

1-1-2006

## Leadership in Educational Administration: Concepts, Theories and Perspectives

Saeid Farahbakhsh

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Farahbakhsh, Saeid (2006) "Leadership in Educational Administration: Concepts, Theories and Perspectives," *Academic Leadership: The Online Journal*: Vol. 4 : Iss. 1 , Article 7.  
Available at: <https://scholars.fhsu.edu/alj/vol4/iss1/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Leadership: The Online Journal by an authorized editor of FHSU Scholars Repository.

# Academic Leadership Journal

## Introduction

In an organization, the associated efforts of many individuals are necessary. To a considerable degree, the actions of human beings in society are determined by their association with formal organizations. Formal organizations have leaders and purposes. Achievement of objectives, which have been set, depends upon the cooperative efforts of individuals. Many times organizations have failed when either their leaders have been of low calibre, or there has been a lack of cooperative effort among members, or the objectives have not been in conformity with what is essential and good for society.

The emphasis on principal as leader may have added a new dimension to the traditional distinction between the dual roles of principal as educator and principal as administrator. Early American schools had principal teachers who were elected, but the position has now evolved towards greater attention to administrative matters (Boyer, 1983). A manager can be appointed. Leadership must be earned, even after appointment to a managerial position. Leadership is not a position in an organisation, but an active, influencing force. Leadership is not based on position or status, but on authority and prestige. Leadership may come from personal enthusiasm, personal authority, credibility, knowledge, skill, or charisma; it is derived from influence that the leader has on his followers (Darling, 1992). Accordingly, the principal holds the highest position in the school. The tone of the school is mainly influenced by the behaviour and personality of principal and it affects the attitude, climate, progress, co-operation, and direction of efforts in the school. In fact, principal is the hub around which the educational activities revolve. There is no denying the fact that school is essentially a co-operative enterprise, in which every member big or small, high or low has a vital role to play.

The school principal is expected to act as a leader in the school. The success of a school to accomplish the goals depends upon the ability of the head to lead staff members. Leadership is one of the four functions that constitute the administrative process. Planning sets the direction and objectives; organizing brings the resources together to turn plans into action; leadership builds the commitments and enthusiasm needed for people to apply their talents fully to help accomplish plans; and controlling makes sure things turn out right. According to Fayol, (1916) there are four main functions of manager namely planning, organizing, command or leading and controlling. According to Kotter, (1990) the primary function of a leader is to identify the essential purpose or mission of an organization and the strategy for attaining it. By contrast, the job of the manager is to implement that vision. The overriding function of management is to provide order and consistency to organisations, whereas the primary function of leadership is to produce change and movement. Management is about seeking order and stability; leadership is about seeking adaptive and constructive change. Although there are clear differences between management and leadership, there is also a considerable amount of overlap (Yuki & Van Fleet, 1989). When principals are involved in influencing a group to meet its goals, they are involved in leadership. When leaders are involved in planning, organizing, staffing, and controlling, they are involved in administration. Both processes involve influencing a group of individuals towards goal attainment.

Educational researches on school effectiveness have recently been dominated by the concept of principal as Leader. These studies identified the principal as instructional leader and as one of the several critical factors in effective schools (Brookover, et al. 1979; Rutter, et al. 1979; Greenfield, 1982; Rutherford, et al. 1983; and De Bevoise, 1984). Recent research on high school has also focused on the principal as leader (Grant, 1982; Coleman, J. et al., 1982; Lightfoot, 1983; Boyer, 1983; Sizer, 1984). Sergiovanni (1984), maintains that the principal's key function in effective schools is establishing goal consensus among staff and developing an institutional identity, and he cited classic studies on Organizational leadership that support this view (e.g., Barnard, 1938; Selznick, 1957; Bennis, 1984). Therefore, the principal as leader concept is increased use because the principal is a key factor in the educational effectiveness. It is a fact that a school principal's leadership behaviour has a subtle influence on the progress of a school. To sum up, the development and expansion of the concept of school administrator as leader may describe a new set of expectations for school administrators. Previous models for behaviour of principal that tended to focus on the roles of the principal as educator or administrator now appear to be less relevant.

### **Concept of leadership**

Leadership comes from the Anglo-saxon word *laedan*, meaning to go, and is defined as guiding, conducting, proceeding, or being foremost. Leadership has been defined in terms of individual's traits, leadership behaviour, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, influence over followers, influence on task goals, and influence on organisational culture. Stogdill (1974) reviewed seventy-two definitions of leadership advanced by writers from 1902 to 1967.

According to Goods Dictionary of Education, (1959) leadership is the ability and readiness to inspire, guide or manage others. Dictionary of Behavioural Sciences (1973) defined that leadership is the exercise of authority in initiating, directing, or controlling the behaviour or attitudes of others, and bring out with their consent, those qualities of personality and training, which make the guidance, and control of others successful. According to Hemphill (1949), leadership is the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing the organizational goals and objectives for changing an organisation's goals and objectives. Tannenbaum, et al. (1961), explained leadership in terms of interpersonal influence, which is defined as influencing people to co-operate towards some goals, which they come to find desirable. Halpin (1966) stated that a successful leader contributed to group objectives and to group relationship. He described leadership behaviour in two dimensions of initiating structure and consideration. Davis (1986) said that leadership is the ability to persuade others to seek defined objectives enthusiastically; the human factor binds a group together and motivates it towards its goals.

McGregor (1978) defined it as leaders inducing followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motives, the wants and needs, the aspirations and expectations of both leaders and followers. Leadership is thus inseparable from the followers' needs and goals as leadership occurs in a group. Therefore, this term refers to leadership behaviour in the group rather than to any sets of traits or personal attributes. It is functional and consists of leadership behaviour and operations. This shift from personal attributes to functional behaviour has marked a significant change in our understanding of the process of leadership. Leadership, therefore, may be considered as a process through which others are influenced towards desired direction.

Lipham (1974), described leadership as that behaviour of an individual which initiates a new structure in interaction within a social system; it initiates change in the goals, objectives, configuration,

procedures, inputs, processes and ultimately the outputs of social systems. The definition takes into account effectiveness and efficiency measures. Group achievement and group maintenance functions, situational and personality determinants, organizational and individual contacts, active and passive relationships, contexts, means and ends, and similar dichotomous definitions leadership is dynamic since it involves social system in action and interaction. Leadership is commonly defined as the process of influencing others in a manner that enhances their contribution to the realization of group goals (Hollander, 1995; Smith, 1995). This process is widely seen to involve the positive impact of one person on behaviour of many others, and for this reason it is often viewed as the key to effective and efficient organisations.

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988) leadership is process of influencing the activities of an individual within a group in its effort towards goal achievement in given situation. Koontz and Weihrich (1990), opined that leadership is an influence, that is, the art or process of influencing people so that they will strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the achievement of group goals. Yoki and Vanfleet (1998) defined that leadership is viewed as a process that includes influencing the task objective and strategies of a group or organisation; influencing people in the organisation to implement the strategies and achieve the objectives, influencing group maintenance and identification, and influencing the culture of the organisation. According to Terry, (1988) leadership is essentially a continuous process of influencing behaviour. A leader breathes life into group and motivations it towards goals.

A more recent definition of leadership is as follows: leadership is the process of influencing and supporting others to work enthusiastically toward achieving objectives (Keys and Case, 1990).

A review of other writers reveal that most management writers agree that leadership is the process of influencing the activities of an individual or an organized group in its efforts towards goal achievement (Stogdill. 1950, Hersey and Blanchard, 1988). Filley, et al. (1977) in an attempt to define leadership differentiated between power, authority and influence. These three ways help in changing the behaviour of the individual or of groups. In order to understand the concept of leadership clearly, these three concepts need to be explained. Power is an ability or capacity in a person to change the behaviour of another person or groups by manipulation of reward and Punishment. This type of power may be coercive power (concerned with physical harm), remunerative power (monetary benefits), normative power, (giving recognition or medal). Whereas power is ability, authority is a right. In fact, authority is legitimised power. There are various types of authority like traditional authority (kings), and bureaucratic authority (through rules and regulations). Influence is an ability in a person to change the behaviour of other person or group without manipulation of reward and punishment.

Moreover, in an organisation like school, there are two major kinds of power: position power and personal power. Position power refers to the power which an individual derives from a particular office or rank in a formal organised system. Personal power refers to the power, which a leader derives from followers. Therefore, French and Raven (1959) identified five common and important types of power: (a) reward (b) coercive, (c) legitimate (d) referent, and (e) expert. Each of these types of power increases a leader's capacity to influence the attitudes, values and general behaviour of others.

Furthermore, authority and power are important in effective organisational leadership as well as in the more day-to-day aspects of administration, because these are parts of the influence process in any organization (Newell, 1978).

Despite the multitude of ways in which the leadership has been conceptualised, several components can be identified as central to the phenomenon of leadership. These are (a) leadership occurs within a group context, (b) leadership is a process, (c) leadership involves influence (d) leadership involves goal attainment, and (e) leadership is interaction of power between leader and others.

### **Leader functions**

To understand the basic nature of leadership, which is considered a part of directive function, one should look into the role played by the leader in a group. The role of leader can be defined in terms of various functions performed by him. Leader performs these functions in every situation. He takes initiative to form a group by bringing members together, infuses life in it and makes it operational for seeking common goals. He also establishes interpersonal relations with members, inspires them, guides them, and helps them to march in the given direction. He takes care of the members by making adequate provisions to satisfy their personal needs and interest so that members can stay in a group for a longer period.

Broadly, it is a leader who makes the group march towards the achievement of objectives. To perform in a better way he maintains high morale among the members of the group led by him. Manz and Sims (2002), argued that the leader is one who has power, authority, or charisma enough to command others.

In this regard, Krech and Crutchfield (1962) have pointed out that all leaders must perform the following functions at least to some degree: (a) as an executive, (b) as a planner, (c) as a policy maker, (d) as an expert, (e) as a group representative (f) as an arbitrator and (g) as a model of behaviour.

The essential function of a leader is to work towards unity and cohesiveness in the organisation and to see that members have a pleasant satisfying experience. According to Killan's (1952) study brought out by the American management association, the following are the five functions of leadership:

1. Leadership makes decisions (not a reckless shooting from the hip but a calculated searching for and weighing of facts).
2. Leadership renders a service (by multiplying the contribution of every individual who is its beneficiary).
3. Leadership achieves results (by guiding human energy in a definite direction for a specific purpose).
4. Leadership elicits response (leading others to sufficient understanding and to motivate the response necessary for accomplishing the task at hand).
5. Leadership is willingness to be different (a discipline and standard of performance higher than that followed by non-leader).

According to Moshal (1998) the more common functions of leadership may be enumerated as under: (a) motivating members, (b) morale boosting, (c) support function, (d) satisfying needs of members, (e) accomplishing common goals, (f) representing members, (g) creating confidence (h) implementing change and resolving conflicts.

Gross-and Herriott (1965) suggest that influence based on personal power is associated with greater effectiveness. They identified six important leadership functions:

- (1) Develop goals, policies, and directions.
- (2) Organize the school and design programmes to accomplish the goals.
- (3) Monitor progress, solve problems, and maintain order.
- (4) Procure, manage, and allocate resources.
- (5) Create a climate for the personal and professional growth and development.
- (6) Represent the school to the district office and the outside world.

### **Leadership skills**

Besides personality traits, it has been assumed that the acquisition of certain skills on the part of leader has almost become a necessity for the successful performance of his task. He would, of course, be successful only to the extent that he is equipped with certain managerial skills in getting things done through people. The term management skills have been used in this context to refer to an ability which can be developed and which is manifested in performance.

Modern management requires various skills. Katz (1955), identified three kinds of skills as technical, human, and conceptual. Actually, an effective leader appears to rest on three personal and basic developable skills: (i). Technical skills, which is used to refer to proficiency and understanding of a specific kind of activity involving, process, procedure or technique. This skill is primarily concerned with working with things. (ii). Human skills, which is the manager's ability to work with others and build a cooperative effort with the group he manages. This skill is primarily concerned with working with people. (iii). Conceptual skills, which implies the ability to visualise the organization as a whole. This skill enables the manager to perceive and recognize the interrelationships of various factors operating within the total organization. The relative importance of these skills varies with the organizational levels. At lower levels, technical and human skills are required more than the conceptual skills. At higher levels, the manager's effectiveness depends more upon conceptual and human skills. Koontz and Weihrich (1998), added the fourth one-design skill to katzs' three skills. This skill involves the ability to solve problems of the organization.

Moshal (1998), classified the abilities required to be possessed by the managers under five skills as follows: (i). Conceptual skills: it is an ability to visualise the organization as a whole system and form image and develop vision in the context of future environment. (ii). Analytical skills: these skills are more related with scientific attitude and thinking on the part of manager for solving different problems and making decisions. (iii). Human relations or behaviour skills: the basic responsibility of every manager is to get things done by others. These skills refer to those abilities, which are needed by the manager to deal with subordinates effectively. (iv). Administrative skills: it refers to those abilities which he uses for coordinating various activities, seeking effective utilisation of allotted resources and getting things done by subordinates. (v). Technical skills: these skills refer to specialised knowledge and proficiency in handling methods, procedures, and techniques for doing specific job.

## **Power resources of leadership**

The concept of leadership relates strongly to power. Weber as a socialist (1947) classified three different forms of power as charisma, tradition and legal/rational. The most widely used and recognized analysis of the bases of power is the framework developed by French and Raven (1959). They identified five general basis of power in organizational settings: legitimate, reward, coercive, expert, and referent power. Another approach categorises power in organizations in terms of position and personal power.

Position power is power that resides in the position, regardless of who holds it. Thus, legitimate, reward, and some aspects of coercive and expert power can all contribute to position power. Position power is thus similar to authority. In creating a position, the organization simultaneously establishes a sphere of power for the person filling that position. He or she will generally have the power to direct the activities of subordinates in performing their jobs, to control some of their potential rewards, and to have a say in their punishment and discipline. There are, however, limits to a manager's position power. A manager cannot order or control activities that fall outside his or her sphere of power, for instance, directing a subordinate to commit crimes, to perform personal services, or to take on tasks that clearly are not part of the subordinate's job.

Personal power is power that resides with an individual, regardless of his or her position in the organization. Thus, the primary bases of personal power are referent with some traces of expert, coercive, and reward power. Charisma may also contribute to personal power. Someone usually exercises personal power through rational persuasion or by playing on followers' identification with him or her. An individual with personal power can often inspire greater loyalty and dedication among followers than someone who has only position power. The stronger influence stems from the fact that the followers are acting due to necessity and thus will respond more readily to requests and appeals. Of course, the influence of a leader who relies only on personal power is limited, because followers may freely decide not to accept his or her directives or orders.

## **Styles of leadership**

Another approach to the study of leadership has been an attempt to identify various styles of leadership. Several different classifications have been developed in connection with this concept. The growth and development of institution depends on the relationship between leader and followers. In fact, leadership style of the principal is based on the interaction among them. Leader's style is a product of the study of leadership behaviour from the point of view of personal qualities of the individual leader. Personal qualities of individuals tend to differentiate them with respect to their leadership behaviour. According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988), the leadership style of an individual is the behaviour pattern that person exhibits while attempting to influence the activities of others. Subordinates of the leader can perceive this behaviour pattern. As Stoner et al. (1996) mentioned, leadership styles are various patterns of behaviour exhibited by leaders during the process of directing and influencing workers.

In a classic study of leadership, Lewin et al. (1939) proposed to find out whether different group behaviours resulted from different styles of leader behaviour. They began the task by defining behaviours that appeared to characterize three known styles namely (a) Authoritarian, (b) Democratic, and (c) Laissez-Faire styles.

While the term laissez-faire leadership is in a sense internally inconsistent, it has nevertheless been used to characterize the behaviour of persons in positions of leadership status who often take a passive stance towards the problems of a group or organization. These styles of leadership have largely been replaced in current thinking by leadership theory and research studies that are typically less ideologically oriented.

Nevertheless, the earlier differentiation of styles of leadership is still useful for some purposes. Actual leadership broadly never exist in a pure form as autocratic, democratic or laissez – faire leadership but to some extent combines them all. Undoubtedly, however, some types of leadership are best characterized by one term and some by another. The different leadership styles may be useful as a means of conceptualising leadership.

A more recent conception of leadership identifies leadership styles as being nomothetic, ideographic, and personal or transactional (Lipham, 1964). These three styles of leadership can perhaps be best understood in reference to Getzels and Guba's social system model (1957). It will be recalled that this model includes (1) an organizational dimension, which concerns organisational decision-making or legislative action; and (2) or personal or idiographic dimension, which concerns the individual or idea aspect of organization.

Other classifications of leaders and leadership styles have been developed, such as task- oriented, technique- oriented, and people- oriented and builders and consolidators. Based on various approaches for studying leaders to increase effectiveness and efficiency of leaders, researchers developed following various styles, models and theories of leadership.

## **Theories of leadership**

There are several distinct theoretical bases for leadership. Because of a persisting interest over a period of years in the phenomenon of leadership, many leadership theories and models have been developed. The leadership theories, according to Stogdill represented serious attempts to gain an increasingly more sophisticated understanding of the nature of leadership. The recent classification of leadership theories as advanced by Stogdill (1974) are: (1) Great man theories; (2) Environmental theories; (3) Personal – situational theories; (4) Interaction expectation theories; (5) Humanistic theories; (6) Exchange theories (7) Behavioural theories; (8) Perceptual and cognitive theories.

Many theories have been put forward to explain the specific qualities and behaviours that differentiate the leaders from the majority. The multitude of theories can be grouped under four main headings:

- i. Trait theory
- ii. Behavioural theories
- iii. Situational theories
- iv. Transformational leadership

## **Trait Theory of Leadership**

Prior to 1945, the trait approach was one of the first systematic attempts to study leadership. In the early 1900, leadership traits were studied to determine what made certain people great leaders. The theories that were developed were called “great man” theories because they focused on identifying the innate traits and characteristics possessed by great social, political, and military leaders (e.g., Abraham Lincoln, Churchill, Mohandas Karam Chand Gandhi). It was believed that a person is born either with or without the necessary traits for leadership.

During this time, research concentrated on determining the specific traits that clearly differentiated leaders from followers (Bass, 1990; Jago, 1982). According to Tead (1935), There are ten qualities that are essential for effective leadership; physical and mental energy, a sense of purpose and direction, enthusiasm, friendliness and action, integrity, technical masters, decisiveness, intelligent teaching skill and faith. Barnard (1938), on the other hand, lists the following traits or qualities: physique, skill, technology, perception, knowledge, memory, imagination, determination, persistence, endurance and courage.

Further, the traits that commonly impress upon the leader fall into two categories: inherent personal qualities and the acquired tendencies. In an attempt to identify and measure leadership qualities and the inherent leadership traits that surely screen leaders from non leaders, it was concluded by Jennings (1961) that fifty years of study failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can be used, to discriminate leaders and non leaders.

A review of the research literature using this trait approach to leadership has revealed few significant or consistent findings (Gibb, 1954). In a major review in 1948, Stogdill suggested that no consistent set of traits differentiated leaders from non-leaders across a variety of situations. An individual with leadership traits who was a leader in one situation might not be a leader in another situation. Personal factors related to leadership continued to be important, but researchers contended that these factors were to be considered as relative to the requirements of the situation. Stogdill analysed and synthesized more than 124 trait studies that were conducted between 1904 and 1947. Stogdill's survey identified a group of important leadership traits that were related to how individuals in various groups become leaders. His results showed that the average individual in the leadership role is different from the average group members in the following ways: (a) intelligence, (b) alertness, (c) insight, (d) responsibility, (e) initiative (f) persistence, (g) self-confidence, and (h) sociality.

The findings of Stogdill's survey also indicated that an individual does not become a leader solely because he or she possesses certain traits. Rather, the traits that leaders possess must be relevant to situations in which the leader is functioning. As stated earlier leaders in one situation may not necessarily be leaders in another situation.

Lipham (1981) pointed out that the lists of traits often included were somewhat contradictory e.g. kind but firm, pensive but active, steady but flexible, forceful but coercive; the test scores responsible for identifying leadership traits were not predictive of leader effectiveness in the institutions; and the traits approach completely ignored the interaction between the individual and the group.

In recent years, there has been resurgence in interest in the trait approach in explaining how traits influence leadership (Bryman, 1992). Lord, et al. (1986) found that personality traits were strongly associated with individual's perception of leadership. Similarly, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) have gone so far as to claim that effective leaders are actually distinct types of people in several key

respects. Further evidence of renewed interest in the trait approach can be seen in the current emphasis given by many researchers to visionary and charismatic leadership.

In short, the trait approach is alive and well. It began with an emphasis on identifying the qualities of great persons: next, it shifted to include the impact of situations on leadership, and most currently, it has shifted back to re-emphasise the critical role of traits in effective leadership (Northouse, 2001).

## **The Behavioural Theories of Leadership**

This approach to the study of leadership concentrates on observed behaviour. The behavioural approaches can be thought in terms of the manner in which the leaders actually behave as observed by subordinates. Researchers studying this style or behaviour approach determined that leadership is composed of essentially two general kinds of behaviours: task behaviours and relationship behaviours. Task behaviours facilitate goal accomplishment; they help group members to achieve their objectives. Relationship behaviours help subordinates feel comfortable with themselves, with each other, and with the situation in which they find themselves. The main purpose of the behaviour approach is to explain how leaders combine these two kinds of behaviours to influence subordinates in their efforts to reach a goal.

McGregor, (1960) assumes the authoritarian style to be theory X and the democratic style to be theory Y. Theory X assumes an average person who dislikes work and has to be coerced, controlled, directed and threatened, prefers to be directed to avoid responsibility, generally has relatively low ambitions, low degree of maturity obviously calls for a tough and authoritarian behaviour by a leader. The authoritarian style of leadership behaviour is based on the assumption that the power of leaders is derived from the position they occupy. Theory Y assumes a person with self-direction and self-control makes an effort to achieve the objectives under proper conditions has a relatively high degree of imagination and creativity in the solution of organisational problems.

The democratic style assumes that the power of leaders is granted by the group they are to lead so that people can be creative and self-directed if properly motivated. These are not only two sets of assumptions that leaders can carry with their subordinates. Rather these are the two extremes and between these two extremes, there can be a variety of shades or combinations or assumptions or theory X and Y that leaders can perceive of the followers. The views of theory X and Y were further closely studied by Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958).

Although many research studies could be categorized under the heading of the behaviour approach namely, (X and Y theory by McGregor, 1960, the Iowa leadership studies by Lewin, Lippit and White in late 1930, Likert's management system in 1961, Group dynamic studies by Cartwright and Zander, 1960 etc.), but the Ohio State University studies, Michigan University studies and the studies by Blake and Mouton are strongly representative of the ideas in this approach. By looking closely at each of these groups of studies, a clear picture can be drawn of the underpinning and implications of the behaviour approach.

### ***Ohio State University Studies***

In 1945, the Bureau of Business at Ohio State University initiated a series of studies on leadership. An interdisciplinary team of researchers from Psychology, Sociology, and Economics developed and used

leaders behaviour description questionnaire (LBDQ) to analyse leadership in numerous types of groups and situations. The Ohio State studies attempted to identify various dimensions of leaders behaviour (Hemphill and Coons, 1957). The staff, defining leadership as the behaviour of an individual when directing the activities of group members towards a goal attainment, eventually narrowed the description of leader behaviour to two dimensions i.e. Initiating structure and consideration that substantially accounted for most of the leadership behaviour described by subordinates. The leadership style is crucial become the style of leadership of the principal and his decisions will determine the success of the school. Further, a review of research and theory on leadership shows that conceptualisation of leadership generally support at least two general and distinct categories. One category is concerned with interpersonal activities and the other with task achievement. The Ohio State leadership studies support the duality. Accordingly, two separate dimensions of leadership behaviour have been identified, initiating structure and consideration. Initiating structure refers to the leader's behaviour in delineating the relationship between himself and members of the work group and in endeavouring to establish well-defined patterns of organisation, channels of communications, and methods of procedure. On the other hand, consideration refers to behaviour indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of his staff (Halpin, 1959).

Shartle (1966) and his colleagues, who have been referred to earlier, conducted the leadership studies in Ohio and pointed out the criteria of leadership behaviour, of which one is sometimes, called the human relation and the other described as the 'get out of the work dimension'. Hemphill, and Halpin who followed Hemphill, identified these two dimensions as initiating structure and consideration.

It is concluded that the higher the meeting point of these two dimensions, the better is the leadership behaviour. When a leader receives from his colleagues the scores equally at a high plane, on both the dimensions, he is considered to be very much effective. If a leader has high consideration for his staff members, if he exhibits a real interest in the personal needs of the members of the group even when he is taking initiative in getting the work done from them, he is considered to be an effective leader. High scores on the dimension of initiating structure manifest the behaviour of the leader who clarifies goals, and organizes for the completion of task. His leadership behaviour can be called to be more institution-oriented. A leader, who receives high score on consideration and low score on initiating structure, is more person-oriented and is less effective. According to this approach, if leader has low score on both the dimensions, he is not effective with this pattern of behaviour. Only those leaders prove to be effective when they show scores high enough on both the dimensions.

In studying leader behaviour, the Ohio state staff found that initiating structure and consideration were separate and distinct dimensions. A high score on one dimension does not necessitate a low score on the other. The behaviour of a leader could be described as any mix of both dimensions. Four quadrants were developed to show various combinations of initiating structure and consideration.

In the series of studies conducted, it was found that leaders high in initiating structure and consideration (a high-high leaders) tended to achieve high subordinate performance and satisfaction more frequently than those who rated low on either consideration, initiating structure, or both. The Ohio State Studies suggested that the high-high style generally resulted in positive outcomes.

There is consistent evidence that leaders secure somewhat higher performance and job satisfaction if high consideration is their dominant leadership style. Considerate leaders are concerned about the

human needs of their colleagues. They try to build teamwork and help colleagues with their problems. Structured, task-oriented leaders, on the other hand, believe that they get results by keeping people constantly busy and urging them to work.

In summarizing research on consideration and initiating structure, House and Baetz (1979) concluded:

1. Initiating structure or task-oriented leadership is necessary for effective performance in all-working groups.
2. Acceptance of task-oriented leadership requires that the task-oriented leader allow others to respond by giving feedback, making objection, and questioning the task oriented leader.
3. Consideration leadership is required in addition to initiating structure leadership when groups are not engaged in satisfying or ego-involving tasks.
4. Groups requiring both kinds of leadership behaviour will be more effective when these leader behaviours are performed by one person rather than divided among two or more persons.
5. When the leadership roles are differentiated, group will be most effective if those assuming the roles are mutually supportive and least effective when they are in conflict with each other.
6. When formally appointed leaders fail to perform the leader behaviours for group success, an informal leaders will emerge and will perform the necessary leader behaviours, provided the group members desire success.

### ***Michigan University Studies***

A group of researchers from the survey research centre at the University of Michigan began their studies of leadership behaviour giving special attention to the impact of leaders behaviour on the performance of small groups (Cartwright and Zander, 1960). The studies identified two types of leadership behaviour, which they called employee orientation and production orientation.

Employee orientation describes the behaviour of leaders who approach subordinates with a strong human relations emphasis. They take interest in workers as human beings, value their individuality, and give special attention to their personal needs. Employee orientation is very similar to the cluster of behaviours identified in the Ohio State Studies as consideration. Production orientation refers to leadership behaviours that stress the technical and production aspects of a job. From this orientation, workers are viewed as a means for getting work accomplished (Bowers and Seashore, 1966).

### ***Managerial Grid***

Perhaps the most well-known model of managerial behaviour is the managerial grid, which first appeared in the early 1960s and since that time has been refined and revised several times (Blake and McCauley, 1991; Blake and Mouton, 1964, 1978, 1985). It is a model that has been used extensively in organisational training and development. The Managerial grid, which has been renamed the leadership grid, was designed to explain how leaders help organisations to reach their purposes through two factors; concern for production and concern for people. Although, these factors are described as leadership orientation in the mode, they closely parallel the task and relationship

leadership behaviours.

Concern for production refers to how a leader is concerned with achieving organisational task. It involves a wide range of activities, including attention to policy decisions, new product development, process issues, workload, and sales volumes to name a few. Concern for production refers to whatever the organisation is seeking to accomplish.

Concern for people refers to how a leader attends to the people within the organisation who are trying to achieve its goals. This concern includes building organisational commitment and trust, promoting the personal worth of employees, providing good working conditions, maintaining a fair salary structure, and promoting good social relations (Blake and Mouton, 1964).

The leadership grid joins concern for production and concern for people in a model that has two intersecting axis. The horizontal axis represents the leader's concern for production, and the vertical axis represents the leader's concern for people. Each of the axis is drawn on a point scale on which score of one represents minimum concern and score of nine represents maximum concern. By plotting scores from each of the axis, various leadership styles can be illustrated.

According to Blake and Mouton (1964) the five leadership styles are described as follows:

- Style 1-1: management is impoverished management – low concern for people and low concern for production. This style is sometimes called Laissez-Faire management, because the leader abdicates his or her leadership styles.
- Style 9-1: Management is task or authoritarian management – Low concern for people but High concern for production.
- Style 1-9: management is country club management – high concern for people but low concern for production.
- Style 5-5: management is middle-off the road management – an intermediate amount of concern for both production and people satisfaction.
- Style 9-9: Management is team or democratic management – high concern for both production and people morale and satisfaction.

Blake and Mouton argue strongly that the 9,9 management style (Team management) is the most effective type of leadership behaviour. According to them, this style results in improved performance, low absenteeism, and turnover of staff members, and high people satisfaction.

### **Situational Theories of Leadership**

It was after 1950 that attention towards interaction between leaders and many variables within their work situation, which influenced their effectiveness, was drawn. Social psychologists began the search for situational variables that had impact on leadership roles, skills, and behaviour and on followers' performance and satisfaction. The emphasis is on the behaviour of leader and their group members and various situational variables. With this emphasis on behaviour and environment, more encouragement is given to the responsibility of training individuals in adopting styles of leader

behaviour to varying situations.

As the name of the approach implies, situational leadership focuses on leadership in situations. The basic premises of the theory is that different situations like governmental, military, business, and educational organisations, even at different times in particular organisation demand different kinds of leadership. From this perspective, to be an effective leader require, that an individual adopt his or her style to the demands of different situations.

While there are many situational models and theories, some of them have received wide attention in leadership research. Some of the important situational theories that attempt to isolate critical situational factors affecting leadership effectiveness are explained below.

### ***Fiedler's Leadership Contingency Model***

Widely respected as the father of the contingency theory of leadership, Fiedler (1967) has developed the leadership contingency model by studying the styles of many different leaders who worked in different contexts, primarily military organisations. He assessed leaders styles, the situations in which they worked, and whether or not they were effective. After analysing the styles of hundreds of leaders who were both good and bad, Fielder and his colleagues were able to make empirically grounded generalizations about which styles of leadership were best and which styles were worst for a given organisational context. Fiedler (1967), suggests that three major situational variables seem to determine whether a given situation is favourable to leaders:

- i. Leader – member relations refers to the extent to which the group trusts the leader and willingly follows her directions.
- ii. Task structure refers to the degree to which the task is clearly defined.
- iii. Position power means the extent to which the leader has official power to influence others. Typically, a manager has position power, whereas a staff member does not.

Fiedler states that the situations are favourable to the leader if all three of the above dimensions are high. In other words, if the leader is generally accepted by followers, if the task is very structured and everything is spelled out, and if a great deal of authority and power is formally attributed to the leader's position, the situation is very favourable. If the opposite exists, the situation will be very unfavourable for the leader. Fiedler was convinced that the favourableness of the situation in combination with the leadership style determines effectiveness.

Based on research findings, contingency theory posits that certain styles will be effective in certain situations. Individuals who are task motivated (low LPC score) will be effective in both very favourable and in very unfavourable situations, that is, in situations that are going along very smoothly or when things are out of control. Individuals who are relationship motivated (high LPC score) will be effective in moderately favourable situations, that is, in situation in which there is some degree of certainty but things are neither completely under their control nor out of their control. The leader who makes a wrong decision in this highly unfavourable type of situation is probably better off than the leader who makes no decision at all.

In order to predict effective and ineffective styles of leadership Fiedler in his theory used on the one

hand interaction of leader personality as measured by the less preferred co-workers the LPC and situation favourably on the other hand as measured by leader member relations, task characteristics, and leader position power.

### ***Path-Goal Theory***

Path-goal theory emphasizes the relationship between the leaders style and the characteristics of the subordinates and the work setting. The underlying assumption of path-goal model is derived from expectancy theory, which suggests that subordinates will be motivated if they think they are capable of performing their work, if they believe their efforts will result in a certain outcome, and if they believe that, the payoffs for doing their work are worthwhile.

The House (1971) version of the theory incorporates four major types of leadership that the leader choose among them:

- i. Directive: the leader tells employees what he expects of subordinates, gives them guidance about what they should do, and shows them how to do it.
- ii. Supportive: the leader shows concern for the well-being and needs of his employees by being friendly and approachable.
- iii. Participative: the leader involves employees in decision making, consults them about their views of the situation, asks for their suggestions, considers those suggestions in making a decision, and sometimes lets the employees make the decisions.
- iv. Achievement oriented: the leader helps employees set goals, rewards the accomplishment of these goals, and encourages employees to assume responsibility for achieving the goals.

The path-goal model proposes that the scope of the job and the characteristics of the subordinates moderate the relationship between a leader's behaviour and subordinates performance and satisfaction. More specifically, if there is ambiguity in the mind of the subordinate about his or her job, the leaders should clarify the path to work-goal attainment; and if the path is already clear, a leader demonstrating high initiating structure will reduce subordinate satisfaction.

### ***Reddin's Tridimensions Management Style Theory***

Reddin (1970) was the first to add the dimension of "effectiveness" to the task concern and relationship concern dimensions of earlier attitudinal models such as the managerial Grid and called it as 3-D Management style theory. The third dimension effectiveness was added to the two – dimensional model in recognition of the fact that the effectiveness of leaders depended on how their leadership style interrelated with the situation in which they operated. When the style of a leader is appropriate to a given situation it is termed effective, when the style is inappropriate to a given situation, it is termed ineffective. However, the basic styles may it be effective or ineffective, depends on the situation. The difference between the effective and ineffective style was often not the actual behaviour of the leader, but the appropriateness of this leader behaviour to the environment in which it was used was of great significance. Thus, the third dimension was the environment called effectiveness because in most organisational settings various performance criteria were used to measure the degree of effectiveness or ineffectiveness of a manager or leader.

The situational elements: Reddin's 3-D theory was a situational theory. It asked a manager to look out beyond himself. In order to look outward he needed to know what to look at. In 3-D theory terminology, he was asked to look at the five situational elements namely organization, technology, superiors, co-workers and subordinates (Reddin, 1970). These elements stood for: (i) Organization, it refers to all those factors which influence behaviour within a social system that are common to essentially unrelated positions. It is sometimes, referred to as extrinsic job factors like culture, climate and values or simply the way we perceive things around here (ii) technology; refers to the way work may be done to achieve managerial effectiveness. Making budgets, making decisions and making inspections are forms of work that could be done in different ways from each other; their technology is different: and (iii) Superior, co-workers and subordinates are concepts which are used in the generally accepted sense. These elements make demands on the manager's style. A manager has to recognise, respond to or change them. A manager has only to exhibit these elements in order to make a comprehensive situation diagnosis. Leaders control the situation and by doing so, they have to first control themselves.

### ***Life-Cycle Theory***

In the leadership models developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1988) in their research efforts, the terms task behaviour and relationship behaviour are used to describe concepts similar to consideration and Initiating structure of the Ohio State Studies. The life cycle or situational theory, states that effective leadership results from the relationship between a leader's style and the readiness of his followers. A follower's readiness is likely to increase over the life cycle of his relationship with the leader, calling for a change in the leader's style over time.

Task behaviour refers to behaviours in which the leader specifies an individual's or group's duties, activities, and responsibilities by goal setting, organizing, scheduling, directing and controlling. To explain what activities each one is to do and when, where, and how, tasks are to be accomplished.

Relationship behaviour refers to the communication behaviour of the leaders, such as listening, giving support, facilitating interactions, providing feedback, and supporting individuals and group; maintain personal relationship between themselves and members of their group by opening up channels of communication (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988).

Combining these, two dimensions results into four basic styles of leadership behaviour as following:

i. Telling: high task, and low relationship. The leader guides, directs, establishes guidelines, Provides specific instructions, and closely supervises performance. A dysfunctional telling-style leader dictates without really considering the employees at all.

ii. Selling: high task and high relationship, the leader explains decisions, clarifies them and persuades employee to follow them as necessary. Too intense selling, however, can result in badgering at employees with too much structure and consideration.

iii. Participating: low task and high relationship. The leader shifts significant responsibility to the followers, encourages employees to participate in decision-making, and facilitates collaboration and commitment. In extreme cases, the leader can bend too far to accommodate the will of the employees, rather than correctly judging the appropriate amount of participation.

iv. Delegating: low task and low relationship. The leader only observes and monitors employee's performance after giving them responsibility for decisions and implementation. Improper application of this style can result in the leader disengaging too much from the decision making process.

To sum up the situational leadership theory, according to Hersey and Blanchard, there is no one best way to influence people which leadership style a person should use with individuals or groups depends on readiness level of the people the leader is attempting to influence. On the other hand, situational leadership is based on an interplay among (1) the amount of guidance and direction a leader gives, (2) the amount of socio-emotional support a leader provides, and (3) the readiness level that followers exhibit in performing a specific task, function or objectives. This concept was developed to help people attempting leadership, regardless of their role, to be more effective in their daily interactions with others. It provides leaders with some understanding of the relationship between an effective style of leadership and the level of readiness of their followers. According to this theory, selecting the appropriate style requires the leader to determine the readiness of the followers. Follower readiness has two components:

i. Ability describes whether employees have the necessary knowledge, skills and experience to perform the task.

ii. Willingness describes whether the employees have the motivation, commitment and confidence to do the task.

Readiness in situational leadership is defined as the extent to which a follower has the ability and willingness to accomplish a specific task. People tend to be at different levels of readiness depending on the task they are being asked to do. Readiness is not a personal characteristic; it is not an evaluation of a person's traits, values, age, and so on. Readiness is preparing a person to perform a particular task (Hersey and Blanchard, 1988).

## **Transformational Leadership**

One of the current approaches to leadership that has been the focus of much research since the early 1980s is the transformation approach. Transformation leadership is part of the "New leadership" paradigm (Bryman, 1992). Recent thinking about effective leadership has supplemented the situational approach with emphasis on the leader's charisma, ability to develop and implement vision of the organisation, and ability of each worker to act as self-leader that is also called super leadership which refers to leading others to lead themselves. According to Manz and Sims (2002), when most people think of leadership, they think of one person doing something to another person. It is influence and a leader as one who has ability to influence another. A classic leader- one whom everyone recognizes is a leader- is sometimes described as "Charismatic" or "heroic." A popular concept is the idea of a "transformational" leader, one who has the vision and dynamic personal attraction to total organisational change.

Transformational leadership is a process that changes and transforms individuals. It is concerned with values, ethic standards, and long-term goals. Transformational leadership involves assessing followers' motives, satisfying their needs and treating them as full human beings. It is a process that subsumes charismatic and visionary leadership.

Transformational leadership is an encompassing approach that can be used to describe a wide range of leadership, from very specific attempts to influence followers on a one-to-one level to very broad attempts to influence whole organization and even entire culture.

According to Burns (1978), Transformational leadership refers to the process whereby an individual engaged with others creates a connection that raises the level of motivation and morality in both the leader and the follower. This type of leader is attentive to the needs and motives of followers and tries to help followers reach their fullest potential. Burns points to Mohandas Gandhi as a classic example of transformational leadership. Gandhi raised the hopes and demands of millions of his people and in the process changed himself.

According to Schermerhorn (1996), the special qualities of transformational leaders include:

- Vision: having ideas and a clear sense of direction, communicating them to others and developing excitement about working hard to accomplish shared “dreams”.
- Charisma: arousing others’ enthusiasm, faith, loyalty, pride, and trust in themselves through the power of personal reference and appeals to emotions.
- Symbolism: identifying “heroes” offering special rewards, and holding spontaneous and planned ceremonies to celebrate excellence and high achievement.
- Empowerment: helping others to develop and perform, removing performance obstacles, sharing responsibilities and delegating truly challenging work.
- Intellectual stimulation: gaining the involvement of others by creating awareness of problems and stirring their imagination to create high-quality solutions.
- Integrity: being honest and credible, acting consistently out of personal conviction.

Bass (1985), one of the proponents of this approach, argues that there are essentially two types of leaders i.e., transactional and transformational. Transactional leaders motivate employee by appealing to self-interest. That is, transactional leaders treat leadership as an exchange that is, a “transaction” – relationship between themselves and their employees. In spirit, they are saying, “I will look after your interests if you will look after mine.” Although nothing may be wrong with this approach, Bass and others argued it fails to lead to the kind of employee commitment and dedication necessary for greatness. To achieve this, the leader must exhibit charismatic, or transformational characteristics.

A transformational leader is one who inspires trust, confidence, admiration and loyalty from his or her followers. As a result, followers are motivated to exert high levels of effort out of a sense of personal loyalty to the leader, if not the organization.

The transformational approach to the study of leadership relies heavily on the trait approach. It is believed that effective leaders exhibit several unique characteristics that give them influence over their followers. According to a study, (Conger and Kanungo, 1987) these characteristics include the following:

- i. High self-confidence, charismatic leaders exhibit strong confidence in their own judgements and

actions.

ii. Ability to articulate a vision, such leaders has a unique ability to put into words an idealized vision of what the future could hold. In fact, the greater the disparity between the status quo and the idealized vision, the greeter the likelihood that followers will attribute extraordinary vision to the leader.

iii. Willingness to assume high personal risks to pursue the vision, charismatic leaders are often seen as being willing to assume great risks to pursue their vision. This commitment to the future and self-sacrifice often entices others to follow.

iv. Use of unconventional strategies, these leaders often use unconventional behaviour or break accepted norms as a sign of their confidence in their course of action. Such attention- getting behaviour often attracts the admiration of the followers.

v. Perception of leaders as change agent, finally, charismatic leaders are often seen by followers as change agents, especially when followers are disaffected or unhappy with current events.

### **References:**

Barnard, C. (1938): *The Function of an Executive*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Bass, B.M. (1985): *Leadership any Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: the Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1990): *Stogdill Handbook of Leadership: A Theory and Research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), New York: Free Book.

Bennis, W. (1984): Transformation Power and Leadership. In T.J. Sergiovanni and J.E. Corball (Eds), *Leadership and Organizational Culture*, Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Blake, R.R., and Mouton, J.S. (1978): *The Managerial Grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Blake, R.R., and Mouton, J.S. (1985): *The Managerial Grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Blake, R.R., and Mouton, J.S. (1964): *The Managerial Grid*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Blake, R.R., and McCause, A.A. (1991): *Leadership Dilemmas – Grid Solutions*. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing.

Bowers, D.G., and Seashore, S.E. (1966): Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with a Good-Factor Theory of Leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, No.11.

Brookover, W. et al. (1979): *School Social System and Student Achievement; School Can Make a Difference*. New York: Harper and Row.

Bryman, A. (1992): *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. London: Sage Publications.

Burns, J.M. (1978): *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Cartwright, D., and Zander, A. (1960): *Group Dynamics Research and Theory*. Evanston, IL: Row

Person.

Coleman, J. et al. (1982): *High school achievement*. New York: Basic Books Inc..

Conger, J., and Kanungo, R. (1987): *Toward a Behaviour Theory of Charismatic Leadership in Organizational Settings*. *Academy of Management Review*.

Darling, J.R. (1992): Total Quality Management: The Key Role of Leadership Strategies. *Journal of Leadership and Organisational Development*, 13(4), PP.3-7.

Davis, K. (1986): *Human Behaviour at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

De Bevoise, W. (1984): Synthesis of Research on the Principal as Instructional Leader. *Journal of Educational Leadership*, 41(5), PP.15-20.

Dictionary of Behavioural Science (1973): Editor: Wolman, Benjamin B., New York: Van Nostrand Company.

Fayol, H. (1916): *General and Industrial Management*. London: Pitman.

Fiedler, F.E. (1967): *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Filley, A.C., House, R.J., and Karr, S. (1977): *Managerial Process and Organizational Behaviour*. Glenview Ill.

French, R.P., and Raven, B. (1959): The Bases of Social Power. In D. Cartwright (Ed), *Studies in Social Power*, Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Getzels, J.W., and Guba, E.G. (1957): *Social Behaviour and the Administrative Process*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Gibb, C.A. (1954): Leadership. In Gardner, Lindzet (ed), *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Cambridge, Mass: Addison- Wesley Publishing Company.

Good, C.V. (1959): *Dictionary of Education*. Second Ed, New York: McGraw Hill.

Grant, G. (1982): *Education, Character and American Schools: Are Effective Schools Good Enough*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University.

Greenfield, W. J. (1982): *Research on Public School Principals; A Review and Recommendations*. Paper Presented at the NIE Conference on Principals for Educational Excellence in the 1980's. Washington, D.C.

Gross, N., and Herriott, R.E. (1965): *Staff Leadership in the Public Schools*. New York: Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Halpin A.W. (1966): *Theory and Research in Administration*. New York: Macmillan Co. Ltd.

Halpin, A.W. (1956): *The Leadership Behaviour of School Superintendents*. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education the Ohio State University.

- Hemphill, J.K. (1949): *Situational Factors in Leadership*. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Press.
- Hemphill, J.K., and Coons, A. E. (1957): Development of the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire. In R.M. Stogdill & A.E. Coons (Eds), *Leader Behaviour and Measurement*. Columbus: Ohio State University, *Journal of Social Issues*, 12, 41-49.
- Hersey, P., and Blanchard, K. (1988): *Management of Organizational Behaviour, Utilizing Human Resources*. Fifth edition, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall International, Inc. Englewood Cliffs.
- Hollander, E.P. (1995): Organizational Leadership of Followership. In P. Collett & A. Furnam (Ed), *Social Psychology at Work*, London: Rout ledge, 69-87.
- House, R.J. (1971): A Path- Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness. *Administrative Science*, No. 16.
- House, R. and Baetz, M. (1979): *Leadership: Some Generalizations and New Research Directions. Research in Organizational Behaviour*, In B.M. Staw, editor, Greenwich, Com: JAI Press.
- Jago, A.G. (1982): Leadership; Perspective in Theory and Research. *Journal of Management Science*. 28(3), PP. 315-336.
- Jennings, E.E. (1961): The Anatomy of Leadership. *Management of Personnel Quarterly*, 1(1).
- Keys, B., and Case, T. (1990): How to Become an Influential Manager. *Academy of Management Executive*, November, PP. 38-51.
- Killan, L.M. (1952): The Significant of Membership in Disaster. *American Journal of Social Science*. 57, 309-314.
- Kirkpatrick, S.A., and Locke, E.A. (1991): *Leadership: Do Traits Matter*. The Educative.
- Koontz, H., and Weihrich, H. (1998): *Essential of Management*. 5<sup>th</sup> edition, New Delhi; Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company limited.
- Kotter, J.P. (1990): *A Force for Change: How Leadership Differs from Management*. New York: The Free Press.
- Krech, D., and Crutchfield, R.S. (1962): *Individual in Society*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Lewin, k., et al. (1939): Patterns of Aggressive Behaviour in Experimentally Crested' Social Climate, *Journal of Social Psychology*, X, May 1939, PP. 271-199.
- Lightfoot, S.L. (1983): *The Good High School*. New York: Basic Books Inc.
- Lipham, H. (1974): *The Principalship: Foundations and Functions*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lipham J.A. (1981): *Effective Principal, Effective School*. American Association of Secondary School Principals, Reston, VA.

- Lipham J. (1964): Leadership and administration. In D.E. Griffith (Ed), *Behavioural Science and Educational Administration*.
- Lord, R.G., Devader, C.L., and Alliger, G.M. (1986): A Meta-Analysis of the Relation Between Personality Traits and Leadership Perceptions: An Application of Validity Generalization Procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Manz, C.C., and Sims, H. P. (2002): *The New Super leadership: Leading Others to Lead Themselves*. New Delhi: Viva Books Private Limited.
- McGregor, D. (1960): *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- McGregor, J. (1978): *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Moshal, B.S. (1998): *Managing an Organization and Management: Text and Cases*. New Delhi: Galgotia Publishing Company.
- Newill, C. A. (1978): *Human Behaviour in Educational Administration*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc. Englewood Cliffs.
- Northouse, P.G. (2001): *Leadership, Theory and Practice*. Second Edition, California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Reddin, W.J. (1970): *Managerial Effectiveness*. Tokyo: McGraw Hill.
- Rutherford, W. L., et al. (1983): *An Analysis of Terminology Used for Describing Leadership*. Austin: Research and Development Centre for Teacher Education. University of Texas.
- Rutter, M.B. (1979): *Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children*. New York: Random House.
- Schermerhorn, J.R. (1996): *Management and Organizational Behaviour Essential*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Shartle, C.L. (1966): *Executive Performance and Leadership*. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Sizer, T. (1984): *Horace Compromise: A Dilemma of the American School*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Smith, P.M. (1995): Leadership. In A.S.R. Manstead & M. Hewstone (Eds), the Blackwell *Encyclopaedia of social Psychology*, Oxford: Blackwell, 358-362.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974): *Handbook of Leadership, A Survey of Theory and Research*. New York: The Free Press.
- Stoner, J. A.F., Freeman, E., and Gilbert, D.R. (1996): *Management*. Sixth edition, New Delhi: Prantice-Hall of India Private Limited.
- Tannenbaum, R., and Schmidt W.H. (1958): *Howto Choose a Leadership Pattern*. Harvard Business

Review, No. 37, March-april.

Tannenbaum, R., Weschler, I.R., and Massarik, F. (1961): *Leadership and Organization, A Behaviour Science Approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tead, O. (1935): *The Art of Leadership*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Terry, G.R. (1988): *Principles of Management*. Homewood Ill: Richard D. Irwin.

Weber, M. (1947): *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, Translated by T. Parsons and A. M. Henderson, New York: Free Press.

Yuki, G., and Van Fleet, D.D. (1998): Theory and Research on Leadership in Organizations. In Dunnette, Marvin D. and Hough, Leatta (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Mambai: Jaico Publishing House, Vol. 3, PP. 147- 197.

VN:R\_U [1.9.11\_1134]