

Public Organization and Management
Dr. Vaneet Kashyap
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Indian Institute of Technology Tirupati

Lecture – 43
Effective Leadership in Public Organizations – III

Hello, dear learners. I hope you are doing well. Let me continue the discussion on the leadership theories. In the previous session, I had concluded with showing you the evolution of leadership research in terms of broad frameworks, trait approaches, behavioral approaches, contingency and others. So, in this session, I am going to now briefly tell you about all these theoretical approaches, what were the contributions made and how the leadership research is now continuing in today's context. First of all, let us talk about the contributions of the trait approaches.

Now, when the leadership researches begin, the researchers were trying to find answers to the issues with respect to what makes leaders effective, what differentiate ineffective leaders from the effective leaders, what differentiate followers from the leaders. So, they were trying to find out the answers from the trait approaches. That's why the trait approaches came into picture. They were trying to find out answers from looking at some of the aspects in the individuals which try to link the success of leadership with those kind of qualities people have.

So, focus of these approaches on understanding the qualities, what kind of qualities people would have and then if there can be some relation to defining the leadership success. Now, in this case, the great man theory as the text of Hughes mentioned. The great man theory they attempted to actually, prove that leaders and followers They are different why because of they have different kind of qualities, different kind of traits are prevalent there that explain why leaders are different from their followers and why ineffective leaders are different from effective leaders and the answer they were trying to find out from the traits so what happened is many research studies have looked into various researchers when they were trying to answer this particular in a complex situation of what goes into leadership they looked into the various aspects look at the traits that people have, personality traits people have the values that people have level of intelligence another aspects also they have taken into consideration, height and things like that, to find out whether they can find out some kind of conclusions that if these are present in the leaders, these traits make leaders effective and differentiate them from ineffective ones and the followers there. now what happened is the conclusions of these research studies that were carried out identifying thousands of our traits trying to find out link between traits and the leadership there were no very conclusive arguments on what kind of traits will lead to leadership success so they found that the conclusions were that

leaders were not very much different from the followers and these traits what we say as somebody is intelligent somebody is having responsibility they are responsible somebody having traits of initiative taken they were already moderately related to leadership success but not they were not very conclusive ideas about what is that in terms of traits that should be there in leaders that will make them very effective and of course that will differentiate leaders from the followers and perhaps they have found out similar kind of traits were actually present in both leaders as well as the followers now the with these aspects with these limitations when they were not having any kind of concrete answers or the conclusions this led to then the behavioral approaches Now, what are the reasons for behavioral approaches and the justification for this is, let us say that the individual personality traits, if you look at, traits are difficult to observe Traits cannot be observed. But, the leadership behaviors, the way people behave, they are easily observable.

So, the focus shifted from identification of the traits to identification of the behaviors, that how leaders, their behavior, their leader behaviors are and how they engage in the behaviors. with others, the leadership behavior that the people engage in, the identification of those behavior will try to then provide some kind of answers to the leadership success. So, the thing is they say that behavior are easily learned, the people can easily observe and learn the behaviors. and more than what the people say in terms of the traits. And then it can make the leadership possible in terms of training for all.

So, behaviors are easily observable in comparison to the traits. So, focus shifted from trait approaches to behavioral approaches. Now, we are going to look into some of the contributions of the behavioral approaches. First, among the study of the behaviors as per the text of Daft titled Leadership, first set of the behaviors, these behavior studies, they were conducted at University of Iowa by Kurt Lewin and the associates. And the two broad category of behaviors that these researchers, they have kind of found were autocratic behaviors and democratic behaviors.

So, leaders in terms of autocratic leaders or democratic leaders showing autocratic behaviors and the democratic behaviors. We will look into this what kind of conclusions that they have said. So, what they have found is they did some research work and try to find out what is this about autocratic leaders and the democratic leaders. Now, what happened is they found out in the groups who are working either with the autocratic leaders or the democratic leaders and they have observed the behavior of people. So, when they were looking at the group who were working under the autocratic leaders, they kind of find out that this particular group was able to perform higher.

Whenever there is the presence of supervision there. So, group was able to perform higher when the leader was present, when the supervisor was present for supervision. In terms of the autocratic leaders and the people who are working with the autocratic leaders, it has been found that these people's performance goes high whenever leader is

there present for supervision. Another important observation in this particular group is when people are working with the autocratic leader, the close proximity with the autocratic leadership style, the feeling of hostility among these members were very, very frequent. They were actually associating this particular closeness of autocratic style of leadership with the feeling of hostility.

That's what is the outcomes of the study that they have done. Whereas, if they look at the democratic leaders or the group people who are working with the democratic ones, they say that leader present or not present, the group performance was actually growing well in comparison to what the others were doing. So, group performance was found to be almost as good even whenever the leader is not there. That is the kind of democratic leaders, followers, they observe the behavior in the people there. And also, when these people, these groups, when they're working with democratic leaders, there were lot of positive feelings of the group members and there was no hostility there.

Now, these authors, they also talked about what kind of behaviors these autocratic leaders and the democratic leaders, they actually have shown in terms of their behavior. So, in terms of autocratic leader what happens is these people they derive their power from position because of position they derive their power and they also have strong control on rewards and that is how they want control the followers in terms of their work outcomes. Now, what happened is then there is also a lot of coercion, threat there and they actually authority in this case is centralized. So, these are the behavior that are being shown by the autocratic leaders. They derive their power from the position.

They actually control the rewards and hence control the work activities because the strong control on rewards will then, their way of getting work done from people is through controlling the rewards. A lot of threat and coercion and of course the authority is centralized. Everything is controlled by the leader. Decision making, control over resources, everything is centralized. On the other hand, if you look at the democratic leader, they believe in delegation.

Delegation of authority. That's why also see that there is lot of positive feelings among the group members there. And also participation in the group is always encouraged by democratic leaders and also they also believe in and relies on subordinates knowledge. That's why participation, they should also be having those kind of competence to actually add value to the work processes and in terms of decision making and so on and so forth. So, these are some of the early work on the autocratic leaders and the democratic leadership behaviors as done by Kurt Lewin and associates, very beginning of the behavioral approaches to leadership.

Then there were studies conducted at Ohio and the Michigan, Ohio state studies and the Michigan state studies. Let us look into what were the major contributions of these

approaches. Now, Ohio State studies talked about two different kind of behaviors, consideration behaviors and the initiating structure as a behavior in the leader. Now, if you look at the consideration as a behavior, consideration as the leadership behavior, The focus is that these kind of, this particular behavior of consideration is actually demonstrated in the sense of when the leaders give lot of respect to the subordinates, there is a respect to the subordinates, then respect to the ideas of the subordinates, they are sensitive to They are sensitive to their subordinates. These are the behaviors I am talking about in terms of initiating structure.

They take care of the feelings of their subordinates and there is the aspect of mutual trust. So, when we talk about the initiating structure as a leadership behavior, these are some of the behavioral indicators. So, the ideas or the feelings of the people, they are very much sensitive to the subordinates feelings and also they establish the mutual trust. That is what are the indicators of the consideration behavior. On the other side, if you look at the initiating structure as the behavioral component, the focus here is on much more task completion, tasks orientation.

Task orientation, focus is on work outcomes. So, direction to the subordinates work and the focus is on goal achievement. And according to the Ohio State studies, leaders can either be on high on consideration or low on consideration. Meaning if they are high on consideration, they will respect the ideas of the followers, they will be sensitive to the subordinates feelings, there will be lot of mutual trust. But if they are low, these all aspect will be lower. This behavior will not be very much there. Then in case of initiating structure, if you look at, if it is high, focus of the leaders will be high on task orientation, direction and goal achievement. And then if it is low, all these things will be low. Now, when these research studies, were being conducted and they're trying to find out whether leaders can exhibit both the kind of behaviors at high level. Can there be situation where consideration as well initiating structure can be high and high? So, there is also a kind of discussion.

And when we talk about the case study of Bank of Baroda, Dr. Anil Khandel was leadership style. He talked about this particular aspect on how can somebody focus with his leadership style. We will talk about when he says that how he take care of both the things simultaneously to get to the work outcome. So, we will look into this when we reach that particular case study. Michigan state study almost kind of in terms of the work the description of the behavior so almost same the jargon they have used is job centered leader behavior and employee centered leader behavior. Now in this case what happened is the idea of the behavior if you look at it is more or less related to the similar kind of the behaviors which we have just talked about in Ohio studies also. If you look at employee-centered behaviors, this basically focus on the needs of subordinates. Focus is on needs of the subordinates as far as employee-centered.

As the name indicates, employee-centered. The focus of the leader is on the needs of the subordinates, showing care towards the followers, taking care of their feelings and so on and so forth. But when we talk about the job-centered leadership behavior, the focus is on enhancing the efficiency. because focus is on task, focus on efficiency works, on goal accomplishment, then focus on cost-cutting kind of behavior. So, these are the behavior which are easily seen in the job centered leaders. So, you see that the comparison in terms of if you look at the initiating structure, it is more related to the job centered leadership behavior and if you look at the consideration behavior, it is more related to the employee centered behavior of leadership.

So, these are some of the behaviors which were highlighted. in terms of the behavioral approaches as far as leadership research is concerned. So now shift from the trait approaches to behavioral approaches. Trait approaches were more inclined towards understanding the traits which can differentiate leaders and the followers or ineffective leaders from the effective leaders. Behavioural approaches focus was much more on finding out the behaviours, identification of the behaviours which can explain the differences.

Then comes some of the research insights from leadership in India, leadership studies in India in terms of the behavior. So, please refer to the work of Professor J.B. Sinha in the paper titled, A Model of Effective Leadership Style in India, published in International Studies of Management and Organization. So, in this paper, Professor Sinha talked about that the focus on tasks in the Indian organization was less and there was always more of cultural preferences for relationships over work.

So, what research say about work value in India, it says that social relationships are much more preferred in the Indian organizations in comparison to the work-related outcomes. So, that was the idea of the research in terms of work values in India. How work get accomplished? So, work get accomplished because the followers, they respect their superiors, they considered them superiors, they are more expert. So, there is always a kind of respect that relationship is there. So, work gets done by that respect But also, the leader's affection, nurturing behavior towards the followers.

That's how the work gets done, you know, by the Indian leaders as far as the work is concerned. Now, what happened is, Because of this nurturant and task behavior they were task oriented but at the same time there was also a support being given among Indian leaders. So that's how a nurturant task leader you know this particular behavior comes in or say much more observable in the Indian leaders. And also, Dr. Anil Khandelwal's leadership style is much more related. But he has used a different kind of, you know, a term for his leadership style, which I will tell you when I will talk about Dr. Khandelwal's style. So, very good way, beautiful way to narrate one's leadership style, you know, in terms of if you really want to do good for people as well as good for the

work outcomes in the organization. So, this is something to do with the Indian leadership studies by Professor Sinha. Then, we will have understanding of contingency and situational approaches and I have talked about this, situational approaches, why we are talking about situational aspect or contingency.

So, from behavioral approaches, the shift comes in here that it is not only behavior or somebody's trait, the important situational variables are also influencing the relationship between the leader's behavior and the performance. There are a lot of situational factors that interacts with the leader's behavior and that's how the performance is impacted. So, that's why the emphasis has gone to understanding the various contingency or situational factors which will explain, what leadership behaviors can lead to effectiveness and it can change depending upon changes in the various situational aspect. Now, one of the earlier theories of the contingency approaches to leadership was Fiedler's LPC theory of leadership. So, according to Fred Fiedler, the leaders, they have dominant behavioral tendency.

They are dominant behavioral tendency and it is very difficult for the people to change these tendencies. And hence, he has proposed the contingency model, which suggests that leadership effectiveness depends upon matching the leaders with the situational aspect. Leader cannot change because they have dominant leadership tendency. So, it is good to match the leaders with the situational aspect.

Let us see what are these theory talked about. So, leader is also called as leader least preferred co-worker LPC you know theory leader Fred Fiedler's LPC theory. Fiedler's least preferred co-worker scale has made use of this to find out whether the leaders are relationship oriented or they are task oriented. So, what it does is they ask the leaders to rate a person whom they have worked with and you know and they have no least likability to work with that person so rate that person in terms of bipolar objectives such as friendly or unfriendly sincere insincere right and the score represent about the leader not the specific individuals the leader evaluates. Though they ask the person to think of a person to rate in terms of least likability to work with, but this score represent much more about the leader and that also is lead to lot of criticism afterward of this theory in terms of how they have considered this particular scale to evaluate the leadership behavior. So, if the score on LPC score was high, the person is to be considered as relationship oriented and if the score on LPC is low, the person is to be considered task oriented.

Now, situational favorability is basically again another component of LPC theory. It basically says that how much control leaders will have on follower and situation and it is explained by leader member relations, task structure and position power. How good are the relationship between leader and member? How well the tasks are structured? What is the position power? Now, depending upon these three sub elements, the various situation that can emerge is, for example, leader-member relations can be good, or it can be poor

right task structures can be high or it can be low position power can be strong or it can be weak so different combination if you look at in terms of you know these situational component and the preference was in terms of one two and three the first preference to the lead leader member relation then second and then third this is in terms of the preference Now, the first situation when everything is in favor, good member relationship, task structure is high, position power is strong, it is a highly favorable situation for a leader. Then, if it is, leader-member relationship are poor and task structure is low and position power is weak, it is the unfavorable situation, right. This is the favorable situation, this is the unfavorable situation.

Now, according to Fred Fiedler and colleagues, what happened is leaders will have two, you know, dominant styles, task orientation or the relationship orientation. Now, according to Fiedler, the task oriented leaders they will perform well in both the situation. Which situation? task-oriented leaders, they will perform better. They are more suitable in the condition of highly favorable situation or highly unfavorable situation. On the other hand, the relationship-oriented leaders will perform better in the situation which are moderately favorable.

You see that situation number 5. Everything is in favor. Task structure is high, position power is high, but leader-member relationship is poor. So, if you put relationship-oriented people here, they will get the work done But idea here is, why do you think that in both the favorable and highly unfavorable situation, both task-oriented leaders perform really better? Because if everything is in favor, focus can be then on increasing the work outcomes. And if the situation is not in favor, at least task-oriented leader make sure that work outcomes are achieved.

That's what is the idea. And the prescription of the model is, prescription says that, which focus should be on situational engineering rather than behavioral flexibility because you see that people have dominant behavioral tendency. They won't be able to change their style. So, the effective organization as per the authors are the one when you match a leader's characteristics with the situational demands. but not focusing on changing leaders behavior because leaders personality traits are much more dominant.

They won't be changing their behavioral tendencies. So, good situation would be, effective organization would be when they will match the leaders characteristics with the situational demands. But you see that this theory has been given way back Now, the things have changed. A lot of other models have now come up which will say that there should be a lot of flexibility among the leaders in terms of bringing in changes in their own behavioural temperament in order to make the situation much more effective. Then comes the path, goal, theory of leadership. Now, this particular theory as per Rene, this draws on the expectancy theory of motivation.

Now, if you look at the expectancy, we talked about this thing. What is the expectancy theory of motivation? People will put in efforts, when these efforts will lead to, there is a, efforts to performance expectancy. then there is a performance to outcomes expectancy and the outcomes which we people are going to achieve they are of high value high valence so efforts are important you know efforts are important and of course effort will be only put in by the people when they will see lot of value in the outcomes now drawing on this particular theory the path goal theory of leadership has been proposed similarly the idea here is that this particular theory it argues that You know, the role of the leaders is to help their, you know, their followers see the goals or we can also talk about in terms of ends, see their goals and of course, tell them the paths to achieve those goals or we can say means to achieve those goals. Now, when there are goals being set, there are end to be achieved, the role of the leader is to clarify the paths. Like, if there are obstacles in the path, the leaders are to remove those obstacles, take care of those obstacles.

Some kind of resources are required. These paths should be, the clarity of the paths and helping followers reach the goals is the duty of the leader. That's what this theory states that right so behaviors which are required to reach these paths are to be clarified by the leader there and in in this context the four different kind of leadership styles which are you know given in the theory are directive style supportive style achievement oriented style and the participative style Now, when it is a directive style, when somebody is following a directive style of leadership, the idea is what kind of behavior will be shown by the people. The leaders will clearly set the expectation of work. They focus on the following rules and procedures.

And they also coordinate the work activities. So, this direction means clearly setting the expectations, focus on following rules, coordinating the work of subordinates. In terms of supportive activities, supportive directive, supportive leadership style, as the name indicate, there will be lot of focus on needs of the followers. Needs of the followers are to be taken into consideration, showing concern for their welfare, creating opportunities for people and of course creating supporting work environment is what is the behavior in terms of supportive leadership achievement oriented style is majorly talking about challenging goals setting the challenging goals for the followers Look for the excellence and higher level of performance from the people so that you can actually enthuse and try to influence them in terms of increasing performance and also have high level of confidence in the abilities of the followers. Participative style is more to do with involving subordinates in the activities. various activities and of course taking their opinions and suggestions for the improvement right now which particular style is going to be you know working best or effective that depends upon the situational factors what is the factor abilities of the followers locus of control ability is basically to do with how much they know about their work in terms of what tasks are given to them Locus of

control is about, what followers or the individuals feel about, the locus of control of people is external or, you know, internal.

It's about control. What do you think about? If something is happening to them, it's because of the internal causes or external causes. So, if somebody believes that whatever is happening to them is because of external causes, their locus of control is external or, you know, in the other way, it can be internal. Then how the tasks are being structured, what is the formal authority of the leader, norms and social relationship in the work group that is going to decide what is going to be effective. Let us take an example of this thing. If people are not able, the ability of followers is less and they have external locus of control.

So, in that case, it is good that the leader follows the directing style of leadership. where they will set the clear expectation, they will focus on rules and procedures, this kind of still works really well. If people have high level of ability and the locus of control is internal, people they believe that whatever they do this because of their own reason, I think in that case one can follow either participative style to depending upon how other factors are or they can also go with the achievement oriented style of leadership which is going to be effective in different situations. So, depending upon how the situational factors they come up in terms of the interaction, the style of leadership can vary from being supportive to directive to achievement to participation style. So, I will stop here. We will continue the discussion on the other leadership theories in the next session.