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ABSTRACT

Thesis Title: Leadership Behavior and Employee Job Satisfaction: A Study of Path Goal Theory in Telecom Sector

This study was designed to test the path-goal theory of leadership in Pakistan telecom (mobile) industry. The study explored relationship between leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) of middle managers and job satisfaction of subordinates. Path-goal leadership model attempts to explain the impact of leader behavior on the subordinate motivation, satisfaction and performance.

Leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) of managers were measured through leader behavior items. Subordinates’ satisfaction was measured by the job descriptive index. While job expectancy I and job expectancy II were measured through job expectancy scale. The four path-goal leader behaviors, seven moderating variables and nine subordinates’ outcomes were measured through the instrument comprising of 189 items. Further, the results of study were obtained by testing 28 hypotheses.

The analysis suggested that the moderating variables influence preference for a particular type of leadership behavior (by the subordinate) and leader behavior has an impact on subordinate satisfaction, job expectancy (I&II) and acceptance of leader. Leader behavior affects satisfaction directly. Further subordinate satisfaction has a direct effect on the subordinate performance which is further influenced by the task demand. There was no difference between male and female respondents regarding any dependent measure. Moreover, the direction of association between variables is not known and it is difficult to predict accurately without further research, which is replicated and revalidated.

Due to time constraints, the research has several limitations. Recommendations are made for future study, particularly replication in the public and private sectors to ensure validity which will help in determining causal relationship between leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter aims at one of the most researched subject in the field of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Leadership. Before introducing path-goal theory (subject matter of the thesis), the chapter will highlight the corporate challenges of today’s world, brief on the state of telecom industry in Pakistan, introduce leadership as a concept, delineate the problem statement, discuss significance of the problem, define objectives of the study, delimitation and assumptions of the study, and finally definition of terms etc.

1.1 Background of the Study

The corporate world is undergoing immense and continuous changes due to globalization, technological advancements, cut throat competition and new mergers and acquisitions causing new factors of employee’ job satisfaction and leadership development, setting new parameters for Organizational effectiveness and gaining Competitive Advantage. Thus at the start of 21st century, the environment can best be described as competitive, challenging, turbulent and unpredictable, (Ward, Bacon & Mackie, 2003).

Katzenbatch (2000) researched more than 25 companies in North America, most of which had achieved superior competitive advantage in the past several years, either financially or in the marketplace. The leadership of these companies was convinced that the performance of their people made the difference, which was again supported by research stating that it was the commitment and energy of people that resulted in performance beyond the norm.

Bard & Michal (2003), say that the success of a company (small/large) and even its sustainability – is primarily determined by the quality of the work done by its people and their ability to rise to challenges. Thus to succeed in the turbulent times, companies need their employees to outperform, which means in the current economy employees coming in
'just to do their job’ is simply not good enough. So the new economy requires different and new approaches. A survey conducted by Henley Management College (2000) found that traditional organizations have now recognized the importance of strategic planning, e-business knowledge and leadership to help cope with the demands of the new economy.

### 1.2 Challenges for Corporate World

Companies are facing deep motivational and satisfaction challenges and this issue becomes blatantly obvious, when we look at hundreds of books and articles and thousands of the experts and specialists dealing with the subject through research and training.

Without going into long stories, citing case studies, discussing theories, what it boils down to is that the difference between being highly motivated and not, is determined by the fact/measure as how employees do their very best in the job; not from a financial or career-management perspective but from deep inside (intrinsic motivation) and environment (extrinsic motivation). The companies are getting aware of the situation and integrating human oriented approach into corporate strategy. Moreover, they are also treating employees not as resources (which deplete or become absent), rather assets (which flourish and grow in value) who add value to the companies as they are part of it.

The biggest challenge to companies is not of resources but of knowledge workers, management and retention. Thus for sustainability and gaining competitive advantage, companies need employees who care for and are involved in their work with their heart and souls. Such level of involvement is not possible without leadership, who clarifies subordinates path to the achievement of goals and subsequently rewards them. It marks the start of challenging times for leaders who will need the right skills and attributes to capture the hearts and minds of their employees (Ward, Bacon & Mackie, 2003).

### 1.3 Telecom Industry in Pakistan

In the era of globalization and information age, the role of mobile telecommunication technology cannot be underestimated. The mobile industry has made tremendous strides over the last two decades, making it a critical benchmark in economic progress (Kenny and Keremane, 2007). However, developing countries have not fully
utilized its potential despite the relatively low amount of investment required in it and the fact that it provides an exceptional opening for the underdeveloped states (Noll, 2000; Garbacz & Thompson, 2007).

In developed and advanced countries, many researches have been undertaken in the field of market development for mobile telecommunications; however, it remains neglected area in developing countries, though recently Pakistan Telecom Authority has taken some initiatives in this regard. This limits our knowledge and understanding of the features of mobile telecommunications transformation, and the social and technological factors involved in this process (Gao and Rafiq, 2009).

With a population of more than 160 million people, Pakistan is the seventh most populated country in the world. It had a per capita income of US$1000 in 2007 and average GDP growth remained 7% over the past five years (Economic Survey of Pakistan, 2008). It’s important to note that despite the power struggle between the military regime and various political parties and the constant threat of militancy, Pakistan has achieved rapid growth in the field of mobile telecommunication.

Table 1-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End of Year</th>
<th>Mobilelink</th>
<th>Ufone</th>
<th>Paktel (Zong)</th>
<th>Instaphone</th>
<th>Telenor</th>
<th>Warid</th>
<th>Total Market</th>
<th>Growth Rate (%Total Market)</th>
<th>Mobile Tele Industry (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>743</td>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,699</td>
<td>128.7</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>420</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,404</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,023</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7,469</td>
<td>2,579</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>12,771</td>
<td>154.3</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17,206</td>
<td>7,487</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>1,041</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>4,863</td>
<td>34,506</td>
<td>170.2</td>
<td>22.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>26,466</td>
<td>14,014</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>10,701</td>
<td>10,620</td>
<td>63,160</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>39.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>32,032</td>
<td>18,100</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>3,951</td>
<td>18,125</td>
<td>15,490</td>
<td>88,020</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>54.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Gao and Rafiq (2009)

Pakistan’s mobile industry is a highly competitive market. It is an interesting case study due to its triple digit growth over the past few years (See Fig 1.1). Mobile telecommunication services were introduced in 1990 and now Pakistan stands as one of the
largest telecom subscriber with the cheapest calling rates in the region. The triple figure growth in mobile industry during the past few years has also increased per capita from 0.52% in 2000 to 54.70% in 2007. Meanwhile, the Pakistan telecommunications market has undergone dramatic transformation (PTA, 2008).

In 1990, telecom liberalization started by issuing the mobile licenses to two private companies. There was no open competition; it was, rather, arranged, with frequent political interferences and lacking patent regulatory policy. Through the Telecommunication Act of 1996, some regulatory bodies were established to oversee the development of Pakistan’s
mobile telecommunication sector. 1996-2003 is described as monopoly and competition phase. The government announced a national cellular policy in 2004, which created a competitive mobile telecommunications market, resulting in exponential growth in Mobile Telecommunication sector. This era is remarked as true competition era as the relevant government agencies as well as the technology and service providers and customers played their due role in encouraging the espousal of novel standards for mobile phone sector and the introduction of new services in the market.

1.3.1 Monopoly Phase

Between 1990 and 1995, government monopolized the fixed telecommunication infrastructure while the mobile phone sector gave an impression as if the competition was all managed. The efficient growth and development of mobile telecommunication industry in a country depends upon the establishment of an effective regulatory administration supported by a clear national policy, whether it encourages a liberal or monopolistic market structure (Gao and Rafiq, 2009). In 1990, licenses were issued to two companies, i.e. Instaphone as well as Paktel with an avowed assurance that this duopoly will be maintained for the next fifteen years (Looney, 1998); however, due to political changes in 1992, another license was issued to Mobilink. The matter was taken to the court by Instaphone and Paktel and, in 1994, eventually Mobilink got approval to operate the Global Systems for Mobile (GSM) technology, while the erstwhile duopoly, comprising of Instaphone and Paktel were left to compete with Advanced Mobile Phone System (AMPS) technology.

In 1995, Federal government imposed a ban on the use of mobile phone in Karachi, resulting in the loss of 26000 mobile subscribers which was more than half of the users at that time. After two years, the ban was lifted but considerable damage had already been done to the potential foreign investment. Further, heavy taxes were levied by the government on mobile services.

The government put best efforts to attract private investors to offer goods and services to the public users but potential investors remained reluctant of entering the market in the absence of an autonomous and transparent institutional mechanism. Instaphone, Mobilink and Paktel focused on business customers only, to whom they were charging very high rates.
Among the pioneer users of mobile services were businessmen, industrialists, professionals, feudal, politicians and those who belonged to high income group, concentrated in the urban areas such as Islamabad, Karachi and Lahore. Similarly, almost all the users were male and mainly in the age group of 35-55 (Gao and Rafiq, 2009).

1.3.2 Monopoly and Competition Phase

The absence of national policy, and fair regulatory mechanism along with: negative government interventions; high taxes; expensive and mega handsets; inflexible payment modes and; focus on business customers, curtailed the growth of mobile industry. The introduction of Telecommunications Act 1996, (which provided a deregulating legal framework) and government declaration of introducing private capitals resulted in a new phase of mobile industry growth. Further Frequency Allocation Board (FAB) was established to allocate frequencies and to manage the field whereas; Pakistan Telecommunication Authority (PTA) was mandated to protect the consumers’ rights and encourage transparent competition. The objective of encouraging competition was achieved by issuing licenses to new mobile operators and supervising the tariff setting. The formation of FAB and PTA had limited administrative function of ministry of commerce (MoC) and in March 2000, MoC was demoted to a division of ministry of science and technology (MoST). Eventually, PTA was placed under direct control of the Cabinet Division with much needed institutional autonomy.

The establishment of PTA and its autonomous status was instrumental in providing a base for the fast growth of the mobile telecommunications industry in Pakistan. Towards the end of 2000, Ufone was awarded license for GSM services. Mobilink emerged as the market leader with 64% of the share, followed by new entrant Ufone (16%) and Instaphone (11%) and Paktel (9%) (PTA, 2008).

To continue as a market leader, Mobilink started offering pre-paid service. Other service providers followed Mobilink and also offered this service to augment their revenues. The service gained great popularity and presently an overwhelming majority, i.e. more than 95% of users is using prepaid tariffs.
Further, mobile operators responded to the requirements/needs of the wider sections of the society during this phase. Previously, the needs of common subscriber were neglected. Similarly, the public perception of mobile handsets also changed, from businessman tool to essential service for common people (Gilani, 2006).

### 1.3.3 Competition and Exponential Growth

Independent regulator who adopted transparent policy making process along with Caller Party Pays (CPP) system enhanced competition, resulting in cheap tariff and various kind of services provided by the GSM networks, resulted in sizable user base in the market by the end of 2nd period (PTA, 2008).

The regulatory institutions were further strengthened in 2004 with the publication of Mobile Cellular Policy 2004, which showed government’s resolve to ensure competition. Moreover, it also drew private investment in this sector at affordable and competitive rates. New licenses of mobile services were issued to two companies, i.e. Al-Warid of United Arab Emirates [UAE] and Telenor, a Norwegian company. Further PTA made it mandatory for all the service providers to reach out to the rural areas to achieve the goal of providing access to mobile communications to everyone.

At present (2006-07), Mobilink is market leader with 50% of the market shares, Ufone being second with 21% of the market shares, whereas new entrants Warid and Telenor have showed impressive performance and captured 14% and 11% of the market share respectively. Paktel and Instaphone have 3% and 1% of the market share respectively. In the summer of 2007, China Mobile Limited, the world’s largest mobile operator, acquired Paktel in US$460 million and rebranded it as “Zong” (PTA, 2008).

This phase (2004 to present) of mobile sector growth is marked with valuable mobile services. The rural areas were also gripped by the intense mobile mania and the demand for mobile services poured in from all over the country. Ironically, most of the users came from the low income group, which had no access in the first phase. To summarize, all social classes/income groups and demographics enjoyed the benefits of mobile telecommunications which had far-reaching social and economic impacts.
1.3.4 Future of Pakistan’s Telecom Industry

As a result of political turmoil, wave of terrorism, lack of good governance and weakening macroeconomic indicators, the growth in cellular segment has considerably slowed down. As per Bloomberg, Mobilink still leads the market with 35.3% market share, followed by Ufone (20.8%), Telenor (20.5%), Warid (17.8%), Zong (5.4%) and Instaphone (0.4%)(PTA, 2008).

On average 2.3 million subscribers were added every month during 2006-07, whilst in Sept. 2008 the subscription has declined by 69%. The government has stopped granting new licenses to mobile operators. A tough competition is going on among existing players to retain existing and attract new users. Going forward, Mobilink is expected to face tougher competition as it has always focused on elite class of society, while Telenor, Warid, and Ufone enjoy a diversified consumer base with lower and middle class income group.

1.4 Leadership & Organizational Success

Leadership as a subject of behavioral science has attracted a lot of attention. It has been formally researched and informally discussed more than any other topic; however, there is still considerable controversy (Luthans, 2008). There are more than 350 definitions of leadership available in literature (Daft, 2005). Throughout the history, the difference between accomplishment and failure has been ascribed to leadership (Kakabadse & Kakabadse, 1999). A Gallup survey suggests that most employees believe it is not the organization, which guides the culture and creates the situations where workers are happy and successful; it is, rather, the leader who does so.

In 2006, a search of the World Wide Web on leadership, revealed 475,000,000 results. Similarly, Ebsco business and management publications database revealed that there was a considerable boost in the number of publication on the subject. The number of articles increased from 136 in 1970-71 to 258 in 1980-81, 1,105 in 1990-91 and an amazing 10,062 in 2001-02 (Storey, 2004). USA is leading investor in Leadership development activities as Fulmer (1997) reported that the corporate sector spent $45 billion in 1997 which was previously merely $10 almost ten years ago. Sorenson (2002), reported that there were 900
college or university leadership programs being offered in the United States alone, offering over 100 specialist degrees and it was double than that of 4 years earlier statistics.

Eberlin & Tatum, (2008) quoted Duke (1998) who said understanding leadership is like watching a parade; what we see depends on where we stand. If we stand on the end of street, we get a very narrow, but detailed view of the activities and the precision of their timing. Whereas, if we stand on the roof of a nearby building, we miss the nuances of the individual performers but we can observe the panorama of elegantly choreographed formation and appreciate the parade from a more appreciative perspective.

The understanding of leadership and its importance has attracted the scholars and researchers all over the world. Bass (2008) very rightly quoted Napoleon, saying that he would have an army of rabbits led by a lion rather than an army of lions led by a rabbit. This statement illustrates those leaders who have courage and vision to make a great difference in their organizations, whereas weak leaders cannot harness the full potential of their subordinates and cannot improve the effectiveness of their organizations, thus loose out in the long run.

Regardless of the attention given and its recognized importance, leadership does remain an elusive concept. Further, although its existence and influence on organizational performance are not questioned yet it is hard to spell out its working and dynamics. But several authors, experts and researchers have endeavored to define the concept. Leadership has been defined in terms of traits, role and relationships, role differentiation, and / or an amalgamation of some or all of these concepts (Howieson, 2008).

Based on the historical influence of leaders, researchers have always tried to find traits of successful leader. But the failure of researchers to find universal traits or leader’s behaviors that are effective in all situations, diverted the attention to find out situational factors that influence leadership effectiveness. Since a single leadership behavior is not good for all situations, the leader needs to adopt him/her to a particular situation and the theory dealing with situational behaviors is called situational theory of leadership. These theories deal with the judicious influence of the above mentioned variables on the leadership behavior.
Leadership is the basic element of organizational effectiveness and gaining competitive advantage. This reflects the level of relationship between the persons where one person affects another person’s or group of person’s behavior in such a way that these efforts get common direction. Stogdill (1990) thinks of leadership in terms of the relationship at workplace among group members wherein the leader, through active contribution and expression of his/her ability to carry out tasks through cooperation, acquires his status.

From the 1920s onward, various surveys regarding the job satisfaction have highlighted the significance of leadership and there has been a consensus regarding the fact that positive attitudes of the manager contributes towards the job satisfaction of the employees (Bass, 2008). It is a major challenge for corporate leaders today to enhance employee job satisfaction. Identification of the factors that lead to increased job satisfaction within corporate culture is of extreme importance and path-goal theory provides useful framework to know the factors that affect job satisfaction.

Leadership research has received relatively lesser attention in Pakistani Corporate sector. Different leadership skills are required for different kinds of organizations. For instance, the leadership skills in the multicultural organizations will be different from those of the unicultural organizations. Therefore, instead of relying on researches in the west, it would be opportune for the organizational researchers to study leadership and job satisfaction issues using their own populations and their own specific problems.

No considerable effort in Pakistan has been made to test the path-goal theory in corporate sector i.e. exploring the relationship among leadership behavior, contingency factors and job satisfaction. This study will attempt to find out the moderating effect of some contingency variables on the relationship of leadership behavior with subordinates outcomes: acceptance of leader, job expectancies and job satisfaction of employees.

1.5 Statement of the Problem

This study aims at exploring the relationship among leadership behavior of managers, and job satisfaction, acceptance of leader and job expectancies of employees taking into account the moderating effect of seven situational variables i.e. task structure,
role ambiguity, stress, locus of control, need for achievement, need for autonomy and perception about ability (of subordinates), after controlling the effect of manager’s stress and role ambiguity in the Telecom Industry of Pakistan.

1.6 **Significance of the Study**

This study is significant as the results of this study would be applicable to the advancement of Path-Goal theory itself and for Telecom Industry of Pakistan. Significance of path-goal theory is based on the fact that its results would serve to expand and build upon already existing knowledge that has been developed by researchers in West.

The results of this study would contribute to the knowledge base essential for the practice of corporate leaders by explaining the interactive affects of the four leadership variables (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented) and task structure, stress, subordinates locus of control, needs, perception about abilities and role ambiguity and job satisfaction, and job expectancies.

This study will add to data about several variables that have been identified in path-goal theory but received little research attention. The early research on path-goal theory conducted by House and his associates (1996), measured only two dimensions of leadership behavior (directive and supportive) whereas participative and achievement oriented behaviors have been given limited research attention along with role ambiguity and expectancies I and II. Thus the results of this study would contribute to the limited database. This study will also contribute to the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) literature.

In summary, this study will provide information that will add to the understanding of the path-goal theoretical base. This research study has significance for corporate leaders because the results obtained from this study will provide information based on research and theory to supervisors thus assisting them in the better delivery of their administrative responsibilities. Supervisors should learn as much as possible about leadership research so as to exhibit the leadership behavior best suited to their own personality, knowledge and situations affecting their roles. Further, they will learn as how each leadership behavior affects employee job satisfaction in the areas of work, pay, and opportunities for promotion,
supervision, and coworker and job in general. The readers would be able to identify relationship between situational variables and subordinate outcome.

1.7 Objectives of the Study

The main objectives of the study were:

1. Analyze leadership behavior of Corporate Managers/Supervisor in terms of directive, supportive, achievement oriented and participative leadership behavior as perceived by their subordinates.
2. Analyze subordinates’ personality characteristics such as locus of control, perception about abilities, need for achievement and need for autonomy.
3. Analyze environmental characteristics such as task structure, and role ambiguity and stress.
4. Explore the relationship between leadership behavior and subordinates’ job satisfaction, job expectancies and acceptance as a leader.
5. Explore the relationship between the attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service) and acceptance of leader, job satisfaction and job expectancies.
6. Explore the relationship between situational factors (locus of control, needs and perception of abilities, task structure, role ambiguity and stress) and subordinates acceptance of leader, job satisfaction, and job expectancies.
7. Explore the effects of personal attributes on job satisfaction, job expectancies and acceptance of leader.

1.8 Research Questions

1. What is the relationship between leadership behavior and subordinates’ acceptance of a leader?
2. What is the relationship between leadership behavior and expectancy I (effort leads to performance), and expectancy II (performance leads to reward), of subordinates?
3. What is the relationship between leadership behavior and job satisfaction of subordinates?
4. What is the relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, employee rank, experience, and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinates’ acceptance of leader?

5. What is the relationship between attributes of subordinate (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience, and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinates’ job expectancies?

6. What is the relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience, and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinates’ job satisfaction?

7. What is the relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement and perception about abilities) and subordinates acceptance of leader?

8. What is the relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement and perception about abilities) and subordinates job expectancy I?

9. What is the relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement and perception about abilities) and subordinates job expectancy II?

10. What is the relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement and perception about abilities) and subordinates job satisfaction?

11. Is there any gender wise difference in the job satisfaction, job expectancy and acceptance of leader of employee?

12. Is there any age wise difference in the job satisfaction, job expectancy and acceptance of leader of employee?

13. Is there any difference in the job satisfaction, job expectancy and acceptance of leader of employees with different qualification?

14. What is the difference among employees’ job satisfaction, job expectation and acceptance of leader having varied length of experience?

15. What is the difference in perception of lower and middle management regarding job satisfaction, job expectancy and acceptance of leader?
1.9 **Null Hypotheses**

Based on the research questions, following null hypotheses were formulated:

- **H01** There is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinate’s acceptance of leader.
- **H02** There is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinates’ job expectancies: expectancy I (effort leads to performance) and expectancy II (performance leads to reword).
- **H03** There is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and job satisfaction of subordinates.
- **H04** There is no significant relationship between linear combination of four leadership behaviors, (directive, supportive, participative and achievements-oriented) and subordinate’s acceptance of leader.
- **H05** There is no significant relationship between linear combination of four leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) and job expectancies of subordinates.
- **H06** There is no significant relationship between linear combination of leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) and job satisfaction of subordinates.
- **H07** There is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinate’s acceptance of leader.
- **H08** There is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinate’s job expectancies.
- **H09** There is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinate’s job satisfaction.
H₀₁₀ There is no significant relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about ability) and subordinates’ acceptance of leader.

H₀₁₁ There is no significant relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates’ job expectancy I.

H₀₁₂ There is no significant relationship between situational factor (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates’ job expectancy II.

H₀₁₃ There is no significant relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates’ job satisfaction.

H₀₁₄ There is no gender wise significant difference in the job satisfaction.

H₀₁₅ There is no gender wise significant difference in the job expectancy.

H₀₁₆ There is no gender wise significant difference in the acceptance of leader.

H₀₁₇ There is no age wise significant difference in job satisfaction of employees.

H₀₁₈ There is no age wise significant difference in job expectancy of employees.

H₀₁₉ There is no age wise significant difference in the acceptance of leader in employees.

H₀₂₀ There is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of employees having different qualifications.

H₀₂₁ There is no significant difference in the job expectancy of employees having different qualifications.
There is no significant difference in the acceptance of leader by employees having different qualifications.

There is no significant difference in job satisfaction of employees having different experiences.

There is no significant difference in job expectancy of employees having different experiences.

There is no significant difference in the acceptance of leader by employees having different experiences.

There is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle managers regarding job satisfaction.

There is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle managers regarding job expectancy.

There is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle managers regarding acceptance of leader.

1.10 Delimitation of Study

The delimitations of this study are as under;

1. There are two types of contingency factors in Path-Goal theory i.e. subordinate characteristics and environmental factors which work as moderator between subordinate attitudes/behavior and leadership behavior. And both of these classes include several variables, but this study was delimited to only three environmental variables i.e. task structure, stress and role ambiguity and four subordinate characteristics i.e. locus of control, perception about ability, need for achievement and need for autonomy.

2. This study was delimited to cellular companies operating in Pakistan.
3. Only leading cellular companies (Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor and Warid) were included in the study whereas Paktel (now Zong) and Instaphone have been excluded due to very low subscription.

4. The data for the purpose of this study was collected from offices of major cellular companies (Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor & Warid) located in Islamabad, Rawalpindi, Faisalabad, Karachi and Peshawar.

1.11 Assumptions of the Study

1. It was assumed that the respondents are aware of the concept of job satisfaction, its components and determinants; job expectancy (I&II) and acceptance of leader.

2. It was also assumed that respondents would cooperate with the researcher in their own and organizational interest.

1.12 Population

The population of the study consisted of the middle and lower managers working in telecom industry (mobile) of Pakistan.

1.13 Sample & Sample Size

Keeping in view the nature and objectives of the study, stratified random sampling technique was most appropriate and sample was selected accordingly. To attain the appropriate information and appropriate number of representative sample, it was decided to collect the information from the permanent employees of the telecom (cellular) sector. Therefore it was decided to approach at least 50 managers & 150 lower managers out of 300 and 700 respectively, working in various organizations of Telecom sector (cellular) of Pakistan to obtain required data / information. Both males and females were included in this sample.
1.14 Analysis of Data

The study was Ex-post Facto Type, as it deals with variables, the manifestation of which had already occurred and variables of the study were not manipulate able or under direct control of the researcher. This was also correlational in nature as it sought to establish relationship among various variables of the study. The statistical analysis was conducted with the help of computer using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).
1.15 Definition of Terms

Leadership

“Leadership is the process of influencing others in order to achieve organizational goals and objectives”.

Directive Leader Behavior

Directive leader behavior is the behavior; a leader exhibits in order to give specific guidance to subordinates by letting subordinates know as what is expected of them. Further, schedules work to be done; maintains definite standards of performance and directs subordinates to follow standard rules and regulations (House and Mitchell, 1974).

Supportive Leader Behavior

Supportive leader behavior is the behavior; a leader uses to show “concern for the status, well-being, and needs of subordinates and such a leader does little things to make the work more pleasant and treats all employees/team members as equals” (House and Mitchell, 1974).

Participative Leader Behavior

Participative leader behavior is the behavior; which involves “consulting with subordinates, soliciting their suggestions and taking these suggestions into serious consideration before making a decision” (House and Mitchell, 1974).

Achievement-Oriented Leader Behavior

Achievement-oriented leader behavior is the behavior; a leader uses to set challenging goals for subordinates and expects subordinates to perform at their highest level. Further, leader seeks continuous improvement in subordinate performance, and demonstrates a high level of confidence that subordinates will assume responsibility, put full efforts and accomplish the challenging goals.
Role Ambiguity

Role ambiguity refers to the degree of uncertainty an employee has about his/her work role. House and Rizzo (1972) have defined role ambiguity in terms of deficiencies in “the existence or clarity of behavioral requirements serving to define role/behavior and the predictability of the outcomes of one’s behavior.”

Task structure

House and Dessler (1974) defined task structure as the degree to which a task, job, work assignment, the execution of rules and/or procedures is simple, repetitive, and unambiguous.

Need for Achievement

Need for achievement refers to an employee’s strong need for career advancement i.e. promotion and or transfer to a higher position as opposed to remaining at the current status.

Job expectancies

Expectancy I refers to an employee’s psychological state where he/she expects that effort extended will lead to high performance, and Expectancy II is defined, as an employee’s psychological state where he/she expects that effective performance will lead to the rewards. In other words, Expectancy II refers to the degree to which high quality and or quantity or both, and timely performance lead to extrinsic rewards i.e. increased pay, promotion, recognition, or security” (House and Dessler, 1974).

Acceptance of Leader

This concept refers to the state where subordinate complies with the directives and orders of his leader and is always ready to accept the decisions made by the leader. He is at high comfort level with his leader and feels pleased while working with him.

Job satisfaction

Job satisfaction is an attitude of an employee towards the working conditions, general atmosphere of the organization, interaction with superiors and colleagues. It is the
feeling, an employee has about his or her job or job experiences in relation to previous experiences, current expectations, or available alternatives.

In this study, job satisfaction has been used as an indicator of the relationship of the employees/team members to work, supervisor and coworkers, measured by the individual scores of the variables such as work, pay, opportunities for promotion, supervision, coworkers, and job in general using job descriptive index (JDI) by Bowling Green University(1997).
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This study aimed at testing the path-goal theory of leadership in Telecom (cellular) industry of Pakistan, so theoretical advancement in the subject of leadership has been discussed in detail. The review of related literature started with the elaboration of leadership concept, and leadership theories, followed by path-goal theory. The description of path goal theory, its predictions and all path-goal variables along with dependent variables especially job satisfaction have been discussed.

2.1 The Nature of Leadership

Leadership is a subject that has generated equal interest among scholars and masses. The term leader connotes the image of a powerful and dynamic individual who has commanded victorious armies, directed corporate empires, or shaped the futures of nations. The world history is description of the stories of military, political, religious and social leaders and the exploits of these brave leaders are the most important element/feature of most legends and myths. Eventual fascination with leadership is because of such a mysterious process, which touches everyone’s life. For example, how did certain leaders (Julius Caesar, and Alexander the Great) built great empires; and why certain leaders (Winston Churchill ) were suddenly deposed, despite their apparent power and record of successful accomplishments; similarly, why did some undistinguished people (Adolf Hitler and Claudius Caesar) rose to the positions of great power; and why do some leaders(Muhammad-PBUH) have followers who are willing to sacrifice their lives for their leader rather take it important part of their faith, whereas other leaders are so despised that their followers conspire to murder them.
The questions about leadership effectiveness have long been the subject of speculation, but scientific research and investigation on leadership appeared in the early half of the twentieth century has tried to define and analyze leadership effectiveness (Howieson, 2008).

Table # 2-1: A Simple History of Leadership Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL THEORY</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>SPECIFIC THEORY</th>
<th>KEY AUTHORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Man</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Leaders are born not made.</td>
<td>1. Iowa Leadership Studies</td>
<td>Lewin, Lippit, White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Identification of personality traits of the leader.</td>
<td>1. Ohio State leadership Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group/Exchange</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Leadership is viewed more in terms of the leader’s behavior and how such behavior affects and is affected by the group of followers.</td>
<td>1. Vertical Dyad Linkage Model. 2. Leader-Member Exchange. 3. Transactional Leadership.</td>
<td>Graen, Graen &amp; Haga, Burns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power-Influence</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Examines the effect of power and influence on Subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Emphasizes the importance of contextual factors on leadership (i.e. nature of work/external environment/characteristics of followers).</td>
<td>1. Situational Theory.</td>
<td>Hersey &amp; Blanchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Charismatic leaders are capable of having profound and extraordinary effects on followers.</td>
<td>1. 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership</td>
<td>House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Leaders shifting the values, beliefs and needs of followers.</td>
<td>1. Transformational Theory</td>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispersed, Informal, Emergent</td>
<td>2000 onward</td>
<td>Informal leadership dispersed throughout organization.</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A Quantitative Evaluation of the Reformulated 1996 Path-Goal of Work Unit
2.2 Definitions of Leadership

The term leadership has different connotations to different people that create ambiguity of meaning. The ambiguity emerges from the fact that the concept entails a multifaceted interaction among the leader, his subordinates and the particular situation (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004). Leadership is not predetermined in humans as opposite in the animal world rather it varies from situation to situation and from individual to individual (Hackman & Johnson, 1996).

Interestingly, there is plethora of definitions of leadership, every researcher, author or expert has come up with his own definition of this concept. The Oxford English Dictionary (1933) suggests that the word “leader” appeared in the English language in 1300, and it refers to the ‘central or focal person who integrates the group’. Further, leadership is a universal phenomenon and has been defined and studied from a wide variety of perspectives and disciplinary approaches (Yukl, 2006), resultantly, there are many different theories of leadership as well.

House, Javidan & Dorfman (2002) report that a few years ago, fifty-four leadership experts from thirty-eight countries reached a consensus that leadership means an ability to influence, motivate and enable others in a way that they contribute towards the efficiency and accomplishment of the mission/goals of organizations which have employed them. Thus a leader is a person/individual who personifies the ability to get others do willingly what needs to be done. Leader inculcates motivation among others to indulge in action and perform and it is this motivation and resultant performance which makes a leader successful.

According to Hellriegel & Slocum (2007), a leader is a person who exhibits ideas, vision, values, influences others, and makes tough decisions and these are the key attributes of leadership.

Wren (1995) has conceived leadership in these terms: “the focus of group processes, as a matter of personality, as a matter of inducing compliance, as the exercise of influence, as particular behaviors, as a form of persuasion, as a power relation, as an instrument to
achieve goals, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role, as initiation of structure, and as many combinations of these definitions”

Leadership is the process of influencing an organized group towards accomplishing its goals (Roach & Behling, 1984). It has also been defined as interpersonal influence which, through the process of communication, is directed towards achieving certain objectives or goals, (Tannenbaum, Weschler, & Massarick, 1987). Johns & Saks (2007) says that “leadership occurs when particular individual exerts influence upon others for the achievement of goal in an organizational setting by enhancing the productivity, innovation, satisfaction, and commitment of the work force”.

Leadership produces positive changes in organization and involves (1) setting of a direction/vision for the organization; (2) aligning employees’ goals with that direction/vision through effective communication; and finally (3) motivating employees to action, partly through empowerment and partly through basic need gratification. The leadership process also creates uncertainty/ambiguity among employees due to changes in the organization and may not necessarily be limited to one person.

Hellriegel & Slocum (2007) defined leadership as the process by which ideas and a vision are developed, then living by values that support those ideas and that vision, influencing others to embrace these values in their own behaviors, and making hard decisions about human and other resources.

Koontz & Weihrich (2007) defined leadership as a relationship through which leaders influence their followers. Thus leadership is the art or a process of influencing people and motivating them to work willingly and enthusiastically towards the attainment of common goals through maximum application of his/her capabilities and in this process leader facilitates progress and inspires the group to attain goals, which the organization has set for itself.

To Jex & Britt (2008) leadership is a series of functions that have to be carried out in order for the group to be effective. Where the group’s task may need to be clarified, resources may be required, occasionally the spirits of group members may need lifting, and the group’s output must eventually be evaluated.
Leadership is the capability of influencing and motivating others to achieve organizational goals. Gray & Stark (1997) defined, “Leadership is both a process and a property, the process of leadership is the use of non-coercive influence to direct and coordinate the activities of the members of an organized group towards the accomplishment of group objectives. As a property, leadership is a set of qualities or characteristics attributed to those who are perceived to successfully employ such influence”.

A detailed review of leadership literature reveals that it is a process of manipulating the performance of an individual or a group for achieving set goals in a given scenario. McShane & Travaglione (2005) say that the leaders that can be called effective if they are helpful to a group of people for defining their goals and finding certain ways through which these goals can be achieved. Leaders facilitate through allocation of the requisite resources and alteration of communication patterns to enable the workers to achieve goals. To achieve that end, leaders use power and persuasion as tools to ensure that their followers are motivated and maintain the clarity of role.

According to Ivancevich, Olekalns and Matteson (2001), a good definition of leadership needs to be broad enough to accommodate different theories, research findings and pragmatic application. Further, a good definition needs to be specific enough to distinguish leadership from other organizational practices such as the application of reward, team morale and job satisfaction.

Kreitner & Kinicki (2004) say that divergence of opinion regarding the definition of leadership springs from the fact that it entails a composite contact among the leader, his followers, and the situation. For instance, a number of researchers define leadership as a combination of certain traits of a person and his physique, while there are others who believe that leadership stands for a set of given attitudes. Whereas, other researchers believe that it is a temporary role and can be played by any one. However, despite disagreement, there is a common thread among the different definitions of leadership as described by Peters and Austin (1989):

“Leadership means vision, cheerleading, enthusiasm, love, trust, verve, passion, obsession, consistency, the use of symbols, paying attention as illustrated by the content of one’s calendar, out-and-out drama (and the management thereof), creating heroes at all levels, coaching, effectively
wandering around, and numerous other things. Leadership must be present at all levels of the organization. It depends on a million little things done with obsession, consistency, and care, but all of those million little things add up to nothing if the trust, vision, and basic belief are not there”.

Regardless of the factors complicating the meaning of leadership, it is still possible to identify some common ground among the numerous definitions. Firstly, leadership involves influencing others’ behavior. Secondly, leadership is viewed as a process and not as an outcome. Thirdly, leadership requires a variety of skills.

Howieson (2008) views that despite the fact that leadership is recognized as an important skill a mystery prevails as to what it actually is and how it can be defined. The fundamental difficulties in defining leadership are concepts such as ‘love’, ‘freedom’ and ‘happiness. Leadership is a multifaceted construct and is open to subjective construal as different researchers have their own intuitive comprehension of this concept, which altogether make it hard to have a succinct definition. Secondly, the way it is defined and understood is strongly influenced by the theoretical stance one takes.

Some scholars view it as the outcome of a set of traits/attributes, while there are others who regard it as a social process that emanates from relationships among the group. This difference in perception always results in different estimation of the leadership’s character. Bratton, Grint & Nelson (2004) identified four problems due to which it is hard to reach at an agreement regarding a universal definition of leadership. The first problem relates to the process. There is no consensus whether leadership emerges from the persona or performance. The second issue is concerned with position of the leader while the third relates to philosophy, meaning whether the leader causes influence on his followers' behavior intentionally or the followers are influenced by the context in which they are working. The last attribute which makes it difficult to reach a consensus is purity. It means whether the individuals of a group embody leadership traits or is it a purely human attribute

2.3 An Integrative Definition of Leadership

Regent university (2006) initiated a research project to propose an integrative definition of leadership, which says “a leader is who selects, equips, trains, and influences one or more follower(s) who have diverse gifts, abilities, and skills and focuses the flower(s) to the organization’s mission and objectives causing the follower(s) to willingly
and enthusiastically expend spiritual, emotional, and physical energy in a concerted coordinated effort to achieve the organizational mission and objectives. The leader achieves this influence by humbly conveying a prophetic vision of the future in clear terms that resonates with the follower(s) beliefs and values in such a way that the follower(s) can understand and interpret the future into present-time action steps”.

Leader converts diversity of followers and gives it one direction with no harm to the distinctiveness of an individual. Further each follower is provided with the required resources that are needed in attaining the objectives of the organization and the development of the members of staff.

2.4 Leadership Dimensions

Barker (2002) reviewed the related literature in order to find leadership definition and concluded that leadership relates to two things, i.e. processes and behaviors. Team of researchers at Regent University (2006) reviewed literature to find a comprehensive definition of leadership and compiled 1000 plus constructs/statements then categorized them into 91 discreet dimensions. Team says that it was problematic to deal with the model of more than ninety dimensions; however, it was necessary to find a way of doing it. Nonetheless even these more than ninety attributes are not enough to grasp the concept (Appendix-N).

2.5 Leadership Effectiveness

In last 80 years, leadership research has mainly paid attention to the determinants of leadership effectiveness and as every researcher has given his/her own definition of leadership, conceptions of leader effectiveness also vary from author to author. The vast majority of researchers assess leadership effectiveness on the basis of the effects a leader’s actions have on his followers and other stakeholders. Different types of outcomes such as efficiency and growth of the group, group’s readiness for crisis management; followers’ contentment and dedication to achievement of the objectives which the group has sent for itself; the psychological well being and development of followers etc., have been used as determinants. But, the most common determinant is the degree to which a leader successfully achieves his/her goals (Howieson, 2008).
The effectiveness of leadership, good or bad, is typically attributed to the leader than to followers or situation (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 2002). Napoleon while talking about the effectiveness of leadership says ‘“Men are nothing; it is the man who is everything…It was not the Roman army that conquered Gaul, but Caesar; it was not Carthaginian army that made Rome tremble in her gates, but Hannibal; it was not the Macedonian army that reached the Indus, but Alexander”.

Yukl (2006) believes that a leader can make difference in terms of relevant end result factors such as performance, goal attainment, and individual growth and development as reflected in his overarching model.

![Yukl's overarching model](image)

**Fig # 2-1** Yukl’s overarching model

Profit margin, sales increase, market share, return on investment and productivity make up for the objective determiners of performance or achievement of goals; while, a leader’s subordinates, peers and superiors help in determining the subjective ratings of his effectiveness. Acceptance of leader by followers is an additional marker of his efficiency. For instance, to what extent the leader satisfies the followers’ requirements and fulfills their expectations, and to what extent do the followers reciprocate him with deference and admiration? Do the followers exhibit strong commitment and willingness to perform on request of the leader, or they do they show resistance, pay no attention to these, or
undermine these? Being absent from duty, being aggrieved, complaining to higher ups, requesting for relocation, slowing down work and deliberately sabotaging the apparatus and facilities, directly indicate that the follower is dissatisfied and hostile toward the leader (Howieson, 2008 & Yukl, 2006).

2.6 Level of Conceptualization For Leadership

According to Yammarino et al, (2005) leadership can be thought of as a person specific process, a two-fold process, a process involving group/s, a process that involves organization and most of theories have confined themselves to one level, as it sounds very hard to build up a multi-level conjecture in this regard.

The type of criterion variables used to evaluate leadership and the type of mediating process used to explain effective leader will determine which level of the leadership process is emphasized (Yukl, 2006 & Howieson, 2008). These levels can be views as a hierarchy, as depicted at Figure # 2.2

![Fig # 2-2](levels_of_conceptualization.png)

**Fig # 2-2 Levels of Conceptualization for Leadership Processes**

The individual level of the leadership process centers on an individual and his affiliation with followers that are also individuals and is also called as dyadic or two-fold process. The dyadic approach to leadership centers on the connection between leader and a follower. In view of a majority of dyadic theories, leadership is a “mutual influence process” between the leader and the follower. The theory implicitly assumes that effectiveness of the leadership only depends on how both the individuals influence each other over time (Daft, 2005).

The second level of analysis of leadership theory focuses on the interaction between
the leader and followers in the form of a group. This level is also called group process. Group process theory focuses on how a group leader adds up to the efficiency of the group (Yukl, 2006 & Daft, 2005)

The third level of analysis of leadership theory focuses on the organization and is called organizational process. Organizational process theories focus on how a leader contributes to the organizational effectiveness by acquiring the necessary resources to survive, effectively adapting to the environment through transformation of the processes to produce its products and services.

The group performance as well as the organizational performance has an effect on the individual’s performance. In case, the group is highly motivated and productive, chances are the individual will be productive too. If the workers are working for a successful organization, they are usually motivated to give out their best.

2.7 An Overview of Major Leadership Approaches

The leadership theory explains a few aspects of the concept. These theories are practical in value as these are useful for the better understanding, prediction and management (Lussier & Achua, 2007). Upon failure to find universal attributes of an effective leader, leadership scholars in early 19900s moved from the “Great man theory” to a view of leadership that was based on the interactions between the leader, task and followers. It also tried to identify the best leadership style/behavior in the given organizational and business environment.

Over the years, researchers and practitioners have developed a variety of views on leadership and one way of doing it is, to categorize it in accordance with most emphasized variable. Three types of variables are relevant for the understandings of leadership effectiveness include; (1) leader’s characteristics (2) followers’ characteristics (3) situation’s characteristics (Yukl, 2006).
2.7.1 Traditional Theories of Leadership

2.7.1.1 The Great Man Theory

The early leadership theories were based on the supposition that leaders were born and not made and such an approach was called Great-man approach and they were believed to possess certain qualities that lead them to greatness (Daft, 2005).

Carlyle’s (1841) work on heroes (The Pennsylvania University, 2001) has reinforced the notion of the leader as a man, bestowed with matchless attributes and captures the imagination of the masses. Bass (2008) maintains that: “There is no such thing as leadership by the masses. The individuals in every society possess different degrees of intelligence, energy, and moral force and in whatever direction the masses may be influenced to go, they are always led by the superior few”.

2.7.1.2 Trait Approach

Earlier researchers’ tried to understand leadership effectiveness through personal traits of the leader. Traits are unique individual attributes of a leader. Eventually this approach evolved into Trait theory of Leadership.

According to Johns & Saks (2007) during World War -I & II, US military recognized their leadership problem, and efforts were put in to find leadership traits that might be used in identifying potential officers.

Hoy and Miskel (2008) noted, with the advancement of field of psychology during 1940s, the trait theory dominated the study of leadership until 1950s. Stogdill (1990) examined 163 leadership trait studies that were carried out between 1948 and 1970 and found more than 10 studies concluding; leader excels the others in attributes that make a leader superior to others. Whereas more than 15 studies state that the leader excels in certain attributes of leadership. From the above, it is believed that the situation in which he/she works determines the attributes and qualities of a leader.

Muchinsky (2006) believes that list of leadership traits is extensive and includes personality characteristics, such as decisive, dynamic, outgoing, assertive, strong, bold and
persuasive. Various other traits such as tall, good looking, poised, articulate, confident, and authoritative have also been proposed and the presence of all these traits in a person prompts others to regard person as a “natural leader”. Locke et al (1996) conducted research and concluded that the presence of such traits is associated with the people in leadership position, but does not necessarily guarantee success.

Elliot & Dwick (2005) noted that three motives or needs that drive the behavior of leaders is; the need for power, the need for achievement, and the need for affiliation. The leadership traits are not attributes that people posses, but are the underlying basis for why they behave as they do. Bono & Judge (2004) used big five personality factors to explain leadership and reported a multiple correlation coefficient of .48 between the five personality factors and success of a leader. The two strongest personality dimensions were Extraversion \( (r = .31) \) and Consciousness \( (r = .38) \), thus reflect that there is a clear personality basis to effective leadership.

According to Hellriegel & Slocum (2007) trait approach assumes that certain physical, social; personality and personal traits are inherent within leaders and can be used to distinguish leaders from non-leaders.
Dubrin (2008) has classified leadership characteristics into three broad categories: Personality traits, leadership motives, and cognitive factors.

### 2.7.1.2.1 Personality Traits

The personality traits can be further divided into two groups: general personality traits such as self-confidence, trustworthiness, extroversion, assertiveness, emotional stability, enthusiasm, and warmth and task-related traits such as passion for work and people, emotional intelligence, flexibility and adaptability, internal locus of control, and courage.

### 2.7.1.2.2 Leadership Motives

Effective leaders are frequently distinguished by their motives and needs. They have strong tendency to occupy a position of responsibility and controlling others. Task-related motives are: the power motive characterized by (1) vigor and determination (2) ways to alter the behavior and thinking of others; and (3) personal standing with those around them; drive and achievement motive; strong work ethic; and tenacity.
2.7.1.2.3 Cognitive Factors

Mental ability and personality are considered important determinants of leadership effectiveness/success. In order to creatively solve the problems of their followers, to inspire them and bring about constructive change, leaders need to be mentally sharp and analytical as they will have to sort out essential information and then critically analyze these. Problem solving and intellectual skills are referred to as cognitive factors.

Factors related to cognitive intelligence are: knowledge of the business or group task; creativity; insight into people and situations; foresights and conceptual thinking; and openness to experience.

Bass (2008) concluded that

“A person does not become a leader by virtue of the possession or some combination of traits---- the pattern of personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relevant relationship to the characteristics, activities and goals of the followers.” (P. 64).

Schyns, & Meindl (2005) quoted Robert Lord and his associates who carried out a meta-analysis in 1986 and concluded that everyone has a leadership prototype. The leadership prototype is a mental representation of the traits and behaviors that people believe are possessed by leaders. A recent study confirmed the presence of leadership prototypes which are influenced by the cultural values. To find, “What values employees look for and admire in their supervisors” the study surveyed more than twenty thousand people from all over the world. The study concluded that 4 traits including forward-looking, honesty, competent and inspiring were considered essential traits.

The trait approach of leadership dominated the beginning years of research on leadership and once again it has got some standing with the current advancement in personality assessment. The Traits help in understanding as to why the people look for top slots in organization and why they act in a certain manner when they take that slot Traits of a leader interact with the situational demands which then influence leader’s behavior, and all this eventually affects group performance. It is hard to know the way a leader affects the performance of the group or their motivation, if we do not examine how the actual behavior of the leaders is reflected in the traits (Muchinsky, 2006).
A large number of researchers agree that traits are very important as a determinant in leadership effectiveness (Covey, 2009; Yukl, 2006; Conger & Kanungo and; 1998 Bryman, 1992).

### 2.7.1.2.4 Applying the Trait Approach

Findings of trait approach are extensively used in Human Resource Management and Management Development. The measurement based on individual trait variables associated with successful leadership performance, are utilized in human resource selection processes to evaluate potential future leaders.

#### Table # 2-2: Taxonomy of Entrepreneurial Traits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Succorance</td>
<td>Needs personal support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>Has high energy level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Harm avoidance</td>
<td>Enjoys exciting activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Is independent in thought and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Risk taking</td>
<td>Is willing to be exposed to uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Social adroitness</td>
<td>Is skilled in persuading others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial affect</td>
<td>Is emotionally aloof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Resists being confined or restricted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 2.7.1.2.5 Limitations of Trait Approach

The trait model of leadership does not predict the effectiveness of leadership due to three reasons. Firstly, there are no consistent patterns between specific traits or set of traits and leadership effectiveness, whereas more than 100 different traits of leaders in various leadership positions have been identified.

Secondly, trait model fails to relate physical traits such as height, weight, appearance, physique, energy, and health to leadership effectiveness. Thirdly, trait leadership model, itself is complex. Fourthly, trait studies were almost entirely based on samples of adolescents, supervisors and lower level managers rather than individuals in significant positions of leaderships, such as high level managers and chief executives with overall responsibility for organizational performance. Thus, trait approach paints somewhat a fatalistic picture, suggesting that some people by their traits are more prone to be leaders than others (Hellriegel & Slocum, 2007).
2.7.1.3 Behavior Approach

The inability of the Trait Approach to define specific traits differentiating between successful and unsuccessful leaders led researchers to investigate other variables such as behavior or actions of a leader (Hellriegel & Slocum, 2007 and Luthans, 2008).

A person’s performance in a particular situation, not his DNA and traits of personality, is important. Hence, instead of searching for traits to explain leadership and leader effectiveness, researchers turned to an examination of the leader’s behavior and its impact on the employees’ performance and their satisfaction.

Thus, behavior theories of leadership are based on the premise that leadership behavior can be determined by studying what leaders do in relation to accomplishing tasks and efforts put by employees in performing the task. Further, level of relationship between the manager and employees is a good predictor of employee retention. Employees having good relationship with their bosses are more likely to be more motivated and satisfied than those having poor relationship with their managers. The relationship between the employee and manager is based on manager’s leadership personality traits and attitudes which directly affect the behavior of employee (Bratton, Grint and Nelson, 2005)

The thrust of early behavioral leadership theory was the leader behavior instead of personality traits. It was believed that leader behavior directly affects work group effectiveness. This led researcher to identify patterns of behavior (called leadership styles) that enabled leaders to effectively influence others (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004)

Different behavioral leadership theorists used different names to classify leadership styles, but the concepts are similar. The majority of studies provide an analytical framework for comparing different leadership styles based on two main types of behaviors: Task behaviors & Leadership behaviors. Person emphasizing on productivity or goals accomplishments is called production centered or having task- oriented leadership style whereas person having concern for the needs, developments and problems of the followers is called employee centered or having person-oriented leadership style.
2.7.1.3.1 Leadership Style

Leadership style is the combination of traits, skills and behavior leaders’ use as they interact with followers (Lussier & Achua, 2007). Although a leadership style is based on traits and skills but behavior is the important component because it is relatively consistent pattern of behavior that characterizes a leader.

2.7.1.3.1.1 University of IOWA Leadership Style

In 1930’s, studies at the University of IOWA concentrated on the manner or style (behavior) of the Leaders and identified three basic leadership styles

**Autocratic:** The leaders make decisions and closely supervise employees’ performance. This can be related to theory X assumptions.

**Democratic:** The leader allows the participation and does not closely supervise the task of employees. This can be related to theory Y assumptions.

**Laissez-Faire:** The leader gives liberty to employees. This is neither theory X nor theory Y and is sometimes called free-rein.

The earlier studies concluded that the democratic style was the most desirable and productive, somehow later studies revealed otherwise.

Beginning in the late 1940s and continuing through the early 1960s, researchers have identified two primary dimensions of leader behaviors: a) support and concern for employees and b) the attention given to task performance and goal attainment.

Four research studies provided the foundation for behavior theories of leadership: The Boy’s Club Study; the University of Michigan Studies; the Ohio State Studies and the work by Blake and Mouton.

2.7.1.3.1.2 The Boy’s Club Experiment

Kurt Lewin(1939) and his colleagues conducted the Boy’s club experiment using 10–year old school boys in 04 clubs on voluntary basis. The boys were assigned number of craft activities for 3 successive 06 weeks and they were supervised by 04 adults who played the role of Autocratic, Democratic, and laissez-Faire.

Ninety-five percent of the school boys liked democratic leadership style but the school boys who worked under the autocratic leaders had the highest performance when
leader was present and they spent 74% of their time on productive activities. While 50% time of the school boys was spent on productive activity in the presence of Democratic leaders and only 33% time of boys was spent on productive work in the presence of their leader.

In the absence of Autocratic leaders time spent on productivity dramatically fell to 29%. in contrast to time spent on productivity under the Democratic leader declined by only 4%. The boys’ club experiment is quoted as reference that there is a clear relationship between the leadership behavior and the groups’ productivity, further, the presence or absence of leader in task performance makes a clear difference.

2.7.1.3.1.3 Leadership Research at the University of Michigan

This research focused on the effect of behavior of the leader or his style on the performance of small group of followers. This research aimed at identifying behavioral differences between effective and ineffective leaders. It was concluded that effective leaders tend to have compassionate relationship with their employees and instead of using individual supervision; they use group method and always set high goals for their followers (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2007).

Based on the responses to a questionnaire, two types of Leadership behavior were identified: production-orientated and employee-orientated or employee- centered leadership behavior-displaying a focus/concern on the human needs of their subordinates. In contrast to the employee centered leaders, the job centered leader directs activities towards efficiency, cost cutting and scheduling (Daft, 2005).

In addition, to affect the performance and satisfaction of subordinates, performance was also influenced by the factors related to the situation with in which leaders and subordinates work. As far as effectiveness was concerned, these researchers discovered that employee-oriented behaviors were linked with higher group performance and higher satisfaction among other group members (Hartel, Ashkanasy & Zerbe, 2005).

The Michigan and Ohio State theories have provided practitioners with information such as what kind of behavior a leader should display to be effective. However, it has not been conclusively resolved as to how and important performance indicators such as
efficiency, production and satisfaction are linked with leadership (Ivancevich, Olekalns & Matteson, 2001).

The behavioral approach to leadership revealed that leaders are made and not born which is opposite to trait approach. Behavioral leadership approach also revealed that there is no one best style of leadership. A leader is identifiable by behavioral characteristic of one style or the other but not the both. Further, it is important to consider that how frequently and how effectively managers exhibit various leader behaviors. Finally, though leadership behavior was demonstrated to affect the subordinates’ performance and satisfaction but performance was also influenced by other factors related to situation within which both Leader and subordinates are working (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2007 and Daft, 2008).

2.7.1.3.1.4 The Ohio State University

The Ohio State University, in the 1950s and 1960s, pioneered the most significant study on leadership behavior approach. When researchers at University of Michigan were investigating the effects of leader’s behavior on the performance of subordinates, the researchers at Ohio State University were investigating how leaders behave when they are leading a work group or a work organization (Yukl, 2006).

Researchers conducted survey to identify specific dimensions of leader behavior and hundreds of employees responded to the behavioral examples (Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire) according to the degree to which their leaders engaged in the various behaviors. Beginning with more than 1,700 dimensions, they eventually concluded that there are only two independent dimensions of a leader behavior: consideration and initiating structure with 4 leadership styles: high consideration with Low structure, high consideration with High structure, low consideration with Low structure, and low structure with High structure. Initially it was hypothesized that a high- structure, high-consideration style would be the one best style of leadership. But research over the years has produced mixed results and it was concluded that there is not one best style of leadership rather effectiveness of leadership style depends upon situational factor (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2007). But to Daft (2008) research suggests that all of these can be effectual.
### Four Leadership Styles Derived from the Ohio State Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Initiating Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low structure, high consideration</td>
<td>Low structure, low consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Less emphasis is placed on structuring employee tasks while the leader concentrates on satisfying employee needs and wants.</em></td>
<td><em>The leader fails to provide necessary structure and demonstrates little consideration for employee needs and wants.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High structure, high consideration</td>
<td>High structure, low consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The leader provides a lot of guidance about how tasks can be completed while being highly considerate of employee needs and wants.</em></td>
<td><em>Primary emphasis is placed on structuring employee tasks while the leader demonstrates little consideration for employee needs and wants.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fig # 2-3  
**The Ohio state University Leadership Model: Four Leadership Styles Two Dimensions**

The key dimensions of leadership behavior are the amount of empowerment or participation the leader allows his/her followers in the decision making process (Bratton, Grint & Nelson, 2005).

Hellriegel & Slocum (2007) concluded that the most positive effect of leaders initiating structure on productivity and job satisfaction of followers occurs when:

- There is high degree of pressure on subordinates/followers for output not by leader but someone else;
- Performing a particular task satisfies employees through engagement process;
- For the completion of particular task employees are dependent on the leader for resources and guidance;
- Employees are psychologically susceptible to be directed as what to do and how to do; and
More than 12 employees are reporting to one leader at one point of time. Similarly, the most positive effects of leader’s consideration dimension/style on the productivity and job satisfaction of employees occur when:

- It is routine task and employees don’t derive any satisfaction from the work, due to lack of engagement factor;
- Followers are inclined towards participative leadership style;
- Team members have to learn something new;
- Due to participative leadership style, employees feel it is their legitimate right to be involved in the decision making process as it affects their job performance; and
- Employees strongly dislike the status differences between them and their leader.

Overall results don’t support the idea that there is one best style of leadership but they do confirm the importance of considerate and structuring leader behavior. Similarly, it has also been concluded that subordinates/followers satisfaction, motivation and performance are significantly associated with these two (consideration and initiating structure) leader behaviors (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2007).

The main limitation of this leadership theory is the little attention given to the situation in which relationship occurred (leader & follower).

2.7.1.3.1.5 Implications for Leaders

Studies suggest that a leader who displays initiating structure generally improves productivity of his followers; and the leader who is ranked high on initiating structure and low on consideration generally has a large number of employee grievances, absenteeism along with high employee turnover rate. It is now accepted that effective leaders can have high consideration and initiating structure at the same time. Leaders having high consideration, have a team with high morale and low level of turnover and absenteeism. At the same time high level of initiating structures are useful in promoting high level of efficiency and performance.

2.7.1.3.1.6 The Leadership Grid

The most widely known behavioral model of leadership is the Managerial Grid which was proposed by Blake and Mouton in 1964. A graphical portrayal of a two
dimensional (”concern for people” and “concern for production”) view of leadership style is called Managerial Grid. It is based on the Michigan and Ohio State studies. It was updated by Robert Blake with Anne Adams in 1978 and 1985, 1991 & 1994 as reported by Amos et al (2008).

Blake and Mouton point out that the variables of the Managerial grid are attitudinal and conceptual, with behavioral description derived from and connected with the thinking that lies behind the action. In other words concern for production and concern for people involve attitude and pattern of thinking as well as specific behaviors.

The Leadership Grid is normative and prescriptive in approach whereas the Ohio State approach is descriptive and non-evaluative. Leadership Grid is often referred as the “One best way” approach and is used for changing the behavior of organizational leaders and to move them all towards the team leadership style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1,9</th>
<th>Country Club Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thoughtful attention to needs of people for satisfying relationships leads to a comfortable friendly organization atmosphere and work temp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9,9</th>
<th>Team Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work accomplishment is from committed people: interdependence through a common stake in organization purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5,5</th>
<th>Middle of the road Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequate organization performance is possible through balancing the necessity to get out work with maintaining morale of people at a satisfactory level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1,1</th>
<th>Impoverished Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exertion of minimum effort to get required work done is appropriate to sustain organization membership,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9,1</th>
<th>Authority Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency in operation results from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robie et al (2001) conducted a study of 1400 Managers in eight countries to find out if similar leadership behaviors accounted for effectiveness in all the countries. They reported that leadership behavior associated with problem solving and driving for results (initiating structure or 9,1 leadership) were consistently related to successful influencing a group to accomplish its goals, regardless of the country. Using 800 Managers in a US high-tech firm, Goff (2000) reported that Managers who spent more time in building relationships (consideration or 1,9 Leadership) also had more satisfied followers. These results indicate that most effective leadership style depends on the criteria used to judge effectiveness.

2.7.3.1.6 Applying the Behavior Approach

Behavioral style approach makes it clear that leaders are made, not born and leader’s behaviors can be systematically improved, changed and developed. Behavioral style research also proves that there is no one best style of leadership and different Leadership styles are more effective in different situations.
Bratton, Grint & Nelson (2005) suggest that reflect plays an important part in effective learning. Engaging in reflective learning is like using a reflecting mirror to look back on actions and thoughts processes. The attitudinal behavior leadership taxonomies provide a mirror for managers that can help them to answer the question “how am I doing as a leader”.

2.7.1.3.1.7 Evaluating Behavioral Approach

Behavioral approach to leadership reveals that there is not one best style of leadership rather the effectiveness of a particular leadership style is dependent on the situation at hand, such as, when faced with the role ambiguity, employees will prefer initiating structure over the consideration. Research also reveals that it is very important to consider as how frequently and how effectively a manager displays various leadership behaviors. The frequency of exhibiting different leadership behaviors is secondary in importance to the effectiveness of a particular behavior. Managers are always encouraged to concentrate on improving the effective execution of their leadership behavior.

Despite its application to Management training and development, behavioral approach has been strongly criticize due to its inability in identifying a universal style of leadership that is effective in all situations. It is also criticized on suggesting so called high-high style as the most effective leadership style. However extensive research in Anglo-American countries has found very limited scope for the preposition (Korman, 1966, Yukl, 2002)

Finally, it is criticized on its failure to demonstrate how leaders’ behaviors are associated with performance outcomes. The behavioral theorists have not been able to establish a consistent relationship between employee performance outcomes and its relationship with leader behaviors. In his evaluation of behavioral taxonomies, Yukl (2006) argued that “Like the trait approach, the behavior research suffers from a tendency to look for simple answers to complex questions”.

All the research studies conducted within the leader behavior paradigm share several similarities with early research on traits. Such as; based almost exclusively on individual observations of individuals working in lower ranks of organizational hierarchy and primarily concerned with supervision; frequently based on questionnaire asking
subordinates to recall the behavior of their superiors (presumably reflecting goals historical pattern of behavior and relationship between leaders and followers) as well as specific recently enacted behaviors; are inductive and lack theoretical orientations; and many leader behavior questionnaires had questionable validity.

2.7.2 Situational Approach

The failure of Trait and Behavioral leadership approaches to identify a single leadership style that was effective in all circumstances lead researchers to turn their attention to the situational aspects of leadership (Daft, 2008; House, 1971). Situational theories propose that the effectiveness of a particular style of leadership depends on the situation. Thus these theories explain that effectiveness of a leadership style is dependent upon factors such as: the situation; the people; the task; the organization; and other environmental variables (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2007).

The situational leadership approach was initially called, Zeitgeist (a German word. meaning spirit of time) and leader was viewed as a product of time and the situation. Thus a person having particular qualities or traits (that the situation requires) will emerge as a leader (Howieson, 2008). The basic tenet of this approach is that a particular behavior that is effective in certain circumstances may be ineffective or less effective under other circumstances, thus making leader’s particular behavior effectiveness contingent upon organizational situation (Daft, 2008). The main goal and objective of situational leadership theory/models is, to identify important situational factors and to observe/study as how they interact to determine appropriate leader behavior. Further, these situational leadership theories deal with the concept that situational factors or intervening variables affect the level of relationship between leader behaviors, subordinate job satisfaction, and performance outcome (Luthans, 2008).

Situational leadership theory has two important hall marks: attempts to discover the extent to which the leadership processes are the same or different, across different organizations, levels of management and cultures; and attempts to identify aspects of a situation that moderates the relationship of leader behavior (or trait) to leadership effectiveness. It is assumed that different behaviors will be effective in different situations instead of one being effective in all situations. Thus a theory describing this relationship is
called Contingency Theory and aspects of the situation that enhance or modify the effects of a leader’s traits or behaviors are called situational moderate variables.

Contingency means that one thing depends on the other thing, and for a leader to be effective requires an appropriate fit between his/her behavior/style and the conditions in the given situations. It is not necessary that if a leadership style works very well in one situation, it will not necessarily be effective in another situation as well (Daft, 2005).

The essence of a contingency approach to leadership is that leaders are more effective when they make their behavior contingent on situational factors, including group members’ characteristics. Further, both the internal and external environments have a significant impact/influence on leader’s effectiveness. Such as, the quality of a work force and the competitiveness’ of environment can influence the choice of a particular leader behavior in order to get maximum output. A manager supervising a group of competent employees can readily develop consensus whereas, a manager facing a competitive environment can easily align individual/group goals with the organizational goals (Dubrin, 2008).

In contingency leadership approach the manager is expected to observe a very high level of flexibility and needs to be visionary, otherwise he will become ineffective. Research shows that the situational variables such as cost, structure, context, and environment are important determinant of effective leadership styles. Similarly, followers’ needs, their level of maturity and cohesiveness among the followers working together in a team also make a significant difference to the best style of leadership.
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**Fig # 2-4**  
*Theoretical contingency approach to Leadership*
Drenth, Thierry & Wolff, C. J. De (2001) noted that the most notable contingency research was conducted by Wofford (1993); Burns & Stalker (1965); and Lawrence & Lorsch (1967). Wofford (2003) found that while there was no single best way of organizing production, a particular organizational design and managerial style of leader were most appropriate for each technological situation. According to her organizations differ not only in their structure and kind of technology but also in managerial behaviors, methods of inter-management communications and interactions. Further in some organizational settings, “it was not always easy to distinguish between those who give and took orders”.

The research findings of Burns (2003) compliment Wofford’s work and provide further support for a contingency approach to a managerial behavior. Jaffee (2001) noted that Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) further developed this type of contingency analysis by showing the importance of establishing an integrating mechanism to counter the centrifugal forces that differentiate and fragment employees.

Leaders do not interact in same manner with all the followers. For example a leader will give general guidelines regarding achievement of set goals to a highly competent and motivated team of followers but will spend a considerable time on coaching & mentoring, directing and training of a team of unskilled and unmotivated followers. Similarly, in case of team of followers with a high level of self-confidence, leader may be less appreciative and gives few assurances but followers with low self-confidence will require high amount of support for the achievement of goals and objectives.
Different studies on leadership raised the question that if there is an optimum way for leaders to adjust their behavior with different followers simultaneously and thereby increase their likelihood of success?, then such leader should either consider followers’ intelligence; personality traits; values; preferences; or the technical competence. Hersey & Blanchard (1969, 1977, 1982, 1984, 2007) Situational Leadership Theory (SLT) tries to answer the above important leadership question.
### 2.7.2.1 Hersey and Blanchard’s Situational Theory

Hersey and Blanchard (2007) observed that for leader to be effective in every situation, the same subordinate should be treated differently as the situation changes. They further described that each style is effective in certain situations and appropriate style depends on the readiness level of followers. The four basic leadership styles are as follows:

- **S (1)** High task, low relationship – Telling style
- **S (2)** High task, high relationship – Selling style
- **S (3)** Low task, high relationship – Participating style
- **S (4)** Low task, low relationship – Delegating style
When followers are immature and are both unable and unwilling to take the responsibility for the completion of task, in such a situation the leader should use a telling style of leadership. Whereas, followers are mature and both willing and motivated to perform the task, the leader should use a selling leadership style. Incase follower are able but unwilling leader should use a participating leadership style. Finally, for the most mature followers who are both able and willing, delegating style of leadership is the best solution.

The follower maturity has two components i.e. job maturity and psychological maturity where Job maturity reflects a subordinate’s task-relevant skills and technical knowledge; and psychological maturity reflects a feeling of self-confidence and self-respect. Subordinate with a high level of maturity has the ability to do a particular task by displaying a high degree of self-confidence.
Heresy and Blanchard (2007) recognized that other situational variables such as expectations of the leader’s boss, the nature of the task, and time pressure are sometimes as important as followers’ maturity but excluded these other kinds of situational variables to have a more narrowly focused model of leader effectiveness.

To be effective and successful in a given situation, it is important for leader to diagnose the follower’s readiness and accordingly select a style that is appropriate for the readiness level of subordinates, such as their degree of education and skills, experience, self-confidence and work attitude (Daft, 2005).
Hersey and Blanchard’s model is simple to understand and is widely used as training tool but it is not strongly supported by scientific research and researchers have concluded that the self-assessment instrument used to measure leadership styles and follower readiness is also in accurate (Kinicki & Kreitner, 2007).

The contingency model is easier to understand because it focuses only on the characteristics of the followers and not those of larger situation but researchers such as Hellriegel & Slocum, (2007), Bratton, Grint & Nelson, (2005) Nelson & Quick, (2000), and others have highlighted limitations of the model such as:

- If each individual has a unique readiness level, then how does a leader address those different readiness levels in a team situation?
- This model focuses only on one contingency factor i.e. follower readiness, whereas other factors such as time and work pressures have been neglected.
- The model assumes that a leader can easily adopt his or her style to fit the situation, which is rarely the case.
- This model has no central hypothesis which might be tested to determine whether it is a valid and reliable theory of leadership.
- Last but not least this model lacks empirical support and also contains internal consistencies.

2.7.2.2 The Fiedler’s Contingency Theory

Fiedler believed that one’s leadership style is a reflection of one’s personality and is constant. His approach is different from the preceding models as it asserts that group efficiency depends on the leader’s psychological direction and on three related variables: group task structure; atmosphere, and leader’s position of power.

It is labeled as contingency model because it is founded on the premise that a leader’s effectiveness depends on the extent where the leader’s style matches the traits of the situation at hand (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2007; McShane & Tony, 2007).

Hoy and Miskel (2008) described three basic postulates of Fiedler’s model as:
- Leadership style is determined by the motivational system of the leader;
• Situational control is determined by group atmosphere, task structure, and position power.
• Group effectiveness is contingent on the leader’s style and control of the situation.

Daft (2007) quoted Fiedler (1965) saying three critical dimensions of the leadership situation relationship that help determine as which leadership style will be most effective in a certain situation: Leader-member relations or the task structure or the position power. He said, “I consider the leader-member relations, the most important dimension, and the position power the least important, of the three”. The favorable leadership situation will exist when the leader has a high degree of control and the results of this control are very predictable.

Research has provided mixed support to this model. Gray & Stark (1997) have criticized Fiedler’s theory in a number of ways, such as: meaning of some of the variables are not clear; the use of the LPC scores to differentiate task and human-relation-oriented leaders is an over simplification of the concept; effectiveness of middle LPC leaders has not been assessed; employee satisfaction has not been used as a criterion of leader effectiveness.
Schriesheim & Kerr (1977) say that LPC score is a “measure in search of meaning” while Ashour (1973) has refused to accept Fiedler’s model as theory since it does not explain how a leader’s LPC score does affect group performance.

Despite all the criticisms, it remains an important breakthrough in the study of leadership. An important indicator to measure the model is the amount of research; it has stirred to consider situational factors more seriously. Certainly, Fiedler has a realistic view of leadership and, as such, this theory is major contribution to the knowledge in the leadership area (Daft, 2007).

2.7.2.2.1 Fiedler’s Contingency Theory in Perspective

Though this theory has been criticized in a number of ways but to Luthans (2008), there are several areas where Fiedler’s model has made a contribution.

1. It was the first prominent theory that presented the concerned approach.
2. It put emphasis on the significance of both the situation and the leader’s qualities in establishing the effectiveness of leader.
3. It resulted in a great body of research, including tests of its predictions and attempts to improve on the model, and inspired the formation of substitute contingency theories.

2.7.2.3 Vroom-Jago Leadership Model

An important leadership question today is, “when a manager should take charge and control of the situation and when should he let the group make the decision themselves in order to effectively perform their work?” In 1973, Victor Vroom and Phillip Yetton published a decision making model to answer this question. It was revised and further expanded in 1988 by Vroom and Jago to: give greater consideration to the ranges that may exist in situational variables; clarify five leadership styles proposed in the earlier model; and further emphasizes on the time driven leadership style in relation to decision making situations. They assert that a leader must decide as what will be subordinates participation level in decision making process and to Griffin (2002) this model sets norms or standards for subordinates’ participation in decision-making process.

This model focuses on varying degrees of participative leadership, and how each level of participation influences the quality and accountability of decisions and has three
major components: leader participation style, a set of diagnostic questions and a series of decision rules. Similarly, a number of situational factors shape the likelihood that either a participative or autocratic approach will give the best outcome (Daft, 2005).

It is based on the premise that situational variables interact with personal attributes or characteristics of a leader and result in leader behavior that can affect organizational effectiveness. Further, the leader’s possible behaviors are contingent upon the interaction between questions and leader’s assessment of the situation while responding these questions (Yukl, 2006).

**Vroom–Jago Time-Driven Leadership Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Note: Dashed line (--) means not a factor.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 2.7.2.3.1 Leadership Styles

The Vroom-Yetton-Jago(VYJ) model not only helps leaders in determining the level and timing of employees’ participation in the process of decision making but also recognizes the benefits of authoritative, democratic and consultative styles of leadership behavior (Vroom, 2000; Vroom & Jago, 2007; Vroom & Yetton, 1973). The five forms of decision making are: the decide Style, where leader alone makes the decision; consult individually style, where leader presents the problem to each team members; consult team style, where all team members are taken onboard; facilitate style, where leader presents the problem to the team members in a meeting; and delegate style, where team members make
the decision within the prescribed limits. Thus key is the leader’s use of the decision method which is most appropriate in a given situation.

2.7.2.3.2 Situational Variables

How does a leader decide as to which of the five decision styles to use in given situation/circumstances? The Vroom-Jago time-driven leadership model has defined seven situational factors/contingency variables which need prior assessment by leader for choosing an appropriate leadership style and the appropriate degree of decision participation depends on a number of situational factors, such as: the required level of decision quality, the level of leader or subordinate expertise and importance of subordinate having commitment. Seven factors are useful for determining the appropriate degree of participation: importance of commitment; decision significance; leader expertise; team support for goals; likelihood of commitment; team competence and team expertise. The first three factors are concerned with quality and technical accuracy of the decision whereas; the last four factors are related to the team members’ acceptance of the decision.

2.7.2.3.3 Implications for Leaders

In order to choose the best leadership style for making a high quality and timely decision leader must have the ability to diagnose the situations correctly. Keeping in view demands of situation, he may take decisions himself/herself or delegate it to the subordinates.

Six separate studies conducted in three different countries concluded that if a manager uses the decision style recommended by Vroom in accordance with the given situation then the chances of that manager’s success are as likely twice in comparison to the manager who is not using the style recommended by this model. Further, higher level managers are more participative in decision making. Female managers use participation style more than male managers. Interestingly, all managers view themselves using high level of participation than their follower’s rate those (Lussier & Achua, 2007).

Empirical research has supported the model. Yukl (2006) points out that the original version of the VYJ model has been widely tested. Indeed it has received more scientific support than any other leadership theory. However, the model has been criticized for several
reasons. Hellriegel & Slocum (2007) criticized the model and pointed out following limitations of this model.

1. Most of the subordinates want to participate in decision-making process that directly affects their jobs, regardless of the recommendations by the model to use a certain style.

2. Certain competencies of a leader play key role in determining the relative effectiveness of the model which will lead to the selection of style that is different from the one, model proposes.

3. Model is based on the assumption that decisions involve a single process, whereas in general decisions go through several cycles.

2.7.3 Substitutes for Leadership

Are there situations when leadership becomes irrelevant? According to some scholars, yes, there are certain occasions when forces in a situation, offer subordinate sufficient assistance and they don’t have to rely on leaders for execution of a job (Kerr & Jermier, 1978; Podsakoff, et al, 1996). For example, individual’s ability, training, nature of goals, rigid and defined rules and procedures, cohesive groups and prior experience of the subordinates can result in effective performance.

The concept of substitutes for leadership was developed by Kerr and Jermier (1978) as existing leadership models failed to account for situations in which leadership is not needed. They believe that effective group performance depends on factors other than leadership; therefore, leadership should be merely taken as another independent variable that influences employee satisfaction and job performance. Leadership substitute model identifies conditions that limit the leader’s ability to influence subordinates or make that particular leadership style unnecessary. The employees with high self-leadership, set their own goals and reinforce their own behavior, maintain a positive thought processes and continuously monitor their own performance, thereby managing both personal motivation and abilities (McShane & Travaglione, 2007).
The substitutes are any or set of characteristics ensuring that subordinates clearly understand their role, know how to work, be motivated to perform effectively, and satisfied with their jobs (Yukl, 2008). Further, the greater the extent to which substitutes for leadership exist in a work setting, the lesser the influence of leader behavior upon subordinates attitudes and performance. Moreover, the concept of substitutes for leadership leads toward many of the same predictions, as does the path-goal theory concerning the situational requirements of effective leadership.

The research on leadership substitutes provides some support. Howell and Dorfman (1997) tested whether leader’s substitution can replace or “act in the place of” a specific leader, results partially supported the idea. Schriesheim & Kerr (1997) reviewed different studies on substitutes for leadership theory and concluded, “although research into leader substitutes has focused attention on situations in which leadership may be neutralized or even may not be needed, the theory is still relatively new and has received limited but encouraging support from subsequent studies”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defining Characteristics</th>
<th>Relationship-oriented Leadership</th>
<th>Task-oriented Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience/training</td>
<td>No effect on</td>
<td>Substitutes for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>Substitutes for</td>
<td>Neutralizes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifference to rewards</td>
<td>Neutralizes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly structured task</td>
<td>No effect on</td>
<td>Substitutes for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides its own feedback</td>
<td>Substitutes for</td>
<td>No effect on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsically satisfying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit formalized goals</td>
<td>No effect on</td>
<td>Substitutes for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid rules and procedures</td>
<td>No effect on</td>
<td>Substitutes for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesive work groups</td>
<td>Substitutes for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To conclude, researchers suggest that leadership can be thought in terms of a series of processes or functions that facilitate organizational and personal effectiveness. Whereas, these processes necessarily need not to be directed by a person in leadership position.

### Comparing the Universalistic and Contingency Approaches to Leadership
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#### 2.7.4 Modern Approaches to Leadership

Although the traditional leadership approaches provide an understanding to organizational change and effectiveness, but the large scale political, societal or organizational changes were not so formulaic. For example it is doubtful that Muhammad (PBUH), Jesus Christ, John of Arc, Vladimir Lenin, Adolf Hitler, Muhammad Ali Jinnah, Moa Zedong, Martin Luther, or Nelson Mandela followed some change formula or plan, yet these individuals changed fundamentals of their respective societies. All these leaders differ in a number of important ways but share one distinct characteristic: charisma.

In order to understand the reasons that lead followers to self-sacrifices and put leader’s vision and mission above their self-interest, in 1980’s researchers started their quest to find the answer. This new development in the field of leadership coincided with significant geopolitical, social and economic changes, higher levels of turbulence, uncertainty, and global competition. Organizations are facing global changes. It requires organizations to learn to do things differently, adopt or develop new technologies,
restructure work flow patterns and foster a high involvement and risk taking organizational climate which is impossible without a transformational and charismatic leadership.

2.7.4.1 Charismatic Leadership Theory

This theory has its roots in the traditional conception of leadership which postulated that the leaders, through their exceptional abilities, have the power to influence their followers in an extraordinary and profound manner. (House & Baetz, 1976, 1979 and Luthans, 2008).

Even though the conception of charisma has its roots in the theory and practice in ancient Greece, its subsidiary growth is accredited to House (1976), whose analysis of religious and political leaders suggests that leaders with Charisma are possess confidence in their associates, have self-confidence, have high expectations of their associates, know the use of personal example, and posses ideological vision.

Charismatic leaders appeal both to the heart and mind of their followers and create an emotional impact. They often emerge in trouble times, whether in society or in organizations, because a strong and inspiring personality can help to reduce stress and anxiety among followers and followers perform beyond the expectations. Charismatic leaders galvanize people to action through their own passion for the work (Daft, 2005; Luthans, 2008).
Charismatic Leadership Model
Robert House

2.7.4.2.1 **Charismatic Leader Behavior**

According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2004), a charismatic leader establishes a general future vision that is a practical, believable, smart future of the organization. To Bennis & Nanus (2003), a leadership expert, the “right” vision unleashes human potential, while, the wrong vision damages the organization. Whereas, second task of charismatic leader involves two key components:

I. Charismatic leaders set high performance expectations and standards

II. Charismatic leaders need to publically express confidence in followers’ ability to meet high performance expectations.
The third and final task of a charismatic leader is; to be a role model. Through their actions, charismatic leaders model the desired values, traits, believes and behaviors needed to realize the vision.

2.7.4.2.2 What Makes a Charismatic Leader?

Studies have identified no. of unique qualities of a charismatic leader. Conger (1999) proposed a four-stage model that illustrates how charisma evolves.

**STAGE ONE**
- Detecting unexploited opportunities and deficiencies in the present situations
- Sensitivity to constituents’ needs
- Formulating and idealized strategic vision

**STAGE TWO**
- Communicating the vision
- Articulating the status quo as unacceptable and the vision as the most attractive alternative
- Articulating motivation to lead followers

**STAGE THREE**
- Building trust through the technical expertise, personal risk taking, self-sacrifice and unconventional behavior

**STAGE FOUR**
- Demonstrating the means to achieve the vision through role modeling, empowerment and unconventional tactics

Fig # 2-6  **Stages in Charismatic Leadership**

Howieson (2008) believes that despite the attention, confidence in this approach is rapidly declining. A number of high profile corporate scandals and the tendency of charismatic leaders to quit organizations after making real changes, has highlighted that this (charismatic leadership way) may not be a sustainable way to lead. Many organizations and industries are seeking alternatives that develop quieter, less individualistic leadership (Mintzberg, 1999; and Badaracco, 2002).

2.7.4.2.3 The Consequences of Charisma

According to Ivancevich, Olekalns, and Matteson (2001) whether it is positive or negative, charisma can result in poor leadership. The very traits that make charismatic leaders influential also sometimes make them ineffectual. Further several problems may emerge from one or both types of charisma, such as:

I. The use of unconventional behaviors is just as likely to alienate, as to inspire potential followers, charismatic leaders therefore need to be aware of their
potential for creating enemies, especially those who wield organizational influence.

II. Since they focus on long-term goals, they tend to be poor in day to day matters and when things start going bad they become over controlling.

III. High self-confidence makes them blind to their flaws in their vision or the plans to attain that vision. So they are likely to ignore warnings from their followers and may fail to understand threats to their goals.

IV. As part of their impression management strategy, they are likely to pay credit for success and fail to acknowledge efforts of followers.

V. Charismatic leaders also fail to properly plan for future.

VI. Negative charisma also experiences difficulty in maintaining a harmonious working environment, reflecting the fact that their prime concern is for power rather than with goal achievement.

2.7.4.3 Transformational Leadership Theory

Transformational leadership theory is also referred as full-range theory of leadership. It is a relationship of mutual inspiration and elevation that converts followers into leaders and then may convert leaders into moral agents” (Burns, 2003). At the heart of this approach are the moral dimensions of leadership and an emphasis on leaders’ ability to motivate and empower his/her followers. Further, studies show that it is more displayed by female managers as compared to male managers.

The goal of transformational leadership is to ‘transform’ people and organizations, and to change their minds and hearts; enlarge their vision, insight and understanding; clarify purposes; make behavior congruent with beliefs, principles or values of the organization; and bring about changes that are permanent and lasting, self-perpetuating and momentum building” (Burns, 2003; Bass, 2008)
2.7.4.3.1 How Transformations Take Place

Dubrin (2008) says that transformational leadership focuses on what the leader accomplishes rather than on leaders’ personal characteristics and his/her relationship with group members. Leaders are entrusted with transforming organizations and inculcate a culture of high performance and lead out the organization from a crisis mode. To accomplish these purposes, they attempt to overhaul organizational culture and subcultures.

**THE LEADER**

1. Raises people’s awareness
2. Helps people look beyond self-interest
3. Helps people search for self-fulfillment
4. Helps people understand need for change
5. Invests managers with sense of change
6. Is committed to greatness
7. Adopts a long-range, broad...
2.7.4.3.2 Transformational Behavior

There is consensus among the researchers that there are common behaviors between charismatic and transformational leaders. Both; charismatic and transformational leaders require an ability to initiate change and challenge the status quo, recognize opportunities for the organization as well as for others, take risks and encourage others to do the same. Further, Transformational leaders require an ability to effectively inspire a shared vision and they must be able to model the way—that is, set the example of commitment to shared vision and values (Lussier and Achua, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Components</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation and articulation of Vision</td>
<td>Leader behavior that is centered at looking for new chances for the organization, with an emphasis on formulation, articulation and inspiration for followers with better future vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Modeling</td>
<td>Being a Model for the employees to inculcate values of the organization among them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering a “buy in” of team goals</td>
<td>To encourage the employees and building team work among followers and committed to achieve common objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High performance expectations</td>
<td>The leader conveys his expectations from the followers, which results in enhanced performance from them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized leader-member exchange</td>
<td>Behavior that shows the leader trust, respects and has confidence in every follower. It deals with their personal needs, not merely the needs of the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Leader’s behavior that motivates the followers to reflect out of the box and examine their previous methods and manners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Bass and his colleagues (2008) have used Burns’s notion of transformational leadership to describe the behavior of industrial leaders rather than political leaders. Further,
Landy and Conte (2005) and Bass (2008) proposed that transformational leaders typically use one of four general strategies such as: *Idealized influence*, through displaying conviction, trust, taking stands on difficult issues, showing commitment to purpose, and awareness of the ethical consequences of their decisions; *inspirational motivations*, by articulating and appealing vision of the future, challenging followers with high standards, talking optimistically & enthusiastically and encouraging; *intellectual stimulations*, by questioning old assumptions, values and believes; stimulating new ways of doing things and encouraging expression of ideas and reasons and; *individualized consideration* through dealing with others as individuals, considering individual needs, abilities, and aspirations, listening attentively and advising, coaching and teaching.

### 2.7.4.3.3 Implications for Leaders

According to Hellriegel and Slocum (2007), faced with increasing turbulence in their environment, organizations need transformational leadership more than ever before and at all levels of hierarchy. The need for leaders with a vision, confidence and determination irrespective of the size of the organization or team, is increasing rapidly.

Such leaders are needed to motivate others to assert themselves, to join enthusiastically in team efforts and to have positive feelings about what they are doing. Leaders need to understand, appreciate and support employees who are willing to take unpopular decisions, who know when to reject traditional ways of doing something and who can accept reasonable risks. A “right to fail” must be nurtured and inculcated as an integral part of an organization’s culture.

Further, transformational leadership fosters synergy by finding new alternatives and solutions that are better than their individual efforts. The greatest opportunity occurs when people don’t see the things the same way i.e. differences present opportunities.
Model of Transformational Leadership

Ahmad (2002) says from the perspective of Islam, the leadership acts in a down to earth manner and provides chances to the group and assists them. The job of the leader is to bring out the best from those he is leading in order to transform the society and accomplish the mission (Bangash, 2000).

This characteristic was best demonstrated by the Holy Prophet Muhammad (SAW), who transformed the Bedouin society in Arabia. He brought the people from darkness/Jahilliyyah (age of ignorance), into the world of light, peace and freedom. He inspired and motivated his followers to reject the established order and struggle to establish the Islamic state (Schwarz, 2002).

The Prophet Muhammad (SAW) and the subsequent Caliphs (RA) were aware of the importance of the delegation process as a way of empowering their followers. They were also aware of matching the demands of the assignments to the level of development of the companions.
For example, Abu Dher Al Ghafari (RA) (the most decent, honest and righteous companion of the prophet), once asked the Prophet Muhammad (SAW) to be a leader in one of the Islamic Province but the Prophet refused saying, that you have a weak personality (and I like for you what I like for myself) and you cannot be leader in a group of two and you can not be a responsible for the orphan’s money (An-Nawawi, 1999).

2.7.4.4 Transactional Leadership

It is based on the principle that there occurs an exchange or transaction process between the leader and his followers. In this process the Leader recognizes followers’ desires and needs and then explains how these needs will be fulfilled in order to achieve the shared objectives in an organization. The leader has to take care of followers’ esteem needs and self-concept in order to help them identify the needs and what needs to be done (Ivancevich et al, 2001; Daft, 2005).

Transactional leadership is ‘managing’- where leader manages to achieve organizational objectives through employees by associating performance in job to incentive and ensuring that they have the required reserves necessary to perform the task effectively and efficiently (McShane and Travaglione, 2007).

The contingency and behavioral theorists adopt the transactional perspective as they focus on leader’s behavior that further improves employee performance and satisfaction. Whereas, transformational leadership is all about ‘leading’ and managing through changing organizational strategies and cultures in order to let them have a competitive advantage.

To be not only effective but also to gain a competitive advantage in turbulent times an organization needs both transactional and transformational leadership because transactional leadership improves organizational efficiency, whereas transformational leadership steers company onto a better course of action.
2.7.4.4.1 Transactional Behaviors

Research shows that with the use of contingent reinforcement, not only productivity increases but level of job satisfaction also increases. Management by exception is displayed in two forms, either; active, in which leader closely monitors subordinate activities and intervene before a problem occurs; or passive, in which the leader intervenes after a problem has occurred.
Comparison of Transactional and Transformational Theories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transactional</th>
<th>Transformational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical emphasis</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>Executives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closed system</td>
<td>Open system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader’s type of power</td>
<td>Legitimate, reward, punishment</td>
<td>Expert, referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower motivation</td>
<td>Self-interest and immediate needs</td>
<td>Group interests and organizational success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating conditions</td>
<td>Stable, refinement of functioning systems</td>
<td>Unstable, need for change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance expectations</td>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>Exceptional performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader behaviors</td>
<td>Monitoring, operational planning, clarifying roles, etc.</td>
<td>Strategic planning, vision articulation, networking, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7.4.5 Servant Leadership Theory

Transformational leader and Servant leader have a commonality as both emphasize on the moral and ethical dimensions of leadership and there is a common difference as well because the servant leader follows his/her path out of a desire/choice to serve others rather than out of a desire to lead. In servant theory of leadership, the servant-leader is “servant first” with true natural feelings. In other words, the basic difference between two concepts is of first desire, servant leader’s first desire is to serve whereas; transformational leader’s first choice is to lead.

Greenleaf (2002) has summarized attributes of servant leaders that they:

I. Listen first so that they may understand the situation.
II. Develop their intuition and the ability to “foresee the unforeseeable”
III. Lead by persuasion, forging change by “convincement rather than coercion”
IV. Conceptualize the reforms they see and lift others to see the possibilities also
V. Empower by creating opportunities and alternatives for those being served
VI. Empathy for the others
VII. Healing infected wounds humanity
VIII. Foresight to the other end
IX. Commitment to the growth of people

X. Building community and stewardship

Model for Servant-leadership

1. teachable;
2. concern for others;
3. controlled discipline;
4. seeking what is right and good for the organization;
5. showing mercy in beliefs and actions with all people;
6. focusing on the purpose of the organization and on the well-being of the followers; and
7. creating and sustaining peace in the organization – not a lack of conflict, but a place where peace grows.


Servant leaders possess: the self-awareness to recognize that their own healing is the source of motivation; the understanding that the search for wholeness is something they share and finally as a change agent, they recognize that the first step to changing the world is, changing oneself (Shriberg, Shriberg & Lloyd, 2002).

As a specific leadership concept, servant leadership continues to create a quiet revolution in the work place and individuals. It has made a radical departure from the industrial paradigm, where a leader was as an all-knowing, all-powerful hero, to the leader who is “servant first”. Further, he is true reflection of values such as cooperation, care, love, diligence, interpersonal relations, perfectionism, hard work, efficiency, ethics, principles, virtues, morality, spirituality, and authenticity (Rode, 2006; Greenleaf, 2002; Fairholm, 2000).
The servant-leadership approach advocates that leader should serve those who work under him/her by helping them to reach maximum effectiveness. Further, the more a servant leader moves higher in the organizational hierarchy, the more he is to serve (Rush, 2002).

Leadership is part of Islamic personality. The Holy Prophet Muhammad (SAW) said, “Each of you is a leader, and each of you will be held responsible for his leadership” Islamic leadership is both guardianship and service oriented. Chowdbury, (2001) says that the servant leader approach and the leader as a servant has been part of Islam since its beginning, 1400 years ago. Allah says, “Indeed, This brotherhood of yours is a single brotherhood and I am your Lord and Cherisher: therefore, serve Me!” (Al-Quran, 21:92).

One of the main principles, which Prophet Muhammad (SAW) taught to the Muslims, is the principle of leadership through service, when he said, “A ruler who has been entrusted with the affairs of the Muslims, but makes no endeavor for their material and moral uplift and is not sincerely concerned for their welfare, will not enter Paradise with them” (Al-Bukhari, 1997).

The Prophet Muhammad (SAW) also said, “Indeed, from amongst the servants of Allah, there are servants who are not prophets, who the prophets and mortals will envoy. The Prophet Muhammad (SAW) then was asked’ “who are they, so that we may love them?” The Prophet Muhammad (SAW) replied, “They are the people who love each other due to Allah’s light, not because of relationship or kinship. They do not fear when the people fear, nor do they grieve when the people grieve” (Al-Tabri, 1987).

Leadership from Islamic perspective, is not just about managing changes; but more importantly, to manage life as a whole with full realization of what is permanent and unchangeable. Leadership is trust (amanah) and with this comes responsibility and accountability.

The Prophet Muhammad (SAW) said, “The leader of the nation is their servant” (Daylami, 1987).
The true spirit of administration in Islam was captured by Umar (RA), the second caliph, as he was quoted saying, “I have appointed over you governors and agents not to beat your bodies or take your money, but rather to teach you and serve you” (Abdel-Hadi, 1970).

The Khalifah (vicegerent, deputy and successor) is another term that connotes meaning of service, agency, stewardship, trusteeship and vicegerency. Khalifah is developing and handling resources on the behalf of real owner (Atari, 2000; Bangash, 2000).

Prophet Muhammad (SAW) said, “All of you are guardians and responsible for your wards. The ruler is a guardian, the man is guardian of his family; the lady is a guardian and responsible for her husband, husband’s house and his off-springs; and so all of you are guardians and responsible for your wards (Al Bukhari, 1997).

Katzenbach and Smith (1993) believe that leader, instead of being a director, should act as a catalyst. They further propose that the leader should listen more than speak; provide opportunities to others to lead instead of leading only; work for others instead of expecting others to work for him; become a match maker instead; and seek a shared understanding of the subject instead of developing consensus.

At present, there is an increasing awareness regarding the importance of social relations in the leadership contract, where a leader is given authority by the followers but each individual himself/herself is the ideal leader in all circumstances. This school of thought in leadership is referred as informal, emergent, dispersed, or distributed leadership. This approach advocates a less formalized model of leadership and proposes that individuals at all levels and in all the roles can exert leadership influence over their colleagues and thus influence the overall direction of the organization (Howieson, 2008).

As in social sciences nothing is concrete rather relative, even the meaning of any word/concept or approach change from person to person, location to location and culture to culture based on knowledge, experience, grooming, traditions and history etc, so a single theory of leadership is neither successful in all situations nor explains all the circumstance; rather each theory has both strengths and weaknesses and its acceptance is primarily
dependent upon individual believes and experiences, demands etc., such as: trait approach can be to select a leader; the behavior approach as what to do in different situations; the situational approach adjust himself/herself keeping in view the nature of task and subordinates; the transformational approach in the times of change and turbulence; Whereas, servant as an alternative way of conceiving the leadership process, the manner in which it occur and the associated values and ethics.

2.8 Path-Goal Theory of Leadership

The situational leadership approach is based on the premise that the type of required leadership depends on the situation an organization is faced with, and contingency approaches to leadership attempt to present the conditions or situational variables that ‘moderate’ relationship between leader behavior and effectiveness.

House’s Path-goal (1971) discusses the interaction of leader behaviors with situational characteristics in determining the leader’s effectiveness; thus making his/her behavior contingent on certain aspects of the situation. In a sense, the theory tries to elucidate the effect of leader behavior on the satisfaction, performance, and motivation of the followers. Thus, it has three features, i.e. motivation, followers and situation, and the incentives to fulfill the needs of the followers. The re-enforcement of change in the subordinate by the leader is a prominent aspect of path-goal leadership (Howieson, 2008).

Bass (2008) believes that path-goal theory tries to elucidate the reason behind the working of contingent rewards and how these rewards effect the subordinates’ satisfaction and motivation. In its earliest version, this theory focused on the leaders’ need to point out the pathway for accomplishing an effort which becomes successful. They accomplish this by “increasing personal payoffs to subordinates for work-goal attainment, and making the path to these pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction in route” (House, 1971).

Path-goal theory asserts that the leader has to exhibit different behaviors to reach different goals, depending on the aspects of situation. House and Dessler (1974) describe the theory, “…..leader behavior will be viewed as acceptable to subordinates to the extent that the subordinates see such behavior as either an immediate source of satisfaction or as an instrumental to future satisfaction.”.
Georgopoulos et al (1957) and Evans (1970) believe that the successful leader shows the follower: rewards (goals) available to him/her; and behaviors (paths) following which he can get those rewards. Further, leader clarifies the goals to the followers as well as paths to those goals. This clarification of both: goals; and paths, enhances the psychological state of the follower and motivates him/her to increase the efforts to perform well and enable him/her to achieve the valued extrinsic rewards such as recommendations for pay increases, contingent on the subordinate’s performance.

House (1996) said, “the essence of the theory is the meta proposition that for leaders to be effective, need to engage in behaviors that complement subordinates’ environments and abilities in a manner that compensates for deficiencies and is instrumental to subordinates satisfaction and individual and work unit performance,”.

Path-goal theory has several assumptions based on the works of House (1971), House & Dessler (1974), and House and Mitchell (1974). These prepositions form the foundation of path-goal theory and include:

1. Subordinates will accept a superior’s behavior if it is an immediate source of satisfaction or instrumental to future satisfaction (House and Mitchell, 1974).
2. A superior’s behavior may increase effort when it makes satisfaction of a subordinate’s needs contingent upon effective performance and/or when it complements the work environment through coaching, guidance, support, and rewards necessary for effective performance (House and Mitchell, 1974).

3. One of a superior’s strategic functions is to enhance a subordinate’s psychological state in such a way that it would result in an increase in motivation to perform and job satisfaction (House and Mitchell, 1974).

4. The particular leader behavior that will enhance motivation is determined by his situation (House and Dessler, 1974).

5. The individual is goal directed and rational (House, 1971).

6. An individual will choose a behavior which is seen as leading to attainment of goals with a valued outcome (House, 1971).

7. A superior’s behavior will satisfy and motivate a subordinate if it increases goal attainment and clarifies the paths to these goals (House, 1971).

8. There is no leadership trait or behavior that is strong enough to be effective in all situations (House & Mitchell, 1974).

9. Role clarity is necessary for task accomplishment.

10. Highly structured tasks are less satisfying than unstructured tasks.

11. Higher level jobs entail less role clarity than do lower level job (House & Deshler, 1974).

The Path-goal theory states that a leader must be able to manifest four different styles of behavior which have been derived from previous research on work behavior and are:

**Directive:** when leader provides specific guidelines to subordinates on how they have to perform their tasks. Further, leader sets standards of performance and provides explicit expectations of performance.

**Supportive:** when the leader demonstrates concern for subordinate well-being and is supportive to individuals.

**Participative:** when leader solicits ideas and suggestions from subordinates and invites their participation in decisions that directly affect them.

**Achievement oriented:** when leader sets challenging goals, emphasizes improvements in work performance, and encourages high levels of goals attainments. (Muchinsky, 2006):
Effective leader’ needs the ability to display these four styles of leader behavior because each produces different results. When to use which style further depends on two types of the situational factors: subordinate characteristics and; environmental characteristics. Leader can influence subordinate’s perception of the job by: removing obstacles from the paths to the desired goals; rewarding them for attaining their goals; and helping them clarify paths to valued goals.

House and Mitchell (1974) say that the leadership style of an individual varies with changing organizational situations. In other words, as a leader faces different problems or circumstances in the organization, he/she adjusts his or her leadership style accordingly. The path-goal theory exists as another means of relating different styles of leadership behavior to differing attitudes and behavioral responses of subordinates.
Fig: 2-7  Causal Relationship in Path-Goal Theory of Leadership
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Fig: 2-9  Causal Relationship for Effects of Supportive Leadership on Subordinate Efforts
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Leaders can affect a subordinate’s performance, motivation and satisfaction in several ways, such as: by clarifying the subordinate’s role as what is expected from him/her; linking rewards to the subordinate satisfactory performance; and increasing the size and value of the rewards (Yukl, 2006).

Further, leader provides support to the follower in the attainment of goals through: alleviating boredom and frustration of work; and fostering the follower’s expectations that his or her efforts will lead to the successful completion of the task. House and Mitchell (1974) recognized that a leader only complements what is missing in the environment, the task, and the competence and the motivation of the subordinate. Thus, the subordinate’s productivity is enhanced if the leader provides needed structure to clarify means and ends if they are missing or unclear to the subordinate. Bass (2008) says the productivity of subordinates increases considerably, once they are convinced that it is an easy “path” in attaining personal goals.
In the words of Wren & Bedeian (2009), a leader’s task contains two elements: a path element designed to influence Expectancy I and; a goal element intended to influence Expectancy II.

1. **Path element.** A leader must clarify and facilitate paths that will enable subordinates to achieve their own goals while simultaneously achieving organization goals.

2. **Goal element.** A leader must emphasize the relationship between subordinates’ goals and organizational goals by increasing the number and kinds of rewards subordinates receive for work-goal attainment.

The path-goal theory proposes that leader behavior will be motivational to the extent that it helps subordinates cope with environmental uncertainties. Gibson (2008) asserts, “A leader who is able to reduce the uncertainties of the job is considered to be a motivator because he/she increases the subordinates’ expectations that their effort will lead to desirable rewards”.

Like Fiedler’s contingency theory of leadership, the path-goal theory does not specify one best way to lead. It rather stresses that to be effective; a leader should select the style most appropriate to a particular situation. Path-goal theory holds that, depending on subordinate characteristics, each of the four types of leader behavior will be used by an effective leader in different situations.
Under this theory, the style a leader uses demonstrates the situation, so leader must be flexible and adopt the style that is required. For example, if subordinates lack confidence in their ability to do the job, they may need more consideration and support. If the leader finds him in a situation in which subordinates are unclear about what to do or how to do it, he or she should provide structured situations. Leader structuring may be essential to provide the task information needed to do the job, thus increasing a worker’s confidence that a high level of effort will accomplish something rather than result in a waste of energy and time.

Dessler (2000) stated that "in highly structured situations (such as might be found on an assembly line), a leader’s additional attempts to structure the situation by closely supervising it or giving instructions, could backfire and reduce both morale and performance." House’s theory predicts that the consideration displayed by the leader is most important when the work itself is uninteresting, tedious, or irksome: “if you’ve got a lousy job, you don’t want a lousy boss also”

Path-Goal Situations and Preferred Leader Behaviors

- **Situation**: Followers lack self-confidence
  - **Leader Behavior**: Supportive Leadership
  - **Impact on Follower**: Increases confidence to achieve work outcomes
  - **Outcome**: Increased effort, improved satisfaction and performance

- **Situation**: Ambiguous job
  - **Leader Behavior**: Directive Leadership
  - **Impact on Follower**: Clarifies path to reward
  - **Outcome**: Increased effort, improved satisfaction and performance

- **Situation**: Lack of job challenge
  - **Leader Behavior**: Achievement-Oriented Leadership
  - **Impact on Follower**: Set and strive for high goals
  - **Outcome**: Increased effort, improved satisfaction and performance

- **Situation**: Incorrect reward
  - **Leader Behavior**: Participative Leadership
  - **Impact on Follower**: Clarifies followers’ needs to change rewards
  - **Outcome**: Increased effort, improved satisfaction and performance

Fig # 2-11  Path Goal relationship by Swenson
2.8.1 Origin of Path-Goal Theory

The Path-goal theory of leadership is widely recognized contingency approach to leadership. The concepts and terminologies used in Path-goal had already been used by Georgopoulos et al. (1957) at University of Michigan’s Institute of Social Research, before it was developed and published as a theory by House. Evans (1970) and House (1971), who wrote separately on the subject, are usually accredited for the current development in the theory.

Path-goal theory of leadership is based on Vroom’s expectancy theory of motivation with its concepts of expectancy, outcomes, valence and instrumentality. House (1996) says, “The theory was stimulated by Evan’s paper (1970) in which the relationship between the Ohio State measures of leader consideration and leader initiating structure and follower perception of path-goal relationship (instrumentality and expectations) were assessed.” In 1971, House formulated a more elaborated version of the theory that included situational variables as well. The theory has been further refined and extended over the years (House 1996; House and Dessler 1974; House and Mitchell 1974).

House & Michel (1974) write that the earlier studies on the subject suggest that the strategic functions of a leader consist of:

1. Understanding and stimulating subordinates’ needs for outcomes which are to some extent under the rulers’ control
2. Enhancing followers’ incentives in order to motivate them for attainment of goals
3. Helping the followers to step forward in order to achieve those incentives
4. Making the followers understand what is expected of them
5. Finally, the leader should reduce those barriers which create frustrations and enhance chances that effective performance results in personal satisfaction.

2.8.2 Theoretical Background

Instrumental and socio-emotional (or expressive) leadership behaviors were the two behavioral aspects of leadership during the 1950s as well as 1960s. These are similar to Leadership Initiating Structure (LIS) and Leadership Consideration (LC) respectively where LIS informs about the extent to which a leader initiates a psychological structure with subordinates by: handing over particular assignments; defining work modus operandi;
explaining expectation and arrangement of the work. Whereas, LC informs us about the extent to which he develops an encouraging atmosphere by: being gracious and easy to talk to; taking care of the private wellbeing of the group; doing little things for the followers and; giving advance notice of change (Howieson, 2008).

Filley, House & Kerr (1976) established a positive relationship between considerate leaders and employees job satisfaction while, relationship between LIS and satisfaction of subordinates was very mixed. Further studies showed that both unskilled and semi-skilled employees will be resented by LIS. In Juxta position, employees in large groups either preferred initiating structure or had smaller disliking in comparison to employees in smaller groups (Hemphill, 1950; and Vroom & Mann, 1960).

In essence, path-goal theory of leadership was advanced to attempt and to reconcile and to integrate these conflicting results of previous studies.

There are quite a few accounts of expectancy theory, but all explain work motivation in terms of a rational choice process where worker decides the level of effort for the job, at a given point in time (Bass 2008).

Vroom (2000) holds that people will have intrinsic motivation to perform a task and to accomplish a given objective only when they have a firm belief that the goal should be accomplished and if they find means for accomplishing that particular goal. In other words, motivation is product of the anticipated worth that an individual places on a goal and the possibility in achieving that goal.

### 2.8.3 Scope of Path-Goal Theory

The Path-goal theory examines the way properly chosen leaders have an effect on the motivation, satisfaction and performance of followers. It is a dyadic theory of leadership (theory based on the notion that a leader develops a unique relationship with each subordinates or group members), which determines how a leader behaves towards his team members and in return how the members of group respond to the leader, also called individualized leadership. In other words, it does not address the effect of leaders on group or work units but rather the effects of supervisors on subordinates (Daft, 2005).
In marriage with prevalent paradigm of leadership, path-goal leadership is primarily a theory of task and person oriented supervisory behavior. Similarly, it does not concern the leadership of entire organization, rather leadership that affects several levels of managers and or subordinates in the organization. In the initial version of the theory, House (1971) asserts,

“The motivational function of the leader consists of increasing personal payoff to subordinate for work goal attainment and making the path to these payoffs easier to travel by clarifying it (the path), reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en-route.”

Therefore, underlying notion of path-goal theory is that individual with authority i.e. superiors will provide the necessary cognitive clarification and ensure that subordinates have an environment to accomplish the stipulated objectives and experience inner contentment and get heroic rewards for the attainment of the stipulated goals and objectives.

Hence, in line with the definition provided by Katz and Kahn’s (1978), the role of the leader is to offer the requisite functional help and capital, which is in addition to the formal organizational and or environmental, in order to make sure that follower’s contentment as well as performance emerge as natural corollaries. According to path-goal therefore, leaders are necessary to perform the role of being instrumental to the satisfaction and performance of the followers.

2.8.4 Path-Goal Theory of Leadership- a Classic

Why path-goal theory has generated so much interest? Davis (1971) answers the question that it is not important as how interesting and non-interesting theories differ from each other rather the theories denying certain assumptions of their audiences are considered interesting theories and vice versa.

To Jermier (1996), the path-goal theory (Filley, House & Kerr, 1976) has denied at least four assumptions of its audiences. Despite a number of attempts by researchers to identify variety of leader behaviors (e.g. Stogdill, Wherry, & Jaynes, 1956), it was the first
theory that persuasively identified manifold behaviors of a leader. Path-goal theory identified 4 theoretically divergent behaviors of the leader, thus refuting what was preconceived notions regarding the exclusivity and predominance of task and relationship oriented leader behaviors.

Secondly, this theory postulated that leadership is a more than a group experience. Leaders were believed to have different impact on the individual motivation of subordinates by having an effect on valence and expectation. Similarly, they had an impact on the satisfaction levels of the individual followers thus denying preconceived notions of the consistency and uniformity of group leadership and opened the field to consider individualized approaches to managerial leadership.

Thirdly, the theory stepped up the interest in contingency approaches in organizational behavior research by indicating more complicated groupings of variables which moderate the impacts of leader’s behavior. Not only did it reject the restrictions of one best way thinking but also examined how combinations of situational variables moderate the effects of leader behavior.

Fourthly, it leads the foundation for consideration of such a situation where leaders’ behaviors had either scarce or no impact. The theory postulated that leader’s behaviors would induce motivation among the followers in such a way that these complement the task environment, thus putting a question mark on the predominance of the preconceived assumptions that behavior of the leader will necessarily have significant impacts. The idea gained momentum, as reflected in the work of Calder (1977), Pfeiffer (1977), Kerr & Jermier (1978), Meindl, Erlich & Dukerich (1985) and others.

Following Davis (1971), one may argue that attention toward path-goal was increased as a result of these refutations and ironically; it’s denying the importance of leader behaviors in certain situations.

Moreover, Davis (1986) gives a number of contentious albeit discerning notions regarding the understanding of the social theories’ reputations. He says,
“To become a classic, then, it is not enough for a social theory to be merely true; it must also be seductive”.

Another mark of the classical theory is that it develops specialists who devote all their research potential in explaining and expanding the inner complications of the structure. Judged on this premise, path-goal has several complicated and delicate characteristics that activate the imagination of a specialist. Wofford and Liska (1993) pinpointed 120 researches which had been carried out to investigate the hypotheses of this theory.

According to Jermier (1996), though this theory is not too multifaceted for description of the two-fold leadership processes but is quite complicated for conventional field study methods. There is a need for complex theories in order to map the increasing complexities of the organizations which are always on the increase. Further, this theory merits extraordinary attention in the field of organizational behavior as it aroused the scholars’ attention to thinking in a more stylish manners regarding the process of leadership.

What has made path-goal theory- a classic? After even four decades of serious assessment, it remains as the most significant conjecture of twofold management in leadership field. Every related book reviews it and cites instances of studies undertaken in this regard. As of Google Scholar’s Search conducted on 10th May 2009, House (1971) has been cited 1,114 times since it was published. Further, its central assertions have earned substantiation time and again by researchers.

Despite the fact that a few claims of the theory have been substantiated, the dominant view among the researchers is that it has not been tested in an adequate manner and current research evidence is not enough to draw final conclusions in this regard. (Bass, 2008; Wofford & Liska, 1993; Yukl, 2006).

2.8.5 Empirical Support

The path-goal has generated considerable empirical support and a brief review of these studies is:
2.8.5.1 Supportive Leadership:

It was hypothesized that supportive leadership will positively affect subordinate satisfaction, performing stressful and frustrating or dissatisfying tasks. This hypothesis was tested in 10 samples of employees (House & Dessler, 1974), only one of these studies denied positive relationship (Luthans, 2008).

2.8.5.2 Directive Leadership:

It was hypothesized that directive leadership is positively correlated with the approval and expectations of the followers when they are performing unclear jobs and is negatively correlated when engaged in clear tasks. In other words, when tasks are ambiguous or organizational procedures, rules and policies are not clear, a leader directive behavior compliments the tasks by providing the necessary guidance and psychological structure for subordinates and when tasks are clear to subordinates, leader directiveness becomes counterproductive. Studies of seven organizations have confirmed the hypothesized equation (Luthans, 2008).

2.8.5.3 Participative Leadership:

It was hypothesized when subordinates are highly ego-involved and the decisions or demand of the task are unclear, the leader will be required to have participative leadership skill in order to positively affect the subordinates’ motivation and satisfaction, regardless of the fact whether the follower is predisposed toward self-discipline, totalitarianism or need for independence; and Similarly, when the followers are not ego-centric and demand of the tasks is unambiguous, the subordinate that are lenient and independent and are self-controlled will have a favorable response to the participation of the leaders whereas those that have a contradictory personality will respond in a less favorable manner.

In a major study in a manufacturing organization, it was found that in non-repetitive, ego involving tasks, employees were more satisfied under participative leaders than under non-participative leaders (Luthans, 2008).

2.8.5.4 Achievement Orientation Leadership:

It was hypothesized that achievement-oriented leadership will cause subordinates to strive for higher standards of performance and to have more confidence in their ability to meet challenging goals.
In three separate organizations, it was found that for employees performing ambiguous, non-repetitive tasks, the higher the achievement orientation of the leader, the more associates were confident that their efforts would pay off an effective performance (Luthans, 2008).

### 2.8.6 Path-Goal Theory as an Exchange Theory of Leadership

Howieson (2008); and Bass (2008) believe that path-goal theory is an exchange theory of leadership because it attempts to explain why and how contingent rewards influence the motivation and satisfaction of the subordinates. The leader enhances, subordinate motivation, satisfaction and performance by clarifying and enhancing path instrumentalities (Yukl, 2006).

Leaders can clarify the subordinate’s role by letting know what he/she is expected to do; linking rewards to his/her satisfactory performance and can increase the size and value of reward. In addition, specific leadership behaviors which contribute to the follower’s attainment of goals are: providing support to the performer; alleviating boredom and frustration with work, especially in time of stress; coaching; providing direction; and fostering the follower’s expectations that his/her efforts lead to the successful completion of the task (Fiedler & House, 1988).

### 2.8.7 Predictions of Path-Goal Theory

Path-goal theory holds that, depending on subordinate characteristics, each of the four types of leader behavior will be used by an effective leader in different situations.

#### 2.8.7.1 Effect of Directive Leadership

Directive leadership will increase subordinate satisfaction when there is role ambiguity, which is likely to take place when the task is unstructured; either little or no formalization; and subordinates are inexperienced in doing the task. Further, role ambiguity causes subordinates to have a low expectancy of being able to perform their tasks effectively, even after putting maximum efforts. In other words, since subordinates do not exactly know what is expected of them, they are pessimistic about doing their work effectively (Nissa, 2003).
Directive leadership behavior that clarifies each subordinate’s role is likely to increase the effort-performance expectancy and thereby increasing subordinate efforts (Yukl, 2006).

2.8.7.2 Effects of Participative Leadership

Participative leadership is supposed to increase subordinate effort in the situation where subordinates have an unstructured task. While participating in decision making about task subordinates learn more about the task and their expected role thereby, role clarity will be increased and subordinates will have higher effort-performance expectancy.

Mitchell’s (1974) study findings suggest that internals are more satisfied with a participative leadership style and externals are more satisfied with a directive style as shown in the figure 2-12.

![Interaction Between Followers’ Locus of Control and Leader Behavior in Decision Making](image)

Internal LOC followers who believed outcomes were a result of their own decisions were more satisfied with participative than directive leaders; External locus of control followers were more satisfied with directive leaders.


Fig # 2-12 Locus of Control: Supervision and Work satisfaction
2.8.7.3 Effects of Achievement-Oriented Leadership

House and Mitchell (1974) proposed that achievement-oriented leadership would create more confidence in subordinates about their ability to achieve challenging goals. According to expectancy theory, leader who sets challenging goals and shows confidence in subordinate ability to attain the goals will increase the effort-performance expectancy of subordinates. To House and Mitchell, this relationship will only occur in the situation where subordinates have ambiguous and non repetitive tasks (“unstructured tasks”). Whereas, in situations where subordinates have repetitive and highly structured tasks, achievement-oriented leadership will have little or no effect on subordinate expectancies or effort (Yukl, 1981).

2.8.8 Path-Goal Theory- A Plethora of Variables

Path-goal theory, which meant to settle right the earlier contradictory findings with regard to the task-oriented and the person oriented behavior of the leader, identified quite a lot of associations between earlier theories and their impacts.

When theory was tested empirically it produced mix results. Wofford & Liska (1993) carried out a meta-analysis of one hundred and twenty tests of this theory's hypotheses; which suggested that there was a significant support for this theory. Recently reviewers have concluded that this theory has not been adequately tested. This is perhaps because of its complexity that specifies four leader behaviors, five situational and follower moderators, five intervening variables (followers expectancies and valences), and two dependent variables (followers satisfaction and performance).
2.8.8.1 Contingencies of Path-Goal Theory

Following are the contingencies of this theory

2.8.8.1.1 Causal variables

In the initial formulation of path-goal theory, House (1971) attempted to reconcile the inconsistent findings of leadership research regarding Consideration and Initiating Structure. While in revision; House and Dessler (1974), described leader behavior in terms of three categories and later on included fourth. Further, as a contingency theory, path-goal theory states that each of the four leadership behaviors will be effective in some situations and not in others.

**Directive leader** tells subordinates as what is expected of them by clarifying performance goals, the means to reach those goals, and the standards against which performance will be judged (McShane & Glinow, 2006). This behavior is identical to initiating structure.

**Supportive leader** treats subordinates as equals. The leader has friendly relationships and shows concern for the well-being and needs of subordinates. He is approachable and exhibits trust, consults subordinates and considers their views in decision making. He creates a friendly climate in the work unit.

Supportive leader will offer a wide range of rewards to subordinates, not limiting to pay increase and or promotion, but also encouragement, pats on the back, and respect.

Schriesheim (1997) believes supportive leaders can affect the behavior of subordinates in two ways: making the job more enjoyable by creating a friendly, open work environment, which leads to the intrinsic reward; and reducing stress and boosting their belief that work will lead to performance. Supportive leadership will be most effective when the task is relatively routine and simple. This behavior is essentially identical to consideration.

**Participative leader** consults subordinates on work related matters and uses their suggestions, opinions and ideas in reaching a decision.
House (1996) stated that

“Participative leader behavior is …… directed toward encouragement of subordinate influence on decision making, consulting with subordinates and taking their opinions and suggestions into account when making decisions.”

**Achievement-oriented leader** sets challenging goals, expects subordinates to perform at the highest level, and continually seeks improvement in performance. The leader not only expects high levels of productivity from subordinates but also displays confidence that subordinates can achieve these high levels.

In short it is all about setting challenging goals, seeking performance improvements, emphasizing excellence in performance, and showing confidence that subordinates will attain high standards.

The path-goal model contends that effective leaders are capable of selecting the most appropriate behavioral style (s) for that situation. Leaders might simultaneously use more than one style at a time such as; they might be both supportive and participative in a specific situation.

### 2.8.8.1.2 Situational Variables

The situational variables in path-goal theory are:

1. **Subordinate’ personal characteristics**’. The subordinate characteristics that are considered important include: subordinate’s needs (need for achievement, affiliation, autonomy) and; subordinate’s personality traits (locus of control).
2. Characteristics of employees work environment, which shape an employee’s perceptions about achieving goals and include; the task structure, the extent to which the job is mechanized, and the degree of formalization imposed by the organization for the subordinate’s job ( job description, standard procedures, and performance standard) and the nature of the work group.
2.8.8.1.3 Perceived Ability

It is the perception of subordinate of his or her own ability to accomplish an assigned task, which is a vital influence on his or her behavior and performance at work. Ability further comprises of the experience or practice gained from prior task performance. Ability is defined as an outcome of aptitude and learning. It reflects person’s potential for performance.

Path-goal theory hypothesizes that the perception of the subordinate’s ability to accomplish an assigned task is very important. Subordinate with high perception ability will prefer participative and achievement oriented leader, on contrary with subordinate with low perception about his abilities will feel more satisfied under the supervision of directive leader.

2.8.8.1.4 Need for Achievement

Need for achievement means how important is it for the individual to progress upward in the organizational hierarchy? House (1996) says that the need for achievement characterizes an individual’s motivation or drive of an accomplishment; which is through his/her own efforts. Subordinates who want independence and prefer self control have high need for autonomy is not satisfied by close supervision and his performance level falls when strictly directed.

The theory hypothesizes that the subordinates with high need for autonomy and self control will prefer achievement oriented leader behavior and will be less satisfied under directive leader.

Need for achievement is a stable and learned characteristic in which satisfaction is obtained by striving for and attaining a level of excellence (Feldman, 1999). It has long been recognized significantly affecting individuals’ performance in certain roles.

Individuals with high need for achievement carefully calculate their goals and set them at levels that maximize their sense of achievement rather than the quantity of work achieved. In other words, they believe more in quality than in quantity.
Further, individuals with high need for achievement seek immediate and concrete feedback on the progress towards goal achievement. Similarly, they choose independent tasks. Managers and other individuals with high need to achieve tended to be successful in their chosen vocations.

Subordinate need for achievement has received little research attention. According to House and Dessler (1974) subordinates with high need for achievement will be more satisfied with directive leader behavior because it clarifies path-goal relationships (House & Dessler, 1974). It is predicted that supportive leader behavior will enhance subordinate job satisfaction when subordinates have low achievement needs.

2.8.8.1.4 Locus of Control

Locus of control refers to the perceived location or source of influence over our behavior. This factor represents beliefs about causes and effects in one’s life.

When the locus (location) of influence (control) over outcomes is within one’s own behaviors such a person is termed an internal (McShane & Glinow, 2005), on contrary person who believes that the locus of influence over outcomes is outside one’s control or that events are incapable of being affected by one’s behavior, Such a person is classified as having an external locus of control and is termed as external.

Thus, internal locus of control is the degree to which individuals are controlled by their internal motives, habits, and values, rather than by external forces and believe that individual effort and competence are the major factors leading to promotion in an organization and thus inclined to work harder. Further, Internals believe that they can affect events and outcomes while, externals feel powerless and unable to influence events no matter what they do and believe that outside forces such as fate, luck, or chance exert a very strong influence on their fortunes. An external views the world as unpredictable and believes destiny is determined by circumstances beyond direct personal control.

Locus of control (LOC), internal or external, has been widely studied since the mid-1960s as a personal antecedent or consequence to a leader’s and to a manager’s behavior.
2.8.8.2.1 Environmental Characteristics

The environmental variables comprise of those aspects which are not within the control of the followers; but play a significant role in the contentment and the capability to carry it out efficiently. These include: work group, formal system of the authority of the organization, and the tasks.

2.8.8.2.2 Task Structure

The extent to which the nature and requirements of the task are specified is called task Structure. House and Dessler (1974) have defined it as the extent to which a task, job, work assignment, execution of rules and/or procedures is simple, repetitive, and unambiguous. A task with low structure is an ambiguous and poorly defined task. According to House and Dessler’s (1974) “Structure” refers to the extent to which role relations are loosely or tightly arranged. “Task structure” also refers to the extent to which what needs to be done is specified and certain.

According to Herbert (1992) task structure depends on:

- Goal clarity: The extent to which task requirements are known to the member.
- Goal-path multiplicity: The extent that there are alternative ways to accomplish the task.
- Decision Verifiability: The extent to which task accomplishment can be evaluated by objective, logical or feedback means.
- Decision Specificity: The extent to which the task has but one correct outcome or several equally good results.

Task structure is one of the variables that have probably received the most research attention of all the environmental variables. Path-goal hypotheses containing the moderating variables task structure are generated in the literature according to leader behavior. Directive leader behavior is one of the most frequently examined leader behaviors. It is often examined in terms of how it affects subordinate job satisfaction when moderated by task structure. The purpose of directive leader behavior is to provide task information and role clarify and therefore, it should have a positive effect on subordinate expectancies, satisfaction, and performance when the task is complex, ambiguous, varied, pressured, or requires interdependence (House, 1971). When the ways to perform the task are routine and simple, subordinates will regard any further clarification by the leader as unnecessarily
close supervision. The close supervision of instrumental leadership may increase performance by preventing “goofing off,” but it also can decrease job satisfaction. Workers are likely to view it as redundant, excessive, and directed at keeping them working on unsatisfying tasks, on the other hand, when the tasks are non routine and complex, an instrumental leadership style is appropriate. It helps subordinates to perform the task.

Leader should adopt directive behavior when the task is non-routine because this minimizes role ambiguity that tends to occur in these complex work situations. Considerate leadership behavior (or supportive, achievement-oriented leadership) was expected to correlate more highly with satisfaction and productivity in structured than in unstructured tasks. The initiation of structure was expected to correlate more highly with satisfaction and productivity in unstructured than in structured situations.

House and Dessler’s (1974) study supported this theory. They found that the initiation of structure (directive leader behavior) was found to negatively correlate with job satisfaction under highly structured tasks. According to path-goal theory, supportive leader behavior will positively affect the followers’ satisfaction for those followers that work on highly ordered, stressful, frustrating or dissatisfying tasks (House and Mitchell, 1974).

It is hypothesized that participative leader behavior positively impact the subsidiary outcomes when the task is unstructured, varied or complex because it reduces ambiguity (House and Mitchell, 1974). It is also predicted that achievement oriented leader behavior will enhance subordinates’ expectancy that their effort will result ineffective performance (expectancy I) when the task is non-routine.

Studies conducted by House, (1971), Dessler, (1973), House & Dessler, (1974), found support for the hypothesized effect for task structure on directive behavior. House, (1971), House & Dessler, (1974), Schuler, (1974), found support for task structure on participative leader behavior. In conclusion, there appears to be mixed findings among researchers as to the acceptance of identified path-goal hypotheses regarding specific leader behavior to job satisfaction when moderated by the variable task structure.
2.8.8.2.3 Role Ambiguity

Role ambiguity refers to the degree of uncertainty an employee has about the work role. It is certainty about duties, authority, and allocation of time, relationships with others, guides, directives, policies etc.

Role ambiguity is a function of discrepancy between the information available to a position occupant and that which is necessary for the adequate performance of role. It is associated with a lack of clarity regarding a worker’s rights, responsibilities, work methods, goals, or accountability.

Every position in an organizational structure has a specified set of tasks or position responsibilities called job description that defines what his/her authority to decide, what he is expected to accomplish, and how he will be judged.

Further, it increases the probability that a person will be dissatisfied with his role, will experience anxiety, will distort reality, and will thus perform less effectively (Rizzo & House, 1970).

It is hypothesized that directive leader behavior reduces role ambiguity and increases satisfaction with the work and leader on contrary when there is role clarity, (subordinates know what to do and how to do it), then directive leader behavior will lower subordinates satisfaction, especially when subordinates perceive close, direct supervision to be an unnecessary imposition of leader control (Yukl, 2006).

House & Rizzo (1970) constructed a questionnaire entitled “Role ambiguity and Role Conflict Scale” to measure correlation with other variables, the scales tended to correlate (1) negatively with measures of need fulfillment, (2) more strongly with leader behaviors indicative of direct as opposed to indirect interactions with subordinates, (3) weakly, but positively, with anxiety and propensity to leave the organization.
2.8.2.3 Stress

Stress is an adoptive response to a situation that is perceived challenging or threatening to persons’ well-being (McShane & Travaglione, 2007). To Kreitner & Kinicki (2007), the stress response is a complex emotion that produces physiological challenges to prepare us for ‘fight or flight’ to defend ourselves against the threat or flee from it. There are three inter-related dimensions of stress: Environmental demands referred to as stressors produce; an adoptive response that is further influenced by individual differences. It is an intangible term used to describe countless other terms such as tension, under the weather, depression, frustration, worn and anxiety out etc.

Antoniou & Cooper (2005) quoted noted that both positive and negative events can trigger identical stress response and can be both beneficial and harmful. The stress that is positive or produces a positive outcome is called eustress. They further noted that: Stress is not merely nervous tension rather it can have positive consequences; similarly, it is not something to be avoided rather its complete absence is death thus making it inevitable. So, efforts need to be directed at managing stress and not escaping it.

According to Muchinsky (2006), psychological responses to stress at work most typically involve affective variables, with job dissatisfaction being the most common. Job stress is associated with increases in negative emotions and moods associated with anger, irritation, annoyance, and intolerance. Chronic stress is also associated with decrements in self-confidence and feelings of personal worth. Kats de Vries et al (2001) proposed that work induced stress can produce a condition whereby individual feels very little or total absence of pleasure. There is a feeling of emotional numbness, and to individuals with this feeling Kats refers as “organizational sleep walkers”.
The physiological response of stress results in high blood pressure; cholesterol level; biochemical levels (like uric acid) and; gastrointestinal conditions (like ulcers) and possible reasons for these physiological irregularities may be role conflict, the pace of work, and work load.

The symptoms of behavioral work stress are: changes in job behavior such as substance abuse at work; flight from job such as absence and turnover; antisocial work behavior such as theft and purposeful damage); antisocial off work behavior such as spouse and child abuse; and self abusive behavior such as drug use and gambling.
Researches show that organizations are paying high cost of work generated stress.

The definitions by various authors are summarized in the table below:

**Table # 2-3: Definition of Job Stress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition of Job Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Seley</td>
<td>Stress means uncertain reaction of the body to demand, and also basic demand from internal or external environment, or reaction result against threat of balance condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Stress is the consequence that an individual’s ability or skills fail to coordinate with the job or the job environment cannot satisfy the individual demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Kroes</td>
<td>Stress is improper occupational pressure or burden which badly affects the psychological and physical condition of the worker himself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Beehr &amp; Newman</td>
<td>Stress is the change that drives the worker from normal psychological and physical condition.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8.8.2.4  A Model of Stress

Figure # 16 presents an instructive model of stress given by Kreitner & Kinicki (2004). The model shows that initially individual appraises four types of stresses. The appraisal then motivates an individual to choose a coping strategy to manage stressors, which in turn produces a variety of outcomes. The model also specifies several individual differences that moderate the stress process.

**Individual Level**
- Job demands
- Work overload
- Under load, and monotony
- Role conflict
- Role ambiguity
- Job security

**Psychological/Attitudinal**
- Job satisfaction
- Organizational commitment
- Job involvement
- Self-esteem
- Burnout
- Emotions
- Depression

**Group level**
- Group dynamics
- Managerial behavior
- Harassment

**Cognitive Appraisal**
- Primary
- Secondary

**Coping Strategies**
- Control
- Escape
- Symptom management

**Organizational Level**
- Culture
- Structure
- Technology
- Introduction of change in work conditions

**Moderators**
- Social Support
- Hardiness
- Type A behavior

**Organizational Level**
- Culture
- Structure
- Technology
- Introduction of change in work conditions

**Cognitive**
- Poor decision making
- Lack of concentration
- Forgetfulness

**Extra organizational**
- Family
- Socioeconomic status
- Commuting time
- Noise, heat, crowding, and air pollution

**Physical Stress**
- Cardiovascular System
- Immune System
- Musculoskeletal system
- Gastrointestinal system

Figure#2- 13  A model of occupational Stress
Stress is body’s general response to any intense physical, emotional, or mental demand placed on it by oneself or others such as: racing to meet a deadline, dealing with a difficult person, or earning a poor grade (Kaplan, 1993).

Sutherland and Cooper (2000) believe that occupational stress is not a new phenomenon; rather it remained there since a long time. Further, they have developed a list of eight most stressful occupations such as: doctors, nurses, social workers, middle managers, the police force etc.

Stress is generally regarded negative and threatening but it can also be stimulating to challenge and change and healthy by improving performance. Successful management of stress depends on the ability to recognize various positions, individual staff occupies on the stress and performance curve and respond accordingly.

It is not necessary that only internal factors induce negative stress on employee rather external environmental factors such as role ambiguity, work over load, bullying by boss, strict time lines, working conditions, relationship with colleagues, lack of resources have high potential of inducing negative stress and have been identified repeatedly by researchers (Kelly, 2000).

Further, there are numerous manifestations of stress. Ward & Abbey (2005) have identified a large no. of stress symptoms including but not limited to: depression, anxiety, frustration, apathy, insomnia, hypertension, absenteeism, cynicism, pessimism, forgetfulness, fearfulness, social withdrawal, bad temper, headache, high blood pressure, gastric, nervous breakdown, deterioration in work performance, loss of confidence, confused thinking, twitching of the eyes, incapable of concentration, excessive smoking, inability to cope. Uncertainty and ambiguity are also potential sources of stress, which are outcome of complexity.
Path-goal theory asserts that when subordinates tasks or work behavior will lead to increase subordinate effort and satisfaction by enhancing leader subordinate relationships on a self confidence, by lowering stress and anxiety through compensating for unpleasant aspects of the work.

When tasks are intrinsically satisfying or environmental conditions are not stressful; in such conditions supportive leader behavior would have little effect on follower satisfaction, motivation or performance.

In this research, stress being studied at two levels: subordinates affecting subordinates out comes and; leader affecting decision-making.
2.8.8.2.5 Consequences of Stress

A study of 118 occupational groups, concluded that employees with high demanding job but low work lives control were likely to suffer heart attacks twice than employees of comparable age (40-54) having less demanding job (Hammar, Alfredsson & Theorell, 1994).

Further, studies show that non-work stressors can equally affect attitudes and behaviors of employees at work. Robles & Kiecolt (2003) quoted Frankenhaeuser (1988) who examined differences in the biochemical levels of working men and women and found that disease-producing biochemical for working men dropped when they arrived home after work. Whereas for working women, it did not decrease until the household chores were also completed.
2.8.8.2.6 Empirical Studies

Studies on work stress have found evidence of relationship between stress and leadership.

Yukl (2006) quoted Fleishman (1964) who found that considerate leader behavior has negative relation with the job stress, whereas between initiating structure and job stress, is positive relationship. Fleishman & Harris (1962) studied influence of different leadership behaviors on turnover rate and found that considerate behavior was negatively related while initiating structure was positively related with subordinates’ turnover.

2.8.8.3 Subordinates’ Outcomes

Why do people leave their job? Researchers report that people stay if they are satisfied with their jobs and are committed to their organizations. Satisfaction with one’s manager is one factor of job satisfaction. Poor leaders drive the employees to quit. Thus job dissatisfaction progresses into employee turnover. Unmotivated employees are usually not satisfied with their jobs. A survey in America found that 77% of workers are not satisfied with their jobs (Lussier & Achua, 2007).

2.9 Motivation

Motivation is a basic psychological process. It concerns the conditions responsible for a variation in intensity, quality and direction of ongoing behavior (Landy & Conte, 2005).

According to Howieson (2008) most theories of motivation are developed from the ‘need-drive-incentive sequence’: the basic process involves needs, which set drives in motion to accomplish them. Drives, or motives, may be classified into primary, general and secondary categories:

- The primary motives are unlearned and physiologically based such as thirst, hunger, avoidance of pain, gender and material concerns.
- The general (or stimulus) motives are also unlearned but are not physiologically based such as curiosity, manipulation, activity and affection.
- Secondary motives are learned such as the needs for power, for achievement, affiliation, security and status.
Motivation is of two kinds based on source i.e. extrinsic and intrinsic. Extrinsic motives are the visible consequences and external to the individual (e.g. money) while, Intrinsic motives are internal to the individual, and are self induced to learn, achieve or on some ways to ‘better oneself’.

The Motivational Process: An Initial Model

2.9.1 Job Performance Model of Motivation

Terence Mitchell (1997), proposed a broad conceptual model that explains how motivation influences job performance and behaviors. It also identifies the causes and consequences of motivation.

The two categories of factors i.e. job context and individual inputs influence each other as well as motivation process of arousal, direction and persistence.
FIGURE # 2-14  A Job Performance Model of Motivation

2.9.2 Theories of Work Motivation

When the theories are focused specifically on work motivation, there are several popular approaches: content theories, process theories and contemporary theories.

2.9.2.1 Content Theories

The content theories aim to find out the ways in which people are motivated to work. The theories concern the identification of motives that instigate followers to work and the prioritization of the drives and motives. These are concerned with the types of
encouragements and objectives, which the people endeavor to accomplish so as to be content, and exhibit appropriate performance (Luthans, 2008).

The Maslow (hierarchy of needs), Herzberg (two factors theory) and Alderfer (existence, relatedness and growth) models attempt to identify specific content factors in the employee (in the case of Maslow & Alderfer) or in the job environment (in the case of Herzberg) that are motivating.

Although the content approach has surface-logic, is easy to understand and can be readily translated into practice but research shows that it has limitations. On the other hand, the content model puts emphasis on important content factors, which would affect hitherto ignored by the human relationists (Howieson, 2008).

2.9.2.2 Process Theories

The process theories are more concerned with the cognitive antecedents that go into motivation or effort, and more importantly, with way they relate to each other (Luthans, 2008). Process models are used to describe and analyze how personal factors (internal to the
(person) interact and influence each other to produce certain kinds of behaviors (Hellriegel, et al, 2007). For example, individuals exert more efforts to obtain rewards that satisfy important needs than to obtain rewards that do not. The four best known models of motivation are expectancy, reinforcement, equity and goal setting. These theories provide a more robust theoretical explanation of work motivation.

2.9.2.3 Contemporary Theories of Work Motivation

Although it is recognized that work motivation theories are generally categorized into content and process approaches, equity and organizational justice theories have also emerged and are receiving research attention.

Equity theory has received more recent attention in the field of organizational behavior and its roots can be traced back to cognitive dissonance theory and exchange theory. It can be extended into what is commonly known as procedural justice.

Equity theory explains condition under which decision outcomes (e.g. pay levels, pay raises and promotions) are perceived as being fair or unfair. Persons engaged in this type of thinking examine the results as opposed to how those results were achieved.

Equity theory is based on distributive justice which is an individual’s cognitive evaluation whether or not the amounts and allocations of rewards in social setting are unfair.

Inequity crops up due to a person’s perception that his/her incentives in comparison with others are less.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person’s outcomes</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>other’s outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person’s inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td>other’s inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person’s outcomes</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>other’s outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person’s inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td>other’s inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person’s outcomes</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>other’s outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person’s inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td>other’s inputs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9.3 Expectancy Theory of Work Motivation

Expectancy theory (Georgopoulous, Mahoney & Jones, 1957; Vroom, 1964; & Howieson, 2008) is explains the leader’s manner of satisfying the followers in way that he decides about the amount of effort he should spend for the job at a given point of time.

According to expectancy theory, motivation depends on a person’s belief that performance emerges from effort (expectancy 1) and rewards are the ultimate end of the performance. These rewards are valued (expectancy II). It is the probability that winning accomplishment of task leads to attractive results. An outcome’s perceived ability is called ‘expectancy’, while “valence” is the attractiveness of each outcome (Vroom 2005)

Theory may be stated as.

\[ \text{Force} = \text{valence} \times \text{expectancy} \]

Where force is the strength of a person’s motivation, valence is the strength of an individual’s preference for an outcome, and expectancy is the probability that a particular action will lead to a desired outcome.

How many expectancies and valences for different persons and levels of efforts combine to determine a person’s motivation is still a matter of speculation and controversy. However, if subordinates believe that valued outcomes can be attained only by making
serious efforts and they believe such an effort will succeed, then they will make the effort (Howieson, 2008).

The effect of the behavior of a leader is to adapt these perceptions and beliefs. In general, the central thrust of expectancy theory of motivation is that an individual will be engaged in specific behaviors because of his/her expectations resulting in specific outcome with resultant valence (i.e. personal utilities or satisfaction from this outcome).

Expectancy theory is now a leading explanation for employee behavior such turnover, joining a new organization, career choice, performance, and leadership effectiveness.

House, (1970) says that in keeping with expectancy motivation theory, leaders should increase the personal rewards subordinates receive for attaining goals and make the path to these goals easier to follow, for instance, by clarifying it and reducing roadblocks and pitfalls.

A more detailed discussion of expectancy theory is beyond the scope of this research. This brief description was intended merely to acquaint the reader with the
motivational concepts used as the foundations of the path-goal theory of leadership because path-goal theory is rooted in the expectancy theory of motivation.

2.10 Relationship between Expectancy Theory of Motivation and Path Goal Leadership

Expectancy Theory of motivation was used by House (1971) in his path-goal theory and broken down into parts that have specific relevance for leadership using the concept of path instrumentality introduced by Evans (1970).

An individual makes probability estimates with respect to behavior with its outcomes, and subjectively places values on these outcomes. The magnitude of these probability estimates indicates the degree of path instrumentality of his/her behavior for work-goal accomplishment and valence. This can be expressed in the following formula (Howieson, 2008).

\[ M = IV_b + P_1 (IV_a + \sum (P_2iEV_i)) \]

Where:
- \( M \) = motivation to work.
- \( IV_b \) = Intrinsic valence associated with goal-directed behavior.
- \( P_1 \) = Path instrumentality of behavior for work-goal attainment.
- \( IV_a \) = Intrinsic valences associated with work-goal accomplishments.
- \( P_{2i} \) = Path instrumentalities of work-goals for extrinsic valences.
- \( EV_i \) = extrinsic valences associated with work-goal accomplishments

In work situations individual estimates the path instrumentality, \( P_1 \), of his/her behavior for the accomplishment of some work goals and factors such as the ability to behave in an appropriate and effective manner; the barriers to work-goal accomplishment; and the support received from others to accomplish the work goal.

In addition, the individual estimates the path instrumentality, \( P_2 \), of the work-goal attainment having valence. Further, he/she also considers and places subjective values on
the intrinsic valence associated with work goal, IV\textsubscript{b}, the intrinsic valence associated the achievement of work goal, IV\textsubscript{a}, and the extrinsic valence associated with the personal outcomes that he/she accrues as a result of achievement in the work goal, EV\textsubscript{i}.

The behavior of the leader is relevant to all of the independent variables in this formulation as he determines what extrinsic reward should be associated with work-goal accomplishment, EV\textsubscript{i}.

Further, the leader through interaction with subordinate can increase the path instrumentality concerning the rewards as a result of work-goal accomplishment, P\textsubscript{2}.

Thirdly, the leader, through his/her own behavior can provide support for the subordinate’s effort and thereby influence the probability that this effort will result in work-goal achievement, which is P\textsubscript{1}.

Fourthly, the leader influences the intrinsic valences associated with goal accomplishment, I\textsubscript{va}, by delegating task to subordinates, to determine the amount of subordinate influence in goal setting and amount of control allowed in the task-directed effort.

Finally, the leader can increase the net intrinsic valences associated with goal-directed behavior, IV\textsubscript{b}, by reducing frustrating barriers, being supportive in times of stress, permitting involvement in a wide variety of tasks, and being considerate of subordinate’s needs.

2.11 Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction refers to the overall feelings one has and the evaluation one makes about one’s job. Job satisfaction represents a person’s evaluation of his/her job in work context. It is an appraisal of the perceived job characteristics, work environment and emotional experiences at work (McShane and Glinow, 2006).

Locke (2002) defined job satisfaction as ‘... a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences’. It includes both one’s affective reactions to one’s job (feelings) and one’s cognitive evaluation of the job (thoughts). This
dual aspect creates challenges in aligning the definition and its measurement. Job satisfaction is often expressed in affective terms, but only its cognitive aspects are measured. In other words, it is really a collection of attitudes about specific facets of the job. Johnson (2008) believes that it should no longer be acceptable to define job satisfaction in one way (affectively) and blindly measure it another (cognitively). One researcher has defined job satisfaction as the pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences.

Hulin & Judge (2003) asserted that an employ’s effective reaction to a job is based on a comparison of the actual outcomes derived from the job with those outcomes that are deserved or expected. Davis (2004) added that feelings of job satisfaction can change with time and circumstances. People differ in what is important to them, and this may also change for the same person.

Dessler (2000) believes that a happy worker is a better worker and what makes a worker happy has attracted the attention of the researchers. Not only this, rather interestingly, the effectiveness of organizations is being measured through satisfaction of its stakeholders since the 1960s. Job satisfaction is a person’s attitude toward the job which is manifested through cognition (beliefs or knowledge), emotions (feeling, sentiments, or evaluations), and behavioral tendencies. Thus it is referred that highly satisfied employee has positive attitude towards work and vice versa.

Several theoretical frameworks have been developed to explain job satisfaction, but there is not a single model that fully explains this complex concept. Researchers (Carmeli & Freund, 2004; Hull, 2004; Thompson, 2002) have credited various factors such as achievement, recognition, compensation, and promotion, as influencers to job satisfaction. Whereas researchers such as Applebaum et al. (2003), believes that leadership style is another factor that has a large impact on job satisfaction.

Many studies (Carmeli & Freund, 2004; Judge & Ilies, 2004) have found relationship between job satisfaction and work-related constructs such as performance, attrition, absenteeism, and work commitment, and personality and mood.
Studies investigating the relationship between leaders’ behavior and employees’ job satisfaction have produced mixed results but found that some leadership styles correlate to job satisfaction more than other styles (Yousef, 2000).

According to Wofford (2003), there are more than 3,000 articles and studies that deal with job satisfaction, and several theoretical frameworks that explain job satisfaction. He found that there are several different definitions for job satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlson, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1962); Scarpello and Vandenberg (1992)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction might be the extent to which the individual’s expectations concerning work have been fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vroom (1964)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is based on an employees’ evaluation of whether they get what they want from a job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1964)</td>
<td>The Minnesota Theory of Work Adjustment defines job satisfaction in terms of the relationship between reinforcers in the work environment and a person’s needs. The closer the relationship between the reinforcers and the person’s needs, the higher the level of job satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herzber (1968)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is based on a human relations theory, which posits that employees develop positive job attitudes if their jobs allow them to fulfill their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke (1976)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction refers to employees’ affective relations to their work role and is a function of the perceived relationship between what one wants from one’s job and what one perceives it is offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrich and Lake (1991)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is a positive emotional state produced from a person’s experience associated with his or her job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallebarg (1977); Spector (1997)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is conceptualized as an affective response to the job situation and can be defined as how much an employee likes her/his work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiesmann, Alexander, and Chase</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the degree of positive affect toward the overall job or its components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke, Russell, and Price</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is defined as an individual’s general attitude towards one’s job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarpello (1992)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction can be conceptualized as the disparity between what the employee desires or wants from a job and what he or she actually receives from the work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeLeon and Taher (1996)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is a function of its intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, and employees’ needs, expectations, and characteristics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm and Mathaisel (2000)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the difference between perception of work and expectations about and importance of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson and Johnson (2000)</td>
<td>Job satisfaction is the employees’ response to the conditions of workplace.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. From A study of worker demographics and workplace job satisfaction for employees in a global engineering and construction organization by T.D. Wofford,( 2003).

2.11.1 Dimensions of Job Satisfaction

There are three generally established aspects of job satisfaction, such as: it is an emotional response to a job situation which cannot be watched; it can, rather, be deduced. Secondly, it is determined by how well outcomes meet or exceed expectation, for example, employees feel that they are working much harder than others in the department but are receiving fewer rewards; thus having a negative attitude towards their work, boss and/or coworkers. On contrary, if they are being treated very well and are being paid equitably, they are likely to have positive attitude; thirdly, it represents several related attitudes.

A substantial portion of the research conducted on job satisfaction over the years has been devoted to explaining what exactly determines employees’ levels of job satisfaction and five job dimensions have been identified to represent the most important characteristics of a job about which employees have affective responses. These are: The work itself, the
extent to which the job provides interesting tasks, opportunities for learning, and the chance to accept responsibility; *Pay*, financial remuneration that is received and the degree to which this is viewed as equitable *vis-à-vis* that of others in the organization; *Promotion opportunities*, the chances for advancement in the organization; *Supervision*, the abilities of the supervisor to provide technical assistance and behavioral support and; *Coworkers*, the degree to which fellow workers are technically proficient and socially supportive.

### Determinants of Job Satisfaction

1. The work itself
2. Pay
3. Growth and upward mobility
4. Supervision
5. Coworkers
6. Attitude toward work

#### 2.11.1.2 Situational Factors that Influence Job Satisfaction

By far the greatest attention has been given to situational influences on job satisfaction. We can’t understand the phenomenon of job satisfaction in isolation rather; we have to remember that employees bring many needs to their job and want to have these satisfied. These, then, include needs for health, security, and pay, and a number of higher-level “growth” needs like the needs to achieve, to be recognized, and to self-actualize (Dessler, 2000). The satisfaction of these needs largely depends on situational factors. For example, the nature of the work, will determine whether the job can satisfy the worker’s needs for achievement and self-actualization, company policy will tell whether the person’s
need for food, shelter, and security are satisfied and workgroup will determine if his or her affiliation need is met. Situational factors like these therefore all have a direct bearing on employee satisfaction.

An early theory of situational influences was Frederick Herzberg’s two-factor theory, which proposed that intrinsic job factors such as the work itself (motivators) caused satisfaction, whereas extrinsic “hygiene” factors external to the job (e.g., pay) caused dissatisfaction. On the face, this theory is appealing, but has not stood the test of time as; both types of factors contribute to both job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction.

There are three general approaches towards job satisfaction: Job characteristics, Social information processing, and Dispositional approaches but the job characteristics model is more enduring theory that focuses on situational causes of job satisfaction and proposes that certain intrinsically motivating features of a job lead to job satisfaction as well as other positive work outcomes. Job characteristic model focuses on five work characteristics: Task identity, Task significance, Skill variety, Autonomy and Feedback.

Furthermore, the empirical research strongly supports the idea that characteristics of the job and the job situation are healthy predictors of employees’ levels of job satisfaction (e.g., Ellickson, 2002)
2.11.1.3 Tools for Measuring Job Satisfaction

How employees feel about their jobs is highly variable and depends upon the feelings about their jobs as well as about selected dimension or facets of jobs, such as supervisor, coworkers, promotional opportunities, pay and so on.

Organizations measure job satisfaction for a variety of reasons, such as to measure employee reactions to a new policy or organizational intervention; identify those aspects of the job with which employees are dissatisfied and or to predict other important attitudes or behaviors (e.g., job turnover). In all instances, a useful measure is important.

The typical methods of measuring job satisfaction employ questionnaires and a number of standardized attitude scales have been developed. While selecting any tool for the measurement of employee job satisfaction, it is important that these measures are reliable (i.e., levels of job satisfaction that are in fact consistent over time demonstrate similar satisfaction scores), valid (i.e., the measure provides a pure measure of job satisfaction), discriminating (i.e., the measure of job satisfaction is equally sensitive to low and high reported levels), and comparable (i.e., the measure allows you to compare job satisfaction scores across groups).

Landy and Conte (2005) explained that overall job satisfaction can be determined by “mathematically combining scores based on satisfaction with specific important aspects of work or a single overall evaluative rating of the job.

Although a large number of measures of job satisfaction are available but choice of measure depends in part on purpose. Some instruments are very popular and widely used by the researchers, such as:

**Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS)** measures job characteristics and also includes a five-item measure of overall job satisfaction. The items of the measure include positively worded statements (e.g., “Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with this job”) as well as reverse scored items (e.g., “I frequently think about quitting this job”).

The items are scored on a seven-point scales ranging from *disagree strongly to agree strongly*. It is easy to administer and has been found to provide a good assessment of
overall job satisfaction. However, two items focus on quitting, a related but different concept.

Therefore, it may not be a pure measure of job satisfaction.

**Job Description Index (JDI)** was first published in 1969 and revised in 1985 and 1992, is commonly cited as the most carefully developed and most frequently used measure of job satisfaction. It measures five facets of job satisfaction: satisfaction with the work itself, pay, promotion, supervision, co-workers. It is very easy to administer and has been accurately measuring employee satisfaction.

The scale includes a total of 72 adjectives or short phrases, and respondents are asked to mark a “Y” (Yes, it describes my job), an “N” (No, it does not describe my job), or “?” (Cannot decide). In practice, there are at least nine, and usually more, adjectives for each of five job satisfaction categories.

A third job satisfaction measure that has enjoyed widespread acceptance is the **Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)** and was developed by Weiss et al. (1967). It consists of 100 items designed to measure the 20 facets of work. There is also a short form of the MSQ, consisting of 20 items does not provide facet satisfaction scores.

The items consist of statements about various facets of the job, and the respondent is asked to indicate his or her level of satisfaction with each.

One common drawback to the above measures is their failure to take into account the relative importance of each facet of job satisfaction. For example, “pay satisfaction” may be more important to some employees than “satisfaction with supervision”.

Porter in his measure, **The Porter Questionnaire**, defines satisfaction as the difference between responses to a “how much is there now” item and a “how much should there be” item. For each item, the researcher then subtracts the employee’s response to the question “How much is there now?” from his response to the question “How much should there be?” and thus derives what is actually a measure of the deficiency in need fulfillment, or dissatisfaction.
Recent research has introduced another component to job attitudes: emotions (Lord, Klimoski, & Kanfer, 2002). Moods and emotions play an undeniable role in how we feel about life, including work.

Fisher & Ashkanasy (2000) proposed that even though moods are not controllable but organizations can be more successful in elevating employees’ moods than in raising their overall level of job satisfaction. They concluded that “the study of emotions in the work place has the potential to add an understanding of behaviors in organizations”.

Muchinsky (2006) drawing upon the research of Lazarous & Lazarous (1994) identified five categories of emotions which are (or can be) manifested in the work place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive</td>
<td>Happiness, Love, Pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negative</td>
<td>Sadness, Hopelessness, Despair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Existential</td>
<td>Anxiety, Guilt, Shame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. “Nasty”</td>
<td>Anger, Envy, Jealousy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Empathetic</td>
<td>Gratitude, Compassion, Sympathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, a number of valid measures exist to measure overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with different aspects of one’s job.

2.12 Job Expectancies

Expectancy is defined as an employee’s psychological state where employee expects that effort will lead to effective performance (expectancy-I) and the effective performance will lead to rewards (expectancy-II). House and Dessler (1974) defined Expectancy II as “the degree to which high quality, quantity, and timely performance leads to extrinsic rewards such as increased pay, promotion, recognition, or security”
An employee’s specific behavior in a particular situation primarily depends upon individual’s expectancies in that situation. For example, an employee is likely to greet an employer warmly if he or she believes that such a behavior might influence (positively his or her chances of receiving a particular favor.

In past researchers have ignored the impact of different leader behaviors on expectancy I and II but currently, there is strong realization to measure/examine subordinate expectancies from a moderating perspective. For example, how a specific leader behavior affects employee job satisfaction when it is being moderated by expectancy I or II?

2.13 Acceptance of Leader

Subordinates are expected to comply with the directives and orders of the leader and to be comfortable while working with him. Participation in decision-making always increases acceptance of leader’ though involving entire group requires lot of efforts and
time but ensures high level of acceptance of decisions and leader also, resulting in efficient execution.

The acceptance of orders by subordinates’ depends upon the surrounding/situational conditions. Further, the compliance of orders is linked the extent such orders are: understood; consistent with the mission of the organization; compatible with the personal interests of the subordinates and to the extent to which subordinate is physically and mentally able to comply with them.

The effective administrative authority leads to willing rather than forced compliance. But each subordinate has a “zone of indifference” maintained by the interests of the group. Johnson (2008) found that the zone of acceptance increased to the extent subordinates is given autonomy.

2.14 Research Studies Using Path-Goal Theory

Path-goal theory since its inception has generated lot of interest by the researchers as it broke away from the traditional leadership approach and denied the already accepted assumptions (Jermier, 1996). But majority of these research efforts focused on propositions of initiating structure and consideration, whereas, some studies have tested the predictions concerning the moderation of leader participation.

House (1971) found that the satisfaction of subordinates was associated with the extent to which the leader’s initiation of structure reduced role ambiguity. Further, he found that the correlates of leader’s initiation of structure reduced role ambiguity. In another study House and Dessler (1974), tested eight hypotheses to determine correlation of leader behavior with the motivation of subordinates in three different business organizations and found a correlation.

A meta-analysis of 48 path-goal studies (11,862 respondents) by Indvik (1985, 1986a) reported that low job level was an indicator of high task structure. Further, directive leader behavior contributed to the intrinsic motivation of subordinates, their satisfaction with the leader, and their overall satisfaction.
Algattan, (1985) by using basic theoretical model of path-goal investigated the relationships between leader behavior and subordinates’ satisfaction and performance, moderated by subordinates’ tasks, growth need and locus of control. He found that external locus of control increased satisfaction and performance under both participative and directive leadership behavior of leader whereas internal locus of control increased subordinate performance and satisfaction under task-oriented leadership behavior.

Johnson’s (2008) hypothesized that participative employee evaluation would increase job satisfaction of nursing personnel. The theoretical framework was based on path-goal theory and turnover and absenteeism rates were analyzed in a three-year retrospective study. The hypothesis was accepted as experimental group showed significant increase in job satisfaction with decrease in turnover and absenteeism.

Gillo, (1982) analyzed the relationship between leader behavior and job satisfaction. The degree of routineness was used for a dichotomous classification of jobs i.e. routine or non-routine. The correlation between leader behavior and subordinates’ satisfactions for routine jobs was compared to the correlation between leader behavior and subordinates’ satisfactions for non-routine jobs but results did not support path-goal theory.

Nelson & Quick (2000) study showed significant differences among the extrinsic and general job satisfaction means of three job groups and indicated limited support for the path-goal theory assumption that job satisfaction increases with job level. Although leader support was positively related to subordinate job satisfaction, these relationships were not moderated by subordinate job level and role clarity as hypothesized.

Research on path-goal theory has been met with mixed reviews. Some studies support House’s theory while others do not. Path-goal theory has also been criticized for its conceptual ambiguity and the lack of clearly defined variables and causal relationship. Another deficiency is that most studies have tested only a few of the propositions while ignoring the rest. Based on these critiques, it has been suggested that there continues to be a need for more and better research to adequately test the theory.

Dessler, (2000) says that Path-goal leadership theory in general has received minimal support in part possibly because of the difficulty of measuring concepts such as
“path”; Whereas Yukl (2006) suggests that methodological limitations raise doubts about the findings. Because almost all the studies used only subordinate questionnaires to measure leader behavior and considered only a few aspects of the model at a time, the theory has been adequately tested.

Bass (2008) argues that despite a considerable amount of general empirical support for it, path-goal theory is complex, which makes it difficult to test the theory’s deduced relationship. Thus, it is not surprising that a wide array emerged from the hundred or more published surveys and experiments that tested various propositions derived from path-goal theory.

White and Bednar (1991) concluded that path-goal theory is intuitively logical and would appear on the surface to be simple to use. At present, however, the number of variables to be considered, along with a lack of conclusive research support for the model as a whole, complicates its application. Further study, coupled with additional refinements in the theory, should help managers use path-goal theory more effectively in the future.
CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY

This study was Ex-post Facto type, it deals with variables, the manifestation of which had already occurred and these variables were not manipulatable/under direct control of the researcher. The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship of different leadership behaviors i.e. directive, participative, achievement-oriented, and supportive (criterion variables) and subordinates’ job satisfaction, job expectancies and acceptance of leader (predictor variables). Using a correlational design, the study investigated as how subordinates’ outcomes (job satisfaction, job expectancies, acceptance of leader) relate to leadership behavior by examining the relationship between leaders’ leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented) and subordinate job satisfaction. This research further examined the relationship between the demographic variables (age, gender, qualification, experience etc.) and subordinates’ outcomes (job satisfaction, job expectancies and acceptance of leader).

This study adopted a survey design and the variables of research were not manipulated. The survey design is used to generalize from a sample to a population so that inferences can be made about the characteristic, attitude, or behavior of the population (Babbie, 2001).

According to Babbie (2001), Surveys have several advantages and disadvantages. The advantages of Surveys are: 1) they are very useful in describing the characteristics of a large population; 2) are flexible, and 3) ask same questions from all respondents, thus strengthening the measurement quality. Whereas, the disadvantages of survey research are: 1) the standardized questionnaire items represent the least common denominator in assessing respondents’ attitudes, orientations, circumstances, and experiences; 2) can be inflexible as the initial survey design must remain unchanged; and 3) are subject to artificiality in the respect that the topic of study may not be amenable to measurement through questionnaires or the act of studying that topic (i.e., an attitude) may actually affect
it. Furthermore, the survey design selected for this study was a cross-sectional and reflected the attitudes of the participants at one point in time.

This study utilized both the internet and surface mail along with personal visits to administer the survey instrument to a large number of respondents across the country. The advantages of using Internet/surface mail were: 1) ease of access to participants working in different cities; 2) avoidance of time constraints; 3) avoidance of organizational problems, such as scheduling difficulties; 4) completely voluntary participation; 5) cost and time savings. Whereas; the personal visits were: 1) clarification of purpose of study and benefit of participation; 2) immediate response and collection of filled in questionnaires and; 3) informal feedback about culture and processes.
Theoretical Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Moderating Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Directive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supportive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement Oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Locus of Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for Autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perception about abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Task Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Role Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subordinate Outcomes
- Job Satisfaction
- Acceptance of Leader
- Job Expectancies

Figure # 3.1 Theoretical Frameworks

Conceptual Framework of Job Expectancies

E-I Effort leads to performance

E-II Performance leads to rewards

Figure # 3.2 Job Expectancies
3.1 Population

The population of the study consisted of the middle and lower managers working as regular employees in different companies of the telecom (cellular) industry of Pakistan in 2006. The estimated population of middle and lower managers working as regular employees in these companies of telecom (mobile operators i.e. Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor, and Warid) industry was about 300 and 700 respectively.

3.2 Sample & Sample Size

Keeping in view the nature and objectives of the study, the stratified random sampling technique was used, thus sample consisted of 60 middle managers & 140 lower managers working in Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor and Warid. To ensure equal representation from the four selected mobile operators, 15 middle managers and 35 lower managers from each organization were approached for the collection of data. Both males and females were included in the sample.

3.3 Instrument

The instrument used for the collection of data for this study consisted of combination of set of questionnaires validated for use in looking at Path-Goal theory. The questionnaires measuring different items of all variables (dependent, independent, and moderating) were combined together to make a comprehensive questionnaire. The final instrument administered to the participants of study comprised of: one set of questions measuring demographics(Appendix-A); four sets of questions measuring four leadership behaviors (Appendix B); three set of questionnaires measuring environmental variables (Appendix C, D, E); One questionnaire measuring subordinate characteristics (Appendix F); one questionnaire measuring acceptance of leader (Appendix G); one questionnaire measuring job expectancies (Appendix H); and one questionnaire measuring job satisfaction (Appendix I).

3.3.1 Questionnaire: Development & Description

The leadership behavior being studied as an independent variable was measured through a set of 20 questions: five questions measuring directive and participative
leadership behavior; seven questions measuring supportive leadership behavior; and three questions measuring achievement-oriented leadership behavior (Appendix- B). The subordinate and environmental characteristics being studied as moderating variables were measured through a set of 45 questions: eight questions measuring task structure; nine questions measuring role ambiguity; 10 questions measuring stress; five questions measuring need for achievement; four questions measuring need for autonomy; four questions measuring perception about abilities; and five questions measuring locus of control (Appendix- C, D, E & F). Subordinates’ outcomes i.e. acceptance of leader and job expectancy (I&II), being studied as dependent variables were measured through a set of 19 questions: seven questions measuring acceptance as leader; six questions measuring job expectancy-I (effort leads to performance) and six questions measuring job expectancy-II (performance leads to rewards); whereas job satisfaction-the third subordinate outcome and primary focus of study was measured through Job descriptive index. The job descriptive index was divided into six components. The people on present job, Job in general, work on present job and supervision had 18 items each; whereas, present pay and opportunities for promotion had nine items each (Appendix- G, H & I).

All of these questions/items combined with general demographic questions comprised a questionnaire of 181 questions/items, which was administered to the participants (Middle & Lower managers) working as regular employees in the major companies(Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor & Warid) of telecom (cellular) industry of Pakistan.

To measure the criterion/independent variable, the scale developed by House & Dessler (1974) was used in this study. In the first version of Theory, House (1971) used Ohio State leadership scale (LBDQ) to measure two leadership constructs- initiative structures and consideration which was strongly criticized by Melcher (1999) on the premise that “path-goal theory” is based on the assumption of Vroom’s expectancy theory and the Ohio State Leadership Scale has no link with the expectancy theory, so how this instruments can be used to operationalise the leadership constructs of path-goal theory. Thus, House & Dessler (1974) revised the theory and leader behavior dimensions were changed to instrumental and supportive leadership behavior and modified version of LBDQ-XII was used. House & Dessler (1974) again revised the theory and leadership behavioral dimensions were changed to directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented. Further, by analyzing LBDQ-XII dimensions (Initiating Structure and
Consideration) they obtained items for three leadership behavior scales: directive, supportive, and participative (Indvik, 1985) and by adding several of their own items, completed the participative scale. House and Mitchell (1974) also developed four items to measure achievement-oriented leader behavior. Internal consistencies for both the LBDQ-XII and House and Dessler items on directive and supportive leader behaviors are sufficiently high (.75 or higher).

The Acceptance of Leader’ was measured through a 10 items scale developed by Nisa (2003). The Job Expectancies Scale developed by House and Dessler (1974) was used to measure job expectancy I and expectancy II. This scale was found to have adequate reliability and Kuder-Richardson scores were in the range of .84 to .88.

The Job Descriptive Index (JDI) including Job in General scale (1997 Revision) developed by Bowling Green State University, were utilized in this study to measure job satisfaction. The JDI and the JIG are widely used self-report instruments. All four types of satisfaction including intrinsic, extrinsic, superior and over-all satisfaction can be tested. The JDI yields five sub-scale scores: people on present job; job in general; work on present job; pay; opportunities for promotion; and supervision. The authors of the JDI reported split half-internal consistency reliability of the five JDI scales ranging from .80 to .88 across six samples. Vroom (1995) has called the JDI “without doubt the most carefully constructed measure of job satisfaction in existence”. The reason for selecting JDI to measure job satisfaction was its high reliability (0.90). Further, it was also considered easy to administer as compared to other measures of satisfaction.

Task structure was measured using a 10-item scale developed by House and Dessler (1974). The scale was found to have Kuder-Richardson reliability of (.69). The scale developed by Rizzo, House, and Lirtzman’s (1970) was used to measure role ambiguity. This scale has been tested for construct validity and found, “significantly and consistently, correlated to several measures of organizational structure, climate, and leader behavior that would be expected to be correlated with the existence of role conflict and ambiguity” (House and Rizzo, 1972). Kuder-Richardson reliability was found to be (.78).
Subordinate characteristics were measured through the instrument developed by Nisa (2003). This questionnaire measured the subordinates’ perception about ability, need for autonomy, need for achievement and locus of control.

All these scales were used for the purpose of data collection and have been developed specifically to test the path-goal theory. Further, the researchers such as Nisa (2003); Chang (1999); Romeo (1992); Indvik (1985); Indvik (1985); Algattan (1985); and Oppenheimer (1981), have used them and found reliable.

Demographic Variables Information consisted of six items seeking information about attributes such as age, gender, qualification, rank, salary range, experience and length of service under current supervisor, was also used in the study.

3.4 Scoring Procedure

1. Job Expectancies Scale and Role Ambiguity Scale consisted of Likert Scale type statements. For positive and negative statements, the scores were assigned on each statement according to the following pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Negative Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree (SA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree (SD)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree (A)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Disagree (D)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided (U)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Undecided (U)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree (D)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Agree (A)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree (SD)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Agree (SA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Task structure Scale was also a five-point scale. Highest value (5) was given to the responses indicating routineness or structuring of the task and lowest value to variety and unstructured of the task.

3 The scoring procedure of Leader Behavior Items, Acceptance of Leader Scale and Subordinate characteristics’ Scale was also on the same pattern as mentioned above for positive and negative statement according to the pattern already explained in scoring procedure number.

4 “Stress” scale was a TRUE/FALSE type scale. A FALSE response received 0 score and a TRUE response received 2 points.
The scoring of Job Descriptive Index was done according to the instructions of JDI and JIG Manual (Stanton and Crossely, 2000). For reversed score items, a “Y” received 0 points, “N” received 3 points, and a “?” received 1 point. For items that are not reversed score, “Y” received 3 points, “N” received 0 points, and a “?” received 1 point. Next, item scores were added up for each facet on the measure. Scores on the JDI and JIG scales were computed by summing the points obtained from an individual’s responses to the items in each facet. For satisfaction with pay and satisfaction with promotion opportunities, the total score was doubled. For missing values e.g. “pay” in case three values were missing for an individual, the missing values were rated “0” and total values were computed as usual, whereas, if three or more than three values were missing then facet total score for “pay” for that individual was not created.

3.5 Sources of Data

The study focused on the companies operating in the Telecom (cellular) Industry of Pakistan and all the companies participating in this research study were operating as private limited companies. Since all companies operating in the private sector don’t have any central database except the personnel or Human Resource department of the concerned company, thus Human Resource Department of participating companies (Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor and Warid) was the primary source of data collection.

3.6 Collection of Data

Researcher approached the Human Resources Departments of the major cellular companies’ i.e. Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor and Warid, Telecom of Telecom Industry of Pakistan, with a letter of introduction duly signed by Supervisor. The letter explained the purpose of the research, with a request to provide number of regular employees on the pay roll of company and working as middle managers along with supervisors/lower managers working in their work unit whom they were directly supervising. Both technical and non-technical areas of the company were included in the study. This letter further requested permission to meet/correspond with the middle managers and their direct subordinates. After seeking the necessary permission from Human Resources Department/company, researcher personally approached the participants of study. Through a variety of methods, all managers (middle & lower) were informed of the research and intended use of data. In addition to the verbal instructions, all questionnaires included written information about
the nature of the research study. Participants were informed that individual names would not be identified in the study. Further, participants were also informed that, in order to maintain confidentiality within the data set, data would be analyzed in aggregate scores, and that any demographic identification information would not be disclosed. Information dissemination for the data collection procedures and uses included: a presentation at certain offices, explaining all managers the leadership and research study; emails and follow-up phone calls.

Since at the time of data collection, researcher himself was working in Telecom (cellular) Industry, personal contacts were also used for the purpose of data collection and ensuring participants of the positive use of data. Somehow, it took six months to complete data collection phase.

The data for the purpose of this study was collected during September 2006 to April 2007 from the offices of the major cellular companies (mobile operators) i.e. Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor and Warid, located in the major cities i.e. Islamabad, Rawalpindi, Faisalabad, Lahore, Karachi and Peshawar. The response rate was 85%.

3.8 Analysis of Data

The study was Ex-post Facto Type, that deals with variables, the manifestation of which had already occurred and variables of the study were not manipulatable or under direct control of the researcher. This was also correlational in nature as it sought to establish relationship among various variables of the study. All kinds of data were based on the perception of participants of the study. In a way, attempt was made to identify leadership behavior or style of the managers as perceived by the subordinates. To explore relationship between these variables Pearson-Product Moment Correlation technique is the most appropriate (Anastasi, 1990). All the hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

The data were analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Test Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_01$ to $H_03$</td>
<td>Pearson – Product Moment Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_04$ to $H_06$</td>
<td>Linear Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_07$ to $H_{13}$</td>
<td>Multiple Regression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{014}$ to $H_{019}$, $H_{026}$ to $H_{028}$</td>
<td>t-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{020}$ to $H_{025}$</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

This chapter has two sections. The first section presents the demographic data obtained from part one of the questionnaires concerning the demographic characteristics of the subjects. This section also explains the measurement dimensions of the leadership behavior, the number of middle and lower managers, their qualifications, experience, length of service under the current supervisor etc.

The second section deals with testing of the null hypotheses and includes the data to ascertain the direction (correlation coefficient) strength (R-square), and percentage of common variance of relationship, at 0.05 significance level between leadership styles of managers and their subordinates job satisfaction, job expectancies and acceptance of leader. T-test and ANOVA were used to test the null hypotheses.
SECTION  I
DESCRIPTION OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The information in this section relates to Middle and Lower managers (permanent employees) working in 4 major cellular companies (Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor and Warid) who were requested to participate in the study. And the response rate both of middle and lower managers remained 85% and 83% respectively. The demographic information for other variables is discussed as under:

Table: 4-1  Age – Gender wise distribution of the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20-40)</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41-60)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in above table#4-1 shows that 75.2% male and 24.8% female were in age group of 20-40. While 83.3% male and 16.7% female were in age group of 41-60.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% within Age</th>
<th>lower management</th>
<th>middle management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20-40)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(41-60)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in above table # 4-2 shows that in the age group (20-40) 72.9% and 27.1% respectively were lower and middle managers. While, in the age group (41-60) 76.0% and 24.0% respectively were lower and middle managers.
The data in the above table # 4-3 shows Gender – Rank wise distribution of the sample. The data revealed that 77.2% male belong to lower management cadre and 22.8% belong to middle management cadre. Whereas; 65.7% female belong to lower management and 34.3% belong to middle management.
Table # 4-4: Gender – Qualification wise distribution of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Male Count</th>
<th>% within gender</th>
<th>Female Count</th>
<th>% within gender</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>% within gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSc</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>113</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table # 4-4 represents the gender – qualification wise distribution of the sample. The table reveals that within male category 25.7% possess BA/BSc degree, 49.6% Masters, 7.1% M.Phil, 1.8% PhD and 15.9% possess other degrees (engineering, commerce, technical etc). Whereas; in female category 20.0% possess BA/BSc, 51.4% Masters, 2.9% M.Phil, 8.6% PhD and 17.1% possess other degrees (engineering, commerce, technical).
Table 4-5: Gender – Salary wise distribution of the Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>male Count</th>
<th>% within GENDER</th>
<th>female Count</th>
<th>% within GENDER</th>
<th>Total Count</th>
<th>% within GENDER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15000-20000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-25000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25001-30000</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001-35000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35001-above</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 113 | 100.0% | 35 | 100.0% | 148 | 100.0% |

The above table # 4-5 shows the gender – salary wise distribution of the sample. The representation of the data revealed that both male and female counter parts received almost the same amount of the salary in slabs of 15000-35000. Whereas in the slab 35000/- and above, there was a major difference in the salaries of male and female respondents of study as only 28.6% of the female receive more than Rs =35000/- in comparison to their male counter parts (44.2%).
Table 4-6: Rank – Salary wise distribution of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Rank lower management</th>
<th></th>
<th>Rank middle management</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total rank</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within rank</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within rank</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15000-20000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20001-25000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25001-30000</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30001-35000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35001-above</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table # 4-6 gives Rank-Salary wise distribution of the sample. The table reveals that among respondents in lower management cadre; 20.7% receive salary in the slab of Rs: 15000-20000, 7.4% in the slab 20001 – 25000, 22.3% in the slab 25001-30000, 11.6% in the slab 30001-35000 and 38% in the slab Rs: 350001-above. Whereas; in the cadre of middle management 4.5% receive salary in the slab of Rs: 15000-20000; 11.4% receive salary in the slab of Rs: 20001 – 25000; 22.7% receive salary in the slab of Rs: 25001-30000; 15.9% receive salary in the slab of Rs: 30001-35000 and; 45.5% receive salary in the slab of Rs: 350001-above.
Table # 4-7: Rank- Qualification wise distribution of the sample size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>lower management</th>
<th>Middle management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within rank</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BSC</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table # 4-7 shows the Rank-Qualification wise distribution of the sample. The data revealed that in the cadre of lower management 32.2% possess BA/BSc, 45.5% Masters, 1.7% M.Phil and 20.7% possess other qualifications (engineering, commerce, technical etc) whereas; in the cadre of middle management 6.8% possess BA/BSc, 65.9% Masters, 15.9% M.Phill, and 11.4% PhD qualifications.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>lower management</th>
<th>middle management</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within rank</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than one year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5years</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table # 4-8 shows Rank-Experience wise distribution of the sample. The data shows that in the cadre of the lower management 12.4% were having less than one year experience; 52.9% having 1-5years; 25.6% having 6-10years; 6.6% having 11-20years and; only 2.5% having 21-30years of experience. Whereas; in the cadre of middle management 43.2% were having 1-5years experience; 45.5% having 6-10years; 9.1% having 11-20years and; only 2.3% were having 21-30years experience.
### Table # 4-9  Rank-Service wise distribution of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>lower management</th>
<th></th>
<th>middle management</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within rank</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within rank</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>% within rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than one year</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table # 4-9 shows Rank-Service wise distribution of the sample. The data revealed that in the cadre of lower management 46.3% were having less than one year service under the current supervisor, 48.8% having 1-5 years and only 5% were having 6-10 years service under the current supervisor. Whereas; in the cadre of middle management 25% were having less than one year service under the current supervisor, 63.6% having 1-5 years and; only 11.4% were having 6-10 years service under the current supervisor.
The above table # 4-10 shows Qualification-Salary wise distribution of the sample. The data revealed that among graduates (BA/BSc) 34.1% received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 12.2% in the slab of Rs 20001-25000; 14.6% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000; 9.8% in the slab of Rs 30001-35000 and; 29.3% in the slab of Rs 35001-above. Among Master degree holders 11.9% received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 7.1% in the slab of Rs 20001-25000; 23.8% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000; 15.5% in the slab of Rs 30001-35000 and; 41.7% in the slab of Rs 35001-above. Among M.Phil degree holders 11.1% received salary in the slab of Rs 20001-25000; 33.3% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000; 11.1% in the slab of Rs 30001-35000 and; 44.4% in the slab of Rs 35001-above.
doctorate degree holders 20.0% received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 40.0% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000 and; 40.0% in the slab of Rs 35001-above. Whereas, among respondents having other forms of degrees (engineering, commerce, technical etc;) 8.0% received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 8.0% in the slab of Rs 20001-25000; 24.0% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000; 12.0% in the slab of Rs 30001-35000 and; 48.0% in the slab of Rs 35001-above.
Table # 4-11  
Salary – Experience wise distribution of the Sample.salary * experience Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>less than 1-year</th>
<th>1-5 years</th>
<th>6-10 years</th>
<th>11-20 years</th>
<th>21-30 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15000-20000</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within salary</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-25000</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within salary</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501-30000</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within salary</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3001-35000</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within salary</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501-above</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within salary</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within salary</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table # 4-11 shows Salary-Experience wise distribution of the sample. The data revealed that among respondents having less than one year experience, 25.9% received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 59.3% in the slab of Rs 20001-25000; 11.1% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000 and; 3.7% in the slab of Rs 30001-35000.

Among respondents having 1-5 years experience 59.3% received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 71.4% in the slab of Rs 20001-25000; 64.9% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000; 52.4% in the slab of Rs 30001-35000 and; 32.3% in the slab of Rs 35001-above. Among respondents having 6-10 years experience 1.1% received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 14.3% in the slab of Rs 20001-25000; 18.9% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000; 38.1% in the slab of Rs 30001-35000 and; 47.7% in the slab of Rs 35001-above. Among respondents having 11-20 years experience; 3.7% received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 5.4% in the slab of Rs 25001-30000; 4.8% in the slab of Rs 30001-35000 and 12.3% in the slab of Rs 35001-above. Whereas; among respondents having 21-30 years of experience; 2.7% received salary in the slab of Rs 25001-30000 and; only 4.6% in the slab of Rs 35001-above.
SECTION II

TESTING OF NULL HYPOTHESES

In order to explore the relationship among leadership behaviors, contingency factors and subordinate outcomes, the null hypotheses were formulated. These hypotheses have been tested in the light of data obtained from 164 participants of the study. The variables of this study have been analyzed by applying the Pearson Product Moment Correlation, Multiple regression, t-test, and ANOVA on SPSS-16 to determine linearity between variables. All hypotheses of the study were tested at (.05) level of significance. To evaluate the mean difference of male and female respondents, an independent-sample t test was conducted.
H₀₁. There is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinates’ acceptance of leader.

### Table # 4-12 Pearson r, Critical Value, R-square and Percent of Common Variance of Leadership Behavior and Acceptance of Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>% VOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>13.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>04.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Oriented</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>13.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-12 Shows correlation coefficient between the independent variable leadership behavior (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) and the dependent variable acceptance of leader. The calculated correlation coefficient for directive leader behavior and acceptance of leader is (.392); for supportive leader behavior and acceptance of leader is (.370); for participative leader behavior (.200) and; for achievement – oriented leader behavior and acceptance of leader is (.369). The four calculated correlation coefficients (for directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented leader behavior) are significant at 0.05 level of significance, so the null hypothesis was rejected. It means that there is a significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinate acceptance of leader. Further, it is evident from the above table that directive leadership behavior has strong relationship as compared to other facets of leader behavior (supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) with acceptance of leader as 15.3 percent variance in acceptance of leader is due to directive leader behavior.
H\(_{02}\). There is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinates' job expectancies: expectancy I (effort leads to high performance) and expectancy II (performance leads to reword).

**Table # 4-13: Pearson \( r \), Critical Value, R-square and Percent of Common Variance of Leadership Behavior and Job Expectancy I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>( p ) value</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>% VOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Oriented</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-13 shows the correlation coefficient for independent variable, leader behavior (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) and job expectancy I. The calculated correlation coefficient for directive leader and job expectancy I is (.062); for supportive leader and expectancy I is (.159); for participative leadership behavior and job expectancy I is (.036) and; for achievement –oriented leader with job expectancy I is (.129). The three calculated correlation coefficients (directive, participative and achievement oriented leader behavior) with expectancy I are not significant (at 0.05 level of significance as indicated by the \( p \)-values), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that there is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinates job expectancy I. Somehow, there is a weaker relationship between the supportive leadership behavior and job expectancy I, as only 2.5% variance in job expectancy I is due to supportive leadership behavior.
Table #4-14: Pearson r, Critical Value, R-square and Percent of Common Variance of Leadership Behavior and Expectancy II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Behavior</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
<th>% VOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Oriented</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-14 shows the correlation coefficient for independent variable, leader behavior (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) and job expectancy II. The calculated correlation coefficient for directive leader and expectancy II is (.091); for supportive leader and expectancy II is (.078) and; for achievement –oriented leader with expectancy II is (.110). The three calculated correlation coefficient (directive, supportive and achievement oriented leader behavior) with expectancy II are not significant (at .05 level of significance as indicated by the p-values) whereas, correlation coefficient for participative leadership behavior and expectancy II is (.034) which is significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that there is no significant relationship between leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) and subordinates job expectancy II. Somehow, there is a weaker relationship between the participative leadership behavior and job expectancy II, as only 0.11% variance in job expectancy II is due to participative leadership behavior.
There is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and job satisfaction of subordinates.

The table # 4-15 shows the correlation coefficient for independent variable, leader behavior (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) and subordinates’ job satisfaction. The results presented in the above table reveals that the calculated correlation coefficients for leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented) with job in general were significant i.e. 0.002, 0.000, 0.000 and 0.012 respectively (at 0.05 level of significance as indicated by the p-values). Similarly, calculated correlation coefficients for leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented) with supervision were significant i.e. 0.003, 0.000, 0.000 and 0.001 respectively (at 0.05 level of significance as indicated by the p-values).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Pay</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Supervision</th>
<th>Coworker</th>
<th>Work in General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directive</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>242</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>289</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supportive</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participative</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.280**</td>
<td>.307**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement Oriented</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>.201*</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.172*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further calculated correlation coefficients for leadership behavior (supportive & participative and achievement-oriented) with coworker and work were significant i.e. 0.000, 0.000 and 0.028 respectively for coworker whereas; for work they were 0.000, 0.001 and 0.010 respectively (at 0.05 level of significance as indicated by the p-values). So the null hypothesis was rejected. It means there is a significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinate job satisfaction.
H₀₄. There is no significant relationship between linear combination of four leadership behavior, (directive, supportive, participative and achievements-oriented) and subordinate’s acceptance of leader.

| Table # 4-16 Linear Regression Analysis for Leadership Behavior as Predictor of Acceptance of Leader. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $t$ value | $P$ | $\beta$ | $F$-Ratio | $R$ | $R^2$ |
| 9.415 | .000 | 15.605 | 29.064 | .403 | .162 |

The table # 4-16 shows the linear regression analysis for linear combination of four leadership behaviors (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) and acceptance of leader by subordinates. It was calculated by adding the scores of four leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented). The regression equation for predicting the acceptance of leader is:

\[
\text{Predicted acceptance of leader} = 15.605 + .12 \text{ leadership behavior}
\]

The analysis of the data resulted in $R$ – square of .162, $F$ – value of 29.064 which means that 16.2% variance in acceptance of leader is due to leadership behavior.

The correlation coefficient between leadership behavior and acceptance of leader was .41, $t$ (152) =9.415, $p =.000$. So the null hypothesis was rejected. Further, it was concluded that leadership behavior does affect acceptance of leader and can be used as predictor of acceptance of leader.
H₀₅. There is no significant relationship between linear combination of four leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) and job expectancies of subordinates.

Table # 4-17  Linear Regression Analysis for Leadership Behavior as Predictor of Job Expectancy I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t value</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.919</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>18.122</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-17 shows the linear regression analysis for linear combination of four leadership behaviors (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) and job expectancy-I of subordinates’. The linear regression was calculated by adding the scores of four leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented). The regression equation for predicting the job expectancy-I of subordinates is:

Job Expectancy I = 18.122 + 0.050 leadership behavior

The analysis of the data resulted in $R$ – square of .017, $F$ – value of 2.618 which means that 1.7% variance in Job Expectancy -I is due to leadership behavior.

The correlation coefficient between leadership behavior and job expectancy-I was .128, $t$ (158) =7.919, $p$ =.000. So the null hypothesis was rejected. It was therefore concluded that leadership behavior does affect job expectancy-I of subordinates and can be used as predictor of job expectancy I.
The table # 4-18 shows the linear regression analysis for linear combination of four leadership behaviors (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) and job expectancy-II of subordinates. The linear regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the prediction of the job expectancy II from the overall leadership behavior.

The regression equation for predicting the job expectancy II of subordinates is:

\[
\text{Job Expectancy II} = 17.620 + 0.050 \text{ leadership behavior}
\]

The correlation between leadership behavior and job expectancy II was .095. The analysis of the data resulted in \( R^2 \) of 0.009, \( t(158) = 7.488, p = .000 \). The R-square of .009 implies that .9 percent of the variation in job expectancy II.
\( H_{06} \). There is no significant relationship between linear combination of leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement – oriented) and job satisfaction of subordinates.

Table # 4-19  Linear Regression Analysis for Leadership Behavior as Predictor of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( t ) value</th>
<th>( P )</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( R^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.870</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>50.763</td>
<td>22.573</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-19 shows the linear regression analysis for linear combination of four leadership behaviors (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) and job satisfaction of subordinates'. The regression equation for predicting the job satisfaction is:

\[
\text{Predicted Job Satisfaction} = 50.763 + .837 \text{Prediction of job satisfaction}
\]

The analysis of the data resulted in R-square of .122. The R-square of .122 implies that the four dimensions of leadership behavior accounted for only 12.2 percent of the variation in job satisfaction. Since the t-value (164) = 3.870, \( p = .000 \) was significant, so the null hypothesis was rejected. It was concluded that leadership behavior does effect job satisfaction and can be used as predictor of acceptance of leader.
H07. There is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinate’s acceptance of leader.

Table #4-20: Multiple Regression Analysis: Age, Gender, Qualification, Rank/Designation, Experience, and Length of Service under Current Supervisor and Acceptance of Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.854</td>
<td>-1.720</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>-.208</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-20 shows the regression analysis for attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience, service under current supervisor) as predictor of acceptance of leader. The analysis of the data resulted in R-square of .039. The R-square of .039 implies that the attributes of subordinates accounted for 3.9 percent of the variation in acceptance of leader. Since the F value (133) .726 was not significant (at 0.05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted.

The beta values and t-values of age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service are all insignificant but had negative moderate correlation except for qualification and experience which have +ve correlation with the acceptance of leader.
H08. There is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinate’s job expectancies.

Table # 4-21 Multiple Regression Analysis: Age, Gender, Qualification, Rank/Designation, Experience, and Length of Service under Current Supervisor and Expectancy I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.509</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>0.395</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2.098</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.295</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>-1.137</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-21 shows the regression analysis of the attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience, service under current supervisor) as predictor of subordinates’ job expectancy I. The analysis of the data resulted in R-square of .54. The R-square of .54 implies that the attributes of subordinates accounted for 54 percent of the variation in subordinates’ job expectancy I. Since the F value (133) 1.057 was not significant (at 0.05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was not rejected.

The beta values and t-values of age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service are all insignificant and had moderate correlation except for experience and service under current supervisor (having -ve correlation) with the subordinates job expectancy I.
Table # 4-22 Multiple Regression Analysis: Age, Gender, Qualification, Rank/Designation, Experience, and Length of Service under Current Supervisor and Expectancy II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-1.034</td>
<td>-.696</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>-.309</td>
<td>-.826</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3.367</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td>.527</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>-.361</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>-.293</td>
<td>-.348</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-22 shows the multiple regression analysis of the attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience, service under current supervisor) as predictor of subordinates’ job expectancy II. The analysis of data resulted in R-square of .73. Since the $F (137) 1.453, p = .190$ was not significant, so the null hypothesis was accepted. It means that the attributes of subordinates cannot be used as predictors of job expectancy II.
H₀₀. There is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor.) and subordinate’s job satisfaction.

Table #4-23 Multiple Regression Analysis: Age, Gender, Qualification, Rank/Designation, Experience, and Length of Service under Current Supervisor and Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-10.152</td>
<td>-1.161</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>2.243</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-7.283</td>
<td>-1.046</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>-.092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td>1.440</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>-7.587</td>
<td>-1.113</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>5.817</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>-1.007</td>
<td>-.204</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-23 shows the multiple regression analysis of the attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience, service under current supervisor) as predictor of subordinates’ job satisfaction. The analysis of the data resulted in R-square of .103. The regression equation was significant \((F (145) 2.243, \ p=.034)\), so the null hypothesis was rejected. It was concluded that the attributes of subordinate do effect the job satisfaction and can be used as predictor of subordinates’ job satisfaction.
There is no significant relationship between situational factor (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about ability) and subordinates’ acceptance of leader.

The table # 4-24 shows the multiple regression analysis of situational factors (Locus of control, ability, task structure, role ambiguity, stress, achievement need and autonomy need) and subordinates acceptance of leader. The analysis of the data resulted in R-square of .347. The regression equation was significant \((F (145) = 9.092, p=.000)\), so the null hypothesis was rejected. Further, all individual variables/situational factors had no significant relationship with subordinates’ acceptance of leader except stress having 0.000 p-values. Moreover, task structure and stress had negative contribution to the acceptance of leader which means that these variables increases acceptance of leader.
There is no significant relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates’ job expectancy I.

### Table # 4-25 Multiple Regression Analysis: Task Structure, Role Ambiguity, Stress, Need for Autonomy, Locus of Control, Need for Achievement, Perception about Ability and Job Expectancy I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t –value</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>2.380</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Structure</td>
<td>-.169</td>
<td>-1.554</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>3.104</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>7.825</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Need</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Need</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>2.669</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-25 presents the multiple regression analysis of situational factors (locus of control, ability, task structure, role ambiguity, stress, achievement need and autonomy need) as predictor of subordinates’ job expectancy I. The analysis of the data resulted in strong R –square of .317. The R-square of .317 implies that the situational factors accounted for 31 percent of the variation in job expectancy I. Since the $F$ value (126) 7.825 was greater than critical value (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was rejected. Keeping in view the $t$ values it was concluded that situational factors: role ambiguity; autonomy need and; ability could be used as predictor of job expectancy I.
**H₀₁₂.** There is no significant relationship between situational factor (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates’ job expectancy II.

**Table # 4-26**  Multiple Regression Analysis: Task Structure, Role Ambiguity, Stress, Need for Autonomy, Locus of Control, Need for Achievement, Perception about Ability and Job Expectancy II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t –value</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>-.851</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Structure</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.421</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>3.454</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>5.463</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.944</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Need</td>
<td>-.231</td>
<td>-1.505</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Need</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>3.016</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-26 presents a multiple regression analysis of situational factors (locus of control, ability, task structure, role ambiguity, stress, achievement need and autonomy need) as predictors of subordinates’ job expectancy II. The analysis of the data resulted in R-square of .245. The R-square of .245 implies that the situational factors accounted for 24 percent of the variation in expectancy II. Since F value (126) 5.463 was greater than the critical value (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was rejected. It was further concluded that individual variables: role ambiguity t (126) = 3.454, p = .001 and; autonomy need t (126) = 3.016, p = .003 can be used as predictor of subordinates’ job expectancy II.
There is no significant relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates' job satisfaction.

**Table # 4-27  Multiple Regression Analysis: Task Structure, Role Ambiguity, Stress, Need for Autonomy, Locus of Control, Need for Achievement, Perception about Ability and Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Structure</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Ambiguity</td>
<td>-.249</td>
<td>-.481</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>3.072</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>-1.887</td>
<td>-2.756</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Need</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy Need</td>
<td>-.648</td>
<td>-.487</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table # 4-27 presents a multiple regression analysis of situational factors (locus of control, ability, task structure, role ambiguity, stress, achievement need and autonomy need) as predictors of subordinates’ job satisfaction. The analysis of the data resulted in R – square of .152. The regression equation was significant ($F (128) 3.072, p=.005$), so the null hypothesis was rejected. It was concluded that stress and achievement need could be used as predictor of job satisfaction. Further, stress had negative contribution to the job satisfaction.
There is no gender wise significant difference in the job satisfaction

Table # 4-28  Gender wise difference regarding job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P -value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113.7719</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>105.4571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-28 shows analysis of gender with subordinates’ job satisfaction. The result of analysis reveals that t value (1.210) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted and it is concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female employees regarding their job satisfaction.

However, male employees have higher mean score (113.7719) than female employees (105.4571) on job satisfaction.
There is no gender wise significant difference in the job expectancy.

Table # 4-29  Gender wise difference regarding job expectancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>P -value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42.3143</td>
<td>-.922</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.1143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-29 shows analysis of gender difference with subordinate job expectancies. The result of analysis reveals that t value (-.922) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female employees regarding job expectancy.

However, female employees have higher mean score (44.1143) than male employees (42.3143) on job expectancy.
There is no gender wise significant difference in the acceptance of leader.

Table # 4-30 Gender wise difference regarding acceptance of leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>24.5905</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.4688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-30 shows analysis of gender difference with acceptance of leader by subordinates. The result of analysis reveals that $t$ value (.144) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between male and female employees regarding their acceptance of leader.
H$_{017}$ There is no age wise significant difference in job satisfaction of employees

Table # 4-31 Age wise difference regarding job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group(20-40)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>110.7643</td>
<td>-.497</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group(41-60)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>114.6000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-31 shows analysis of age difference with subordinate job satisfaction. The result of analysis reveals that t value (-.479) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between Age group(20-40) and Age group(41-60) age respondents regarding their job satisfaction.
There is no age wise significant difference in job expectancy of employees

Table # 4-32  Age wise difference regarding job expectancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group(20-40)</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>42.3258</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group(41-60)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42.2500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-32 shows analysis of age difference with subordinate job expectancies. The result of analysis reveals that t value (.033) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between Age group(20-40) and Age group(41-60) age respondents regarding their job expectancies.
$H_{019}$ There is no age wise significant difference in acceptance of leader in employees

Table # 4-33 Age wise difference regarding acceptance of leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age group(20-40)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>24.5118</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group(41-60)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.5833</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-33 shows analysis of age difference and acceptance of leader. The result of analysis reveals that t value (.936) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between Age group(20-40) and Age group(41-60) age in the acceptance of leader.
There is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of employees having different qualifications.

**Table # 4-34** Difference regarding job satisfaction of employees with different qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A/B.Sc</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A/M.Sc</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phill</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.627</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-34 shows analysis of difference in qualification and subordinate job satisfaction. The result of analysis reveals that F value (1.627) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that there is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of employees with different level of qualifications.
\( H_{021} \) There is no significant difference in the job expectancy of employees having different qualifications.

Table # 4-35 Difference regarding job expectancy of employees with different qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A/B.Sc</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A/M.Sc</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-35 shows analysis of different levels of qualifications with subordinates’ job expectancies. The result of analysis reveals that F value (1.400) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that there is no significant difference in the job expectancies of subordinates with different level of qualifications.
**H_{022}** There is no significant difference in the acceptance of leader of employees having different qualifications.

**Table # 4-36** Difference regarding acceptance of leader of employees with different qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.A/B.Sc</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A/M.Sc</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Phil</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-36 shows analysis of subordinates’ acceptance of leader having different qualifications. The result of analysis reveals that F value (1.437) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that there is no significant difference in the subordinates acceptance of leader having different level of qualifications.
H$_{023}$ There is no significant difference in job satisfaction of employees having different experiences.

Table # 4-37 Difference regarding Job Satisfaction of employees with different experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 Year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.225</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-37 shows analysis of subordinates’ job satisfaction with varying length of experience. The result of analysis # 4-37 that F value (2.225) is not significant (at 0.05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that there is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of employees with varying length experiences.
H_{024} There is no significant difference in job expectancy of employees having different experiences.

Table # 4-38 Difference regarding Job Expectancy of employees with different experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 Year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 -30 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-38 shows analysis of subordinates’ job expectancies with varying length of experience. The result of analysis reveals that F value (1.484) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that there is no significant difference in the job expectancies of employees with varying length of experience.
There is no significant difference in the acceptance of leader of employees having different experiences.

**Table # 4-39** Difference regarding Acceptance of Leader of employees with different experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1 Year</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.085</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 -30 Years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-39 shows analysis of acceptance of leader by subordinates with varying length of experience. The result of analysis reveals that F value (1.085) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference regarding acceptance of leader of employees having different experiences was accepted. It is therefore, concluded that there is no significant different in the acceptance of leader by subordinates with varying length of experience.
There is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding job satisfaction.

Table # 4-40  Difference in perception of lower and middle management regarding job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t.</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Managers</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>111.5082</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>110.6818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-40 shows analysis of difference in the perceptions of lower and middle managers regarding job satisfaction. The result of analysis reveals that t value (.133) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in perception of lower and middle management regarding job satisfaction was accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of lower and middle management regarding job satisfaction.
There is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding job expectancy.

Table # 4-41  Difference in perception of lower and middle management regarding job expectancy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Managers</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>40.9487</td>
<td>-2.799</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40.0500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-4 shows analysis of difference in the perception of lower and middle managers regarding job expectancies. The result of analysis reveals that t value (-2.799) is significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in perception of lower and middle management regarding job expectancy was rejected. It is concluded that there is a significant difference between the perception of lower and middle management regarding job expectancy.
There is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding acceptance of leader.

Table # 4-42  Difference in perception of lower and middle management regarding acceptance of leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Managers</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>24.3391</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Managers</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.4324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table # 4-42 shows analysis of difference in the perception of lower and middle managers regarding acceptance of leader. The result of analysis reveals that t value (-.111) is not significant (at .05 level of significance), so the null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in perception of lower and middle management regarding acceptance of leader was accepted. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between lower and middle management regarding acceptance of leader.
CHAPTER-V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of summary, major findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to test path-goal theory in Telecom (cellular) industry of Pakistan by conducting research on the middle and lower managers working as regular employees in four major cellular/mobile operators i.e. Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor and Warid. The relationship among perceived leadership behavior of middle managers and subordinate job satisfaction, Job expectancies and acceptance of leader with selected moderating variables was examined.

House & Mitchell (1974) path goal theory was the theoretical framework of the study. All the research questions and hypotheses were developed using path goal theory. The main objective was to test the effect of leader’s behavior i.e. directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented on subordinates’ job satisfaction and was used as an independent variable in the study. Whereas, dependent variables of the study included Job satisfaction of subordinates, which further comprised of: coworkers; job in general; work on present job; pay; opportunities for promotion; and supervision. The second dependent variable used in this study was the subordinates’ job expectancies. Job expectancy further comprised of Job expectancy-I, which means that efforts put in by subordinates will result in increased performance; and job expectancy-II, which means that subordinates’ increased performance will result in increased rewards for them. The third dependent variable used in this research study was the acceptance of leader by the subordinates depending upon the kind/ type of behavior used by the leader depending upon the work situation i.e. task
structure, level of stress etc and the amount of rewards on the attainment of goals by the subordinates. The moderating variables of study were further divided into two categories i.e. Subordinates’ characteristics, which included subordinates’ need for achievement, subordinates need for autonomy, perception about abilities, and locus of control (internal or external), and environmental characteristics such as task structure, role ambiguity and stress.

Path-goal theory is both situational and contingency in approach as in situational approach there is an underlying assumption that different situations require different types of leadership behaviors, while contingency approach to leadership attempts to specify the condition or situational variable that ‘moderates’ relationship between leader behavior and performance criteria/effectiveness. Moreover, it is an exchange theory, as it explains why and how contingent rewards work. Theory assumes that effective leader behavior has a positive impact on subordinate job satisfaction because an effective leader can easily identify how a subordinate’s needs, values, and expectations interact with the individual’s job, which in turn impact job satisfaction of an employee.

Path-goal theory is an effective tool to determine what type of leadership behavior is most effective under specific conditions and has been utilized by consultants and trainers for the training of managers as path-goal theory not only suggests what type of leadership behavior may be most effective in a given situation but it may also be used to explain why that particular leadership behavior is most effective.

According to House and Mitchell (1974), the basic premise of the path-goal approach is that subordinates are motivated by leader behavior to the extent that leader behavior influences achievement of work goals and the attractiveness of these goals. Further, the most effective leader provides/ ensures the availability of valued rewards to followers (the “goal”) and then helps them find the best way of getting there (the “path”). Research conducted from time to time has also proved that job satisfaction is affected by leader behavior. Now research is being conducted on the determinants of job satisfaction.

The population of the study was middle and lower management (300 and 700 respectively) of the major companies of the telecom (cellular) industry of Pakistan. The sample of the study consisted of 60 middle managers and 140 lower managers of Mobilink,
Eleven sets of instruments were used in this study. One instrument consisting of 20 questions was used to measure the independent variable of the study i.e. leadership behavior. Out of 20 questions: five questions were used to measure directive leadership behavior; seven questions were used to measure supportive leadership behavior; five questions were used to measure participative leadership behavior; and three questions were used to measure achievement oriented leadership behavior.

Seven sets of instruments were used to measure the moderating variables: one instrument consisting of eight questions was used to measure the task structure; one instrument consisting of nine questions was used to measure the role ambiguity; and one instrument consisting of 10 questions was used to measure the stress. One instrument consisting of five questions was used to measure need for achievement of subordinates; one instrument consisting of four questions was used to measure need for autonomy of subordinates; one instrument consisting of four questions was used to measure the perception about the abilities; and one instrument consisting of five questions was used to measure the locus of control of subordinates. Thus out of seven instruments measuring moderating variables- three sets of instruments were used to measure the environmental characteristics and four sets of instruments were used to measure the subordinate characteristics.

Three sets of instruments were used to measure the dependent variables/subordinates’ outcomes of the study i.e. acceptance of leader, job expectancies, and job satisfaction. One instrument consisting of seven questions was used to measure the acceptance of leader by subordinates. One instrument consisting of 12 questions: six each was used to measure job expectancy-I and job expectancy-II respectively. One instrument consisting of 80 items (people on present job: 18, job in general: 18, work on present job: 18, pay: 09, opportunities for promotion: 09 and supervision: 18) was used to measure the job satisfaction.

On the basis of the objectives and research questions of study, 28 null hypotheses were formulated aiming at identifying the determinants of job satisfaction and exploring
relationships between different leadership behaviors and subordinates outcomes. Pearson –
Product Moment Correlation, Linear Regression, Multiple Regression, t-test and ANOVA
were used to test the hypotheses of the study. All types of computations for the analysis of
data were done by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) with the help of
computer.
5.2 Findings of the Study

On the basis of analysis of data for descriptive and inferential statistics, following findings were drawn for this study:

**Descriptive Statistics**

The data was collected from middle and lower managers working as regular employees in the major telecom (cellular) companies i.e. Mobilink, Ufone, Telenor and Warid. The ages of participants of study were divided into two groups: age group (20-41) and age group (41-60).

1. Thus gender wise distribution of the sample shows that 75.2% of male and 24.8% of female respondents represented age group (20-40), while, 83.3% male and 16.7% of female respondents represented age group (41-60). (Table # 4-1)

2. Age – Rank wise distribution of the sample shows that among respondents in the age group (20-40) 72.9% were lower managers while, 27.1% were middle managers. Among respondents in the age group (41-60), 76.0% were lower managers while, 24.0% were from middle management cadre. (Table # 4-2)

3. Gender – Rank wise distribution of the sample shows that 77.2% of male respondents were from lower management cadre while, 22.8% from middle management cadre. Whereas, 65.7% of female respondents were from lower management and 34.3% from middle management. In total 74.5% sample is represented by the lower and 25.5% from middle management cadre. (Table # 4-3)

4. Gender – Qualification wise distribution of the sample reveals that among male respondents 25.7% possessed BA/BSc degree, 49.6% Masters, 7.1% M.Phil, 1.8% PhD and 15.9% other degrees (engineering, commerce etc). Whereas, among female respondents 20.0% possessed BA/BSc, 51.4% Masters, 2.9% M.Phil, 8.6% PhD and 17.1% other degrees (engineering, commerce etc.). (Table # 4-4)

5. Gender – Salary wise distribution of the data revealed that within the different salary slabs, male and female counterparts received almost the same amount of the salary except for the salary slab Rs =35000/pm and above. Further, only 28.6% of the
female respondents received more than Rs =35000/pm, whereas, 44.2% male were receiving salary in or above salary slab of Rs.35000/pm. (Table # 4-5)

6. Rank – Salary wise distribution of the sample reveals that among lower mangers 20.7% respondents were receiving salary in the salary slab of Rs:15000-20000, 7.4% in the slab of 20001 – 25000, 22.3% in the slab of 25001-30000, 11.6% in the slab of 30001-35000 and 38% the slab of Rs: 350001-above. Whereas among middle managers 4.5% were receiving salary in the slab of Rs: 15000-20000, 11.4% in the slab of 20001 – 25000, 22.7% in the slab of 25001-30000, 15.9% in the slab of 30001-35000 and 45.5% in the slab of Rs: 350001-above. (Table # 4-6)

7. Rank- Qualification wise distribution of the sample revealed that among lower managers 32.2% possessed BA/BSc; 45.5% Masters; 1.7% M.Phil; and 20.7% other qualifications (engineering, commerce etc) whereas, among middle managers: 6.8% possessed BA/BSc, 65.9% Masters, 15.9% M.Phil, and 11.4% PhD qualifications. (Table # 4-7)

8. Rank-Experience wise distribution of the sample showed that among lower managers 12.4% had less than one year experience; 52.9% had 1-5 years; 25.6% had 6-10 years; 6.6% had 11-20 years; and only 2.5% had 21-30 years of experience. Whereas, among middle managers: 43.2% had 1-5 years experience; 45.5% had 6-10 years; 9.1% had 11-20 years; and only 2.3% had 21-30 years experience. (Table # 4-8)

9. Rank-Service wise distribution of the sample revealed that among lower managers: 46.3% had less than one year of service under the current supervisor, 48.8% had 1-5 years and only 5% had 6-10 years service under the current supervisor. Whereas, among middle managers 25% had less than one year service under the current supervisor, 63.6% had 1-5 years and only 11.4% had 6-10 years service under the current supervisor. (Table # 4-9)

10. Qualification-Salary wise distribution of the sample revealed that among graduates: 34.1% were receiving salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 12.2% in the slab of 20001-25000; 14.6% in the slab of 25001-30000; 9.8% in the slab of 30001-35000; and 29.3% in the slab of 35001-above. Among respondents with master degree:
11.9% were receiving the salary slab in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 7.1% in the slab of 20001-25000; 23.8% in the slab of 25001-30000; 15.5% in the slab of 30001-35000; and 41.7% in the slab of 35001-above. Among respondents with M.Phil: 11.1% were receiving salary in the slab of Rs 20001-25000; 33.3% in the slab of 25001-30000; 11.1% in the slab of 30001-35000; and 44.4% in the slab of 35001-above. Among respondents with PhD: 20.0% were receiving salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000; 40.0% in the slab of 25001-30000; and 40.0% in the slab of 35001-above. While among respondents with other degrees (engineering, commerce etc.): 8.0% were receiving salary in the slab of 15000 – 20000; 8.0% in the slab of 20001-25000; 24.0% in the slab of 25001-30000; 12.0% in the slab of 30001-35000; and 48.0% in the slab of 35001-above. (Table # 4-10)

11. Salary – Experience wise distribution of the Sample revealed that among respondents who received salary in the slab of Rs 15000 – 20000: 25.9% had less than one year experience; 59.3% had 1-5 years experience; 11.1% had 6-10 years experience; and 3.7% had 11-20 years experience. Among respondents who received salary in slab of 20001-25000: 14.3% had less than one year experience; 71.4% had 1-5 years experience; and 14.3% had 6-10 years experience. Among respondents who received salary in the slab of 25001-30000: 8.1% had less than one year experience; 64.9% had 1-5 years experience; 18.9% had 6-10 years experience; 5.4% had 11-20 years experience; 2.7% had 21-30 years experience. Among respondents who received salary in the slab of 30001-35000: 4.8% had less than one year experience; 52.4% had 1-5 years experience; 38.1% had 6-10 years experience; and 4.8% had 6-10 years experience. While among respondents who received salary in the slab of 35001-above: 3.1% had less than one year experience; 32.3% had 1-5 years experience; 47.7% had 6-10 years experience; 12.3% had 11-20 years experience; and 4.6% had 21-30 years experience. (Table # 4-11)

Inferential Statistics

The following are the findings of the study with regard to statistical analysis of data.

12. The Null Hypothesis: 1 that there is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinate’s acceptance of leader was rejected because four calculated correlation coefficients were significant. It means that there is a
significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinate acceptance of leader. (Table # 4-12)

13. The Null Hypothesis: 2 that there is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinates’ job expectancies: expectancy I (effort leads to high performance) and expectancy II (performance leads to reward) was accepted because there was no significant relationship between leadership behavior and subordinates job expectancy (I&II). (Table # 4-13 & 4-14)

14. The Null Hypothesis: 3 that there is no significant relationship between leadership behavior and job satisfaction (Work, Pay, Promotion, Supervision, Coworker and Job in General) of subordinates was rejected. There is significant relationship between four leadership behaviors and six facets of subordinates’ job satisfaction. (Table # 4-15)

15. The Null Hypothesis: 4 that there is no significant relationship between linear combination of four leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievements-oriented) and subordinate’s acceptance of leader, was rejected because the calculated correlation coefficient between leadership behavior (directive, participative, supportive and achievement-oriented) and acceptance of leader was significant. It was concluded that leadership behavior affects subordinates’ acceptance of leader and can be used as predictor of acceptance of leader by the subordinates. (Table # 4-16)

16. The Null Hypothesis: 5 that there is no significant relationship between linear combination of four leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) and job expectancy (I&II) of subordinates was rejected because the regression equation between linear combination of four leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) and job expectancies of subordinates was significant. Therefore it was concluded that leadership behavior affects subordinates’ job expectancies and can be used as predictor of subordinates’ job expectancies. (Table # 4-17 & 4-18)
17. The Null Hypothesis: 6 that there is no significant relationship between linear combination of leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement – oriented) and job satisfaction of subordinates was rejected because regression equation between linear combination of leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement – oriented) and job satisfaction of subordinates was significant. Therefore, it was concluded that leadership behavior does affect job satisfaction and can be used as predictor of subordinates’ job satisfaction. (Table # 4-19)

18. The Null Hypothesis: 7 that there is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinate’s acceptance of leader was accepted because regression equation between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinate’s acceptance of leader was not significant. The beta values and t-values of all the attributes were insignificant and had negative moderate correlation except for qualification and experience (which have +ve correlation) with the acceptance of leader. (Table # 4-20)

19. The Null Hypothesis: 8 that there is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor.) and subordinates’ job expectancy (I&II) was accepted because the multiple regression equation for attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor.); and subordinate’s job expectancy I was not significant. The beta values and t-values of age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service were insignificant but had moderate correlation except for experience and service under current supervisor (which have -ve correlation) with the subordinates’ job expectancy I. Similarly, the relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) and subordinate’s job expectancy II were not significant except for rank. So it can be concluded that rank can be used as predictor of expectancy II. (Table # 4-21 & 4-22)
20. The Null Hypothesis: that there is no significant relationship between attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor.) and subordinate’s job satisfaction was rejected because multiple regression equation for attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor.); and subordinates’ job satisfaction was significant. Therefore, the attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) as predictor of job satisfaction can be used as predictor of subordinates’ job satisfaction. (Table # 4-23)

21. The Null Hypothesis: that there is no significant relationship between situational factor (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about ability) and subordinates’ acceptance of leader was rejected. The regression equation for situational factors (Locus of control, ability, task structure, role ambiguity, stress, achievement need and autonomy need) and subordinates acceptance of leader was significant except stress. Further, the two variables: task structure and stress had negative contribution to the acceptance of leader which means that these variables increase acceptance of leader. (Table # 4-24)

22. The Null Hypothesis: that there is no significant relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates’ job expectancy I, was rejected. The regression analysis for situational factors (locus of control, ability, task structure, role ambiguity, stress, achievement need and autonomy need) and job expectancy I resulted in strong R –square of .317. The R-square of .317 implies that the situational factors accounted for 31 percent of the variation in expectancy I. and F value (126) 7.825 was greater than critical value at .05 level of significance. Keeping in view the t values, it was concluded that situational factor: role ambiguity, autonomy need and ability could be used as predictor of job expectancy I. (Table # 4-25)

23. The Null Hypothesis: that there is no significant relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates’ job
expectancy II was rejected. The regression equation was significant. It was concluded that individual variables made significant contributions; role ambiguity and autonomy need can be used as predictor of subordinates’ job expectancy II. (Table # 4-26)

24. The Null Hypothesis: 13 that there is no significant relationship between situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for autonomy, locus of control, need for achievement, & perception about abilities) and subordinates’ job satisfaction was rejected. The regression equation was significant. It was concluded that task structure, role ambiguity and need for achievement could be used as predictor of subordinates’ job satisfaction. (Table # 4-27)

25. The Null Hypothesis: 14 that there is no gender wise significant difference in the job satisfaction was accepted because there was no gender wise significant difference regarding job satisfaction of the employees. Somehow, male employees had higher mean score. (Table # 4-28)

26. The Null Hypothesis: 15 that there is no gender wise significant difference in the job expectancy was accepted because there was no gender wise significant difference regarding job expectancy. Somehow, female employees had higher mean score on job expectancy. (Table # 4-29)

27. The Null Hypothesis: 16 that there is no gender wise significant difference in the acceptance of leader was accepted. There was no gender wise significant difference in the acceptance of leader. (Table # 4-30)

28. The Null Hypothesis: 17 that there is no age wise significant difference in job satisfaction of employees was accepted. There was no age wise significant difference in job satisfaction of employees. (Table # 4-31)

29. The Null Hypothesis: 18 that there is no age wise significant difference in job expectancy of employees was accepted. It was concluded that there was no age wise significant difference in job expectancy of employees. (Table # 4-32)
30. The Null Hypothesis: 19 that there is no age wise significant difference in acceptance of leader among employees. There was no age wise significant difference in perception regarding acceptance of leader. (Table # 4-33)

31. The Null Hypothesis: 20 that there is no significant difference in the job satisfaction of employees having different qualifications was accepted. There was no qualification wise significant difference regarding job satisfaction of employees having different levels of qualification. (Table # 4-34)

32. The Null Hypothesis: 21 that there is no significant difference in the job expectancy of employees having different qualifications was accepted. It was concluded that there was no qualification wise significant difference in the job expectancy of employees having different levels of qualification. (Table # 4-35)

33. The Null Hypothesis: 22 that there is no significant difference in the acceptance of leader of employees having different qualifications was accepted. It was concluded that there was no significant difference regarding acceptance of leader among employees having different levels of qualification. (Table # 4-36)

34. The Null Hypothesis: 23 that there is no significant difference in job satisfaction of employees having different experiences was accepted. It was concluded that there was no significant difference in job satisfaction of employees having different length of experiences. (Table # 4-37)

35. The Null Hypothesis: 24 that there is no significant difference in job expectancy of employees having different experiences was accepted. It was concluded that there was no significant difference regarding job expectancy of employees having different length of experiences. (Table # 4-38)

36. The Null Hypothesis: 25 that there is no significant difference in the acceptance of leader by employees having different experiences was accepted. It was concluded that there was no significant difference regarding acceptance of leader by employees having different length of experiences. (Table # 4-39)

37. The Null Hypothesis: 26 that there is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding job satisfaction was accepted. It was
concluded that there was no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding job satisfaction. (Table # 4-40)

38. The Null Hypothesis: 27 that there is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding job expectancy (I&II) was rejected. It was concluded that there was significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding job expectancy (I&II). (Table # 4-41)

39. The Null Hypothesis: 28 that there is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding acceptance of leader was accepted. It was concluded that there is no significant difference in the perception of lower and middle management regarding acceptance of leader. However middle managers had slightly higher mean score than lower managers. (Table # 4-42)
5.3 Conclusions

In the light of findings of this research following conclusions were drawn:

1. The independent variable, leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) are positively and significantly correlated with subordinates outcomes i.e. acceptance of leader by subordinate, job expectancies (I&II) and job satisfaction.

2. Directive leadership behavior has strong relationship with acceptance of leader as compared to other facets of leader behavior (supportive, participative and achievement-oriented). This clearly illustrates that when a business is in exponential growth phase there is greater need of directive behavior in which leader gives specific guidance to subordinates, letting them know as what is expected of them along with scheduling of work, defining standards of performance and finally ensuring standard rules and regulations are followed.

3. Leadership behavior (directive, participative, supportive and achievement-oriented) has significant relationship with job satisfaction. Leader behaviors (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) are significantly related with supervision and job in general while, supportive, participative and achievement oriented leader behavior have significant relation with work and coworker.

4. There is no significant relationship between leader behavior and subordinate expectancy (I&II).

5. The attributes of subordinates (age, gender, rank, and length of service under the current supervisor) have moderate and negative correlation with acceptance of leader whereas; qualification and experience have positive correlation with acceptance of leader.

6. The attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, and length of service under the current supervisor) have no effect on the job expectancy (I&II) except
rank of the employee whereas, experience and service under current supervisor have negative correlation with subordinate job expectancy (I&II).

7. The attributes of subordinates (age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor) have significant correlation with job satisfaction. Somehow, age, gender, rank and length of service under current supervisor have negative correlation with job satisfaction.

8. The situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for achievement, need for autonomy, locus of control and perception about ability) affect the subordinates’ acceptance of leader, job expectancy (I&II) and job satisfaction.

9. Task structure and stress have negative correlation with subordinates’ acceptance of leader.

10. Locus of control; task structure and; subordinate need for achievement have negative relationship with job expectancy (I).

11. Role ambiguity and subordinate need for autonomy have negative contribution to job expectancy (II).

12. Stress and subordinate need for achievement have strong relationship with job satisfaction whereas; task structure; role ambiguity; subordinates’ need for autonomy and; stress has negative contribution to the job satisfaction.
5.4 Discussion

This study investigated the relationship of leader behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented) with employee job satisfaction under situational factors and to identify which leadership behavior is more effective keeping in view the organizational business and type of industry. The outcome of this research may be used in the recruitment of right man for the right job and promoting individuals whose competencies are in match with the organizational requirements. Further, on the basis of identification of desired leadership behavior, extensive training programs may be conducted for the middle and lower managers.

It has been established on the basis of literature that leadership behavior is very important while reviewing the organizational performance, employee morale and their satisfaction. Further, leadership can’t be viewed in vacuum rather it is product of situation in which a task is performed and personal competence. Thus the situation in which work is performed and the individual who accomplishes the particular task influence the outcome. This is in conformity to Daft (2005), who calls it “mutual influence process” and Kreitner & Kinicki (2007) who believe that not only leadership behavior was demonstrated to affect the subordinates’ performance and satisfaction but performance was also influenced by other factors related to situation within which both Leader and subordinates are working.

Path goal theory holds that depending upon subordinates’ and task characteristics, an effective leader will use each of the four types of leader behaviors in different situations. Findings of the study concluded that the independent variable-leadership behavior (directive, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented) had significant effect on dependent variables: acceptance of leader; Job expectancy (I&II) and; job satisfaction. The analysis reveals that directive leader behavior has strong relationship with acceptance of leader which is in conformity with path goal theory which states that subordinates are more satisfied with directive leader behavior when task is not structured. Further highly structured tasks are less satisfying than unstructured tasks (House & Dessler, 1974). The reward system in telecom sector allows the manager to reward their high performing team members and they also have influence in hiring and promotion of their team members but results reveal a weaker relationship between leader behavior and job expectancy (I) except for supportive leader behavior. Similarly, for job expectancy (II), correlation with directive;
supportive and; achievement-oriented was not significant except for participative leadership behavior. This is in non conformity with path-goal assumption that superior behavior may increase effort when it makes satisfaction of a subordinates’ needs contingent upon effective performance and/or when it complements work environment through coaching, guidance, support and rewards necessary for effective performance (House & Mitchell, 1974).

Leadership behavior (directive, participative, supportive and achievement-oriented) had significant relationship with job satisfaction. Leader behavior (directive, participative, supportive and achievement oriented) was significantly related with supervision and job in general as indicated by their p-value. Supportive and participative and achievement oriented leader behavior had significant relation with work and coworker.

There were no differences between female and male respondents on any dependent variable. The attributes of subordinates had no significant effect on the acceptance of leader by subordinates. However, male employees had higher mean score than female employees and employees in age group (41-60) had higher mean score than those in age group (20-40). Similarly, middle managers had higher mean score as compared to lower managers on acceptance of leader. The beta values and t-values of age, gender, rank, and length of service under the current supervisor had moderate and negative correlation with acceptance of leader whereas; qualification and experience had positive correlation with acceptance of leader.

The attributes of subordinates had no significant effect on the job expectancy (I&II) except rank of the employee. However, female employees had higher mean than male employee and employees in age group(20-40) had higher mean score than employees in age group(41-60) whereas Lower managers had higher mean score than middle managers on job expectancy (I&II). The beta and t-values of age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor had moderate correlation. Whereas, experience and service under current supervisor had negative correlation with subordinate job expectancy (I&II).

There was no significant difference between male and female employees of telecom (cellular companies) sector regarding job satisfaction though male employees had higher mean score than female employees on job satisfaction. Similarly, age, qualification,
experience and rank of employees had no significant relationship with job satisfaction. Somehow, employees in age group (41-60) had higher score on the job satisfaction. This difference may be because of the fact that those in age group (20-40) are more ambitious and want immediate promotions, higher increase in salaries and more authority and freedom to work independently as compared to employees in age group (41-60) who understand corporate policies and business realities. Similarly, lower managers have higher mean score than middle managers on job satisfaction. The possible explanation of this may be the delayed promotion and or salary increase of employees in age group (41-60). The beta and t-values of age, gender, qualification, rank, experience and length of service under the current supervisor had significant correlation. Age, gender, rank and length of service under current supervisor had negative correlation with subordinate job satisfaction.

The situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for achievement, need for autonomy, locus of control and perception about ability) do affect the subordinates’ acceptance of leader, job expectancy (I&II) and job satisfaction.

All the situational variables except stress had no significant relationship with subordinates’ acceptance of leader. Further, situational factors: task structure and; stress had negative correlation with subordinates’ acceptance of leader which means that these variables increase acceptance of leader. The situational factors: perception about ability; role ambiguity and; subordinate need for autonomy had strong correlation with Job expectancy (I) whereas; situational factors: locus of control; task structure and; subordinate need for achievement had negative relationship with job expectancy (I). Further, situational factors: role ambiguity and; subordinate need for autonomy had significant relationship with job expectancy (II) whereas; situational factors: role ambiguity and; subordinate need for autonomy had negative contribution to job expectancy (II). The situational factors: stress and; subordinate need for achievement had strong relationship with subordinates’ job satisfaction whereas; situational factors: task structure; role ambiguity; subordinates’ need for autonomy and; stress had negative contribution to the job satisfaction.

The tasks performed by the group and individual members affect and are affected by leadership. The particular leader behaviors required to perform tasks, have consequences for the subordinates’ job satisfaction, the group’s productivity, and the organization’s performance. The task requirements affect in every aspect whether a leader is needed, who
emerges as a leader, how the leader behaves, and what kind of leadership behavior will result in enhanced performance and satisfaction of the followers. Different tasks demand different skills and abilities, and the individuals who emerge as leaders have different competencies relevant to the requirements of the different tasks. In order to be effective and successful and to meet task complexities, challenges and competition, managers must be aware that ‘difficult jobs’ can cause stress, anxiety and frustration.

The path goal theory assumes that highly structured tasks are less satisfying than unstructured tasks. This study confirms this assumption because task structure was negatively related to the acceptance of leader and subordinate job satisfaction. This confirms Indvik (1985) and Nissa (2003) study findings that leader behavior had certain effect on job satisfaction when task structure is considered moderating. This study also confirms path goal prediction that when task is dissatisfying, routine or structured subordinate will be dissatisfied, as there was an inverse relationship between task structure and acceptance of leader, which means subordinates are more satisfied with directive and participative leadership behavior in an unstructured task. According to path goal theory, directive leader provides specific guidance to subordinates by letting subordinates know as what is expected of them along with scheduling of work to be done, maintaining definite standards of performance and directing subordinates to follow standard rules and regulations. It will create positive effect on subordinates’ expectancies, job satisfaction and performance when task is complex, ambiguous and varied (House, 1971). This will lead to negative correlation with subordinates’ acceptance of leader, job expectancy (I&II) and job satisfaction who are engaged in tasks with directive leader. This study concluded that directive leader behavior had most significant relationship with acceptance of leader having 15.3% variance followed by supportive and achievement oriented leader behavior having 13.69% variance in acceptance of leader. So this study confirms the assumptions of path goal theory and supports findings of studies conducted by House & Mitchell (1974); House & Dessler (1974); Szilagyi & Simms (1974) and; Nissa (2003).

Path goal theory assumes that directive leader behavior increases subordinates’ acceptance of leader and job satisfaction by clarifying roles and responsibilities, thus helping subordinates to perform their work smoothly. It was further assumed that highly stressed subordinates had low level of job satisfaction. In this study it was found that stress had inverse relationship with job satisfaction and acceptance of leader and job expectancy.
(II). It means highly stressed subordinates had greater acceptance when manager displayed directive leadership behavior. Similarly, high directive leader behavior had positive effect on subordinate job expectancy (II). This result supports path goal assumption that subordinates working under stress were more satisfied and highly motivated to work with a directive leader who clarifies roles to subordinates and provides guidance to them.

Path goal theory hypothesizes that subordinates’ with low perception about ability to accomplish the task will feel more satisfied with directive leader behavior and on other hand subordinates with high perception about their abilities will be more satisfied with participative and achievement oriented leader. The findings of this study revealed that perception about ability had an inverse relationship with job expectancy (II) which confirms path goal assumption that employees with low perception about ability are satisfied with directive leader behavior.

The locus of control refers to the perceived location or source of influence over our behavior. In other words, locus of control is the degree to which individual sees environment responding to his or her behavior. Path goal theory assumes that subordinate scores on locus of control moderate the relationship between participative leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction. The results of this study show that locus of control had negative relation with job expectancy (I) which means they had external locus of control and externals had greater acceptance for directive leader behavior. This study confirms path goal theory that directive leadership has positive relationship with job satisfaction when subordinates have external locus of control. This finding supports Leonard (1992) study.

Path goal theory assumes that role ambiguity causes dissatisfaction and low expectancy to perform task effectively and efficiently. In this study, role ambiguity had negative relationship with job satisfaction. Johnson (2008) found that there was a significant and inverse relationship between role ambiguity and subordinate job satisfaction. This is further supported by the significant relationship between directive leader behavior and subordinates’ acceptance of leader and job satisfaction. As the telecom Industry was passing through a rapid expansion phase and there was cut throat competition in the industry, so roles and responsibilities were not clearly documented but subordinates were expected to achieve targets. In such situation directive leader behavior who clarifies the paths by clearly defining roles and responsibilities to subordinates by establishing rules and regulations and
minimum standards of performance was more required. According to path goal theory, directive leader behavior reduces role ambiguity and increases subordinate satisfaction. The role ambiguity has inverse relationship with job satisfaction, which means directive leader behavior will be more effective in such situations because directive leader behavior removes obstacles by clarifying path and defining rules and regulations. These findings support Leonard (1992).

Path goal theory predicted that directive leader behavior will be more effective for the subordinates who have need for achievement. As directive leader through clarifying path guides subordinates in achieving their goals. Similarly, participative leader behavior is also effective as leader participates with subordinates in setting, clarifying and achieving goals. The results of this study reveal that there is an inverse relationship between subordinates’ job expectancy (I&II).

Yukl (2006) says that for subordinates with high need for autonomy participative leader behavior will increase the intrinsic valence of work resulting in greater effort and higher result. The results of this study revealed that need for autonomy had inverse relationship with employee job satisfaction.

5.4.1 Implications for Corporate Leaders

The position of middle managers in management thinking has always been indecisive. On one hand, they have been viewed as critical actors of corporate performance and change and on the other hand, they are absent as objects of analysis. Mintzberg (1999) says that middle managers get direct qualitative information which is priceless for strategic decision-making. They also have ‘tacit knowledge’ which is essential for strategy formation. Their middleness lies in being caught between those below, whose co-operation they need, and those above, who desire from them to implement stated policy/achieve given targets as per deadlines.

This study was important due to the role of telecom (cellular) industry in economic growth and its contribution in creating employment opportunities but also improving quality of life of a common man. Further, so far no effort had been made to study the corporate leadership and employee job satisfaction. Thus it was expected that the present study would be able to generate scientific thinking about leadership in telecom (cellular) industry.
Similarly, the study would provide the leadership behavior knowledge to business leaders in general and middle managers in particular to increase satisfaction, motivation and the performance of employees.

In the absence of research, corporate managers are not effectively utilizing the dynamic leadership theories needed to maintain and advance leadership knowledge in today’s increasingly complex environment. The results and theoretical knowledge of this study will help the corporate managers in self-improvement resulting to increased productivity, and performance through effective management along with enhanced subordinates motivation and job satisfaction.

The nature of work and problems arising out thereof, today demands more focus on situational/contingency leadership behavior than ever before. The critical determinant factor of organizational success is the satisfaction, morale and performance of its employees. The leader has to win by his special qualities of confidence, the respect and the acceptance of the led. Leader’s failure to be sensitive to peoples’ feelings; failure to recognize other peoples’ stress; failure to develop and guide employees; failure to encourage feedback on their own (the leader’s) performance; and failure to consult those affected before making decisions, leads not only to the failure of individual leader but will also lead to the organizational in effectiveness.

Leadership cannot be thought in vacuum rather it is a product of the situation and experiences. The situation in which the job is to be done and the people, who are to accomplish it, can’t be seen separately. Managers being success story in one organization may be failure in another organization which further highlights consideration of situational factors. Path-goal theory holds that, each of the four types of leader behavior will be used by an effective leader in different situations.

According to situational leadership theory, a leader behavior depends on the situation, so the leaders must be flexible and adopt the appropriate behavior as situation demands. Further, Path-goal theory argues that the leadership behavior of an individual varies from situation to situation. In other words, depending upon situation i.e. nature of problem or circumstances in the organization, an effective leader adjusts his or her leadership behavior accordingly. The path-goal theory relates different types of leadership
behavior to differing attitudes and behavioral responses of subordinates. For example, if subordinates lack confidence in their ability to do the job, they may need more consideration and support, but if subordinates’ perception about ability is high, a leader should delegate responsibilities to the subordinates, set challenging goals for them to achieve and show confidence in subordinates attaining the goals.

According to path-goal theory, participative leadership is an important leadership behavior because, employees in the center of an operation have knowledge both of problems and of solutions to solve these problems. Upon consultation they not only feel motivated but also the right kind of participation yields affiliation and acceptance. Above all, it gives employees a sense of accomplishment. So in the situation where subordinates have a highly structured task and a clear understanding of their job, participative leadership is best suited.

Path-goal theory defines supportive leader as one who, offers a wide range of rewards to subordinate such as encouragement, pats on the back, and respect. And to be more effective, leader can make the job more interesting by creating a friendly, open work environment, where employees are motivated to work harder and therefore achieve their goals and feel more satisfied while doing it. This behavior is most effective where task is relatively routine and simple.

In highly unstructured and non-routine job, where subordinates have role ambiguity, subordinates want clear directions from leader rather than sympathy. So leaders should avoid giving direction in a structured situation and provide guidance to subordinates in ambiguous situations. In situations where subordinates have a high need for autonomy and achievement, participation in decision making will increase the intrinsic valence of the work for these subordinates, thus resulting in the greater effort towards achievements of targets and higher satisfaction. And the situations where subordinates have internal locus of control, will be more satisfied with a participative leader while externals would be more satisfied with a directive leadership behavior. Similarly, in situations where subordinates had a highly structured task and a clear understanding of their job, participative leadership and achievement-oriented leadership had little or no effect on the effort-performance expectancy of subordinates.
Middle managers can persuade lower managers to create an environment of support, openness, trust and confidence in which subordinates see problems as an opportunity to learn and contribute to the solution of these. Since lower managers are working with others, so their satisfaction depends upon the extent to which the leadership roles of the middle managers satisfy their needs and expectations. Corporate leadership should create an environment that makes the employee believe in his work, to bring out the best of what he is capable of and stimulates him to bigger and better efforts. Middle managers are responsible for planning and initiative, organization and direction, cooperation and coordination, the effectiveness of the organization and the employee performance and satisfaction.

Professional background and training of the middle manager is an important determinant of their leadership behavior. The findings of this study may be helpful in designing and developing training programs for the effectiveness of leadership behavior of corporate leaders. Moreover, to become an effective leader needed to face challenges of the turbulent and uncertain times.

The contextual significance of this work cannot be overlooked as the research results are context-specific. The samples of this study included middle-managers (supervisors) and lower-level managers, rather than individuals in positions of significant authority, such as high-level managers and chief executives with overall responsibility for organizational performance. The skills and competencies of these ‘high-grade staff’ are different from other sectors of the Pakistan labor market and whilst this research was undertaken in a telecom (cellular) industry, so the results of this study can’t be used for other organizations in the private/corporate sectors.

The four leader behaviors: directive leader behavior; supportive leader behavior; participative leader behavior and; achievement-oriented studied in this research are all ‘soft-skill orientated’. At higher levels of management, it is argued that these ‘soft’ behaviors would be similar across varying cohorts. But contextual significance of this research cannot be ignored, and leadership behaviors studied in telecom industry (cellular) may not be applicable to all managerial levels in other sectors.

To date, leadership and management have often focused on ‘hard’ skills such as planning, organizing and directing, all within an impersonal hierarchical structure.
However, current thinking is now shifting towards an increase in the importance of ‘soft’ skills such as coaching, guiding and communicating.

Leadership can be conceptualized as an individual process, dyadic process, a group process and an organizational process. And all leadership theories focus on only one of these levels, because it is very difficult to develop a multi-level theory that is parsimonious and easy to apply. The dyadic approach to leadership focuses on the relationship between a leader and another individual who is usually a follower- not in one direction but with dynamic equilibrium.

The employee of today requires a subtly different approach in the ways that they are led and managed, though employee did what he/she was told because the order came from someone senior but today’ this is no longer acceptable. Now employees are more ‘questioning’ and, willing to respond to leadership behavior that involve them in the decision making process by explaining the rationale behind the decision and rewarding their achievements. In this respect, the importance of providing/ensuring valuable rewards for followers (“goals”) and then help them finding the best way of getting there (“path”) cannot be overlooked to effective managerial leadership.

Today, we are moving towards organizations with core values of alignment, creativity and empowerment. And corporate leaders are required to adapt to peer leadership, matrix-style management and team building in a fast-paced, high tempo environment- which requires a holistic and multifaceted approach to leadership and stresses interactive participation, open communication and continuous learning for both the leaders and the followers. Thus leadership becomes the hallmark of creation of systems, structures and environments where interaction, facilitation and learning can occur.

In its most succinct terms, the function of a leader as explicated in path-goal theory is “To increase personal pay-offs to subordinates for work-goal attainment and make the path to these pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying it, reducing road blocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction en route”(House, 1971). Thus, the effective leader is one who assists subordinates through paths, which ultimately lead to organizationally-desired and individually-valued outcomes. The need for such leadership is moderated by characteristics of the environment as well as by characteristics of the subordinates. As Bass (2008) notes: “The leader ‘needs to complement only what is
missing in a situation to enhance the subordinate’s motivation, satisfaction, and performance”.

House Path-Goal Theory of leadership effectiveness was published 35 years ago, was based on the work of Georgopolous, Mahoney and Jones (1957), and the doctoral dissertation and earlier work of Evans (1968, 1970), and Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory of motivation (to identify the effects of leader behavior on subordinate outcome variables). From this initial development by Evans in 1968, path-goal theory has developed into a contingency form (House, 1971) and into a general diagnostic model (Kerr & Jermier, 1978).

Initially, path-goal theory focused on the impact of subordinates’ expectancies and, to a lesser extent, the provision of valued rewards. Further, Burns’s (2003) work on transformational leadership led to the development of charismatic and transformational theories of leadership (House, 1977) which take path-goal theory to its logical transcendental limit.

Studies on path-goal theory have produced generally inconsistent findings. Theory also has some conceptual limitations as well as it suggests only one-way impact i.e. from leader to follower, which could promote dependency; similarly, it also fails to explain adequately the relationship between leadership behavior and worker motivation. Moreover, interpreting the meaning of the theory can be very confusing because of its complexity and at the same time it incorporates so many different aspects of leadership; consequently, it is difficult to implement.

The original theory was stated in broad and general terms, with a belief that this would facilitate its modification and extension over time (Filley, House, & Kerr, 1976; House, 1971; House & Dessler, 1974; and House & Mitchell, 1974). But, House’s (1971, 1974) model does not take into account how organizational culture and climate, working conditions, technology, or type of organizational design affect the leadership process. In addition, path-goal theory does not account for the political behavior of leaders, strategic leadership of organizations, or leadership as it relates to change. Similarly, the working environment since the 1970s has changed significantly due to political, economic, socio-cultural, technological, legal and environmental reasons. Moreover, today academics and practitioners see leadership very different today than as it was seen 30 years ago. In other
words, the environment in which leadership is enacted may have evolved beyond the development of path-goal theory itself.

Although there are a number of concerns about how path-goal theory has been tested hitherto, but according to Schriesheim et al (2006) three prime concerns are:

- Poor quality measures have often been used in previous path-goal theory tests. This shortcoming is believed to have limited the level of support for the theory (House, 1996).

- Most researchers have tested only a few aspects of the theory while ignoring other aspects. It has been suggested that this has occurred because: “Scholars generally feel uncomfortable in refining, extending, and testing the path-goal framework, partly because the easiest relationships have already been tested… and partly because of the difficulty of developing meaningful extensions of or modifications to the theory” (Schriesheim & Neider, 1996, p. 319). Addressing this second concern, House (1996) developed a substantial revision of the original theory, further explicating its theoretical underpinnings and providing a clearer basis for future tests of the path-goal approach.

- All direct tests — to date — of path-goal theory have employed only raw score or compound analyses. Failing to test appropriately the level of analysis at which relationships occur can result in effects being missed or misidentified. In general, the lack of explicit attention to level of analysis issues has been strongly criticized as a very serious deficiency and limitation of previous leadership and management research (Klein et al., 1994). Since none of the approximately 120 studies investigating the theory has directly tested both path-goal hypotheses and their hypothesized level(s) of analysis, suitable research is clearly needed; this is one purpose of this study.

The four leader behaviors of path-goal are treated discretely which is based on the assumption that each of the leader behaviors will have unique effects. When asked for discrete information from participants they give discrete information, and separate treatment of each type of leadership behavior in reality can be troublesome, thus likely interactions among the various leader behaviors must be considered.
Having said all this, Path-goal theory, however, was the first leadership theory that convincingly specified multiple leader behaviors though Stogdill, Wherry, & Jaynes, 1956 had attempted to identify more leadership dimensions but ended with simplistic one- and two-dimensional models of leadership, i.e. task and relationship-oriented leader behavior. Path-goal theory made a breakthrough and specified four conceptually distinct varieties of leader behavior, by denying what was taken-for-granted about the exclusiveness and primacy of task and relationship-oriented behaviors by including participative and achievement-oriented behaviors (Hunt, 1996).

Path-goal theory stated that leadership was, in essence, a dyadic process- more than a group phenomenon. Leaders were theorized to impact the motivations of individuals by affecting their valences and expectations. They also impacted the satisfaction levels of individual subordinates and the degrees to which individuals accepted the leader by denying the uniformity and consistency of group leadership. Further, path-goal theory by identifying more complex combinations of moderating variables on the effects of leader behavior accelerated the move toward contingency approaches in organizational behavior research. Finally, and most importantly, path-goal theory laid the groundwork for considering situations where behaviors of leaders were of little or no consequence by stating that leader behavior would be motivational for subordinates to the extent that it complements the work environment and supplements it with what is otherwise lacking thus suggesting that in certain situations leadership becomes irrelevant.

The questioning of the primary assumption in leadership research by House resulted in the work of Calder (1977) Pfeiffer (1977), Kerr and Jermier (1978), Meindl, Erlich, & Dukerich (1985) and others. Ironically, a major feature of the path-goal theory of leadership that made it interesting was that it bordered on denying the importance of leader behaviors in certain situations, thereby raising to awareness the fundamental assumption in the field (Evans, 1996).

Path-goal leadership theory is basically a ‘functional’ approach to leadership, emphasizing on diagnosis of functions, to be performed by subordinates’, work environments to keep them motivated, perform at high levels, and be satisfied. And by identifying key functions necessary for subordinates’ motivation, performance, and satisfaction; identifying the degree to which these functions are provided by sources other
than the leader (e.g., the task, co-workers, professional training, etc.); and by predicting the effects of different types of leader behavior based upon the assessments outlined in the two steps above, path-goal theory can be extended further.

Miner’s (2002) says, “Path-goal theory has a compelling logic to it that other theories have not achieved” and that “one cannot help but conclude that in this respect, path-goal theory is on the right track.” Despite the fact that the theory has not been adequately tested, path-goal theory has made many important contributions to the study of leadership by providing a conceptual framework and by guiding researchers how to identifying potentially relevant situational variables and as a result OB writers and experts can not complete their work without mentioning path-goal theory, and use it as dominant guiding imagery especially when thinking about contingency approaches to leadership.

This study has established that there is a relationship between the variables; however, the direction of this association can’t be predicted accurately and causality of leader behavior relationship can’t be argued without further research, which is replicated and revalidated with other samples.
5.6 **General Recommendations**

Leadership cannot be thought in vacuum rather it is a product of the situation and experiences. The situation in which the job is to be done and the people, who are to accomplish it, can’t be seen separately. As the study concluded that there is a significant relationship between leader behavior and subordinates’ outcomes i.e. acceptance of leader by subordinates, job expectancy (I&II) and job satisfaction. Further situational factors (task structure, role ambiguity, stress, need for achievement, need for autonomy, locus of control and perception about ability) also affect the subordinates’ acceptance of leader, job expectancy (I&II) and job satisfaction. Thus management of the cellular companies may benefit from the findings of this research by taking following actions to improve the performance of their organizations, enhance employee morale and job satisfaction:

1. Revisit/re-define the job descriptions and work structure to avoid role ambiguity resulting in job dissatisfaction.

2. Manage the expectation of employees in the age group (20-40) who are more ambitious and want immediate promotions, higher increase in salaries and more authority and freedom to work independently.

3. Revise the promotion policies and compensation structure which ensures internal equity and promotes culture of performance, justice and fair play.

4. Controlling stress by managing work load, ensuring work-life balance and clearly defining job descriptions and work structures.

5. Introduce participatory management to ensure involvement of subordinates in decision making and also a wide range of rewards to subordinate such as encouragement, pats on the back, and respect.

6. Design and develop training programs to train managers on the role of situational factors (environmental and subordinate characteristics) in the organizational effectiveness and employee job satisfaction.
5.7 Recommendations for Further Research

The findings of the study suggested five recommendations for future research:

1. The leader behaviors established from this research are of middle managers performing tactical and operational role in the organization. Therefore, it would be useful to determine the relevant leader behaviors at the strategic levels.

2. The underlying mechanism of path-goal theory deals with expectancy, a cognitive approach to understanding motivation where people calculate effort-to-performance probabilities. As theories of motivation have evolved over the last 30 years, so it is time to develop and test path-goal theory with one of the current theories of motivation which will also add to the understanding of complexities of human behavior.

3. The interactions between leader behaviors, interactions among moderating variables, time-lagged effects, and relationships among dependent variables and many other aspects of real-world organizational behavior in these areas need to be investigated/studied.

4. It would also be useful to extend this study to other major industries such as financial/banking industry, IT industry, textile industry and pharmaceutical industry etc. so that the results of this study should be compared with the other industries.

5. This research has examined satisfaction of the individual member of the work unit. But it is also important to identify which either performance or satisfaction contributes most to the achievement of organizational goals and its effectiveness.
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Appendix A

Demographic Variable Information Performa

1. Your age: ____________ Years
2. Gender: Male / Female
3. Qualification:
   1. BA/BSc
   2. Master
   3. M. Phil
   4. PhD
   5. Others (Please Specify)___________
4. Rank:
   1. Lower Management
   2. Middle Management
5. Salary Range:
   1. 15000-20000
   2. 20001-25000
   3. 25001-30000
   4. 30001-35000
   5. 35001-above
6. Number of Years of Experience:
   1. Less than one year
   2. 1-5 years
   3. 6-10 years
   4. 11-20 years
   5. 21-30 years
7. Length of Service Under Current Supervisor:
   1. Less than one year
   2. 1-5 years
   3. 6-10 years
**Appendix B**

**Leader behavior Items**

Responses: 5) Always  4) Often  3) Occasionally  2) Seldom  1) Never

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Directive Leadership Items (DL)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>He lets group member know what is expected of them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He decided what shall be done and how it shall be done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He schedules the work to be done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He maintains definite standards of performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supportive Leadership Items (SL)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>He is friendly and approachable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He puts suggestions made by the group into operation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He treats all group members as his equals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He looks out for the personal welfare of group members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He is willing to make changes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He helps me overcome problems which stop me from carrying out my task</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He helps me working on my tasks more pleasant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participative leadership items (PL)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>When faced with a problem he consults with his subordinates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before making decision he gives serious consideration to what his subordinates have to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He asks subordinates for their suggestions concerning how to carry out assignments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before taking action he consults with his subordinates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He asks subordinates for suggestions on what assignments should be made</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Achievement oriented leadership items (AL)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My Supervisor encourages continual improvement in my performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Supervisor lets me know what is expected of me to perform at my highest level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Supervisor demonstrates confidence in my ability to meet most objectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Task Structure

Kindly rate as you feel correct rating for your job:

1. Problems which arise on my job can generally be solved by using standard procedure
   Definitely not true of my job 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely true of my job

2. I can generally perform my job by using standardized methods
   Definitely not true of my job 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely true of my job

3. Problems which I encounter in my job can generally be solved in a number of different ways.
   Definitely not true of my job 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely true of my job

4. How similar are the tasks you perform in a typical work day?
   5- Almost all the same
   4- Quite a few same
   3- Only a few same
   2- Very few same
   1- Almost all different

5. If you were to write a list of the exact activities you would be confronted by on an average work day, what percent of these activities do you think would be interrupted by unexpected events?
   1- 80-100%
   2- 60-80%
   3- 40-60%
   4- 20-40%
   5- 0-20%

6. How much variety is there in the work tasks, which you perform?
   1- Very much
   2- Quite a bit
   3- Some
   4- Little
   5- Very little
7. Every job is confronted by certain routine and repetitive demands. What percent of the activities or work demands connected with your job would you consider to be of a routine nature?

1- 0-20%
2- 20-40%
3- 40-60%
4- 60-80%
5- 80-100%

8. The task of some individuals is more “structured” than others: the goals are clearer, the methods to be used are more understood, and the problems are more repetitive and less unique, for example. Would you please rate what you feel is the degree of “structure” of your job by circling the best response.

My job is highly Unstructured

My job is highly Structured
## Role Ambiguity

### Responses:
1. **Strongly agree**  
2. **Agree**  
3. **Never decided**  
4. **Disagree**  
5. **Strongly Disagree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. #</th>
<th>STATEMENTS</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UD</th>
<th>DA</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I know what my responsibilities are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I do not know if my work will be acceptable to my Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am told how well I am doing my job by my Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are lack of policies and guidelines to guide me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Explanation is clear of what has to be done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel certain how I will be evaluated for a raise or promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I know exactly what is expected of me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have to work under vague directives or orders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There are clear, planned goals and objectives for my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Stress

Read each statement and mark those that tend to be TRUE of you with a “T” those which are definitely not true of you with an “F” for FALSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do not have very good health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I sometimes feel weak all over</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>My job tends to directly effect my health</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I have had trouble getting to sleep or staying asleep</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I work under great deal of tension</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I get irritated or annoyed over the way things are going</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>If I had a different job, my health would probably improve</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I seem to tire quickly</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I often “take my job home with me” in the sense that I think about it when doing other things</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix F

## Subordinate Characteristics

Kindly rate the extent you feel it is correct for you {Minimum -1 2 3 4 5 – Maximum}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Achievement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, how much do you feel that your Supervisor can do to further your career in the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much weight your supervisor’s recommendation have in any decision, which would promotion, transfers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your present job plans do you want a promotion to a higher position at some point in time?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it important for you to progress upward in higher education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it important for you to get promotion in your job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Autonomy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think you should do your job independent?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to work according to the directions of others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it important for you to be independent in your work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your present job, do you feel comfortable when self controlled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception about Ability</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know enough about the job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very competent and up-to-date in my subject</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always produce work of high quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think myself better than majority of my colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what do you trust to fate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that what is going to happen will happen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that fate can be changed with struggle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree your misfortunes result from the mistakes you make</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree you have little influence over the things that happen to you</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Acceptance of Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the behavior of your supervisor is acceptable for you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent you act upon the directions of your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the supervision of your supervisor is acceptable to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent you are ready to accept the orders of your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent the leadership style of your supervisor is acceptable for you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you want to get rid of your supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent you follow the directions of your supervisor willingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H

### Job Expectancy Scale

Responses: 5) Strongly agree 4) Agree 3) Never decided 2) Disagree 1) Strongly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort Leads to Performance (EI)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Putting forth as much energy as possible leads to my producing high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality output.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing things as well as I am capable leads to high quality output.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting forth as much energy as possible leads to my producing high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality output.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying hard as I can leads to high quality of output?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trying hard as I can leads to turning out my production requirement on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving the job all I can leads to a high quality of output.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Leads to Rewards (EII)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Producing a high quality output increases my chances of promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producing a high quality output is rewarded with higher pay here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the job done in time increases my chances of promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the job done in time is rewarded with higher pay here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company gives me recognition for producing high quality output.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The company gives me recognition for getting my job done on time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Job Descriptive Index

Directions: Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work? In the blank besides each word below write.

Y For “Yes” if it describes your work
N For “No” if it does NOT describes it
? If you can not decide

Work on Present Job
- Useful - Frustrating
- Tiring - Simple
- Satisfying - Healthful
- Boring - Good
- Creative - Uncomfortable
- Respected - Pleasant

Workers on Present Job

Directions: Think of the pay you get now. How will does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay?

Y For “Yes” if it describes your work
N For “No” if it does NOT describes it
? If you cannot decide

Present Pay
- Income adequate for normal expenses - Barely live on income
- Insecure - Underpaid
- Less than I deserve - Well paid

Directions: Think of opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these? In the blank besides each word below, write.

Y For “Yes” if it describes your opportunities for promotion
N For “No” if it does NOT describe them
? If you cannot decide

Opportunities for Promotion
- Good opportunities for promotion - Promotion on ability
- Opportunities somewhat limited - Dead-end job
- Regular promotions  - Infrequent promotions

Directions: Think of kind for supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this? In the blank besides each below,

Y For “Yes” if it describes the supervision you get on your job
N For “No” if it does NOT describe them
? If you can not decide

**Supervision**

- Asks my advice  - Hard to please
- Impolite  - Praises good work
- Know job well  - Annoying
- Influential  - Intelligent
- Up to date  - Poor planner
- Around when need  - Bad
- Has favorite  - Lazy

Directions: Think of your job in general. All in all, what it is like most of time? In the blank beside each word, writ:

Y For “Yes” if it describes your job
N For “No” if it does NOT describe it
? If you can not decide

**Job in General**

- Pleasant  - Superior  - Bad
- Better than most  - Ideal  - Waste of time
- Excellent  - Enjoyable  - Good
- Worthwhile  - Worse than most  - Acceptable
### Appendix J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know what my responsibilities are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel certain about how much authority I have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know that I have divided my time properly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to “feel my way” in performing my duties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am corrected or rewarded when I really don’t expect it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know if my work will be acceptable to my boss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My boss tells me how well I am doing my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are lack of policies and guidelines to guide me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation is clear of what has been done.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel certain how I will be evaluated for a raise or promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know exactly what is expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to work under vague direction or orders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear, planned goals and objectives for my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Read each statement and mark those that tend to be TRUE of you with a “T”, and those which are definitely not true of you with an “F”, for FALSE.

I don not have very good health.       T  F
I am often bothered by acid indigestion or heartburn.  T  F
I sometimes feel weak all over.        T  F
My job tends to directly affect my health.  T  F
I wake up with stiffness or aching in joints or muscles.  T  F
I have had trouble getting to sleep or staying asleep.  T  F
I work under the great deal of tension.  T  F
I have felt fidgety or nervous as a result of my job.  T  F
I get irritated or annoyed over the way things are going.  T  F
If I had a different job, my health would probably improve.  T  F
I seem to tire quickly.  T  F
Problems associated with my job have kept me awake at night.  T  F
I may now have an ulcer but I am not sure of it.  T  F
I have felt nervous before attending meetings.  T  F
I often “take my job home with me” in the sense that I think about it when doing other things.  T  F
I often wonder whether it is all worth it.  T  F

Thank you very much for taking time to complete this questionnaire. I appreciate your effort and value your input.
## LEADERSHIP DIMENSIONS

| 1. Encouragement | Encourage the heart (LPI Leadership Practices Inventory; Kouzes & Posner, 1995)  
Support (Ragins, 1989)  
Cheerlead, support, and encourage more than judge, criticize, and evaluate (Blanchard, 1996)  
Provide encouragement needed for continuous improvement (Fitz-enz, 1997)  
Encourage and reinforce (Wilson, George, Wellsins, & Byham, 1994)  
Improves self-encouragement and mental skills (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996) |
| 2. Risqué | Takes risks (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998; Bradford & Cohen, 1984; Wilson, O’Hare, & Shipper, 1990)  
Risk taker (KA-I; Shaskin & Burke, 1990)  
Ability to take risks (Cain, 1998)  
Make tough decisions (Cain, 1998)  
Seize opportunities (Bradford & Cohen, 1984)  
Making and taking risks—creating opportunity (Taffinder, 1997)  
Seizing chances when presented (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
Personal risk (Conger & Kanungo, 1998)  
Experiments and takes risks (Yeung & Ready, 1995)  
Take initiative beyond job requirements (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999) |
| 3. Active | Fast (Cox & Hoover, 1992; Kanter 1995)  
Participate actively (Kent & Moss, 1990) |
| 4. In front | Be first (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
Symbolize company to the outside world (Deal & Kennedy, 1982)  
Enhance the company’s image (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
To go before (Richardson—New Dictionary of the English Language, 1844)  
A guide (Buzzan, Dottino, & Israel, 1999; Cox & Hoover, 1992; DePree, 1989; Edinger, 1967; Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1990; Richardson—New Dictionary of the English Language, 1844; Rost, 1993)  
Conductor (Richardson—New Dictionary of the English Language, 1844)  
Represent the organization (Plachy, 1987)  
Control actions (Cox & Hoover, 1992) |
| 5. Feedback | Provide feedback (Staub, 1996) (SMP)  
Giving feedback (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996)  
Focus on strengths (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996)  
Provide specific and frequent feedback to improve team performance (Kanter, 1995)  
Remain open to criticism (Gastil, 1997) (Smith, 1996) (Kanter, 1995)  
Advocates feedback (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
Observe themselves-feedback (Smith, 1996) |
| 6. Trust    | Build trust (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)  
|             | Builds trust by reducing fear (Ryan & Oestreich, 1998) 
|             | Trust subordinates (Smith, 1996)  
|             | Trust associates (Smith, 1996)  
|             | About trust (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997) 
|             | Trust (Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood, 1999; Wilson, George, Wellens, & Byham, 1994)  
|             | Trusting staff to deliver (Esgender & Kusy, 1999)  
|             | Inspires trust (Bennis, 1997)  
|             | Generates trust (Bennis, 1997)  
|             | Develops trust across a network of constituencies (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
|             | Creates an environment that encourages trust (Deming, 1986)  
| 7. Flexible | Flexible (Kanter, 1997)  
|             | Flexible about people and organizational structure (Maccoby, 1981)  
|             | Conceptual flexibility (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
|             | Principled flexibility (Staub, 1996)  
| 8. Inform   | Information sharing (Daft & Lengel, 1998; McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
|             | Share information (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)  
|             | Inform every employee (Barnes, 1996)  
|             | Partnerships (Daft & Lengel, 1998)  
|             | Perceives others as part of the same whole rather than as separate  
|             | Goal for people to feel a sense of belonging to something bigger and more important than just an individual job (Daft & Lengel, 1998)  
|             | Possess willingness and ability to involve others (Schein, 1992)  
|             | Elicit participation (Schein, 1992)  
|             | Ability to convince others—including those you cannot interact with face-to-face to support you (Sadler, 1997)  
|             | Helps people to see themselves as components in a system (Deming, 1986)  
|             | Connects people to the right cause (Murphy, 1996)  
|             | Create enthusiastic support for the goals of the business (Fitz-enz, 1997)  
|             | Strategic alignment (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
|             | Break down barriers (Shelton, 1997)  
|             | Partnership building (Esgender & Kusy, 1999) (Daft & Lengel, 1998)  
|             | Feels personal value comes from mentoring and working collaboratively with others (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
| 10. Togetherness | Reduce barriers by encouraging conversations (Daft & Lengel, 1998)  
|             | Break down barriers between departments/people (Shelton, 1997)  
|             | Encourage openness (Bradford & Cohen, 1984)  
|             | Promote openness (Barnes, 1996)  
|             | Synergizes stakeholders (Murphy, 1996)  
|             | Seeks synergy (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
|             | Build group synergy (Buzzan, Dottino, & Israel, 1999)  
|             | Builds an sense of unity (Daft & Lengel, 1998)  |
| 11. Clarity | Increase clarity and agreement (Bushe, 2001)  
Refine our perception of what we aspire (Chatterjee, 1998)  
Perceives-defines-expresses reality (DePree, 1989)  
Demonstrate extraordinary levels of perception and insight into the realities of the world (Schein 1992)  
Clear objectives (Cox & Hoover, 1992) |
| 12. Lead the way | Formulate and define purpose (Bernard, 1938)  
Leaders are in front of those they lead (Grint, 2000)  
The head of the firm (Fairholm, 2001)  
Knows where it is going (Munroe, 1997)  
Focused (Kanter, 1997)  
Determination (Cox & Hoover, 1992; Meyer, House, & Slechta, 1998; Snyder, Dowd, & Houghton, 1994)  
Determines where business is going with broad internal and external objectives (Timpe, 1987) |
| 13. Coordination and collaboration | Concerned with transformation of doubts into cooperation (Long, 1963)  
Foster collaboration by promoting cooperative goals (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)  
Collaborators (Cox & Hoover, 1992; Kanter, 1997)  
Brings out people's abilities to coordinate (Jacobson, 2000)  
Gets people to move along with him/her and each other with competence (Jaques & Celment, 1994)  
Causes others to act or respond in a shared direction (DuBrin, 1997)  
Champions of cooperation-understanding-knowledge (Waitley, 1995)  
Collaborative and interdependent (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
Coordinator (Quinn, 1988)  
Advocate partnering and collaboration as preferred styles of behavior (Fitzenz, 1997)  
Understands benefits of cooperation and losses from competition (Deming, 1986)  
Build collaborative relationships (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |
Build teams (Bradford & Cohen, 1984; Crosby, 1997; Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood, 1999)  
Build self-managing teams (Bridges, 1996)  
Team builders (Ragins, 1999; Snyder, Dowd, & Houghton, 1994)  
Build a team spirit (Harung, Alexander, & Heaton, 1999)  
Build relationships with people (O’Conner, 1997) |
| 15. Achieves | Achievement (Donnithorne, 1994; Stogdill, 1950)  
Makes things happen (Harris, 1989; Nanus, 1989; Sadler, 1997)  
To cause progress (Cox & Hoover, 1992) |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | **A tool to achieve results (Olmstead, 2000)**  
Achievement orientation (Cox & Hoover, 1992) |
| 16. Creative | Creative (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997)  
Creative and innovative ability of work force will help their company break away from the pack and remain competitive in global economy (Buzan, Dottino, & Israel, 1999)  
Creative thinking (Harung, Alexander, & Heaton, 1999)  
Creativity indefinitely (Buzan, Dottio, & Israel, 1999)  
Is an original (Bennis, 1997) |
| 17. Innovative | Innovate (Bennis, 1997)  
Develop fresh ideas to long-standing problems and open issues (Snyder, Dowd, & Houghton, 1994)  
Innovating (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997)  
High level of innovation (Cox & Hoover, 1992) |
| 18. Fresh Thinking | Think in new and fresh ways (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1997)  
Brings the organization out of the box (Jacobson, 2000)  
Capacity of a human community-people living and working together to bring forth new realities (Senge, 1990)  
Initiating (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997)  
Developing perceptual alternatives (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996)  
Open mind that welcomes the novel and unusual ideas (Schein, 1992)  
Ignite innovation (Corbin, 2000)  
Meet the challenge of oneself to improve (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1997)  
Make improvements continuously (Barnes, 1996)  
Greatest effort and most insightful thinking (Wadsworth, 1997)  
Conceptual skills (Bennis, 1997)  
Uses intuition and foresight to balance fact-logic-proof (McGee-Cooper & Trammel, 1995)  
Stays current with emerging trends (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |
| 19. Problem-solver | Solve problems that arise (Murphy, 1996)  
Acknowledge problems openly (Barnes, 1996)  
Urge consideration of counterintuitive alternatives (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1997)  
Avoids role of chief problem-solver (Smith, 1996)  
Sound analytical and problem-solving skills (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
Make decisions that solve problems (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)  
Initiation of acts that result in consistent pattern of group interaction directed toward solution of mutual problems (Hemphill, 1949) |
| 20. Customer | Exhibit strong customer orientation (Yeung & Ready, 1995)  
Focus on customers (Barnes, 1996)  
Visualize the business through the customers eyes (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
Respond to customer needs (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999) |
| 21. Character | Character that inspires (Montgomery, 1961)  
Character (Bennis, 1997; Danzig, 1998; Donnithorne, 1994)  
Emotional stability (Auguinis & Adams, 1998) |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates personal character (Ulrich, Zenger, &amp; Smallwood, 1999)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22. Plans/guides/directs</strong></td>
<td>Provide guidance (Staub, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilize to shared aspirations (Kouzes &amp; Posner, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence shared direction (Seeman, 1960; Shartle, 1956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishes direction (Conger, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directing activities of a group toward shared goals (Hemphill &amp; Coons, 1957)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of a clear and complete system of expectations (Batten, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Act in ways that results in others acting or responding to a shared direction (Shartle, 1956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Process of arranging a situation (Bellows, 1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulate strategy (Yeung &amp; Ready, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giving direction (Jacobs &amp; Jaques, 1990; Mileham &amp; Spacie, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sets the purpose or direction (Jaques &amp; Clement, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct and command (Cox &amp; Hoover, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sets clear and agreed goals (Eales-White, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set standard of performance (Deal &amp; Kennedy, 1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning and organizing (Managerial Practices Survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regulate the course (Rost, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call forth authentic action in response to issues (Terry, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine strategy (Moxley, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make things happen (Harris, 1989; Nanus, 1989; Sadler, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bias toward action (Bennis, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employs dynamic planning (Napolitano &amp; Henderson, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23. Understands skills of followers</strong></td>
<td>Knows the work of subordinates (Donnithorne, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skillful deployment of personal qualities (Pettigrew, 1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Takes responsibility for knowing-understanding-enabling the creative people in the organization (DePree, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discover-unleash-polish diverse gifts (DePree, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide the organization (Wadsworth, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guides a traveler/head that leads/heads that conducts (Crabb, 1839)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide a group to consensus (Naisbitt &amp; Aburdene, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide group in a beneficial direction or valuable destination (Wadsworth, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To guide (Cox &amp; Hoover, 1992; Richardson, 1844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide the workforce so they feel valued (Buzan, Dottino, &amp; Israel, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide organization to new levels of learning (DePree, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25. Deals with change in organizations</strong></td>
<td>Course of action is changed (Bogardus, 1934)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work in systems that are trying to change (Vaill, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See new possibilities (Kanter, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To take charge to make things happen (Sadler, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seek change (Sadler, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coping with change (Kotter, 1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 26. Group interaction | Communicates new direction (Kotter, 1990)  
Influence planned change (Harris, 1989)  
Build bridge to positive and productive change (Meyer, Houze, & Slechta, 1998)  
Help organizations adapt to change (Jacobson, 2000)  
Helps individuals, departments, and organizations adapt to change (Jacobson, 2000)  
Enable continuous change and movement toward some desired destination (Bradshaw, 1998)  
Identify themselves as change agents (Tichy & Devanna, 1990)  
Promote change (Wilson, George, Wellins, & Byham, 1994)  
Manage changes required to realize the vision (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)  
Leaders change first (Change Mentor, 2001)  
Serve as a catalyst and manager of strategic change (Yeung & Ready, 1995)  
Willingness to change (Greenleaf, R. K., edited by Beazley, Beggs, & Spears, 2003)  
Institutionalizes change (Harris, 1989)  
Propensity for instituting change (McLean & Weitzel, 1992)  
Manage change (Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood 1999)  
Involve others in planning, introducing, implementing and integrating change (Change Mentor, 2001)  
Heal wounds inflicted by change (Murphy, 1996)  
Make change happen and work as change agent (Schein, 1992)  
Embraces change (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
Coordinating leadership tasks in change cycles (Crosby, 1997)  
Embraces change (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
Enlarges capacity for change (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |
|---|---|
| 27. Unifies                      | Mutual stimulation (Pigors, 1935)  
|                                 | About joining and coming together (Daft & Lengel, 1998)  
|                                 | Attract to persuade (Richardson, 1844)  |
|                                 | Deal with incompetence (Smith, 1996)  |
| 29. Is an example               | Humility (Collins, 2002)  
|                                 | Fierce resolve (Collins, 2002)  
|                                 | Is a Models for followers (Munroe, 1997)  
|                                 | Be an example (Covey, 1996)  
|                                 | A model (Covey, 1996)  
|                                 | Go ahead of (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
|                                 | Show the way (Cox & Hoover, 1992; Richardson, 1844)  
|                                 | Create a path (Cox & Hoover, 1992; Hesselbein, Goldsmith, & Beckhard, 1996)  
|                                 | Deals with own discouragement as one way of modeling (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996)  
|                                 | Provide role models (Deal & Kennedy, 1982)  
|                                 | Model the way (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)  
|                                 | Mentor (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995; Quinn, 1988)  
|                                 | Show the way to induce to follow (Richardson, 1844)  
|                                 | Leads by example (Vaughn, 1997)  
|                                 | Models values (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  |
| 30. Servanthood                 | Serves (Farling, Stone, & Winston, 1999; Laub, 1999; Russel, 2001; Munroe, 1997)  
|                                 | Motivated by desire to serve others (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
|                                 | Helpful individuals (Jacobson, 2000)  
|                                 | Are generous and magnanimous (Smith, 1996)  
|                                 | Do unto others-serve (Smith, 1996)  |
| 31. Persuade                    | Impress will on those led (Moore, 1927)  
|                                 | Make people like it (Titus 1950)  
|                                 | Persuasion (DuBrin, 1997; Hollander 1978; Spears & Lawrence, 2002)  |
| 32. Empowerment                 | Share power and control (Maccoby, 1981; Schein, 1992; Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood, 1999)  
|                                 | Empower and engage employees (Covey, 1996)  
|                                 | Not fear the strengths in subordinates (Drucker, 1997)  
|                                 | Releases intelligence, creativity and initiative of others (Simmons, 1996)  
|                                 | Activating talents of others (Rusaw, 2001)  
|                                 | Concern for empowerment (Shelton, 1997)  
|                                 | Influences people to think-feel-take positive action to achieve goals (Capezio & Moorehouse, 1997)  
|                                 | Empower each individual team member to take actions that are needed to achieve vision (Beck & Yeager, 2001)  
|                                 | Transfers ownership of work to those who execute the work (Belasco & Stayer, 1994)  |
| 33. Challenge the status quo | Challenges the status quo diplomatically (Caroselli, 2000)  
Challenges the status quo positively (Caroselli, 2000)  
Challenging the process (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)  
Does not maintain the status quo (Conger & Kanungo, 1998)  
Challenge the norm (Taffinder, 1997)  
Go beyond the status quo (Taffinder, 1997)  
By confronting and challenging the status quo-searches for opportunities (Yeung & Ready, 1995)  
Busts the bureaucracy (Shelton, 1997)  
Breaks down hierarchy (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
Maintain a sense of outrage (willing to take the heat and pressure from above to correct wrongs) (Smith, 1996) |
| --- | --- |
| 34. Power | Power to influence thoughts and actions of others (Zalenik, 1992)  
Power over decision-making process of community life (Lowery, 1962)  
Ability to use power effectively (Koontz & Weiheich, 1990)  
Ability to use power in a responsible manner (Koontz & Weiheich, 1990)  
Power (Ragins, 1989)  
Exert power through dignity (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
Personal power (Fairholm, 2001)  
Share power (Maccoby, 1981; Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood, 1999; Schein, 1992)  
Participative approach to management and willingness to share power (Maccoby, 1981)  
Power of the authority of the office (Deming, 1986)  
Power of knowledge (Deming, 1986)  
Power of personality (Deming, 1986)  
Induce obedience, respect, loyalty, and cooperation (Moore, 1927)  
Position of authority (Olmstead, 2000) |
| 35. Technical | Technical competence (Bennis, 1997; Hinkin & Tracey, 1994; Smith, 1996)  
Technology foresight (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
Comfortable with advanced technology (Bennis, 1997)  
Advance technology transfer and venturing (Harris, 1996)  
Display technical skills (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999) |
| 36. People-oriented | Identify, evoke, and use the strengths of all resources in the organization—the most important of which is people (Batten, 1989)  
Relational (Edinger, 1967)  
Interpersonal (Moloney, 1979; Schriesheim, Tolliver, & Behling, 1978)  
Interpersonal interaction (Schriesheim, Tolliver, & Behling, 1978)  
Read and understand others (Staub 1996)  
Skill in building relationship with others (O’Connor, 1997)  
Generates confidence in people who were frightened (Bardwick, 1996)  
Concern for well-being (Shelton, 1997)  
Focus on relationship (Humphrey, 1987)  
Friendly (Kanter, 1997; Tyagi, 1985)  
Reciprocal relationship (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)  
Caring (Maccoby, 1981)  
Focus on interpersonal interactions to increase organizational effectiveness (Schriesheim, Tolliver, & Behling, 1978)  
Responsibility to represent followers’ needs and goals they want to achieve (Plachy, 1987)  
About people (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997; Maccoby, 1981; Mileham & Spacie, 1996)  
Knowing people are the primary asset of any organization (Buzan, Dottino, & Israel, 1999)  
Engage the whole person (Corbin, 2000)  
Emotional side of directing organizations (Barach & Eckhardt, 1996)  
Interpersonal skills (Hinkin & Tracey, 1994)  
Sensitivity to members needs (Conger & Kanungo, 1998)  
Treats with respect (Tyagi, 1985)  
Change people’s physical state of being (Blanchard)  
Create emotion by generating certainty in people who were vacillating (Bardwick, 1996)  
Concerned with what others are doing (Grint, 2000)  
Helps people see themselves (Deming, 1986)  
People skills (Bennis, 1997)  
Understands people (Deming, 1986)  
Sensitive to what motivates others (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
Guide workforce so they are valued as part of the team (Buzan, Dottino, & Israel, 1999)  
Believe in people (Tichy & Devanna, 1990)  
Nurturing humane organizations and communities (Crosby, 1997)  
Support individual effort (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)  
Guidance (Wilson, George, Wellins, & Byham, 1994)  
Nurture the right relationship processes (Barnes, 1996)  
Studies results with the aim to improve his/her performance as a manager of people (Deming, 1986)  
Humanity (Napolitano, & Henderson, 1998)  
Tries to discover who—if anybody—is outside the system and in need of special help (Deming, 1986) |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25. Take care of people (Smith, 1996)  
Thank people (Smith, 1996)  
Appreciate people (Smith, 1996)  
Recognize people (Smith, 1996)  
Recognition (SMP)  
Show compassion (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)  
Nurture the leader-follower relationship (emotional) (Smith, 1996) |
| 37. Diversity  
Richness of deep diversity—that will lead to deeper unity (Terry, 1993)  
Confronts diversity at every turn (Terry, 1993)  
Reaches across boundaries (Terry, 1993)  
Understands that people are different from each other (Deming, 1986)  
Fully utilize people regardless of race, gender, ethnic origin, or culture (Fitz-enz, 1997)  
Seek and cherish diversity (Smith, 1996) |
| 38. Self  
Control actions (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
Improves self-encouragement and mental skills (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996) |
| 39. Independent  
Work well alone (Handy, 1989) |
| 40. Facilitator  
Facilitator (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1990; Quinn 1988)  
Facilitates by asking questions, drawing people out to guide group to consensus (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1990) |
| 41. Culture  
Ability to act in a manner conducive to responding to and arousing emotion (Koontz & Weihrich, 1990)  
Promote culture (Wilson, George, Wellins, & Byham, 1994)  
Serve as a catalyst and manager of culture change (Yeung & Ready, 1995)  
Integrate different cultures, sectors, and disciplines (Drucker, 1997)  
Build or create culture (Schein, 1992)  
Maintain and support the culture (Schein, 1992)  
Posses skills in analyzing cultural assumptions (Schein, 1992)  
Consciously promote a clearly articulated, stimulating culture (Fitz-enz, 1997)  
Protect culture from perils of crisis (Murphy, 1996)  
Listening to followers without judgment increases followers’ creativity (Michalko, 2001)  
Creates an environment that encourages trust, freedom, and innovation (Deming, 1986) |
| 42. Environmentally aware  
Environmental sensitivity (Conger & Kanungo, 1998)  
Make sense of happenings in their world that otherwise would not make sense (Pfeiffer, 1977)  
Aligns assets and skills of the organization with the opportunities and risks presented by the environment (Timpe, 1987)  
Ability to block out the unnecessary and concentrate on the necessary (Cain, 1998)  
Are expected and perceived to make contributions to social order (Hosking, 1988)  
Demonstrates uncompromising environmental responsibility (Kanter, 1995) |
| 43. Training | Concern for growth (Shelton, 1997)  
Promote training and development (Syrett & Hogg, 1992)  
Maximizes the capability of people to fulfill purpose (Jacobs, 1997)  
Coach the development of personal capabilities (Belasco & Stayer, 1994)  
Encourages others to learn quickly (Belasco & Stayer, 1994)  
Deliberately causing people-driven actions in a planned fashion (Crosby, 1997)  
Coach people (Vaughn, 1997)  
Willing to teach skills (Smith, 1996)  
Develop followers (Eales-White, 1998)  
Guide the organization and people to new levels of learning and performance (DePree, 1989)  
Concerned with self-development and the development of others (Maccoby, 1981)  
Commitment to growth of people (Spears & Lawrence, 2002)  
Promotes continuous learning (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |
| 44. Communication | Provide a system of communication (Bernard, 1938)  
Influence through communication (Tannenbaum, Wescbler, & Massarik, 1961)  
Influence exercised in a situation and directed through the communication process (Tannenbaum, Wescbler, & Massarik, 1961)  
Frequency of communication tied to job performance (Kacmar, Witt, Zivnasca, & Gully, 2003)  
Articulate vision-values-strategy (Yeung & Ready, 1995)  
Align people by communicating (Kotter, 1990)  
Frequently communicate (Syrett & Hogg, 1992)  
Unshakeable commitment to communication (Esgender & Kusy, 1999)  
Active listening improves the leader-follower relationship (Rutter, 2003)  
Positive communication leads to positive actions (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987)  
Encourage followers to speak their mind (Sims, 2005)  
Good communication skills (Miles, 1997)  
High quality interpersonal communication leads to high quality leader-follower interaction (Campbell, White, & Johnson, 2003)  
Provide open communication and information to personnel-customers-suppliers (Harris, 1989)  
Actively communicate a wide range of information to employees (Covey, 1996)  
Creating and communicating meaning in formal and informal forums (Crosby, 1997)  
Use language to touch the heart (Heskett & Selesinger, 1996)  
Have communication skills (Stettner, 2000)  
Engages in dialogue (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |
| 45. Humor | Uses humor to take the edge off during stressful periods (Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995)  
Utilize humor to keep perspective (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996) |
|   | Uses a funny story to turn an argument in his or her favor (Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995)  
|   | Makes us laugh at ourselves when we are too serious (Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995)  
|   | Uses amusing stories to defuse conflicts (Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995)  
|   | Uses wit to make friends of the opposition (Dubinsky, Yammarino, & Jolson, 1995)  
|   | Use humor (Smith, 1996)  
|   | Use humor to lift others up (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
| 46. Self-confident | Dares to be themselves (Munroe, 1997)  
|   | Self-awareness (Bennis, 1997; Bushe, 2001)  
|   | Self-esteem (Bennis, 1997)  
|   | Secure sense of strengths (Miles, 1997)  
|   | Possess a belief in self (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
|   | Self-confidence with humility (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
|   | Understands oneself (Crosby, 1997)  
|   | Determination (Cox & Hoover, 1992; Snyder, Dowd, & Houghton, 1994)  
|   | Submit self to mirror test and find comfort with person there (Drucker, 1997)  
|   | Self-efficacy (Harung, Alexander, & Heaton, 1999)  
|   | Confidence (Meyer, Houze, & Slochta, 1998)  
|   | Determination to achieve (Meyer, Houze, & Slochta, 1998)  
|   | Awareness of self (Spears & Lawrence, 2002)  
|   | Conscious of weaknesses and strengths (Maccoby, 1981)  
|   | Disciplined and determined (Snyder, Dowd, Houghton, 1994)  
|   | Decisive (Implicit-leadership-theory measure) (Harung, Alexander, & Heaton, 1999; Smith, 1996)  
|   | Conviction (Bardwick, 1996; Taffinder, 1997)  
|   | Focused and disciplined (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
|   | Welcomes criticism and fights paranoia (brutally honest with self) (Smith, 1996)  
| 47. Optimistic | Identify and combat discouraging fictional beliefs (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996)  
|   | Models optimistic philosophy (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996)  
|   | Optimism (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
|   | Enthusiasm (Vaughn, 1997)  
| 48. Knowledge | Superior intelligence (Crabb, 1839)  
|   | Think deeply (Kanter, 1995)  
|   | Possess learning agility for self-knowledge (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1997)  
|   | Think through problems (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1997)  
|   | Critical thinking skills (Harung, Alexander, & Heaton, 1999)  
|   | Knowledge (Deming, 1986; Giblin, 1986; Waitley1995)  
|   | Learns fast (Belasco & Stayer, 1994)  

| Analytical thinking (Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood, 1999) |
| Learn from mistakes and successes (Kanter, 1995; Kouzes & Posner, 1995; McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995) |
| Learn form failure (Smith, 1996) |
| Crystallized thinking (Meyer, Houze, & Slecta, 1998) |
| Expertise (Bardwick, 1996) |
| Think strategically (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996) |
| Learns unceasingly (Deming, 1986) |
| Logic (Auguinis & Adams, 1998) |
| Seeks opportunities to learn (Kanter, 1995) |
| Seek broad business knowledge (Kanter, 1995) |
| Practice insight by seeing things from new angels (Kanter, 1995) |
| Expands information and access to new knowledge (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |

49. Influence

The role of the manager/leader is to motivate (McGregor, 1960)
Interpersonal influence (Tannenbaum, Weschler, & Massarik, 1961)
Process of influencing the activities of an organized group (Rauch & Behling, 1984)
Process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988)
Attempt at influencing the activities of followers (Donnelly, Ivancevich, & Gibson, 1985)
Art of influencing others to maximum performance (Cohen, 1990)
Influence through communication (DuBrin, 1997)
Influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of the organization (Katz & Kahn, 1978)
Leadership requires power to influence the thoughts and actions of other people (Zalenik, 1992)
Influence process to get people to willingly do what must be done and do well what ought to be done (Cribbin, 1981)
Process of influencing the activities of an organized group (Stogdill, 1950)
Influence over movements and actions of others (Crabb, 1839)
Influence attempts that avoid the invocation of power and relative status (Whyte, 1943)
Influencing people toward cooperation (Tead, 1935)
Ability to persuade or direct men (Reuter, 1941)
Influencing activities or an organized group to goal setting/achievement (Stogdill, 1958)
Influence behavior toward desired end (by word or deed) (Engstrom, 1976)
Acts which influence to shared direction (DuBrin, 1997; Seeman, 1960; Shartle, 1956)
Influences decisions and actions of others (Lowry, 1962)
Influence agent (Edinger, 1967)
Influence actions of others in shared approach (Gibb, 1959)
Process of influence-persuasion (Hollander, 1978)
Two-way influence relationship (Hollander, 1978)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50. Goal-oriented</th>
<th>Influential increment over and above mechanical compliance (Katz &amp; Kahn, 1978)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence members that is successful (House &amp; Baetz, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence activities of an individual or group (Stogdill, 1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influences group activities (Rauch &amp; Behling, 1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence behavior of another individual or group (Hersey, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All about influence (Maxwell, 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence planned change (Harris, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influences dreams (Danzig, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influences individuals or groups to think (Capezioo &amp; Moorehouse, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence between leader and follower (Hollander, 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence activities of organized group (Rauch &amp; Behling, 1984; Stogdill, 1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability and willingness to influence others so they respond willingly (Clawson, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence outside of formal authority (Blank, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social influence that aids and enlists support to accomplish (Chemers, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal influence directed to attaining goals achieved through</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication (Donelly, Ivancevich, &amp; Gibson, 1985; DuBrin, 1997;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tannenbaum, Weschler, &amp; Massarik, 1961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence people so that they will contribute (Koontz &amp; Weihrich, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influencing actions of individuals, groups, and organizations to get results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Olmstead, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational influence (Hinkin &amp; Tracey, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efforts toward goal achievement (Donelly, Ivancevich, &amp; Gibson, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toward goal achievement in a given situation (Moloney, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toward the attainment of some goal or goals (Donelly, Ivancevich, &amp; Gibson, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspires as to goals (Munroe, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplishment of a goal through the direction of human assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Prentice, 1961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Successfully marshals his human collaborators to achieve particular ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Prentice, 1961)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gets them to move along together with competence (Jaques &amp; Clement, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influences goal setting and goal achievement (Stogdill, 1950, 1958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stimulates accomplishment of goals (Davis, 1942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organized efforts to achieve goal setting and achievement (Stogdill, 1958)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation toward goal (Tead, 1935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cement unifying men for cooperative action to achieve given objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Titus, 1950)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cure behavior towards objectives (Edinger, 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move towards production goals (Boles &amp; Davenport, 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence to common objectives or compatible goals (Gibb, 1959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aimed primarily at attaining goals (Hollander, 1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence to goal attainment (Moloney, 1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elicit goals (Staub, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adopt personal-active attitudes toward goals (Zalenznik, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Causing willing effort to be expended to achieve purpose (Jacobs &amp; Jaques, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplish common task or goal (Chemers, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieve organizational goals (Meyer, Houze, &amp; Slechta, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible to accomplish tasks (Fairholm, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps the group to achieve its goals, increase effectiveness (Bushe, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accomplish the leaders agenda (Crosby, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide transcendent goals (Batten, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluates progress towards objectives (Murphy, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal clarification (Hinkin &amp; Tracey, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. A force</td>
<td>Principal dynamic force (Davis, 1942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key dynamic force (DuBrin, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Competitiveness (Roberts, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Values</td>
<td>Rational exchange of values (Schlesinger, 1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Articulate values (Yeung &amp; Ready, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operate from a set of inspiring core values and beliefs (Fitz-enz, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define, shape, and use core values (Heskett &amp; Sclesinger, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common ground based on shared values (Daft &amp; Lengel, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values based (Meyer, Houze, &amp; Slechta, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure structures and systems in organization reflect values (Covey, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher states behavior in terms of principles, values, and intentions (Kent, Crotts, &amp; Aziz, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have values and beliefs that serve as basis for direction and action (Snyder, Dowd, &amp; Houghton, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show tolerance of diversity and intolerance of performance, standards, and values (Fitz-enz, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They are value driven (Tichy &amp; Devanna, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Models values (Napolitano &amp; Henderson, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well-integrated values system (Cox &amp; Hoover, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live the values of “my unit” (Heskett &amp; Sclesinger, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develops core values (Napolitano &amp; Henderson, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Resourceful</td>
<td>Resourcefulness (Giblin, 1986; Napolitano &amp; Henderson, 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adaptive (Bennis &amp; Goldsmith, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Loyalty</td>
<td>Loyalty (Roberts, 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Mission</td>
<td>Create a path-finding mission (Hesselbein, Goldsmith, &amp; Beckhard, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure structures and systems in organization reflect mission (Covey, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alignment of the workforce to the mission (Esgender &amp; Kusy, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Commitment</td>
<td>Commitment from people (Ulrich, Zenger, &amp; Smallwood, 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gain commitment from members (Conger, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop commitment to carry vision (Oakley &amp; Kurg, 1994)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary commitment of followers (Nanus, 1989)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage commitment (Dinkmeyer &amp; Eckstein, 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilize individual commitment (Ulrich, Zenger, &amp; Smallwood, 1999)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 57. Manages | Manage systems and keep them as stable and serviceable as possible (Vaill, 1998)  
Set standards (Smith, 1996)  
Understands and conveys to other the meaning of a system (Deming, 1986)  
Takes a systems approach (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
Pumps life and meaning into management structures and brings them to life (Barach & Eckhardt, 1996)  
Align and ensure the match between organization and strategy (Covey, 1996)  
Engender organizational capability (Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood, 1999)  
Fully commit to a long-term strategy of building a valuable institution (Covey, 1996)  
Assembly and reassembly of organizational components, including projects-teams-locations (Esgender & Kusy, 1999)  
Effective management of risk (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
Active management by exception behavior (Waldman, Ramirez, & House, 2001)  
Good management (Fairholm, 2001)  
Management skills (Humphrey, 1987)  
Blend multiple organizational models (Corbin, 200)  
Understands a stable system (Deming, 1986)  
Manage projects through cross-functional teams (Barnes, 1996)  
Manage cross-functional purposes (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999) |
| 58. Listening | Listening (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996; Spears & Lawrence, 2002)  
Attentive to what is said (Tyagi, 1985)  
Listens (accepts ideas, criticisms, feedback) (Smith, 1996)  
Listen more than tell (Heskett & Sclesinger, 1996)  
Asks what and why (Bennis, 1997)  
Listens deeply (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
Listens respectfully (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
Most likely to listen first (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
Listens and learns without passing judgement (Deming, 1986)  
Listens without judgment (Deming, 1986; McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995) |
| 59. Resources | Organize resources—human people (O’Connor, 1997)  
Organize wide range of resources (Rusaw, 2001)  
Art and process of acquiring, energizing, linking, and focusing resources of all kinds (Bradshaw, 1998)  
Focus on resources (Bradshaw, 1998)  
Champions of resources (Waitley, 1995)  
Have resources needed to form networks (Kanter, 1995)  
Provide resources needed for continuous improvement (Fitz-enz, 1997)  
Dedicate resources to process innovations (Kanter, 1995)  
Cultivate diverse resources (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |
| 60. Energy | Energizes (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997; Nanus, 1989; Senge, 1990)  
Breathes life into the organization (Senge, 1990) |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 61. | Attractive/approachable | Active (White, Hodgson, & Crainer, 1996; Zalenznik, 1989)  
Ensure energy is released and sustained across initiatives (Taffinder, 1997)  
Energy (Danzig, 1998)  
Fast (Kanter, 1998)  
Participate actively (Kent & Moss, 1990) |
| 62. | Healing | Attract followers (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997; Richardson, 1844)  
Friendly (Kanter, 1997; Tyagi, 1985)  
Easy to approach (Tyagi, 1985)  
Approachable (Smith, 1996)  
Visible and approachable (Smith, 1996) |
| 63. | Selection of people | Healing-oneself and others (Spears & Lawrence, 2002)  
Heal wounds inflicted by change (Murphy, 1996)  
The organizational environment must be one of healing (Kerfoot, 1999)  
Healing is one of the characteristics of servant leaders (Greenleaf, 1970) |
| 64. | Responsible | Selects the right people (Murphy, 1996)  
Knows future lies in the selection-nurturance-assignment of key people (DePree, 1989)  
Select the most talented team members available (Kanter, 1997; Shin, 2004)  
Values alignment (Brown, Ledford, & Nathan, 1991; Kristoff, 1996) |
| 65. | Dedicated | Responsible (Fairholm, 2001)  
Responsible attitude (Maccoby, 1981)  
Uses power responsibly (Koontz & Weilhrich, 1990)  
| 66. | Time management | High dedication to the job (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
Use time effectively (Smith, 1996)  
Manage time and resources (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999) |
| 67. | Networks | Networking (MPS) |
| 68. | Ethics | Emphasize ethics (Syrett & Hogg, 1992)  
Have ethics (Stettner, 2000)  
Display professional ethics (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)  
Sanctioning conduct (enforcing ethical conduct-laws-norms) (Crosby, 1997) |
| 69. | Integrity | Integrity (Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood, 1999)  
Leadership acts with integrity (Kanter, 1995)  
Exudes integrity (Smith, 1996) |
| 70. | Courage | Courage (Roberts, 1990; Snyder, Dowd, & Houghton, 1994)  
Courageous individuals (Tichy & Devanna. 1990)  
Passion and courage (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |
| 71. | Reflection | Reflects feelings (Dinkmeyer & Eckstein, 1996) |
| 72. | Emotion | Create emotion by generating action where there was hesitation (Bardwick, 1996)  
Create emotion by generating strength were there was weakness (Bardwick, 1996)  
Create emotion by generating expertise where there was floundering (Bardwick, 1996) |
| 73. | Human resources | Human resources frame (Bolman & Deal, 1991)  
Human resources management (Gratton, Hope-Hailey, Stiles, & Truss, |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **74. Conflict resolution** | Negotiate resolution to conflict (Murphy, 1996)  
Resolves conflict diplomatically and finds common cause (Kanter, 1995)  
Interpersonal competencies to resolve conflicts in a constructive manner (Harung, Alexander, & Heaton, 1999)  
Resolving residual conflict in formal and informal courts (Crosby, 1997) |
| **75. Decision-making** | Make decisions (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)  
Making decisions and implementing decisions about legislative, executive, and administrative policy (Crosby, 1997)  
Decisiveness (Harung, Alexander, & Heaton, 1999; Roberts, 1990) |
| **76. Disciplined** | Develop self-discipline (Barnes, 1996)  
Well-organized life (Cox & Hoover, 1992) |
| **77. Ambiguity** | Tolerates ambiguity and paradox (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
Deal effectively with complex, ambiguous, and contradictory situations (Lombardino & Eichinger, 1997)  
Ability to deal with complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty (Tichy & Devanna, 1990) |
| **78. Effective** | Effectiveness (Munroe, 1997)  
Lead effectively (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997) |
| **79. Boundaries** | Sets parameters (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998) |
| **80. Internal** | Inner locus of control (Harung, Alexander, & Heaton, 1999)  
Internal locus of control (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
Intrinsic motivation (Cox & Hoover, 1992) |
| **81. Financial** | Broker (Quinn, 1988) |
| **82. Personality** | Personality in action under group conditions (Bogardus, 1934)  
Interaction of specific traits of one person and other traits of many (Bogardus, 1934) |
| **83. Stays the course** | Stay the course (not follow fads) (Deming, 1986)  
Constancy of purpose (Deming, 1986)  
Don’t totally change direction (Deming, 1986) |
| **84. Authentic** | Authentic Leadership Model (Avolio, Gardner, Walumbwa, Luthans, & May, 2004)  
Authentic (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995) |
| **85. Inspires and motivates** | Simulates, motivate, and coordinated the organization (Davis, 1942)  
Inspires others to go (Munroe, 1997)  
Motivates and inspires (Kotter, 1990)  
Motivates by satisfying basic human needs (Kotter, 1990)  
Causes people to respond with vigor (Danzig, 1998)  
Inspires people to understand the social, political, economic, and technological givens (Crosby, 1997)  
Produces movement in the long-term best interest of the group (Kotter, 1990)  
Recognize that people must motivate themselves (Cain, 1998)  
Inspire extra effort (Bradford & Cohen, 1984)  
Catalyze, stretch and enhance people (Batten, 1989)  
Motivates and coordinates (Davis, 1942) |
| 86. Direction of the vision | Comprehend that humans have differing motivation forces at different times and situations (Koontz & Weihrich, 1990)  
| | Ability to inspire (Koontz & Weihrich, 1990)  
| | Motivation (Ragins, 1989)  
| | To cause to follow or pursue (Richardson, 1844)  
| | Inspire enthusiasm (Vaughn, 1997)  
| | Inspires confidence (Montgomery, 1961)  
| | Inspire staff to discover natural creativity, express creative ideas freely (Buzan, Dottino, & Israel, 1999)  
| | Motivate themselves to draw on (Richardson, 1844)  
| | Create a motivational climate (Batten, 1989)  
| | Inspire others to lead (Humphrey, 1987)  
| | Inspiring (Kent, Crotts, & Aziz, 2001)  
| | Motivates (Davis, 1942)  
| | Conceptualization (nurture abilities to dream great dreams, think beyond the day today) (Spears & Lawrence, 2002)  
| | Motivates across generation boundaries (Esgender & Kusy, 1999)  
| | Exhibit extraordinary levels of motivation to enable group members to learn change (Schein, 1992)  
| 87. Inspires the vision | Determines direction (Timpe, 1987)  
| | Process of giving purpose (meaningful direction) to collective effort (Jacobs & Jaques, 1990)  
| | Leadership revolves around vision-ideas-direction (Bennis, 1989)  
| | Sets direction for vision (Ulrich, Zenger, & Smallwood, 1999)  
| | Create and describe the vision (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)  
| | Create direction (Kotter, 1990)  
| | Consistently provide the organization a clear direction (Kanter, 1995)  
| 88. Articulates the vision | Rally men and women to common purpose (Montgomery, 1961)  
| | Exhibit conviction in creating a vision (Hesselbein, Goldsmith, & Beckhard, 1996)  
| | Marshalling, energizing, and unifying of people toward the pursuit of vision (Kent, Crotts, and Aziz, 2001)  
| | Challenging a team of people to reach to a vision (Beck & Yeager, 2001)  
| | Create a compelling vision (Shelton, 1997)  
| | Establishment of a thrust toward a purpose (Kent, Crotts, & Aziz, 2001)  
| | Inspiring a shared vision (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)  
| | Create a vision with meaning (Bennis, 1997)  
| | Inspires pursuit of a shared vision (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
| 89. Sells the vision (buy-in) | Articulate tangible vision (Yeung & Ready, 1995)  
| | Convey vision (Syrett & Hogg, 1992)  
| | Looks at the horizon (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997)  
| | Integrate agreed vision of the future (Simmons, 1996)  
| | Present vision so that others want to achieve it (O’Connor, 1997)  
| | Ability to get members of the organization to accept ownership of vision as their own (Oakley & Kurg, 1994)  
| | Infuses dreams-inspires vision (Danzig, 1998)  


|   | Energizes and attracts people to enroll in a vision of the future (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997)  
|   | Focus on gaining understanding and buy-in from all parties (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
|   | Shares big picture (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)  
| 90. Guides the vision | Provide guidance through shared vision (Stabu, 1996)  
|   | Guides the vision (Munroe, 1997)  
|   | Work into context by providing vision (Eales-White, 1998)  
|   | Ensures structures and systems in organization reflect vision (Covey, 1996)  
|   | Claim the future through reconnaissance (Heskett & Selesinger, 1996)  
|   | Strongly define a sense of purpose and vision (Bennis, 1997)  
| 91. Visionary | Transcend the vision (McLean & Weitzel, 1992)  
|   | A broad view, a new territory of the organization’s direction (Martin, 2001)  
|   | Develop vision (Bradford & Cohen, 1984)  
|   | Creates the big picture (Eales-White, 1998)  
|   | Have a vision (Kanter, 1995; Snyder, Dowd, & Houghton, 1994)  
|   | Ability to see clearly (Sadler, 1997)  
|   | Knows the future (Heskett & Selesinger, 1996; Spears & Lawrence, 2002)  
|   | Has a long-range perspective (Bennis, 1997)  
|   | Are visionaries (Tichy & Devanna, 1990)  
|   | Has eye on the horizon (Bennis, 1997; Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997)  
|   | Thinks completely (big picture) (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
| 92. Stamina | Physical stamina (Roberts, 1990)  
|   | Emotional stamina (Roberts, 1990)  
|   | Perseverance (Danzig, 1998)  
|   | Build stamina (Smith, 1996)  
| 93. Miscellaneous | Pragmatic (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
|   | Preserve what makes the company special (Deal & Kennedy, 1982)  
|   | Charisma (Danzig, 1998; Whetten & Cameron, 1983)  
|   | Respectable (Maccoby, 1981)  
|   | Is his/her own person (Bennis, 1997)  
|   | Unconventional behavior (Conger & Kanungo, 1998)  
|   | Enhance the quality of work life (Harris, 1989)  
|   | Initiation and maintenance of structure (Stogdill, 1974)  
|   | Consistently make effective contributions to social order (Hosking, 1988)  
|   | Must be able to leverage more than his own capabilities (Bennis, 1989)  
|   | Answers the question what is really going on (Terry, 1993)  
|   | Balance (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)  
|   | Do the right thing (Bennis & Nanus, 1985)  
|   | Create follower-ship (Staub, 1996)  
|   | Be chief (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
|   | To begin (Cox & Hoover, 1992)  
|   | Capable of inspiring others to do things without actually sitting on top of them with a checklist (Bennis, 1989)  
|   | Art of mobilizing others (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)  
|   | Orchestrate a 360 worldviewview (Corbin, 2000)
Talk more than others (Kent & Moss, 1990)
Make federations of corporations (Bennis, 1997)
Agile (Bennis & Goldsmith, 1997)
Astuteness (Giblin, 1986)
Producer (Quinn, 1988)
Compatibility (Giblin, 1986)
Order the chaos (Corbin, 2000)
Quality (Danzig, 1998)
Give a point to the working lives of others (Birch, 1999)
Hard work (Miles, 1997)
Multi-tasking (Esgender & Kusy, 1999)
Values others input (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)
Accountability (Roberts, 1990)
Pragmatic approach (Cox & Hoover, 1992)
Persuasion (Spears & Lawrence, 2002)
Break major tasks into bite size chunks (Gower)
Tenacity (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)
Empathy (Spears & Lawrence, 2002)
Timing (Roberts, 1990)
Credibility (Roberts, 1990)
Handles emotion in self and others (Bergman, Hurson, & Russ-Eft, 1999)
Ensures that boundaries are porous and permeable (Bennis, 1997)
Learn from adversity (Cox & Hoover, 1992)
Descriptiveness (Bushe, 2001)
Curiosity (Bushe, 2001)
Appreciation (Bushe, 2001)
Attitude of mind (Birch, 1999)
Desire (Roberts, 1990)
Procedural justice (Hinkin & Tracey, 1994)
Autocratic (Leadership Scale for Sports, LSS)
Dependability (Roberts, 1990)
Type A personality (Cox & Hoover, 1992)
Functionality (Ragins, 1989)
Accountably to make it safe to learn from mistakes (McGee-Cooper & Trammell, 1995)
Industriousness (Auquinis & Adams, 1998)
Shifts paradigm (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)
Summons old-fashioned work-place virtues like loyalty-commitment-on the job exuberance (Wadsworth, 1997)
Promote an entrepreneurial spirit in innovative ventures (Harris, 1989)
Judgement (Bennis, 1997)
Excellence (Harris, 1989) (SLP)
Self-renewal (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)
Stewardship (Spears & Lawrence, 2002)
Controls ambition and ego (Smith, 1996)
Passion (Napolitano & Henderson, 1998)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests assumptions (Napolitano &amp; Henderson, 1998)</th>
<th>Open mind (Cont) (Schein, 1992)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reach out to partners (Schein, 1992)</td>
<td>Does not expect perfection (Deming, 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain high standards of dignity (Smith, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share their passion and expertise (McFarland &amp; Senn, 1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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