

# A STUDY OF THE DIFFERENCE OF LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ZUARI CEMENTS LIMITED

Mr. P.V. Nagarjuna Reddy, Research Scholar, Rayalaseema University, Kurnool, A.P.  
Dr. G. Haranath, Assistant Professor, Yogi Vemana University, Kadapa, A.P.

**Abstract:** This paper attempts to study the differences in the leadership styles as perceived by the leaders and sub-ordinates in a public-sector enterprise. The study has revealed that differences do exist in different leadership styles - authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant, as perceived by the leader himself and perceived by the subordinates in Zuari Cements Limited (ZCL). In this paper, the authors made an attempt to identify the differences in leadership styles as perceived by the leaders and subordinates in ZCL.

## Introduction

The essentials of leadership are the same to all leaders in all positions due to the variation in the skills required, roles played, functions performed, issues tackled and the relationships promoted, different leaders have different perceptions of leadership. And, several attributes have been made both for the success and failure of leadership in the form of properties and processes or traits and styles of leaders. Further, even these attributes cannot provide a totally satisfactory guidance for the success of leadership. Hence, theoreticians and practitioners of leadership have developed the 'contingency approach'.

## Concept of Leadership

The word 'leader' stems from the root *leden* meaning 'to travel' or 'show the way'. It has been derived from the verb "to lead." This also implies "to advance," "to expel," "to stand out," to guide and govern the actions of others. A leader is a person who leads a group of followers. The common characteristic that can be found in many of the definitions of Leadership is the 'influence' exerted by the leader. That is, he tries to influence the behaviour of others in a specific direction.

Leadership is a process of influencing the behaviour, beliefs and feelings of the members of a group. The functions of leadership however, cover wide range of activities like coordinating, decision-making, policymaking, group representing, controlling, arbitrating, etc. Leadership, not being a single phenomenon, is affected by many variables and involves several skills like technical, human, conceptual, designing, creative, communicative and decision making. The main aspect of influencing people by a leader is the power, which has many sources. The leadership effectiveness covers the personality of leader, past experience, expectations of superiors, the characteristics of subordinates, the requirements of the task, and the organisational climate and policies.

Twentieth century has witnessed several theories on leadership which is a complex concept having a bearing on motivation, morale, organizational climate, human relations, and communication. The ability to influence people in a group is indispensable in organizations. Beginning with scientific management the evolutionary process of leadership can be traced with three theories viz., trait theory, behavioural theory and contingency theory. The trait theory has been put to rigorous research by Byrd, Jennings, Gheselli, Stogdill etc., and resulted in the development of behavioral theory. Likert's system 4 theory, McGregor x and y theory, Continuum theory of Tannenbaum and Schmidt, etc. has opened new vistas on the behavioural dimensions of leadership. The confusion and controversy of trait and behavioural theories have given way to the contingency models of leadership like Fiedler's contingency model, Vroom and Yetton contingency model, path goal theory, life cycle theory, tri-dimensional model, learning model, etc.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Several studies made by different authors in both theoretical and empirical spheres of Leadership. Various definitions and concepts of leadership have been reviewed by a number of scholars including Morris and Seeman; Shartle; Carter; Gibb and Bass. From such syntheses the leadership has been defined as an initiation of structure; a locus of group processes; as an art of inducing compliance; as an exercise of influence; as an actor behaviour; as a goal achievement; as an effect of interaction; as a differentiated role, and as a personality and its effects.

Weschler, Kahane and Tannenbaum (1952) studied employees in a naval research laboratory. They found that 63.3 per cent of the members of the division headed by the permissive leader were 'well satisfied' with their job, whereas 39.3 per cent of the members of the division headed by the restrictive leader were 'well satisfied' with their job. In addition, the employees' perceptions of morale in their immediate work group, the division, and the laboratory were considerably higher in the permissively run division than in the restrictively run division.

McCurely and Eber (1953) studied groups composed of authoritarian and democratic subjects. Their leaders were coached in either democratic or authoritarian patterns of behavior. Authoritarian groups were somewhat more effective than the democratic groups in speed of problem solving on a group made, although the differences were not significant.

Spector and Suttell found no difference in group performance under democratic and autocratic leadership.

Calvin, Hoffmann and Harden (1957) conducted a series of three group problem solving experiments, comparing democratic and authoritarian leadership styles. They found that no consistent trend emerged in favour of either style. However, their less intelligent subjects performed better under authoritarian leaders, while the more intelligent ones did a shade better under democratic leaders.

Fox (1957) explored the effects of participative, and autocratic leadership styles (he called these as 'positive' and 'negative' styles) on member satisfaction in conference groups. The participative style created more permissive atmosphere, greater member satisfaction with the leader, and easier acceptance of group decisions, as compared to 'negative' or authoritarian leadership style.

Mullen (1965) compared the leadership styles of managers in three divisions of a large automobile insurance company, and its relationship to each division's efficiency and effectiveness. Each manager showed a distinct leadership style: one was democratic, another laissez faire, and the third was authoritarian. It was concluded that all three divisions were operating at an equally high rate of efficiency. Measures of effectiveness did not show any difference between divisions.

Thiagarajan and Deep (1970) found that authoritarian leaders as more influential than the persuasive, and the persuasive more than participative.

Verma (1977) constructed a Likert type scale to measure authoritarian (F), nurturant-task (NT) and participative (P) styles of student leaders and found the coefficient of correlation between F and NT, NT and P and F and P was 0.31, 0.39, and 0.11 respectively.

Kalra (1980) has studied the pattern of styles of 70 managers and has found that most of the managers have their leadership behaviour guided by the situations in their organizations.

Sinha (1980) in his study lists out three types of leadership styles as 1. Participative. 2. Authoritarian and 3. Nurturant-task leadership.

Omer Bin Sayeed (1990) attempted to examine conflict handling strategies, leadership behaviour and leadership styles (relationship and task-motivated styles) in a common framework.

Syed Vazith Hussain (2002) made an attempt to analyse different leadership styles in small scale industries at micro level. The decision making styles are identified by him are: Style I Benevolent autocrat; Style II Strict autocrat; Style III Prior consultation; Style IV Democratic style and Style V Delegation.

**Need of the Study :** From the foregoing studies, it can be said that the success and failure of any organization is attributed to the effectiveness of leadership. Thus, the leadership has become indispensable and managers are to be replaced by leaders, despite the argument that leadership is dispensable by another school of thought. As such, the topic of leadership has occasioned research studies without limit, and new dimensions are added to leadership theory and practice. The present study attempts to analyze different styles of leadership and its perceptions by their subordinates.

**Objectives of the Study:** To identify the differences in leadership styles as perceived by the leaders in the ZCL; to find out the differences in leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates; and to find out the differences in leadership styles as perceived by the leaders and the subordinates in the ZCL.

Hypotheses:

- (i) There is no significant difference in the leadership styles at the inter levels.
- (ii) There is no significant difference in the leadership styles in the inter levels as perceived by their subordinates.
- (iii) There is no significant difference in the leadership styles as perceived by the leader himself and those perceived by his subordinates.

#### Methodology of the Study:

The study is mainly based on primary data collected. The present study confines itself to Higher, Middle and lower hierarchical levels in ZCL. The leadership styles were measured as judged by the leader himself (Leader's Self Perception). For the analyses of leadership styles of the Higher and Middle level employees, the leader's self perception was used. Five Leadership Styles as judged by the leader himself viz., Authoritarian, Participative, Bureaucratic, Task-Oriented and Nurturant leadership styles were used. The total sample for the study consists of 168 officers of ZCL. Many studies have been undertaken on leadership styles adopted in different organizations. But relatively only a few attempts have been made to study the leadership styles in ZCL.

#### Analysis

The analysis of the difference between leadership styles as judged by leader himself and as judged by his subordinates of different levels of employees of ZCL.

The leader's self perception and the subordinate's perception on superior styles reveals about the leadership styles of Top Management, Middle Management and Junior Management of ZCL. Scores on five leadership styles viz., authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant were computed from both leader's evaluation of ones own style and subordinates perception on superior's styles.

With a view to find out difference between leadership style of a superior, as judged by the superior himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates, the analysis was done at three levels viz., Top Management, Middle Management and Junior Management. Firstly, for the Top Management level the leader self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Middle Management) perception on superior style. Secondly, for the Middle Management level the leader self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Junior Management) perception on superior style. Thirdly, for the Junior Management level the leader self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Clerks) perception on superior style. For all this 't' test was used to find out the significant difference between the leaders self perception and as perceived by their subordinates.

A. The difference between leadership styles of Top Managements self perception and as perceived by their subordinates of ZCL.

Table 1

Mean, Standard Deviation and 't' values for five Leadership Styles of Top Management as judged by leader himself and as judged by his subordinates of ZCL

S.No.	Leadership Styles	Self judgement			Judged by his subordinates			't' value
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	Mean	N	Standard Deviation	
1	Authoritarian (A)	22.444	9	4.773	17.204	49	4.449	0.011
2	Participative (P)	24.111	9	1.269	22.204	49	3.247	0.005
3	Bureaucratic	26.667	9	2.784	22.082	49	3.829	0.001

	(B)							
4	Task-orientation (T)	25.778	9	3.420	23.673	49	3.112	0.115
5	Nurturant (N)	25.556	9	3.321	23.673	49	3.986	0.124

Source: Compiled from field survey

Table 1 presents the difference between leadership styles as judged by the leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates of Top Management of ZCL. Mean values of authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant styles are higher in self judgement of Top Management than judged by his subordinates. In authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant styles of the Top Management self judgement and as judged by his immediate subordinates do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.011, P<0.05; P0.005, P<0.05; B0.001, P<0.05; T0.115, P<0.05 and N0.124, P<0.05). Hence, the hypothesis of "there is no significant difference in leadership styles of employees of ZCL as judged by leader himself and as judged by his subordinates" is accepted.

A. The difference between leadership styles of Middle Management self perception and as perceived by their subordinates of ZCL.

Table 2

Mean, Standard Deviation and 't' values for five Leadership Styles of Middle Management as judged by leader himself and as judged by his subordinates of ZCL

S.No.	Leadership Styles	Self judgement			Judged by his subordinates			't' value
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	Mean	N	Standard Deviation	
1	Authoritarian (A)	19.878	49	3.522	16.05	40	5.063	0.001
2	Participative (P)	24.204	49	3.391	23.025	40	4.172	0.154
3	Bureaucratic (B)	23.265	49	5.179	26	40	2.792	0.002
4	Task-orientation (T)	26.000	49	2.492	24.15	40	3.512	0.007
5	Nurturant (N)	25.347	49	3.212	23.325	40	4.002	0.012

Source: Compiled from field survey

Table 2 presents the difference between leadership styles as judged by the leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates of Middle Management of ZCL. Mean values of authoritarian, participative, task-orientation and nurturant styles are higher in self judgement of Middle Management than judged by his subordinates whereas mean values of bureaucratic style is higher in judged by Middle Management subordinates than self judgement. In authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant styles of the Middle Management self judgement and as judged by his immediate subordinates do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.001, P<0.05; P0.154, P<0.05; B0.002, P<0.05; T0.007, P<0.05 and N0.012, P<0.05). Hence, the hypothesis of "there is no significant difference in leadership styles of employees of ZCL as judged by leader himself and as judged by his subordinates" is accepted.

A. The difference between leadership styles of Junior Management self perception and as perceived by their subordinates of ZCL.

Table 3

Mean, Standard Deviation and 't' values for five Leadership Styles of Junior Management as judged by leader himself and as judged by his subordinates of ZCL

S.No.	Leadership Styles	Self judgement			Judged by his subordinates			't' value
		Mean	N	Standard Deviation	Mean	N	Standard Deviation	
1	Authoritarian (A)	21.200	40	4.937	18.03	202	4.361	0.001
2	Participative (P)	25.575	40	3.637	22.520	202	3.923	0.001
3	Bureaucratic (B)	23.250	40	3.888	23.426	202	4.423	0.806
4	Task-orientation (T)	26.325	40	2.401	23.020	202	3.007	0.001
5	Nurturant (N)	27.375	40	2.250	23.257	202	3.080	0.001

Source: Compiled from field survey

Table 3 presents the difference between leadership styles as judged by the leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates of Junior Management of ZCL. Mean values of authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant styles are higher in self judgement of Junior Management than judged by his subordinates. In authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant styles of the Junior Management self judgement and as judged by his immediate subordinates do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.001, P<0.05; P0.001, P<0.05; B0.806, P<0.05; T0.001, P<0.05

and N0.001, P<0.05). Hence, the hypothesis of “there is no significant difference in leadership styles of employees of ZCL as judged by leader himself and as judged by his subordinates” is accepted.

#### Findings:

No significant difference is found in leadership styles at Higher, Middle, Lower Level Managers as judged by leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates in ZCL.

#### References

- [1] Morris, W.T. and Seeman, M. “The Problem of Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Approach,” *American Journal of Sociology*, 56 (1950), pp.149-155.
- [2] Shartle, C.L. “Studies in Naval Leadership,” in H. Guetzkow Groups, *Leadership and Men*, Carnegie Press, Pittsburgh, 1951.
- [3] Carter, L.F. “Leadership and Small Group Behaviour,” in M. Sheriff and M.O. Wilson, eds., *Group Relations at the Crossroads*, Harper, 1953.
- [4] Gibb, C.A. “Leadership,” in G. Lindzey and others., *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Addison-Wesley, Mass, 1954.
- [5] Bass, B. M., *Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, Harper, New York, 1960.
- [6] Weschler, J.R., Kahane, M., and Tannenbaum, R. “Job Satisfaction, Productivity, and Morale: A Case Study,” *Occupational Psychology*, 26, (1952), pp.1-14.
- [7] McCurely, H.G., and Eber, H.W. “Democratic Versus Authoritarian: A Further Investigation of Group Problem Solving,” *Journal of Personality*, 22, (1953), pp.258-269.
- [8] Spector, P. and Suttell Barbara, J. “Research on the specific leader behaviour patterns most effective in influencing group performance,” American Institute for Research, Washington, D.C., 1956.
- [9] Calvin, A.D., Hoffmann, F.K. and Harden, E.L. “The Effect of Intelligence and Social Atmosphere on Group Problem Solving Behavior,” *Journal of Social Psychology*, 45, (1957), pp.61-74.
- [10] Fox, W.M. “Group Reaction to two types of Conference Leadership,” *Human Relations*, 10, 1957, pp.279-289.
- [11] Mullen, J.H. “Differential Leadership Modes and Productivity in a Large Organization,” *Academy of Management Journal*, 3 (1965), pp.107-126.
- [12] Thiagarajan, K.M. and Deep, S.D. “A Study of Supervisor Subordinate Influence on Satisfaction in four Cultures,” *Journal of Social Psychology*, 82 (1970), 173-180.
- [13] Verma, Jyoti. “A scale for measuring Leadership styles,” A.N.S. Institute of social studies, Patna, 1977 (mimeographed).
- [14] H.K. Kalra “Leadership Styles of Executives in Indian Enterprises,” unpublished Research Report, Punjab Agricultural University, Ludhiana, 1980.
- [15] Sinha, J.B.P., *The Nurturant Task-Behaviour*, Concept Publishing Company, New Delhi, 1980.
- [16] Omer Bin Sayeed “Conflict Management Styles: Relationship with Leadership Styles and Moderating Effect of Esteem for Coworker,” *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol.26, No.1, July 1990, pp.28-52.
- [17] Syed Vazith Hussain “Leadership Styles in Small Scale Industries,” *The Indian Journal of Commerce*, Vol.55, No.3, July-September 2002, pp.45-54.