

THE NEW DIRECTIONS IN LEADERSHIP RESEARCH: AN OVERVIEW

Chetan Sinha*

Abstract *The present review attempts to assemble various dimensions of leadership especially, cognitive and social content under cultural and cross cultural paradigms. Apart from that, review attempted to capture and questions the universalistic notions of leadership phenomenon. Studies have been conducted on the issue of leadership in the Indian context following the western lineage but still the picture is hazy and limited to the superficiality of the dominant views. The depth of the leadership phenomenon has perhaps still not been clearly understood. Leadership phenomenon from time primordial was dealt under one meta-theoretical assumption i.e., great man theory which was individually based on Cartesian-Newtonian epistemology. New leadership approach doesn't deny the cognitive factors and traits as is happening in present sociological research movements but it is operating within the broader social dimensions and power structure. The notions of leadership as constructed and operated under different cultural value system based on the social context is the thrust of present review. However, this construction of leadership should be analyzed not only from universalistic agency but also from sociocultural point of view. It is recommended that researchers must look into leadership from the standpoint of diversity and socio-historical origins. The neglected cultural, social, historical and political milieu in the action of individuals has its own varied complexity; and precaution is inevitable in the process of abandonment of universalism. Thus, leadership channelling its individualistic theoretical history of singularity and universality and redirect its status as driven by complexities in societal structure going beyond the ideology of 'one-shot-finish'.*

Keywords: *Cognitive View, Culture, Leadership, Prototypical Abstraction, Value, Social Identity, Sociocultural Paradigm.*

The field of leadership has been one of the most widely studied topics in social sciences. Focus in the area has shifted from that of individual leader to the combined effect of leaders, followers, peers, supervisors, work setting/context, and culture, including a much broader array of individuals representing the entire spectrum of diversity, public private, and not-for-profit organisations (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). It was pointed out that this trend has been increasingly evident over the past 20 years with samples of populations from nations around the globe. Horner (1997) agrees that over the years, the concept of leadership has been studied extensively in various social contexts and theoretical frameworks. Although leadership construct may be regarded as a process, researchers working in the area have mostly relied on personal attributes, where situation and contexts were largely not in the perceptual field. However, the classical theorists have contributed from the metatheoretical paradigm of stable internal characteristics symbolizing born leaders (Bernard, 1926), leadership was also explained to some extent from the followers perspective too (see Meindl, 1985). However, when no clear answers emerged out of the trait studies which relied on internal characteristics of leader differentiating it from followers (Horner, 1997), researchers began to focus on the process of leadership practices (Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill & Coons, 1957) in the context of organisational effectiveness (also see Haslam, Reicher & Platow, 2011; Horner, 1997).

Instead of being defined in the individual differences paradigm, leadership came to be represented through models as dyadic, shared, relational, strategic, global, and a complex social dynamic process (Avolio, 2007; Yukl, 2006). In the following discussion, some historical positions of leadership will be discussed and an effort will be made to understand its present stand under the broader umbrella of culture and value system.

LOOKING BACK AT OLD PSYCHOLOGY OF LEADERSHIP

According to available literature, two of the major studies conducted in western context with regard to importance of situations in the leadership practices were Fiedler's (1967) contingency theory and House and Mitchell's (1974) path-goal theory. Fiedler's (1967) work took two variables into account namely, leadership style and situational favourability, whereas House and Mitchell (1974) laid emphasis on followership behaviour in which the leader is primarily responsible for helping followers develop behaviours that may enable them to achieve their goal (Horner, 1997, p.29).

Other classical theories of leadership focussed on the level of involvement of followers in the organisational decision-making (Vroom & Yetton, 1973) and leader-member exchange theory involving nature of relationship between followers and leaders (Graen, 1976). With the complexity

* Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi

of the situation and over reliance on mechanistic theories, a new outlook was developed in the process of studying leadership with focus on organizational culture (Schein, 1985) which was an offshoot of the situational model with more appropriate methodologies. Horner (1997) posited that an important aspect of culture is change and organizations which tried to resist change faced more difficulties than organizations who adapted to change (Baron, 1995). Hence, as the environment shifts and develops (Horner, 1997), it is important to understand how leaders are able to adapt to changes, and the manner they bring social change which depends on their worldview, social identity, and culture.

Creating an environment in which employees are more motivated to work rather than imposing a specific set of behaviour on the part of leader is an important issue to be dealt with. But the importance of culture is imperative from the leader's standpoint, in understanding it as well as to meet the need of organization. Thus, the role of a leader becomes important in perspective of changing times for effective cultural management. In due processes of assessing leadership, different perspectives emerged to give different notions of leadership ranging from motivational perspective to cultural-constructive perspective in contemporary analysis. However the trait perspective was found to have lost its relevance with the advent of different disciplines and from the ideological point of view. This perspective had gained importance in the dawn of the 21st century with the construction of the robust model of personality namely, the OCEAN (Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness and Neuroticism) model (McCrae & Costa, 1996). Next to this, the process of understanding culture, social processes, followers' construction of reality or knowledge of themselves and the world around them, and group members' identification with the group created a major thrust on the part of researchers in understanding leadership (Bruner, 1986; Drath & Palus, 1994; Haslam, 2001; Kegan, 1982; Manz & Sims, 1989).

Multilevel theories of leadership are now on display due to their rigorous emphasis on leaders, followers, and contexts conceptually and commensurably. But scholars (Yammarino, Dionne, Chun, & Dansereau, 2005) concluded that there are limitations to the study of multilevel theories since their inception, and that they have not addressed levels-of-analysis issues appropriately in "theory, measurement, data analysis, and inference drawing" (p. 10).

Evidence from recent literature still creates scepticism on any general model of leadership and essentially evidence based model of leadership development (Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). The role of heredity in leadership development in the context of whether leadership is the born construct or is the matter of environmental influence together with the gender influence is predicted to be major driving force (Arvey, Zhang, Avolio, & Krueger,

2007). Lord and Hall (1992) cite how too many researchers have used simple bivariate correlation to examine complex issues of leadership. Also, most models have concentrated only on the causal factors and prediction (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009), while very few of the research had been oriented to test these prediction under actual field research settings and controlled leadership intervention (Yukl, 2006). Reichard and Avolio (2005) reported that regardless of theories, leadership interventions (training, actor/role play, scenario/vignette, assignments, expectation etc) had positively impacted on work outcomes.

Through meta-analysis in the context of positive leadership intervention, it was concluded that none had used more than one model of leadership and same happened with regards to leadership intervention. The impact which was made on the basis of these studies impels policy dissemination in terms of guiding principle instead of judging in terms of born characteristics. One of the emerging areas of interest in leadership research is the relationship of leadership to cognitive science in terms of how leaders perceive, decide, behave, and take action (Lord & Brown, 2004) and how leaders self-concept and/or identity is formed, changed, and influences behaviour (Swann, Chang-Schneider, McClarty, 2007). According to Avolio, Walumbwa, and Weber (2009), "leaders' working self concept gets constructed simultaneously in the process of interaction with current context, it is also based on more stable self-concepts and identities stored in the individuals long-term memory" (p. 426).

COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY AND LEADERSHIP

The way leaders and followers attend to, process, and make decisions, and develop including linkage of self-concept and meta-cognitive theories to research on leadership will no doubt contribute to the understanding of the development of leadership and followership. A broad range of topics such as self-concept, meta-cognitions, and implicit leadership theory are the major areas of research under cognitive psychology and leadership (Lord & Emrich, 2000). Under the umbrella of cognitive psychology, leadership research found two major models, viz, model of leadership development emphasizing leaders cognitive attributes (Lord & Hall, 2005) and the other one emphasizing the contribution of shared thinking in the development leadership creativity (Mumford, Connelly, & Gaddis, 2003). Both the above-mentioned models show variation in the leadership cognition namely, activities with the individual leaders and interaction that occur between individuals (Mumford, Connelly, & Gaddis, 2003). Lord and Brown's (2001) model examined two specific ways in which followers were motivated to choose the regulation of action/behaviour for example, patterns of value and the followers self concept, creating a collective identity that the follower

ultimately embraces as his or her own. Both the values and self-concept are viewed as mediating the linkage between the leader's actions and the behaviour of the follower (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009, p. 427). The existence of array of peripheral and core identities becomes salient to an individual depending upon the situations and context. Consequently, the question of activation of identities under the spectra of situations has important impact on the research on leadership and followership. (see Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009).

PROTOTYPICAL ABSTRACTIONS OF LEADERSHIP

The leadership research on social identity formation has also focussed greatly on what constitutes prototypicality which showed that followers may possibly be more drawn to leaders who are models of groups they fit into or would like to connect (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). Lord, Brown, Harvey, and Hall (2001) recently contested that prototypes are dynamic, not moderately stable as earlier notion, and can be applied and adapted based on the existing constraints or challenges being confronted by leaders.

The way implicit theories and prototypes affected the leaders' and followers' perceptions and how these affect the behaviour in terms of their biased view of others was the major concern of researchers for 25 years (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). However, research focussed on implicit leadership theories and various performance outcomes (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005) together with the recent trends in this literature coinciding with authentic leadership development programme (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). Lord and Emrich (2000) identified two major streams of work in the cognitive revolution in leadership research namely, individual and dyadic cognition and collective cognition. Within the individual and dyadic stream, social information processing theories such as leadership categorisation theory (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984) continue to inspire research on followers' perceptions and evaluations of leaders (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005). Under collective cognition, researchers recently identified essential characteristics of organizational sense-making in an attempt to influence and transform the attitude and belief of followers (Hodgkinson & Healey, 2008).

The recent introduction of the social identity approach into the leadership domain holds considerable potential as a "conceptual bridge across the individual/dyadic and collective cognition streams" (Hodgkinson & Healey, 2008, p.398). Hogg's (2001) work combined the effort in the voluminous literatures on prototypicality, social attraction, and attribution and information processing thereby providing a basic understanding of leadership processes in situations in salient groups. Effort has increased in demonstrating that individuals are recognised and evaluated as emergent

leaders in accordance with their degree of fit with the prototype of the salient in-group (Pierro, Cicero, Bonaiuto, van Knippenberg, & Kruglanski, 2005, van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, De Cremer, & Hogg, 2004) as opposed to their fit with more generic leadership schemas or categories (Lord, Foti, & DeVader, 1984). Recently social identity theory has been applied to the analysis of leader-member exchange relationships (Hogg, Martin, Epitropaki, Mankad, Svensson, & Weeden, 2005) and transformational leadership processes (Kark, Shamir, & Chen, 2003).

Cognitive approaches to investigate leadership draw heavily on several literatures (Epitropaki & Martin, 2005; Lord & Emrich, 2000; Lord & Hall, 2005; Mumford, Connelly, and Gaddis, 2003; Lord & Brown, 2001; Lord & Brown, 2004; Wofford, Goodwin, Whittington, 1998). Several attempts have been made in the process of development of theoretical account, example, researchers have portrayed the social identity approach, combining self/social categorization and social identity theories, as an overarching conception capable of providing unified insights across multiple domains (Haslam 2001, Hogg & Terry, 2000).

Impact of Culture and Values in Leadership: Emic Dimensions of leadership

A major study in leadership across the situation was done by House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta (2004), in an important initiative called GLOBE (Global Leadership and Organisational Behaviour Effectiveness Project). In this project, the relationship between societal culture, organisational culture, and leadership prototypes were investigated in 62 societies having different cultural practices. From the findings, it was found that mainly two leadership attributes are operating universally namely, charismatic leadership and team-oriented leadership. Both organisational value and societal values, rather than practices, were significantly related to leadership prototypes (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). For example, power distance was positively related to self-protective leadership and negatively related to charismatic and participative leadership (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). This notion contradicts the earlier findings that power distance is higher in collectivistic culture and charismatic leaders are the product collectivistic culture (Sinha, 1997). However, scholars predicted the role of collectivism and organic organizational structures in the emergence of charismatic leaders (Pillai & Meindl, 1998) but still the manifestation of charisma is culturally driven but present in varying forms (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007). Brodbeck et al. (2000) found significant variation in leadership prototypes and behavioural manifestation of the prototypes within and across the cultural clusters. Variations were also reported across hierarchical positions (Den Hartog, House, Hanges, Ruiz-Quintanilla, & Dorfman, 1999).

An investigation by Ensari and Murphy (2003) revealed that individualistic cultures perceive leader (charisma) in terms of recognition and schema (person fitting into their schema of good or bad leader) whereas collectivistic cultures perceive their leaders in terms of inferences (i.e., on the basis of performance outcomes). Some studies have based their results on reasoning applied by the employees i.e., on the basis of “logic of appropriateness” model and “logic of consequences” model, such as Japan and U.S respectively (Valikangas & Okumura, 1997). Zander and Romani (2004) found that across-country variance accounts for more variance in leadership preferences than within-country variance i.e., across demographic and occupational grouping.

Beyond culture's influence on leadership prototypes, there are important cross-cultural differences in leadership behaviors and practices (Gelfan, Erez, & Aycan, 2007, p. 492). Smith et al. (2002) in their study on managers of 47 countries found that cultural values were correlated with vertical sources of guidance. When strategies of executives was compared in 20 countries, it was found that adherence to existing strategies was the result of individualism, low uncertainty avoidance, low power distance and short term orientation (Geletkanyez, 1997), whereas in terms of leaders' goal priority, individualism and long-term orientation was found to be positively correlated to the importance given to profit, and negative correlation was observed, when power distance related to law abiding tendency inherited in that particular culture (Hofstede, Pedersen, & Hofstede, 2002).

Culture is the major force behind the practice of influence and power by the leader, and in this regard, major differences were encountered between individualistic and collectivistic culture, for example, practice of coercive power in individualistic culture and expert power in collectivistic culture (Rahim & Magner, 1996). But these studies are skeptical in their outcome as different results had been obtained by some researchers such as Ralston, Vollmer, Srinivasan, Nicholson, Tang, and Wan, (2001). Fu et al. (2004), observed 12 nations and found that perceived effectiveness of influences strategies is influenced by both individual-level variables (beliefs) and macro-level variables (e.g. national culture values).

Leadership discourses among mainstream academics also highlighted the most represented category of transformational and transactional leaders. Transformational leadership was seen as more effective than transactional leadership though both the leadership dimensions were seen as originating universally (Bass, 1997). But cultural specificities are always found to be intermingling into the geographical entities where leadership is practiced counterfeiting to other cultures and fitting into the followers' schema.

In the Indian context, Svadharma or orientation towards one's duty is best fitted into the practice of transformational leadership (Mehra & Krishnan, 2005). Apart from task and relationship-oriented leadership as found in various studies (Fu et al, 2004; Bass, 1997), role-related behaviors befitting the situation (political role, teacher's role etc) has its own emergent value (Shenkar, Ronen, Shefy, Hau-siu Chow, 1998).

Any organization together with its goals and objectives has its roots in a particular cultural context and thus, is not just mechanistic in its approach but it is circumscribed in social-economical entity as well, which is built on the employee's identifications and trust in terms of not diluting their cultural and historical values. Societal and familial values are respected in the same way as employee value organizational objectives and this assertion finds place in Indian context to some extent (Sinha, 2002). Research has shown that culture moderates the relationship between leadership and employees' outcomes (Dorfman & Howell, 1997; Elenkov & Manev, 2005; Newman & Nollen, 1996; Shin & Zhou, 2003; Walumbwa & Lawler, 2003). Cultural fitting and unfitting of leadership models may lay major breakthroughs in potential research making it more potent for the root level of analysis and not shying of from the bold prediction of future interdisciplinary intercourse.

Values and Leadership

Kluckhohn defined value as “... a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action” (as cited in Parsons & Shils, 1962, p. 395). The expansion of the term value beyond the relatively narrowed philosophical domain of the metaphysical allowed the consideration of several other value constructs relevant to different fields such as leadership and educational administration (see Begley, 2000) example, social ethics (Beck, 1990, 1993, 1999; Cohen, 1982; Frankena, 1973), transnational principles (Hodgkinson, 1996), the rational moral values (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2000) and self-interest (Begley & Johansson, 1998; Evers & Lakomski, 1996; Hodgkinson, 1996). The way values are conceptualized is the matter of patterns of differential preferences which is the derivation from the actual behaviour (Triandis, 1972) or as importance or desirability attached to different sets of behaviour (Sinha, 1994). It becomes possible to distinguish the values manifested from individuals from the more collective social values of a group, profession, society, or organization (Begley, 2000 p. 235). Values in terms of importance attached to certain behaviours, irrespective of the probability of people actually performing them, tend to assume a universal structure

(Schwartz & Bilsky, 1987) which remains intact despite the events around them. Begley (2000) allocated the importance of values in the educational field when he out-marked the positivistic and post-positivistic cult which ignored the role of values inherent and the cultural specificity and appreciated the role of critical and constructivists' paradigms. Thus, highlighting the value syntax working in the cultural settings namely, actions/speeches, attitudes, value, motivation and self has become important agenda for the present day educationists and researchers (Begley, 2000). Arenas of valuation have their importance in its multiplicity described by Hodgkinson (1978, 1991) starting from the personal valuation as self to the next layer of group to organizational influence to community and culture to the most least sorted but most important as transcendental. This arena illustrates the various sources of values, clearly conveying how values can be derived by the individual from multiple external and internal environmental sources and also the source of value conflicts of the individual with different layers of valuation arenas as community or society or organization as microcosm of the culture (Begley, 2000).

New Aspects of Leadership

As discussed in the previous section, leadership has both cultural and cross-cultural implications. For example, emphasis on paternalistic leadership showing its positive impact on employee attitudes in collectivistic and high-power-distance culture (Aycan, 2006; Farh & Cheng, 2000; Pellegrini & Scandura, 2006; Sinha, 1997; Westwood, 1997). Apart from paternalistic leadership, supervisor-subordinate guanxi (Yang, 1994) explains how supervisor decides on promotion and reward allocation after his /her performance control on subordinates (Law, Wong, Wang, D., & Wang, 2000; Chen, C.C., Chen, Y.R. & Xin, 2004). In another comparative work of expatriate and local leader under emical analysis of multicultural context (Howell, Romero, Dorfman, Paul, & Bautista, 2003; Suutari, 1996), it was found that expatriate leader change their leadership styles to fit the local context in which he or she is involved (Hui & Graen, 1997, Smith, Wang, & Leung, 1997) by setting cooperative goals and using cooperative conflict management strategies (Chen et al, 2006), with an efforts in deciphering leader-follower match in terms of cultural differences, practice and ethnicity (Chong & Thomas, 1997). Accounting above variables in the leader-follower interaction, is the precursor of effective and positive leadership effect in the multicultural context (Gelfand, Erez, & Aycan, 2007).

Saal and Knight (1988) made progress in identifying what behaviours differentiated leaders from followers and how the behaviours could be taught in the process of broadening the focus of the management to include both people-oriented activities along with task-oriented activities (Horner, 1997).

Traits and process of leadership didn't best fitted the concern of researchers regarding the best approaches to leadership, so the next thing focussed into the analysis was the interaction of traits, behaviour and situations of leader. This contingency theory assumed that the effects of one variable on leadership may be contingent on the other behaviour (Horner, 1997, p. 28). A major insight gained from the above approach was leadership response contingent on the diversity of situation (Saal & Knight, 1988). Thus, a more realistic view of leadership has surfaced that endorsed the complexity and situational specificity of overall effectiveness (Horner, 1997).

Future Standing of Leadership(S) Phenomenon: from Global to Local

The present review is an attempt to assemble the dimensions of leadership as a category of leadership processes looking into the social and cognitive content under cultural and cross cultural paradigms. Apart from that, this review attempted to capture the universalistic notions as prevalent among people in the form of value system. However, this construction of leadership should be analyzed not only from universalistic agency but also from sociocultural point of view. Many studies have been conducted on the issue of leadership in the Indian context following the western lineage but still the picture is hazy and limited to the superficiality of the dominant views. The depths of the leadership phenomenon have perhaps still not been clearly understood. Like the Gardner view on the diversity of intelligence, researchers must look into leadership from the standpoint of diversity and socio-historical origins. The neglected cultural, social, historical and political milieu in the action of individuals has its own varied complexity; and precaution is inevitable in the process of abandonment of universalism.

Conclusion, Reflections and Criticism

Today's main trends of leadership research have witnessed the diversities of findings. From time primordial, the host to valued leadership role was indistinguishable male with dominating personality displaying the power and image of the conqueror. However, this image itself was preference for the female leader who happened to become the owner and distributor of resource like her male counterparts. The shift of this archetype to more democratic and people oriented personality is the result of preferences of those who happened to be voiceless and fragile in the history of leadership. This shift in the social history of leadership display the root from where the things are changing and this is the valuation and self esteem related to ones most preferred group membership. For example, the trends like women leadership (Eagly, 2003), Dalit leadership (Hardtmann, 2009), Black

leadership (e.g., Ogbu, 2008) etc. shows itself the people awareness of their history of oppression and their recognition of leader who is more a skilled entrepreneur of their social identity (see Reicher, Haslam, & Hopkins, 2005; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). This drift of leadership phenomenon towards understanding diversities still converge towards the individualistic point of view towards understanding the social identity and group identities

The studies on leadership effectiveness are based on the metatheoretical assumptions of either 'societies in individual' or 'individuals in society'. The implications of these studies are manifold either to intervene at the societal levels or at the individual levels. There are many training programs and institute worldwide which assembles the traits and qualities of leaders active in different professions and work for training. At one level, it is encouraging that leadership qualities can be learned and are malleable to the extent it respects the hidden diversities in individual. But at the other level, it legitimize the structure which is appropriated by the dominant value system in society, for example, if the value attached for leader who is a millionaire is 'intelligence' then the hardwork and other form of intelligence utilized in low valued task (for exam carpenter or farming) will be highly underestimated and thus creating more social inequalities boosting the present structure of hierarchical inequality in the society.

Understanding diversities in the social structure under which the leadership protocols are displayed vary not only between the groups but also within the group. The groups which are represented more in the social structure are the epitome of power and politics prominent in any society and thus thwart the voices and values of underrepresented groups. However, the present need is to understand the interaction dynamics between groups and individuals and come out with not only the holistic view of leadership in the cultural context but also to see the neglected aspect of leadership such as democratic leadership which shapes the cognition and make that societal culture unique. This will help in understanding that processes of leadership are not universal step but have more integrative pace powered by the diversities of experiences laden in the history of mankind.

Indian Context: The research explaining the leadership style prominent in Indian context pointed that leaders are effective only when they display the traits of nurturant and task orientation. According to Sinha (1990), the nurturing-task leader is high on both the dimension of nurturing and task orientation. Nurturing-task leader creates a climate of purposiveness and maintains a high level of productivity. But he also shows care and affection for the well-being of his subordinate and is committed to their professional growth (Sinha, 1980). Context plays a very important role in the working of leader. Indian settings witnessed the demarcation in private and public organizations and even in schools,

structural and functional differences were evident. Sinha (1990) found that there exists a difference in public and private enterprises or organizations where the leader plays or transmits his/her leadership role. Government and private organizations including schools differ in their outcomes. It is generally witnessed that government or public sector organizations are loss making bodies but that is not the case with private sector organizations which most of the time run into profits. The studies of various enterprises in Bihar by Sinha (2002) reveal and showed the success of public sector also. Sinha (2002) viewed that "the most critical factor underlying the success of public enterprises (navratnas) is a nature of their leadership, particularly at the top, which is characterized by political support and patronage that enables the leader to exert himself and to deal effectively with his subordinates and employees, concerned ministry, department or apex body (b) Continuity over a period of time, which gives him scope for planning, establishing and modifying systems of management and orienting them towards achieving results for which he may be held accountable (c) The setting of role models for subordinates in terms of personal integrity, vision, dedication and capacity to work hard (d) A nurturing and paternal orientation which enables the leader to identify talents even at lower levels, groom them by sending them out for special training, place them in key positions and look after their career interests and (e) Strong faith in human resource development which leads him to make arrangements for the growth of the employee. A major difference found between these private and public enterprise was in terms of power these leaders possessed. Leaders of private organization reflected more power wielding then their public counterparts. A key factor responsible for this is dependency and the hierarchical position of leaders in public enterprises, where power and authority are relatively different. According to Sinha (2002), "Strong doses of delegation, decentralization and empowerment can be blended with nurturing and task oriented leadership in order to reclaim neglected human resources and improve their competitiveness."

Through many researches it was found that there is the gross relationship between leadership and management with cultural settings (Hofstede et al., 2002, 1980; House et al., 2004; Pearce & Osmond., 1999). These studies came to the conclusion that people in low power distance countries like USA minimize inequalities, are more democratic and less concentrated on authority. In comparison to low power distance countries, high in power distance countries like India are characterized by opposites (Hofstede, 2002). Hofstede (2002) found that people in high power distance countries preferred directive leadership but these findings were less revealing in the high power distance countries like India where people preferred their leaders to be participative and willingly cooperative as this is evident in the nurturing-task orientation theory of Sinha (1980). The question emerges,

however, that what are factors which make leader nurturant and task oriented in the eyes of the followers and how followers romanticize their leader as an image or replica of their own social identity and traits? This requires proper understanding taking multidisciplinary approach comprising the sociology, economics, anthropology, politics and history of leadership.

India is pointed to be most undemocratic form of democracy based on the process of hierarchy which has been socialized in the family itself (see Kakar & Kakar, 2009). Jai B P Sinha work on Indian leadership style fixed the possibility of hierarchical ladder operating within the social psychological boundaries of being Indian. It was observed that Indians are socialized towards hierarchical relationship and dependence proneness derived from the colonial past, which make it very difficult to adjust to the aforesaid organization encouraging freedom of expression and democratic lifestyle, if not earlier than in modern times. It is not to say that hierarchy is a myth but it can be main contributing agent in the reduction of conflicts and sustaining coordination (see Halvey, Chou, & Galinsky, 2011).

As it is required to understand leadership process covering broader and deeper aspects, the tools to enrich the learning should focus on the interdisciplinary methods not confining to the same experimentation but triangulating it with more complementing methods and tools. Even understanding any phenomenon depends on the social context, culture and social experience of the people and Indian setting demands more intruding techniques covering the broader geographical milieu to have better picture from the actors' (people) viewpoint.

REFERENCES

- Arvey, R. D., Zhang, Z., Avolio, B. J. & Krueger, R. F. (2007). Developmental and Genetic Determinants of Leadership Role Occupancy among Women. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92, pp. 693 - 706.
- Avolio, B. J. (1999). *Full Leadership Development: Building the Vital Forces in Organisations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting More Integrative Strategies for Leadership Theory-Building. *American Psychologist*, 62, pp. 25 - 33.
- Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. A. & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership Theories, Research, and Future Directions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, pp. 421 - 449.
- Aycan, Z. (2006). Paternalism: Towards Conceptual Refinement and Operationalization in K.S. Yang., K.K. Hwang and U. Kim (eds.), *Scientific Advances in Indigenous Psychologies: Empirical, Philosophical, and Cultural Contributions* (pp. 445 - 66). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Baron, A. (1995). Going Public with Studies on Culture Management. *Personnel Management*, 18(6), pp. 50 - 54.
- Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the Transactional - Transformational Leadership Paradigm Transcend Organizational and National Boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52, pp. 130 - 139.
- Beck, C. (1990). *Better Schools: A Values Perspective*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Beck, C. (1993). *Learning to Live the Good Life*. Toronto, Canada: OISE Press.
- Beck, L. G. (1999). Metaphors of Educational Community: An Analysis of the Images that Reflect and Influence Scholarship and Practice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 35(1), pp. 13 - 45.
- Begley, P. T. (2000). *School Leadership in Canada* (2nd ed.), Hillsdale, ON, Canada: Paul Begley & Associates.
- Begley, P. T. & Johansson, O. (1998). The Values of School Administration: Preferences, Ethics & Conflicts. *The Journal of School Leadership*, 8(4), pp. 399 - 422.
- Bernard, I. I. (1926). *An Introduction to Social Psychology*. New York: Holt.
- Brodbeck, F. C., Frese, M., Akerblom, S., Audia, G. & Bakacsi, G. (2000). Cultural Variation of Leadership Prototypes across 22 European Countries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, pp. 1-29.
- Brown, M.F., Trevino, L.K., & Harrison, D.A. (2005). Ethical Leadership: A Social Learning Perspective for Construct Development and Testing. *Organisation Behavior and Human Decision Making Processes*, 97, pp. 117 - 134.
- Bruner, J. (1986). *Actual Minds Possible Worlds*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University.
- Chen, C. C., Chen, Y. R. & Xin, K. (2004). Guanxi Practices and Trust in Management: A Procedural Justice Perspective. *Organizational Science*, 15, pp. 200 - 209.
- Chong, L. M. A. & Thomas, D. C. (1997). Leadership Perceptions in Cross-Cultural Context: Pakeha and Pacific Islanders of New Zealand. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, pp. 275 - 293.
- Cooper, C. D., Scandura, T. A. & Schriessheim, C. A. (2005). Looking Forward but Learning from Our Past: Potential Challenges to Developing Authentic Leadership Theory and Authentic Leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, pp. 475 - 493.
- Den, H. D. N. & Verburg, R. M. (1997). Charisma and Rhetoric: The Communicative Techniques of International Business Leaders. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, pp. 355 - 391.
- Den, H. D. N., House, R. J., Hanges, P. J., Ruiz-Quintanilla, S. A. & Dorfman, P. W. (1999). Culture Specific and Cross-Culturally Generalizable Implicit Leadership

- Theories: Are Attributes of Charismatic/Transformational Leadership Universally Endorsed? *Leadership Quarterly*, 10, pp. 219 - 256.
- Dorfman, P. W., Howell, J. P., Hibino, S., Lee, J. K., Tate, U. & Bautista, A. (1997). Leadership in Western and Asian Countries: Commonalities and Differences in Effective Leadership Processes across Cultures. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, pp. 233 - 274.
- Drath, W. H. & Palus, C. J. (1994). *Making Common Sense: Leadership as Meaning-Making in a Community of Practice*. Greensboro NC: Centre for Creative Leadership.
- Eagly, A. H. (2003). Few Women at the Top: How Role Incongruity Produces Prejudice and the Glass Ceiling. In D. Van Knippenberg & M. Hogg (Eds.), *Leadership and Power: Identity Processes in Groups and Organizations* (pp. 79 - 93). New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Elenkov, D. S. & Manev, I. M. (2005). Top Management Leadership and Influence on Innovation: The Role of Sociocultural Context. *Journal of Management*, 31, pp. 381 - 402.
- Ensari, N. & Murphy, S. E. (2003). Cross-Cultural Variations in Leadership Perceptions and Attribution of Charisma to the Leader. *Organization Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 92, pp. 52 - 66.
- Epitropaki, O. & Martin, R. (2005). From Ideal to Real: A Longitudinal Study of the Role of Implicit Leadership Theories on Leader-Member Exchanges and Employee Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, pp. 659 - 676.
- Evers, C. W. & Lakomski, G. (1996). *Exploring Educational Administration: Coherentist Applications and Critical Debates*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Farh, J. L. & Cheng, B. S. (2000). A Cultural Analysis of Paternalistic Leadership in Chinese Organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and Organizations in the Chinese Context* (pp. 94 - 127). London: Macmillan.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Frankena, W. K. (1973). *Ethics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Fu, P. P., Kennedy, J., Tata, J., Yukl, G., Bond, M. H. (2004). The Impact of Societal Cultural Values and Individual Social Beliefs on the Perceived Effectiveness of Managerial Influence Strategies: A Meso Approach. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 35, pp. 284 - 305.
- Geletkanycz, M. A. (1997). The Salience of Culture's Consequences: The Effects of Cultural Values on Top Executive Commitment to the Status Quo. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, pp. 615 - 634.
- Gelfand, M. J., Erez, M. & Aycan, Z. (2007). Cross-Cultural Organizational Behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, pp. 479 - 514.
- Graen, G. (1976). Role-Making Processes within Complex Organisations. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Halpin, A.W. & Winer, B. J. (1957). A Factorial Study of the Leader Behaviour Description. In R. M. Stogdill and A. E. Coons (eds.), *Leader Behaviour: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.
- Halvey, N., Chou, E. Y. & Galinsky, A. D. (2011). A Functional Model of Hierarchy: Why, How and When Vertical Differentiation Enhance Group Performance. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1(1), pp. 32 - 52.
- Hardtmann, E. M. (2009). *The Dalit Movement in India: Local Practices, Global Connections*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Haslam, S. A. (2001). *Psychology in Organisations: The Social Identity Approach*. London: Sage.
- Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. & Platow, M. J. (2011). *The New Psychology of Leadership: Identity, Influence and Power*. Sussex: Psychology Press.
- Hemphill, J. K. & Coons, A. E. (1957). Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire. In R. M. Stogdill & A. E. Coons (eds.), *Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement*. Columbus, OH: Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University.
- HodgeKinson, G. P. & Healey, M. P. (2008). Cognition in Organisations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 59, pp. 387 - 417.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1978). *Towards a Philosophy of Administration*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational Leadership: The Moral Art*. NY, Albany: Suny Press.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1996). *Administrative Philosophy*. Elsevier-Pergamon, Oxford.
- Hofstede, G. J., Pedersen, P. & Hofstede, G. (2002). *Exploring Culture: Exercises, Stories and Synthetic Cultures*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Hogg, M. A. (2001). A Social Identity Theory of Leadership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 5, pp. 184 - 200.
- Hogg, M. A., Martin, R., Epitropaki, O., Mankad, A., Svensson, A. & Weeden, K. (2005). Effective Leadership in Salient Groups: Revisiting Leader-Member Exchange Theory from the Perspective of the Social Identity Theory

- of Leadership. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin*, 31, pp. 991 - 1004.
- Hogg, M.A. & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social Identity and Self-Categorization Processes in Organizational Contexts. *Academic Management Review*, 25, pp. 121 - 140.
- Horner, M. (1997). Leadership Theory: Past, Present and Future. *Team Performance Management*, 3(4), pp. 270.
- House, R. J. & Mitchell, R. R. (1974). Path-Goal Theory of Leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3(4), pp. 81 - 98.
- House, R. J., Hanges, P. W., Javidan, M., Dorfman, P. & Gupta, V. (2004). *Culture, Leadership and Organizations: The GLOBE Study of 62 Societies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Howell, J. P., Romero, E. J., Dorfman, P. W., Paul, J. & Bautista, J. A. (2003). Effective Leadership in the Mexican Maquiladora: Challenging Common Expectations. *Journal of International Management*, 9, pp. 51 - 73.
- Hui, C. & Graen, G. B. (1997). Guanxi and Professional Leadership in Contemporary Sino-American Joint Ventures in Mainland China. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, pp. 451 - 465.
- Kark, R., Shamir, B. & Chen, G. (2003). The Two Faces of Transformational Leadership: Empowerment and Dependency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, pp. 246 - 255.
- Kegan, R. (1982). *The Evolving Self: Problem and Process in Human Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., Wang, D. & Wang, L. (2000). Effects of Supervisor- Subordinate Guanxi on Supervisory Decisions in China: An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Human Resource of Management*, 11, pp. 751 - 765.
- Lord, R. G. & Brown, D. J. (2001). Leadership, Values, and Subordinate Self-Concepts. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, pp. 133 - 152.
- Lord, R. G. & Brown, D. J. (2004). *Leadership Processes and Follower Self Identity*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L. & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual Constraints on Prototype Generation and Their Multilevel Consequences for Leadership Perceptions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12, pp. 311 - 338.
- Lord, R. G. & Emrich, C. G. (2000). Thinking Outside the Box by Looking Inside the Box: Extending the Cognitive Revolution in Leadership Research. *Leadership Quarterly*, 11, pp. 551 - 579.
- Lord, R. G. & Hall, R. J. (1992). Contemporary Views of Leadership and Individual Differences. *Leadership Quarterly*, 3, pp. 137 - 157.
- Lord, R. G. & Hall, R. J. (2005). Identity, Deep Structure, and the Development of Leadership Skill. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(4), pp. 591 - 615.
- Lord, R. G., Foti, R. J. & De Vader, C. L. (1984). A Test of Leadership Categorization Theory: Internal Structure, Information Processing, and Leadership Perceptions. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 34, pp. 343 - 378.
- Luthans, F. & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Authentic Leadership: A Positive Developmental Approach. In K. S. Cameron & J. E. Dutton & R. E. Quinn (eds.), *Positive Organizational Scholarship* (pp. 241 - 261). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Manz, C. C. & Sims, H. P. Jr. (1989). *Super Leadership*. NY: Prentice Hall Press.
- McCrae, R. R. & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1996). Toward a New Generation of Personality Theories: Theoretical Contexts for the Five-Factor Model. In J. S. Wiggins (ed.), *The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Theoretical Perspectives* (pp. 51-87). New York: Guilford.
- Meindl, J. R., Ehrlich, S. B. & Dukerich, J. M. (1985). The Romance of Leadership. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30, pp. 78 - 102.
- Mehra, P. & Krishnan, V. R. (2005). Impact of Svadharma-Oriented Transformational Leadership and Followers' Trust in Leader. *Journal of Indian Psychology*, 23, pp. 1 - 11.
- Mumford, M. D., Connelly, S. & Gaddis, B. (2003). How Creative Leaders Think: Experimental Findings and Cases. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14, pp. 411 - 432.
- Newman, K. L. & Nollen, S. D. (1996). Culture and Congruence: The Fit between Management Practices and National Culture. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 24, pp. 753 - 779.
- Ogbu, J. (2008). *Minority Status, Oppositional Culture & Schooling*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Parsons, T. & Shils, E. (1962) *Toward a General Theory of Action*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pearce, C. L. & Osmond, C. P. (1999). From Workplace Attitudes and Values to Global Patterns of Nations: An Application of Latent Class Modelling. *Journal of Management*, 25, pp. 759 - 778.
- Pellegrini, E. K. & Scandura, T. A. (2006). Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), Paternalism and Delegation in the Turkish Business Culture: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(2), pp. 264 - 279.
- Pierro, A., Cicero, L., Bonaiuto, M., Knippenberg, D. & Kruglanski, A. W. (2005). Leaders Group Prototypicality and Leadership Effectiveness: The Moderating Role of

- Need for Cognitive Closure. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, pp. 503 - 516.
- Pillai, R. & Meindl, J. R. (1998). Context and Charisma: A "Meso" Level Examination of the Relationship of Organic Structure, Collectivism and Crisis to Charismatic Leadership. *Journal of Management*, 24, pp. 643 - 671.
- Rahim, M. A. & Magner, N. R. (1996). Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Bases of Leader Power: First- Order Factor Model and Its Variance across Groups. *Multivariate Behavioural Research*, 31, pp. 495 - 517.
- Ralston, D. A., Vollmer, G. R., Srinivasan, N., Nicholson, J. D., Tang, M. & Wan, P. (2001). Strategies of Upward Influence: A Study of Six Cultures from Europe, Asia, and America. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, pp. 748 - 755.
- Reichard, R. J. & Avolio, B. J. (2005). Where Are We? The Status of Leadership Intervention Research: A Meta-Analytic Summary. In W. L. Gardner, B. J. Avolio & F. O. Walumbwa (eds.), *Authentic Leadership and Practice: Origins, Effects, and Development* (pp. 203 - 26). London: Oxford University Press.
- Reicher, S., Haslam, S. A. & Hopkins, N. (2005). Social Identity and the Dynamics of Leadership: Leaders and Followers as Collaborative Agents in the Transformation of Social Reality. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16, pp. 547 - 568.
- Reicher, S. & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and Nation*. London: Sage.
- Saal, F. E. & Knight, P. A. (1988). *Industrial/Organizational Psychology: Science and Practice*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schwartz, S. H. & Bilsky, W. (1987). Toward a Psychological Structure of Human Values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, pp. 550 - 562.
- Shapiro, J. & Stefkovich, J. (2000). *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Shenkar, O., Ronen, S., Shefy, E. & Hau-siu, C. I. (1998). The Role Structure of Chinese Managers. *Human Relations*, 51, pp. 51 - 73.
- Shin, S. J. & Zhou, J. (2003). Transformational Leadership, Conservation and Creativity: Evidence from Korea. *Academic Management Journal*, 46, pp. 703 - 714.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1994). Cultural Embeddedness and the Developmental Role of Industrial Organizational Psychology in India. In H. C. Triandis, M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (2nd ed.) (4, pp. 727 - 764). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1997). Indian Perspectives on Leadership and Power in Organizations. In H.S.R. Kao & D. Sinha (eds.), *Asian Perspectives on Psychology* (pp. 218 – 35). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sinha, J. B. P. (2002). Towards Indigenization of Psychology in India. In G. Misra, & A. K. Mohanty (eds.), *Perspectives on Indigenous Psychology* (pp. 440 – 457). New Delhi: Concept.
- Smith, P. B., Peterson, M. F., Schwartz, S. H., Ahmad, A. H. & Akande, D. (2002). Cultural Values, Sources of Guidance and Their Relevance to Managerial Behaviors: A 47 Nation Study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, pp. 188 - 208.
- Smith, P. B., Wang, Z. M. & Leung, K. (1997). Leadership, Decision - Making and Cultural Context: Event Management within Chinese Joint Ventures. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, pp. 413 - 431.
- Sparrowe, R. T. (2005). Authentic Leadership and the Narrative Self. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, pp. 419 - 439.
- Suutari, V. (1996). Variation in the Average Leadership Behaviour of Managers across Countries: Finnish Expatriates' Experiences from Germany, Sweden, France and Great Britain. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7, pp. 677 - 707.
- Swann, W. B., Chang, S. C. & McClarty, K. L. (2007). Do People's Self-View's Matter? Self-Concept and Self-Esteem in Everyday Life. *American Psychologist*, 62, pp. 84 - 94.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The Analysis of Subjective Culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Valikangas, L. & Okumura, A. (1997). Why Do People Follow Leaders? A Study of a U.S. and Japanese Change Program. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8(3), pp. 313 - 337.
- vanKnippenberg, D., van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D. & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Leadership, Self, and Identity: A Review and Research Agenda. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, pp. 825 - 856.
- Vroom, V. H. & Yetton, P. W. (1973). *Leadership and Decision-Making*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Walumbwa, F. O. & Lawler, J. J. (2003). Building Effective Organizations: Transformational Leadership, Collectivist Orientation, Work- Related Attitudes and Withdrawal Behaviors in Three Emerging Economies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 14, pp. 1083 - 1101.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S. & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure. *Journal of Management*, 34, pp. 89 - 126.

- Westwood, R. (1997). Harmony and Patriarchy: The Cultural Basis for Paternalistic Headship among the Overseas Chinese. *Organization Studies*, 18, pp. 445 - 480.
- Wofford, J. C., Goodwin, V. L. & Whittington, J. L. (1998). A Field Study of a Cognitive Approach to Understanding Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(1), pp. 55 - 84.
- Yammarino, F. J., Dionne, S. D., Chun, J. U. & Dansereau, F. (2005). Leadership and Levels of Analysis: A State-of-the-Science Review. *Leadership Quarterly*, 16, pp. 879 - 919.
- Yang, M. (1994). *Favors and Banquets: The Art of Social Relationships in China*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Yukl, G. A. (2006). *Leadership in Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Zander, L. & Romani, L. (2004). When Nationality Matters: A Study of Departmental, Hierarchical, Professional, Gender and Age- Based Employee Groupings' Leadership Preferences across 15 Countries. *International Journal of Cross-Cultural Management*, 4, pp. 291 - 315.