formulated:

- **Is it possible to create perspectives of effective leader that would be perceived as effective in state funded or privately owned universities in India?**
- **What exogenous and endogenous factors would influence the leadership effectiveness depending upon ownership of a university in India?**

1.9 LIMITATIONS

Since the base of this research is state funded or privately owned universities, the focus is put only on these types of universities only excluding from the study other types of institutions of higher education and research, including institutions of excellence, mainly established by the state.
However, leadership can be perceived in different ways in the eyes of different people. In addition, the term of leadership rely on different aspects, whereas the situational factors are one. As this quantitative study does not take these situational factors into account, there might be factors that affect the answers. Organizational cultures are as well something that is not taken into account. Since this is a general study, which intends to determine the cultures of the countries, these aspects are not possible to consider.

The topic of leadership effectiveness is huge and therefore, we believe the time devoted for this thesis was inadequate. Leadership effectiveness is a very important subject for many people, not only for those who are directly associated with a university, but also for other people for many reasons. We believe that there are so much more to study in this subject, and the knowledge should reach more people in order to become more effective in the education sector. In addition, as a result of the expansion of education sector and emergence of knowledge economy more people start working in institutions of higher education, and therefore, it is even more important to be aware of differences and have the knowledge of what behaviors are accepted in different types of ownerships of a university. However, to become effective one must be able to be innovative and situation-oriented.

One major limitation in this research process was the numbers of respondents. To get 1000 answers from each type of university was difficult, and we did not get that many answers. Even though we did contact much more people than 1000 persons in each type of university, a small percentage responded. As the time went by quickly, we had to gather the data even though we did not have enough respondents.

We hope our thesis will be useful for those who read it, especially those who answered the questionnaire. Our thoughts and our results might at least open up the interest for leadership effectiveness and provide some people with interesting and for them undeveloped aspects.

### 1.10 PRESENTATION OF THE STUDY

This study examines research on University leadership effectiveness, focusing specifically on the effectiveness, followed by a review of existing research on
effective leaders in institutions of higher education. The scholar analyzes how leader effectiveness is defined and measured, and concludes that this is one of the major shortcomings in the knowledge base. The report then details relationship of effectiveness to emotional intelligence, role efficacy and locus of control.

Leader effectiveness and locus of control have been some of the most discussed variables related to human behaviour in teams and organizations. Since the beginning of the last decade, emotional intelligence has begun to acquire extraordinary importance, perhaps due to impact at the workplace from the changes forced by economic globalization, and due to information and communications technologies. There have been many studies to conceptualize and understand the nature of these variables. The present study was designed to explore the impact of emotional intelligence and locus of control as critical constructs on leader effectiveness and role efficacy in State and private universities in India. The report of the study has been classified into seven chapters for clarity of presentation.

Chapter 1 introduces the significance of the study and the reasons why the study has been selected. It is followed by an exhaustive review of literature in terms of leader effectiveness, emotional intelligence, locus of control, role efficacy and their respective correlates. The available literature is presented to highlight the gaps in knowledge to supplement the primary objectives of the study. Conceptualization and operationalization of the concepts involved in the study are precede the focus of the problem followed by objectives of the study. The chapter also then formulated the research problem and discusses the major limitation of the study.

Chapter 2 describes the general profile of the universities in India and the research design. Universe of the study, survey population, sampling techniques, the sample and the tools adopted for data collection and analysis, reliability and validation of the questionnaire, content analysis, statistical tools adopted and applied are also presented in this chapter. The investigation is an exploratory cum descriptive cum diagnostic study based on a trivariate factorial constitution, and each independent variable has two levels.

Chapter 3 presents twenty-four experiments, each in a tabular form to highlight the direction taken to accomplish the objectives of the study. A sample of 337 elements drawn from an initial sample of 521 university professors and
administrators was used for computation of results. The 24 experiments tested 840 hypotheses. Each experiment has a bimodal configuration presenting significant findings based on analysis of variance and t-test analysis. The significant results have been summarized at the end of each experiment, and are later consolidated into a grand summary. The data was treated statistically for arriving at the outcome of the whole effort. The chapter has presented the steps taken by using analysis of variance and t-test analysis of the data.

Chapter 4 amalgamates the findings of the study with the available literature to build a logical base for filling up the gaps in knowledge. The results have been discussed in detail under a framework of reasonably acceptable notions classified for an organized presentation and understanding. Chapter 5 has the conclusions and the suggestions. The conclusions have been presented within the framework of objectives of the study, and with specific reference to the broad purpose of the study. In view of certain limitations of the study, which could not be avoided, and experiences gained from this academic endeavor, the suggestions have attempted to highlight some critical issues for further research. Chapter 6 is an effort to understand the application value of the findings. The implications have been presented to seek out the utility and applications of the outcome of the study. The references based on the works cited in the report have been presented at the end.
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