

CHAPTER-1

I N T R O D U C T I O N

Definition : Leadership Effectiveness can be viewed from a bunch of definitional view points. A great many researchers defined leadership as 'a social influence process by which a person steers the members of the group towards a goal'.

According to Stogdill (1950, -- p.3), "Leadership may be considered as the process (act) of influencing the activities of an organised group in its effort toward goal setting and goal achievements".

According to Hollander (1978; -- p.1) "Leadership is a process of influence between a leader and those who are followers". The statement, 'a leader tries to influence another people in a given direction' is relatively simple, but it seems to capture the essence of what we mean by Leadership (Korman, 1971, p.115).

Leadership is defined as the process of influencing activities of an organised group towards goal achievement. (Rauch and Behling, 1984).

The common elements in these definitions imply that leadership involves a social influence process in which a person steers members of the group toward a goal.

Coming to the earliest possible literature, as far as leadership in formal organisation is concerned, Stogdill and Shartle put it nicely as 'It is assumed that it is proper and feasible to make a study of leadership in places where leadership would appear to exist and that if a person occupies a leadership position he is a fit subject for study. (Stogdill and Shartle, 1984; p.287)).

In this connection, the leader is a person who is formally designated as such. The formal organisation throws up a range of such positions for whom goal oriented group activities (Stogdill and Shartle, 1948) are an important responsibility. Researchers concerned with leadership in organisations have tended to adopt this strategy. The definitional view of literature can be studied from the following view points :

1. LEADERSHIP AND INFLUENCE : Particularly it is very difficult to distinguish leadership from kindred concepts like power and authority over their immediate subordinates. Indeed in some approaches to the study of leadership deliberate attempt is made to fuse it with the concepts like power (i.e. French and Snyder, 1959; Janda; 1960). The problem of distinguishing leadership from their influence processes has been addressed by Kochan, Schmidt and Decotilis (1975). This notion also corroborated the views of Mintzberg (1973).

Again, it would seem important to maintain a distinction between the leader who is in a leadership position and who has power and authority vested in his/her office, and leadership as an influence process which is more than the exercise of power and authority as Etzioni (1965), for example, suggested.

2. THE ORGANISATIONAL CONTEXT : Organisational effectiveness depends on the successful leadership styles. This view is also related to the organisational theory (Etzioni, 1961; Woodward, 1970; Perlmutter, 1972). Research evidence in these context shows that the behaviour of designated leader is substantially affected by the expectations held of them by their own bosses, subordinates and peers (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1975). Katz and Kahn offered the following useful definition of leadership in this context, The essence of organisational leadership to be the influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organisation. (1978, p.528).
3. MANAGEMENT AND LEADERSHIP : Much of the early research on leadership was concerned with the investigation of the traits of leaders. The most prominent research strategy of their period was that exemplified by Stogdill and Shartle's (1948).

They developed strategy and carried out the famous Ohio State Leadership Studies which proved to be most exhaustive in the field of leadership in organisations. This study provided the evidence of discrimination between management and leadership terms, like 'leadership style', 'supervisory style,' and 'Managerial Style' and tend to be used interchangeably.

In recent years a number of authors have conducted studies to distinguish between leadership and management. Zalennik (1977) draws a distinction between managers and leaders. The former are reactive organisation men concerned with routine and short term projects, whereas, 'the leaders adopt a personal and active attitude toward goals'. A congruent view to that of Zalennik (1977) has been expressed by Binnis (1976) who suggests, 'the leaders must be a social architect who studies and shapes what is called 'the work culture'.

Not only do the above definitions enable one to distinguish leadership from management, they also cope well with the interest in the values and culture of organisations (Bryman, 1984b) which has developed in recent years.

LEADERSHIP AND EXCHANGE :

A great many researches suggested that 'leadership may be a two way influence process'. The work of Hollander is most clearly associated with this idea in which he tends to refer to it as a 'transactional approach'. He proposed the view that to continue in a position of leadership, the leader must be responding to the needs of his followers (Hollander and Julian, 1969). Similarly, in a study of emergent leaders at Antarctic scientific situation (Nelson, 1964) found that the most liked leaders were those who were motivated to be efficient group members. That means the leadership is not a one way influence process and that the leader must be responsive to the group of his position to be viewed as legitimate. For that purpose Hollander proposes an 'idiosyncratic model'. In which he suggests that 'leaders gain credit by virtue of the competence they display in connection with the group's primary task (1978). So once a fund of credits has been accumulated the leader is in a position to be innovative and can depart from normal group practice to a certain degree.

Following three practical problems with which the working definition does not really cope were mentioned namely, the difficulty that is encountered in distinguishing leadership in an organisational context from the exercise of power and authority, from conformity with organisational protocol and from management and managerial activities.

Besides that, as far as methodological issues on leadership is concerned, researches recently have emphasized in two broad approaches which tend to be used by researchers the cross-sectional (or correlational) design and the experimental design. The predominant emphasis in both contexts has been to conceive of participative leadership as an independent variable which enhances various 'outcomes' like the productivity or job satisfaction of subordinates which are taken to be dependent variables.

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable
!-----!	!-----!
!Leader Behaviour!	!Subordinate out come!
!(e.g. participative!	!(e.g. job satisfac-
!leadership)!	!-ction performance)!
!-----!	!-----!

Fig. 1 The study of Leader behaviour.