Advance Course in Social Psychology

Prof: Pooja Garg

Department of Humanities and Social Sciences

Indian Institute of Technology, Roorkee

Week-11

Lecture 45 : Group Leadership- Part IV

Hello friends, welcome back. Let us continue with the discussion about different leadership styles and theories. Right now, I will continue with another model that is leader participation model. Previously it was Pardekul theory. Right now, I am going to talk about leader participation model developed by Victor Vroom and Philip Yeaton and revised twice in 1973 and 1988. This model again talks about, discuss about and focus that how leader and follower can be in alignment to reach the group goal.

This is, but obvious that this is the only ultimate aim of any leader or leadership style that how the group goal or organizational goal can be achieved. But there are different patterns to be followed, theoretical patterns to be followed to create that kind of synchronization and alignment between leader and follower to reach the goal. According to Victor Vroom and Yeaton, they have focused that no doubt leader has to be there to take care of each and every activity that takes place in the organization and it must relate to the followers so that the group goal can be achieved. Now, according to this theory leader participation model, the propounders have focused that it becomes important to prescribe that how much participation subordinate should be allowed in making decisions.

We in generally we just focus that employees should be encouraged, followers should be encouraged to voice their opinion and participate in decision making latitudes. But at the same time Victor Vroom and Philip Yeaton also talks about that how much amount of participation should be allowed in making decisions. They have expanded the thought process in a different direction that how much participation is allowed to the subordinates in making decisions. So, according to leader participation model, recognizing the task structure and varying demands of routine and non-routine activities, the leader must identify each and every aspect of the situation and reflect to the task structure. To reflect to the task structure definitely role of subordinates play an important role, but to what extent subordinates are being made part of the decision making to reach or maintain that task structure that is a significance of leader participation model.

I will just read out that the leader participation model attempts to prescribe how much participation should be allowed in making decisions. According to this model recognizing the task structures the varying demands for routine and non-routine activities this theory argued

that leader behavior must adjust to reflect the task structure. This adjustment is based on the amount of participation that is allowed to the subordinates in decision making process. Despite the amount of participation, brooms have proposed a decision tree. This is an approach they have propounded which assumes that the degree to which subordinates should encourage should be encouraged to participate in decision making depends on the characteristics of the situation.

Situation is very important in any sense be it about any crisis or any facilitation that has been to be provided to the followers. So, based on this decision making tree, this decision tree is focusing on the amount of participation that should be allowed to every subordinate in making decision about the particular task. Now, this decision tree is based on allowing the participation of the subordinates in decision making process and at the same time to what extent the information is being collected or solicited from the part from the subordinates and how directly impacts the decision making of the leader. In other words no one decision is best for all situations and after evaluating different problems and attributes the leader determines an appropriate decision style that specifies the amount of subordinate participation. Depending on the severity of the problem, depending on the nature of the situation the leader will decide that how much the appropriate decision making power will be handed over to the leaders in the decision making process.

So, depending on the situation the amount of participation will be allowed to the subordinates. So, the model is a complex decision tree incorporating seven contingencies. Here seven contingencies means situations under what situations it depends on the severity of the situation, but ultimately there is some alteration or change in the situation where the leader has to identify how much amount of participation is allowed to the subordinates. Now, identifying those contingencies based on yes or no there is a tick mark system that every time the leader is identifying the severity of the situation and these situations will decide that who will participate in what amount. So, based on this decision tree seven contingencies were identified by Victor Vroom and Yaton and by identifying based on yes or no choices five alternative leadership styles or situations are identified.

But later on these contingencies were revised and were expanded to 12 contingencies to define that which leadership style is more appropriate. So, these contingencies are importance of the decision that under what circumstances a particular decision has to be taken, importance of obtaining subordinate commitment to the decision may be every employee or subordinate will not be committed to the decision. So, that has to be decided that who will be more committed if a particular decision has been taken in a different situation whether the leader has sufficient information to make a good decision. Sometimes the leader is not aware of the whole situation that how any complexity that has evolved in any situation then what are the factors responsible for it. So, under such circumstances or situation the leader first has to take a note of the whole situation that where are the missing loops or loopholes and how they can be filled in fourth that how well structured the problem is.

Sometimes the problem is very direct and it is clear to understand we can interpret we can perceive the problem in a very clear cut manner. But sometimes the problem is very vague problem is there, but there is vagueness and we cannot find the root cause of the problem. So, this is again a situation where specific leadership style should be identified and the amount of participation by the subordinates. The other situation is whether an autocratic decision would receive subordinate commitment which kind of leadership style if it is autocratic then even if any decision has been imposed then how leader will react to it, react in form of commitment that whether the leader will accept that directive in a very clear cut or straightforward fashion or not. Sixth whether subordinates buy into the organizations goal whether the subordinates are accepting the group goal and fit in the group goal.

It is not necessary that every follower will easily accept to any change in the organization and maybe he will not be able to fit into that problematic situation. So, under what circumstances the subordinate buy into the organizations goal they are fitting in or setting them in alignment with the organizational goals. Whether there is likely to be conflict among subordinates over solution alternatives maybe in any particular situation the leader can take this decision. But maybe the subordinates will come up with a better or maybe less better alternative and there can be a conflict of interest at which solution to be adopted. There can be a conflict whether subordinates have the necessary information to make a decision.

If leader does not have the complete or necessary information sometimes the subordinates also do not have complete information about the situation and they find difficulty in coming back to the proper decision. Again lack of knowledge, lack of expertise can create such type of situation where decision making becomes difficult. Time constraints on the leader that make that may limited subordinate involvement. Sometimes immediate decision has to be taken under a state of crisis of emergency. Under such circumstances maybe time is less decision has to be implemented this reduces the involvement of subordinates in that situation.

Whether this situation occurs then a tick has to be there in form of yes and then decision making will take place. Whether cost to bring geographically dispersed subordinates together is justified. Now suppose any organization have different different offices in different part of world or in one city itself right. How to align those problems and relating that problem to every office of the organization and how to bring all the leaders all together subordinates all together to resolve the problem. Whether it is justified to conduct or resolve the problem in this manner then geographical equation also plays a major role.

So logistics even has been considered in decision making. Whether cost to bring geographically dispersed subordinates together justified. Importance to the leader of minimizing the time it takes to make the decision. What is the importance of time in the decision making process that is in the hand of the leader. How much time the leader will take to take the decision that expects that amounts to use to make the decision in minimum time so as to save the resources and efforts of all the subordinates.

And the last importance of using participation as a tool for developing subordinate decision skills. That the leader must understand that using subordinate skills as a tool must be an important factor in decision making system. Now in all these 12 contingencies if we tick even on 3 or 4 or 7 contingencies this creates a platform where a leader can easily identify that what amount of participation is required and for the subordinates to come to a particular decision. This is the leader participation model based on contingencies. There can be number of contingencies not only based on 12 but these are the specific 12 conditions which has been identified by Vroom and Yaton that how decision making has to be taken based on the amount of participation allowed to the subordinates.

Thus Vroom and Yaton and Jago which was again revised they have identified a normative decision model which helps to answer the above questions. The model also identifies 5 different styles ranging from autocratic to consultative to group based decisions on the situation and level of involvement. Now based on these 12 contingency they have proposed again that based on the extension of the theory they have proposed a normative decision model where different kind of leadership styles have been identified and to fit in into these contingencies or fitting these contingencies based on these 4 leadership styles. So, these leadership styles will define the situation, the style, the situation and the level of involvement of the subordinates. This is decisionary in terms of amount of participation based on information sought from the employees.

So, the first style is autocratic type 1 it is A1 autocratic type 2 A2 consultative type 1 C1 consultative type 2 C2 and group based type 2 right. So, these are the models. So, when we are talking about autocratic type 1 A1 a leader makes his own decisions using information that is readily available to him at the time and this type is completely autocratic where the leader has not given any space to the subordinates to involve in decision making and he or she has taken the decision on his own which is a clear cut autocratic leadership style. There is no mentioning any other thing that how the leader has taken the decision, but it is completely based on following autocratic leadership style. The other is autocratic type 2 the leader collects the required information from the subordinates makes a decision, but at the same time the problems or decisions are not discussed or informed to the followers and here followers involvement is just providing information.

The leader will collect all the information from the follower, but no information will be shared with the followers and decision will be taken unilaterally by the leader itself. So, this is only the superficial amount of participation based on collecting the information and then taking the decision on your own. Autocratic style is still there the only difference is that difference from A1 to A2 is that in A2 category the leader is just collecting information from the subordinates and beyond that no consultation has been made with the subordinates and no participation has been allowed by the subordinates. The other is consultative type 1 the leader share that is C1 the leader shares problem with the relevant followers and seek their ideas and suggestions and make decisions alone, but here the follower do not meet with the leader they just the leader

just discuss the problem they will seek the leader will seek all the information from the subordinates, but at the same time the leader decision may or may not reflect his followers influence. Again the information has been collected from the subordinates, but the leader is not at all influenced by the subordinates.

His only focus is on collecting the information not getting influenced and again taking his own decision regarding any situation. So, here follows involvement is at the level of providing alternatives individually. Now, individually here to whomsoever the leader will consult it is not to consulting every member of the group it is only about selecting only few people within the group as per the situation soliciting all the information and feedback not getting influenced, but yes definitely taking his own decision. Whereas, in consultative type 2 the leader shares problems with relevant followers as a group and seek their ideas and suggestions and makes a decision alone, but the difference is that here the followers meet each other they understand their alternatives, but the leaders decision may not be may not reflect the followers influence. The only thin line difference is that in consultative type 2 followers meet the leader directly there is face to face interaction the members voice their opinions they suggest they give their ideas, but again the leader is not getting influenced by the information or suggestions which he has collected from the from the leader, but again decision will be the leaders.

So, here followers involvement is at the level of helping as a group in decision group help is there, but influence is not there that is consultative type 2. So, if we talk about consultative type 1 ideas and alternatives are being discussed with the followers, but the leader does not meet with the followers only specific people are being consulted. Where in consultative type 2 members meet directly and have face to face interaction with the leader, but again the leader is least influenced by the alternatives and suggestions given by the followers and the leader takes his own decision. And the other is group based type 2 the leader discuss problems and the situation with followers at the group level or consider subordinates as a group member and seek their ideas and suggestions through brainstorming and the leader accepts the decisions and does not try to force his or her ideas the decision accepted by the group is the final one. This is the most comfortable and conducive leadership style when the leader considers group members as a group he expresses the situation explains the situation in a clear cut manner.

He solicits the information and suggestions and feedback by the by the subordinates and incorporates those ideas and suggestions in his own decision making. So, here at this level the leader is highly influenced by the subordinates. So, in all in all there are 5 situations under which different kind of leadership styles have been identified by victim room , Yetton and Jago that how these situations has made the leader to decide and define the amount of participation which is allowed to the subordinates in the decision making process. That is why this theory is known as leader participation model. This is the model where the leadership styles 3 leadership styles autocratic, consultive and group based leader have been identified based on the amount of information that has been sought by the leader and how much amount of participation is allowed in decision making process.

So, if I if we talk about autocratic leader A1 and A2 how in A1 there is no interaction with the follower, but in A2 the interaction is with the follower, but there is no influence. If we talk about consultative leader again the leader will follow, but there is no influence where in C2 the follower will meet the will meet the leader, but there is no influence only decision making is there. So, amount of information accordingly even based on face to face interaction or not and in group based leader G2 members and the leader meet in face to face situation and they tend to identify the loopholes and incorporate the followers or subordinates ideas and suggestions. So, this is how the leader participation model based on the decision tree. So, decision tree is that leader and then it has been expanded to different kinds of 3 leadership styles.

Then again and some leadership styles have been identified based on the amount of participation allowed by to each member and how information plays an important role, ban and influence plays an important role in the whole decision making process where only the leaders is involved and less involvement by the followers. So, the original and revised model has been encouraging, but the model is far too complex for the typical manager to use. So, if I just go back to this diagram there is so much of complexity decision making is there, but to what extent and at what level what amount of participation has to be decided which makes the decision process a delayed process and a very complex process. To avoid this complexity they actually developed a computer program to guide managers through all the decision branches in the revised model. Fitting up all the information in the program and then deciding which leadership style is more appropriate based on that feeding of the information by the subordinates participation that will define the leader participation model.

So, here we can say that the most significant aspect of this theory is that even role of technology has also played significantly in identifying the leadership style to be adopted by the leader in order to make a particular decision to handle any situation right. So, this is the leader participation model by Victor Vroom, Yettin and Jago. I will close this discussion here. Thank you so much. Thank you.