An important and critical aspect of a research project is the survey of related literature which helps in acquiring and locating comprehensive information about the subject and comparable data useful in the interpretations of results. Literature on leadership is so vast that it is not humanly possible to review whole literature in leadership. However, an attempt is made to review the core literature on leadership which is directly relevant for the present study. Review has been divided into following three broad categories:

(a) Review and development of Leadership Behaviour;
(b) Leadership studies in India; and
(c) Leadership Studies in Library and Information Science.

Review and Development of Leadership Behaviour

Reviewing of literature in leadership began in 1940’s. Out of three reviews, (Bird, 1940; Jenkin, 1947; Stodgill, 1948) Stodgill’s was most influential. Stodgill carried a subsequent review and published ‘Handbook of leadership’ in 1974. This has been further revised, and updated and expanded by Bass (1981, 1990) after Stodgill’s death. There have been other useful assessments such as Gibb’s (1947; 1969), Mann (1959), Hollander (1985), Bryman (1986), House and Singh (1987) etc. providing a comprehensive account of study of
leadership. Approach to leadership studies can be broadly classified into following three categories:

(a) Traits approach;

(b) Behavioural approach; and

(c) Contingency approach.

Traits Approach

Leadership studies started with kind of traits or personal features which distinguish leaders from non leaders. These were broadly classified into three types namely physical factors such as height, weight, physique, appearance and age, Secondly, ability characteristics such as intelligence, fluency of speech, Scholarship and knowledge and thirdly a wide range of personality characteristics like; conservatism, introversion-extroversion, dominance, personal adjustment, self confidence, interpersonal sensitivity and emotional control. Mann (1959) in his survey found positive relation between personal personality traits and leadership in eighty percent of the studies. Stogdill (1948) concluded, "qualities, characteristics and skills required in a leader are determined to a large extent by the demands of a situation in which he is to function as a leader". Stogdill's and other reviews of Bird (1940) and Jenkin (1947) during this period are cited as major reasons which shifted the trend of study of leadership from traits approach to-wards behavioural approach. However, this did not stop the studies on trait approach. 162 studies on traits of leadership were reported by Stogdill (1974) published during 1948-1970. Table 2.1 gives the summary of traits researched upto 1970 (Bass, 1990, table 5.2)
Table 2.1. **Personality Traits Associated with Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>No of position finding (Survey 1970)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Physical characteristics</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Social background</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Intelligence and ability</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Task related characteristics</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Social characteristics</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership, 1990, p. 80

Thus it becomes quite evident that maximum studies during that period were conducted in personality traits followed by social characteristics and task related characteristics. Personality characteristics included adaptability, adjustment, assertiveness, alertness, emotional balance, enthusiasm, extroversion, independence, objectivity, originality, ethical conduct, resourcefulness, self confidence, strength of conviction and tolerance of stress. Task related characteristics included derive to achieve and excel, drive for responsibility, enterprise, persistence against obstacles, responsibility in the pursuit of objectives and task orientation. Social characteristics include ability to enlist cooperation, administrative ability, attractiveness, cooperativeness, nurturance, popularity, prestige, interpersonal skills, social participation and tact and diplomacy. Social background included education, social status and mobility.

But what mixture of traits constitute a effective leader. Korman (1968) concluded, that bulk of trait research situated in formal organisations did not really permit the prediction of leadership ability. So what cluster of characteristics will make a effective leader? Opinions
differ and there is no overall comprehensive theory of personality of leaders. Individual differ from each other and differences may be on the basis of age, sex, family background, physique so on. Thus it "should be emphasised that some of the variance in who emerges as a leader and who is successful and effective is due to traits of consequence in the situation, some is due to situational effects, and some is due to the interaction of traits and situation." (Bass, 1990). Thus some individuals will attempt to lead in some situations in which they find themselves, but other will avoid doing so whenever possible and some individuals will lead in only certain situation.

**Behavioural Approach**

These developments led to shift from traits of the leaders towards their style of leadership during 1950's onwards. Leadership styles or behaviour is treated as synonyms in literature. Stogdill (1974) surveyed 52 factorial studies and listed 26 factors based on frequency of their citations. Most frequently occurring factors were description of skills of leader but next most frequent set of factors concerned with how leaders relate to their group. The behaviours included maintaining the cohesiveness of the group, coordination, task motivation, task performance, and high quality of output. A concern for the group's performance was softened by nurturant behaviour and the use of informal controls. These factors were as follows: maintaining a cohesive work group, maintaining coordination and teamwork, maintaining standards of performance, maintaining informal control of the group and nurturant behaviour. List of factors with number of studies as reported by Bass (1990) are reproduced here for better understanding.
Table 2.2  Factors in 52 Studies Survey by Stogdill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No.</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Number of Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Technical skills</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Social nearness, friendliness</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Task motivation and application</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Supportive of the group task</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Social and interpersonal skills</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Emotional balance and control</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Leadership effectiveness and achievement</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Administrative skills</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>General impression (halo)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Intellectual skills</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Ascendence, dominance and decisiveness</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Willingness to assume responsibility</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Ethical conduct, personal integrity</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Maintaining a cohesive work, group</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Maintaining coordination and teamwork</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Ability to communicate, articulativeness</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Physical energy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Maintaining standards of performance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Creative independence</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Conforming</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Courageous, daring</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Experience and activity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Nurturant behaviour</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Maintaining informal control of the group</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Mature, cultured</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Aloof and distant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Most of the research during this period led to mainly dichotomy of leadership styles. One on side authoritarian or task oriented leadership style and on other side people oriented styles or participative styles. However, there have been other approaches also. Some of the representative approaches of leadership behaviour are discussed below:
The Lewin, Lippitt and White Study (1939)

One of the earliest and influential attempt to study leadership behaviour was made by K Lewin, R. Lipitt and R. White. They identified three basic styles of leadership. Authoritarian where the leader has all the power and influence in decision making; democratic where the leader shares power and influence in decision making with his group and Laissez-faire where all the power and influence in decision making is given to the group members. They experimented with ten years old boys who were exposed to above mentioned styles. They arrived at some conclusions, namely: (a) best leadership style in terms of group satisfaction is democratic style (b) groups with authoritarian leaders tended to display hostility and aggression towards the leader (c) the least productive was laissez-faire. The study obviously emphasised democratic style as the most effective.

The Ohio State Leadership Studies (1945)

The Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University started series of leadership studies in 1945 under the leadership of Shartle. An interdisciplinary team developed 1,800 statements describing different aspects of the behaviour of leaders. Out of which only 150 statements on the basis of exclusiveness on subscale were selected. Thus Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was developed. LBDQ was administered to wide variety of situations and after factor analyzing, the results were amazingly consistent. The two dimensions of leadership emerged viz., consideration and initiating structure which accounted to 83 percent of the variance of matrix (Halpin and Winer, 1952; Fleishman, 1957). These two factors are separate and independent dimensions of leader behaviour and emerged in successive factor
studies (Fleishman, 1973). Consideration factor describes the extent to which a leader exhibit concern for the welfare of the other members while initiating structure shows extent to which a leader initiates activity in the group. Therefore, shows orientation towards task.

Ohio studies were first to emphasize the importance of both task and human dimensions in assessing leadership. These studies generated a lot of research about its psychometric properties reliability and validity (Schriesheim and Ker, 1974), relation between consideration and initiating dimensions, relation with other leadership styles etc. However, ohio research studies were not without shortcomings. They faced a lot of criticism over the years. Shortcomings have been summarized by Alan Bryman (1986) as follow:

(a) **Discrepant Findings**

Studies are based on statistical correlational approach. Every study in which consideration and initiating structure figure prominently revealed that magnitude and direction of correlation between each of them was highly variable (Korman, 1966).

(b) **Absence of Situational Analysis**

Ohio studies failed to take situational variable which moderates the relation between leader behaviour and various outcomes into accounts (Korman, 1966).

(c) **Problem of the Group**

Most of the leadership theories are in relation to group and ohio studies are no exception. This involves averaging individual subordinates description of their leader to form a group level description. It has been observed that leaders behave in different ways to different group members. Therefore, it is the leader in relation to the subordinate, not to a work group or unit, which is the focus of their attention.
(d) The Non-observation of Leader Behaviour

A major problem with the Ohio scales and many other measures of leadership behaviour is that they rely predominantly on subordinate account of what particular leader do.

The Michigan Leadership Studies

At the same time that the Ohio State studies were being conducted, a group of researchers from the survey Research Centre at the University of Michigan began their studies of leadership under the general directorship of Rensis Likert. The Michigan group also developed two distinct dimensions of leadership behaviour which they labelled as job-centered leadership and employee centered leadership similar to consideration and initiating structure of Ohio studies. However, later Michigan studies (Bowers and seashore, 1966) summarized and synthesized earlier available concepts and arrived at four factor approach. These factors are:

(a) Support-Behaviour that enhances the subordinates sense of personal worth.
(b) Interaction facilitation - the engendering of close, mutually satisfying group relationships
(c) Goal emphasis - the stimulation of enthusiasm, without pressure, for the achievement of high performance level.
(d) Work facilitation providing the technical and organisational means for goal accomplishment; Scheduling, coordinating and planning.

Criticism against the Michigan studies focused on same lines as on Ohio State studies due to conceptual symmetry between the two.
Blake and Mouton's the Managerial Grid (1964)

Very popular approach of identifying leadership style is Robert R Black and S. Mouton's managerial grid. The managerial grid's approach is a contrast between two approaches - concern for production and concern for people - which are essential ingredients of effective management. Each concern is conceptualised as a nine point scale, thus having eighty one possible combinations of managerial behaviour. Some of the important combinations are:

(a) 1,1 'Impoverished management' - having low score on both dimensions
(b) 1,9 'Country club management' - high on concern for people
(c) 9,1 'Task Management' - high on task
(d) 5,5 'Middle approach' - some concern for people and some concern for task
(e) 9,9 'Team Management' - ideal situation high on both task and people orientation

Grid style is based on assumptions about how to achieve production with and through others. This leads to clearly recognisable patterns of behaviour. It is this behaviour that impacts others and leads to identifiable consequences. Evidence available clearly points in the direction of 9,9 grid style as being the most effective from the standpoint of achieving production by whatever criterion: volume, quality, speed, safety, customer service, return to investment etc. Furthermore, 9,9 seems to be the most capable of producing creativity that promotes individual satisfaction (Blake and McCanse, 1991).

Response to this managerial grid was mixed. The study suffers from methodological weakness which arise fundamentally because of absence of control groups. One is left with the
possibility that the observed effects could have occurred anyway or that some other form of managerial training would have had the same or even a greater effect (Bryman, 1986).

**Likert’s “System 4” (1961, 1967)**

Likert’s System 4 is a systematic development of the ideas and research generated by the Michigan leadership studies. Likert’s approach is based on ‘principle of supportive relationship’ which Likert says is, "The leadership and other processes in the organisation must be such as to ensure a maximum probability that in cell interactions and in all relationships within the organisation, each member, in the light of his background, Values, desires, and expectations, will view the experiences as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance." (Likert, 1961 p 103). On the basis of above theoretical structure, Likert distinguished four kinds of management which are as follows:

(a) **System 1** - an “Exploitive authoritative” (systemic confidence or trust in subordinates).
(b) **System 2** - ‘benevolent authoritative’ (Manager has condescending confidence and trust such as master and servant)
(c) **System 3** - ‘Consultative’ (Manager has substantial but not complete confidence and trust. Still wishes to keep control of decisions).
(d) **System 4** - ‘participative Management’ (Manager has complete confidence and trust in subordinates in all matters).

One of the major criticism of Likert’s system 4 has been the implication of universality of the system approach. Although Likert’s points out that, “difference in the kind of work --- in the skills and values of the employees will require quite different procedure and ways, yet system 4 will be always effective than system 1”. However, proponents of contingency leadership theories do not agree with his generalisation.
Participative Leadership

It has been now widely accepted that when participative climate is created, there is greater satisfaction in the groups, less aggression, and they are more productive (Lewin, et al, 1939; Black and Mouton’s, 1964 and Likert, 1961,67). Yukl (1971) has argued for the examination of participativeness of leader behaviour distinct from consideration and initiating structure. Participative leadership, then involves a shift-away from authoritarian, highly directive forms of leadership towards a broader range of individuals being allowed and encouraged to play a part in decision making. The idea that greater participation must be encouraged in contemporary organisation is widespread in the literature (Bryman, 1986). Thus participative style gives increased autonomy to people, shares power, and still leader remains a active member among the group in decision making. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) in 'How to choose a leadership pattern' focussed exclusively on participative leadership. They discussed effectively about degree of participation ought to be allowed to subordinates and under what circumstances. Yukl (1981) review of the field experimental literature dealing with the leadership between participation and satisfaction tends to be supportive towards positive relationship. Stogdill (1974) examined the relationship between participative management and cohesiveness and productivity in 26 organisations. He found out that out of 26, 22 correlations were negative and 10 of them were statistically significant. Thus, indicating that use of participative leadership is limited. Experimental research relating to effects of participation in formal organisational settings is inconclusive. There is more evidence to suggest that it enhances satisfaction than performance (Bryman, 1986). Therefore, he suggests that participative leadership have an effect on job satisfaction but not others.
Moreover, these studies do not take into account situational factors like organisational climate into account which can affect participative leadership/outcome relationships.

**Contingency Approach**

Trait and behavioural approaches to leadership did not study situational factors like organisational factors, nature of task, group structure etc. in a systematic order. Underlying assumption in a contingency approach is that a particular leadership style moderates a leadership style-outcome relationship. Thus, not only leader behaviour but also other variables related to organisational climate etc will determine the effectiveness of a particular style. Various contingency approaches are discussed as follows:

**Fiedler’s Contingency Model (1967)**

Fiedler’s contingency model is one of the most widely researched model of leadership. Therefore, indicating one of the most important contribution to the theory of leadership. Fiedler administered a scale to people in leadership position to rate a person whom he or she least liked working with, which he termed as 'LPC' least preferred coworker. They were asked to rate his/her LPC in terms of eight points, 13 bipolar adjectives. These adjectives were tense-relaxed, cold-warm, supportive-hostile, boring-interesting, quarrelsome-harmonious, gloomy-cheerful, open-guarded, back biting-loyal, untrustworthy-trustworthy, considerate-inconsiderate; nasty-nice, agreeable-disagreeable, insincere-sincere, and kind-unkind. Those who rated favourable were high LPC and those unfavourable were low LPC but later on Fiedler introduced third category which was termed as middle LPC (Fiedler and
Chemers, 1984). However, major literature deals with high LPC and low LPC. High LPC is people oriented leadership style and low LPC is task oriented style. This along with situational factors will determine the effectiveness of leadership style. The theory postulates that the leadership style is determined by the needs the individual seeks to satisfy in the leadership situation and the increasingly less favorable leadership situation represents a corresponding increase of threat to the leaders’ need gratification. Individuals with different leadership styles seek to satisfy different needs and thus respond differently to the threat which the unfavourable situation presents. The performance of interacting groups and organisations is therefore, contingent upon the favourableness of the leadership situation as well as upon the executives’ leadership style. Situational favourableness comprised of three factors which are as follows:

(a) Leader-member Relations

This is also called group atmosphere i.e. relation between leader and groups members. It is assumed that good relations will likely make it easier for leader to lead.

(b) Task structure

Structured task will facilitate leader’s position to monitor group performance. Structured task is where tasks are clear, well-defined and every group member knows exactly what he has to do.
(c) Position Power

This refers to formal authority of leader and to which extent leader has the ability to administer reward and punishments to subordinates and to enforce compliance.

Some of the major conclusions of Fiedler’s contingency model are summered by (Ansari 1990, p 27) as follows:

(a) Persons who are unsuccessful in one leadership situation may be quite successful in another.

(b) No one set of personality traits or leadership characteristics will determine an effective leader for every situation. Both the situation and the leader’s personality must be evaluated in order to select a successful leader.

(c) There is no such thing as an ideal leader.

(d) Task motivated as well as relationship motivated leaders excel in some situations and not in others.

(e) The model offers some guidelines to help management to predict the appropriate situation for a specific leadership style.

(f) The model suggests some possibilities for changing the behaviour of leaders to fit situational requirements. If that is not possible, then perhaps the situation can be changed to fit the behaviour of the existing leaders."

A lot of field studies, field experiments and laboratory experiments and octant analysis were conducted to validate the contingency model. But "Despite a vast array of publications on the reliability, validity and meaning of LPC and situational favourableness and despite supportive tests of the model, the validity of the model continues to be disputed (Bass, 1990). The main contribution of the contingency model has been that situational factors were taken into account for leadership effectiveness. "While the Fiedler approach has attracted a good deal of controversy, the essence of the model has been enormously influential. The suggestion that
A leader's effectiveness is contingent upon the situation has found much more favour than the specific model with which Fiedler has been associated with (Bryman, 1986).

**Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory - 1977**

This theory draws heavily from Ohio leadership studies and contingency model of leadership. They identified mainly two types of leadership styles which are:

1. **Task style:** The leader defines roles and explains what and how each subordinate has to do.
2. **Relationship style:** The leader has close personal relationship with the members of the group.

Besides these they added situational factor in the form of "follower's maturity". This refers to 'willingness and ability of a person to take responsibility for directing his/her own behaviour --- in relation to the specific task to be performed." (Hersey, et al, 1980 P 100). Maturity has psychological and job maturity components into it. Therefore this model suggests that leader can change his behaviour with his subordinates keeping in view their maturity level. Therefore, leader behaviour may change at two different times with the same subordinate. However, this model suffers from number of conceptual confusions and deficiencies in the general approach (Graeff, 1983).

**House's Path-goal Theory of Leadership**

Robert House (1971)’s path-goal theory is closely related with motivational factors. According to House and Dessler (1974, p 31) who further revised it, "the motivational
functions of the leader consist of increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work goal attainment, and making the path to these payoffs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction enroute."

Further formulation of this approach (House and Mitchell, 1974; Filley et al, 1976) examines four kinds of leadership behaviour which are:

(a) Directive leadership,
(b) Supportive leadership,
(c) Participative leadership,
(d) Achievement oriented leadership.

These types of leadership behaviour is contingent upon mainly two variables namely - personal characteristics of subordinates and environmental factors.

Literature search shows that only one of two hypothesis received consistent empirical support. Hypothesis that the higher the task structure of the job performed by subordinates, the higher the relationship between supportive leader behaviour and subordinate's satisfaction is substantiated. However, hypothesis that higher the task structure of the job, lower the correlation between directive leader behaviour and subordinate's satisfaction has mixed research support.

The Vroom-Yetton Contingency Model (1973)

The Vroom-Yetton contingency model (1973) is based on the approach to help the leader
in decision making process. The model contains 5 leadership styles, seven situational discussions, fourteen problem types and seven decision rules. Starting point of the model is a problem for which a leader must seek out a solution. Leader should share his decision making with his subordinates to a greater or lesser extent. Five levels of participation are proposed with follow code, such as A = an autocratic process, C = a consultative process and G = group decision making. Thus five types of leadership style or decision styles identified are:

AI Leader solves the problem himself with whatever information is available to him.

AII He obtains information from subordinates without disclosing the purpose of seeking information and decided on the solution of problem himself.

CI He shares problem with relevant subordinates individually and makes a decision without bringing them together as a group.

CII Leader shares the problem with subordinates as a group and obtains their ideas and suggestions together. Leader's decision may or may not reflect subordinates' influence.

GII Here leader acts as a coordinator of the group. Problem is discussed and alternatives are evaluated and generated together and a solution or decision acceptable to whole group is taken.

The effectiveness of the five decision making styles is contingent on seven critical conditions stated in the form of 'yes' or 'no' conditions. These are the leader information rule, the goal congruence rule, the unstructured problem rule, the acceptance rule, the conflict rule, the fairness rule and the acceptance priority rule.

There seems a fair amount of support for the Vroom-Yetton model but not without problems too. Model is too complex to be used in actual practice (Field 1979) as it is viewed as a programme to be used, rather as a stimulus for people to examine their own behaviour.
Conclusion

Leadership research has proliferated over the past few decades with numerous competing theories and models that attempted to explain leader behaviour and their effectiveness.

Trait approach has been one of the earliest approach to leadership studies. The dissatisfaction with trait approach during 1940’s led to the shift of interest in behavioural style. Important among them are Ohio State Leadership studies which gave impetus to further development in behavioural approach. Table 2-3 presents the summary of findings of various leadership model.

Table 2-3 Summary of Findings of Different Leadership Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SI.NO</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lewin, Lippit and white</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>People oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ohio state leadership studies</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>People oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Michigan leadership studies</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>People centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Job centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blake and Moutons’ managerial grid</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1.9 Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,1 Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Likerts’ System</td>
<td>1961, 1967, 1979</td>
<td>Participative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exploitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fiedlers’ contingency model</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>High LPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low LPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Houses’ path-goal theory of leadership</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Achievement oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Direction oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hersey and Blanchards’ life cycle or situational model</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Relationship behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vroom-Yetton contingency model</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>GII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Al</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear from table 2.3 that most of leadership studies have dichotomy of task/directive/initiation/job centered on one side and people oriented/supportive/considerate/participate on other sides. Most of the criticism of behaviour approach is based on methodological issues and inconsistent results. One of the important drawback of behavioural approach is its failure to take situational variables into consideration while determining the effectiveness of leadership style. This led us to the contingency behaviour or situational model of leadership. Fiedler was first to bring situational favourableness variable in consideration in determining leader effectiveness. His contingency model generated a steam of research for over two decades.

![Fig. 2.1 Contingency Approach to Leadership](image)

The main contribution of the contingency model has been to provide an approach to the study of leadership in which situational factors are not merely residual phenomenon but central ingredients of an account of leadership effectiveness. Another main contribution of contingency model is that it suggests that leaders need to be flexible in their behaviour (Yukl,
1981, Graeff, 1983) i.e. leadership styles will differ depending on the situation it demands.

Recent trend has been to return to personal characteristics and special qualities in our emerging fascination with charismatic and inspirational leaders (e.g., Nadler and Tushman, 1989). Even in hardened bureaucracies, there are leaders with knowledge of system, good connections and the ability to mobilise resources and take risks required for creative administration. "We are likely to see more of theory and research about inspirational process (Bass, 1990). Further he concludes, "An enormous amount of original creative research coupled with wasteful repetition of tests and general disregard for negative results, .... Nevertheless the much has been accomplished in spite of all."

Leadership Studies in India

Studies concerning various aspects of leadership in India have been previously reviewed. D. Sinha (1972) reviewed the Indian literature on Industrial psychology from 1926-70. Out of 500 studies, 25 pertained to leadership. Jai B.P. Sinha (1981) reviewed 39 studies on organisational leadership for the period 1971-76. Majority of these studies were on style of effective leadership. Pradip N. Khandwalla (1988) reviewed post 1976 literature on Indian organisation effectiveness in "Psychology in India". Several other reviews on Indian organisational behaviour (Chaturvedi, 1977; Ganesh, 1981) indicate that almost thirty percent of total studies reviewed were on Motivation, Job satisfaction and leadership. These reviews suggest that focus of bulk of research in organisational behaviour in India is at microlevel. Khandwalla (1988) in his review arrived at thirteen conclusions. Some of the related conclusions are as follows:

34
(a) "There is considerable evidence that strategic top management behaviour strongly
influences organisational effectiveness. A proper orchestration of the
organisation's goals, structure and influence processes vis-a-vis employees and
clients by the top management, keeping in view the environment of the
organisation, seems to make for organisational success (Paul, 1982; Prahlad and
Thomas, 1977).

(b) There is evidence that synergistic modes of top management contribute to
organisational effectiveness. (Anand Ram, 1980; Khandwalla, 1981, Maheswari,
1978) e.g; professional and participative modes may be effective in complex
environment.

(c) Vigorous, participative and progressive paternalistic modes of top management
seem to contribute to organisational effectiveness. (Khandwalla, 1983;

(b) Managers tend to believe that different management characteristics and
organisational processes contribute to organisational effectiveness and
ineffectiveness (FORE, 1984). They believe that leadership, team spirit,
innovation, the organisation's coping ability, consideration for the staff, the
identification of employees with organisational goals, effective control, and
career advancement potential contribute to organisational effectiveness.
Inadequate resources, low social legitimacy, poor management, poor planning,
a bureaucratic system, lack of coordination, and lack of identification of
employees with organisational goals as well as contextual factors such as
government practices and union behaviour are perceived to be the major factors
contributing to organisational ineffectiveness.

(e) Evidence indicate that a certain type of leadership process namely Nurturant Task
(NT) followed by participative is conducive to greater effectiveness of work
groups (Sinha, 1984)".

Areas which remain under researched are institution building process, impact of technological
changes on organisational behaviour and how do configurations of context, management
goals, style, strategy, structure, systems and organisational culture and processes affect
different indications of organisational effectiveness.

Thus, it can be safely said that it is people oriented leadership styles namely democratic,
considerate or participative which are more effective (Daftuar and Krishnan, 1971; Kakar,
1971; Pandey 1976 etc) rather than authoritarian or bureaucratic style emphasised in earlier studies. But, are real participative style of leadership truly effective in Indian conditions? There seems to be conflicting results. Sinha and Sinha (1974) identified certain Indian societal values namely - Lack of commitment, preference for personalised relationship, dependence proneness, lack of team orientation, aram (Relaxation or rest) and preference for showing off which are not conducive to participative management. Keeping these values in view, it was felt that participative management was not conducive to Indian environment and if introduced will be grossly misunderstood (Sinha, 1973).

Therefore, the leadership style which was formulated to meet the requirements was named nurturant task style (NT) (Sinha 1980). The NT style obviously has some components for task and some for nurturance. It indicates that NT style emphasises task to be completed and subordinates understand and accept the goals of organisations. Further, Sinha says "NT Reader structures his and his subordinates roles clearly so that communications are explicit, structured and task-relevant. He initiates, guides and directs his subordinates to work hard and maintains a high level of productivity. He, thus creates a climate of purposiveness and goal orientation. This task orientation, however, has the mix of nurturance. He cares for his subordinates, shows affection, takes a personal interest in their well being and above all, is committed to their growth. He wants them to grow up and mature so that they can assume greater and greater responsibilities and spare the leader for other tasks". Thus it is effective for those subordinates who want to maintain dependency, a personalised relationship and status differential and not ready for participative situations. NT style is supposed to be forerunner of participative style as once the subordinates achieve maturity, they generate pressure on leader to shift to participative style of management.
The NT style has been supported by various studies (Ansari, 1981, 1986, 1990; Hinger, 1982; Hassan, 1986; Singhal, 1981; Verma; 1986). Further Sinha (1983) presented twelve studies with evidence in support of the model. In a recent study by Ansari (1990), he has shown that NT style is highly endorsed style of leadership in subordinates rating of superior’s behaviour, but however whether or not work group effectiveness translates into organisational effectiveness has not been demonstrated. Much more work is needed on effective ways of institutionalizing the ethics of diagnosing organisational health, growth, development, innovation, professionalism etc. in a culture in which growth and innovations are crucial but the work ethic, the capacity for fearless self diagnoses, and the capacity for collaborative collective action are weak (Khandwalla, 1988). Further, he concludes, "exhortations to leaders to be NT or participative in disregard of macro-organisational realities would be nonsensical." Moreover, there is no evidence regarding the shift in leadership from nurturant to participative style (Ansari, 1986). Literature survey does not throw light on effectiveness of leadership styles of librarians working in India. None of the studies have been so far reported testing the NT model of leadership in library organisations of India.

The present study proposes to test the effectiveness of NT model in academic libraries of India.

**Leadership Studies in Library Information Science Field**

Modern librarians are facing leadership crisis. The age of traditional librarianship has been immensely influenced by information age and impact of technology. There is so much
turbulence in the profession that it has become challenging to cope with changes which requires dynamic leadership. However, librarians always played a very crucial role in leading and guiding to the source of knowledge. Irving J. Spitzberg (1992) sums up rightly, when he says:

"Librarians who question critically and reflect upon their own leadership are those, most likely to contribute to our understanding and create more effective knowledge resource, that can improve leadership in libraries and through libraries for the larger society. Those who have thought reflectively about leadership will be able to understand their experiences of leadership and followership and use that insight to serve their constituents. That reflection will help choose the best sources among the plethora of writings about leadership. This service through contemplative leadership is indeed the essence of leadership and a profound contributions to be made by leading librarians".

Besides this, rapidly changing technological changes have accelerated the development of information centers. Librarians are under lot of pressure to implement new technologies in their organisations for effective and quick dissemination of information. To manage these changes and to better position libraries so that they remain major players in the campus information infrastructure, the next generation of librarians will require not only competent managers, but professionals who exhibit a full range of leadership qualities (Dougherty, 1989). But very little is known about leadership qualities of librarians.

Academic librarians paid a great deal of attention to improve the quality of management during 1970’s in their libraries but 1980’s saw the attention being shifted to more specific
areas like leadership behaviour of librarians. It was during this period some important books on leadership were published (Riggs, 1982; Riggs and Isabine, 1988; Woodsworth and Von Wahlde, 1988). Important issues like "Director - Management activities and effectiveness" (Euster, 1987). "Relation between leadership behaviour and goal attainment in selected academic librarians" (Cones, 1979) and 'Leadership, organisational dynamics and rate of change in selected public libraries in the northeastern USA' (Boyd, 1980) and "Leaders and managers: literature review, synthesis and a new conceptual framework" (Euster, 1984) were discussed. Even American Library Association’s annual conference chose 'Developing leadership in human resources for Library and information Science as its theme during 1987-88 (Berry et al. 1988).

**Library Leaders- Qualities**

What type of qualities a library leader should possess to be the effective in his organisation? Literature does not throw much light on this aspect. However, it was in 1973 when Arthur M. McAnally and Robert B Downs in their classic article 'The changing role of Director of University Libraries' identified various difficulties like pressures from various sources, lack of cohesive library planning and institutional inability to accommodate which contributed to the declining status of library directors. In the circumstances, he suggested flexibility, adaptability, ability to keep emotional balance and extreme persuasiveness as quality of library directors. Reprinting of this classic article after a gap of fifteen years (College and Research Libraries, 1989) indicates that qualities of a model director suggested by the authors are relevant even these days. Cheryl A. Price (1987) listed thirteen job related factors that librarians should expect to find in a position. These qualities are: stability; responsibility,
job description, meaning in a position, leadership flexibility, support by administration, clear administrative lines, professional salary, support service, growth opportunities and a healthful and comfortable environment. Although these qualities seem idealistic but they are supposed to be milestone that librarian should pursue to achieve.

Price's article generated a debate about what professional librarians (followers) expect from administrations (Librarians) (Fink, 1987; Alley, 1987). Effective administration is described in terms of leadership, clarity and the actualisation of values (Fink, 1987). Numerous opportunities exist for improving the lot of administrations and librarians through changes in library organisation, that allow for greater participation in the management process on the part of librarians, with increased opportunities to build trust and understanding (Alley, 1987).

Moore (1983) also described several traits that are essential for success as an academic library director. He administered the Jackson Personality inventory and Ghiselli self description inventory to library directors and concluded that flexibility, adaptability, willingness to change, stable and equitable temperament, emotional balance and endurance as qualities librarian should possess.

Besides, qualities of a librarian, other leadership issues which were discussed during this period are status (Creth, 1989). Traditional versus modern managerial practices including model of leadership (Martell, 1972) and impact of new technologies on library leadership (Sager, 1982). Sager discussed how the new technologies enhance the quality of service which is the main goal of libraries, are in conflict with budgetary constraints, acquisition of books and political considerations.
Leadership Styles of Librarians

During 1980's some survey studies were conducted in order to ascertain the leadership style of librarians using behavioural Science methodologies. Cognitive styles of persons helps in understanding the learning styles of persons. Learning styles, in turn throws light on decision styles which are part of the whole leadership styles. Some of tests available in Psychology have been used on librarians also to assess their learning styles and decision styles. The assumption here is that learning styles and decision styles of librarians will not differ significantly from others. David A Kolb’s ‘learning style inventory’ was used to assess the cognitive styles of librarians (Varlejs, 1985; Choi, 1989). Kolb identified four learning styles viz; converger, diverger, assimilator and accommodator. These styles are based on four stages-cycle of concrete experience, reflective observation abstract conceptualisation and active experimentation. Varley’s found librarians more likely to be divergers (33.30%) and have weak abstract conceptualization skills. However, Jim M Choi found librarians to be assimilators (38.6%) followed by the converger (27.1%), the diverger (19.3.%) and the accommodator (15%). Assimilators tend to prefer reflective and abstract modes of learning and converger prefer active and abstract modes of learning. Thus, one can safely state that a majority of academic librarians tend to prefer or have strength in abstract conceptualization.Learning styles had significant differences among some background variables like sex, concrete experience etc. Results of both studies are conflicting.

Mintzberg’s managerial’s role typology has been used to examine the managerial profile of library directors (Moskowitz, 1986; Mech, 1990). Managerial effectiveness is significantly influenced by manager’s insight into their work holds true for librarians also. It was found
that academic library directors are involved with more internal managerial roles. However, significant difference among the managerial role profile of directors at different institutions was reported.

Terrence F. Mech identified two types of roles for library directors viz., internal and external. It was reported that 45% of the directors spent ‘much and more’ of their time on internal roles as compared to 22% of external roles. Internal roles include leadership which is elaborated as supervising subordinates’ work, including placement, training, motivation, and evaluation of employees.

In order to certain the decision styles of librarians, ‘Decision style inventory’ developed by Rowe and Boulgarides in 1983 was used to assess the decision style of 370 academic library directors by T.E. Mech in 1993. The four decision styles identified were directive, analytical, conceptual and behavioural. The directive style has low tolerance for ambiguity and is focussed on task and technical concerns, analytical style has a high tolerance for ambiguity and is also oriented towards task and technical concerns. The conceptual style has a high tolerance for ambiguity and is interested in people and social concerns. They are generally future oriented thinkers. Behavioural style has a low tolerance for ambiguity and is also oriented towards people and social concerns. Behaviourals are supportive, good listeners, receptive to suggestion and communicate easily. Study reveals high significant difference in preferred decision styles among library directors of various institutions. Behavioural decision style was the predominate decision mode of style followed by directive style. There was significant negative correlation \( r = -13 \) between behavioural style and years of administration and significant positive correlation \( r = .12 \) between age and
directive style. Thus it can be concluded that leaders or library directors behave differently in different institutions and background variables do influence their behaviour.

Do librarians differ from corporate leaders? Sixty one librarians were interviewed during 1987-90 in order to compare the characteristics of library leaders with those of corporate leaders (Sheldon, 1992). Research methodology of Bennis and Nanus (1985) was replicated in order to find the differences, if any, between corporate leaders and library leaders. Interviewers were asked the same question as asked by Bennis and Nanus. It was observed in the study that qualities Bennis and Nanus identified viz., attention through vision, meaning through communication, trust through positioning and positive self regard were also possessed by library leaders. Besides, librarians added the "societal value" to their work as a key motivating factor, a belief that they are doing more deep and satisfying work than translating outcomes into profits. However, this study had serious limitations as identified by author herself. Firstly, that one's behaviour as perceived by others is not measured and secondly, there is an assumption that one is able to articulate one's strength and weakness.

The Ohio State Leadership Model and Librarians

The Ohio state research group developed an instrument to measure behaviour exhibited by supervisors as described by subordinates. This was outcome of serious shortcomings of other models as discussed above. This instrument: The Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBQD) form - XII measures leaders on two dimensions viz., consideration and initiating structure as perceived by subordinates. This instrument was administered to three large public libraries (Dragon, 1979) and one academic library (Sparks, 1976) and
sample of professional librarians (Scamell and Stead, 1984). Results of these studies are consistent with results of other empirical studies conducted. A.C. Dragon shows that library superiors were described by their subordinates as higher in behaviour associated with initiating structure than in behaviour associated with consideration. In Spark’s study, replies from the subordinates show a close correlation with the leader’s perception of himself on considerate dimension than on initiating structure. Scamell and Stead (1984) studied the relationship between subordinates assertiveness, leader behaviour, and subordinates role stress for a sample of professional librarians. Findings reveal a significant correlation between initiating structure and consideration for the low assertive subordinates, assertiveness did not otherwise moderate the relationship between either consideration or structure and subordinates, role ambiguity, role conflict and need for clarity. These studies are not without some shortcomings. Dragon used the instrument only on subordinates and did not correlate it with leader’s perception of himself. Sparks used very small sample of 15 subordinates out of which only 11 subordinates participated in the study. Thus, in spite of the fact, that results are consistent with already available findings, it becomes difficult to draw conclusions.

Consistent with these findings, Hall (1979) noted that students who were graduating from library school preferred consultation to more directive style of leadership. In the same way, R.J. Solomon (1976) demonstrated that those directors of university departments who earned higher leadership scores (according to their subordinates) led university library departments which were more effective in serving other departments according to the directors of the other departments.
There have been other attempts also to study leadership behaviour of librarians which would throw light on understanding it. Various methods and techniques have been used namely; citation analysis technique employed to understand the nature of publication records of 115 library leaders (Bandelin, 1991); Librarianship of last century was reviewed in order to explore entrepreneurial leadership among the leaders of librarianship (Kilgour, 1992). F.G. Kilgour described the innovations of nine entrepreneurial librarians including himself. Even though, some stalwarts like Antonio Panizzi (1797-1879), Charles Ammi Cutter (1876), Charles Coffin Jewett (1816-1868), Melvil Dewey (1851-1931) etc, are included yet, the list does not seem exhaustive. Alice Geroz (1992) administered two surveys to 1208 randomly selected group in order to develop a list of perceived library leaders. The list was used to learn the subfield of leadership and the degree of fieldwide integration as evidenced by the extent of shared perception by respondents. Study revealed that leaders tend to be associated most strongly with category "other" whose members may serve as professional's professional; that is, high status field members and directing professional associations.

**Conclusion**

By the above review, it is quite evident that need to study the leadership behaviour of librarians was also realised in order to improve the existing situations of libraries and adapt to the changing conditions. Various aspects of library leadership namely - qualities of library leaders, learning styles and decision styles of librarians etc have been studied using either behavioural science methodologies or other methodologies like citation analysis etc.
In spite of all these efforts, a clear picture of effective model of library leadership has not emerged so far. Moreover, no serious attempt has been made to study leadership behaviour of Indian librarians. With the background of the studies reviewed, this study aims at studying leadership styles of librarians and their effectiveness in university libraries of India. The underlying assumption was that socio-economic conditions of librarians will influence and determine his/her leadership style.