

# Leadership in Government General Hospitals: A Case Study of Leadership Styles as Perceived by Leaders of Government General Hospital, Chittoor District, A.P.

<sup>1</sup>Madhu Kumar, <sup>2</sup>Dr. G. Haranath

<sup>1</sup> Mr A. Madhu Kumar, M.B.A., Research Scholar, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, T.N., India

<sup>1</sup> Dr. G. Haranath, M.Com., M.B.A., Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Yogi Vemana University, Kadapa, A.P., India

## **Abstract:**

**L**eadership is affected by many variables and involves with several skills like technical, human, conceptual, designing, creative, communicative and decision making. 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. In the present study an attempt is made to analyze the leadership styles in government general hospital sector.

**Key Words:** Authoritarian, Participative, Bureaucratic, Task-orientation and Nurturant leadership styles.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of an organization is attributed to leadership styles of employees. This is due to the fact that leadership style affects the individuals and groups from the view point of motivation levels. In essence, leader has to play a pivotal role in accommodating himself with the subordinates through an appropriate style in a given context and to meet the personal, physical and other requirements of the subordinates so as to enable them to find satisfaction in their work. Nevertheless, the leadership styles vary very widely with the levels of the employees in an organization and also with the pattern of organization like Government General Hospital. As a result the leadership effectiveness changes with the changing conditions like individuals characteristics, hierarchical levels, organization patterns and organizations variables. Hence, the leadership styles affect the organizations variable and vice-versa. The perception of leadership style, however, varies when judged by leader himself and judges by his subordinates.

## II. LEADERSHIP CONCEPT

The understanding of leadership has ever been very difficult due to complexities involved in it. Leadership has always been a key topic in management; organizational behaviour, and industrial psychology. The concept and practice of leadership are closely related to personality. The key function of leader is to create a vision and achieve the same.

There are as many definitions of leadership as there are scholars who have attempted to analyze and understand the concept, but there is no universally accepted definition of it.

The Oxford English dictionary (1933) notes that the word "Leader" appeared in the English language as early as 1300A.D. However, the word "Leadership" did not appear until about 1800A.D. Albeit, Leadership appears to be a rather sophisticated concept, words meaning 'chief' or 'king' are the only ones found in many languages to differentiate the ruler from other members of society. A preoccupation with leadership occurred predominantly in countries with Anglo-Saxon heritage. Though, leaders have existed in all cultures throughout history; the practice and philosophy of leadership can be gleaned from writings as diverse in content, philosophy and time as those found in the Greek classics such as Homer's Iliad, the Old and New Testaments, the Mahabharatha, the Ramayana and the Bhagavatha and the Kautilya's Arthashastra in India, essays about Confucius in China, Machiavellian The Prince which is concerned with rules and principles for obtaining and holding power.

But, the understanding, developing predicting and managing behaviour of leader is still an enigma, despite there are about 33,000 articles and books written about so far in 20<sup>th</sup> century. The basic question is 'what in fact constitutes leadership?' While Gore and Silander have mentioned about five thousand entries on the concept of leadership, Stogdill reviewed seventy two definitions of leadership. Karmel is of the opinion that it is very difficult to settle on a single definition of leadership that is general enough to accommodate these many meanings and specific enough to serve as an operationalisation of the variable. However, there is a certain underlying unity among the various conceptualizations made in this area.

Different scholars have focused on multiple aspects of leadership like: the creative and directive force of morale (Munson, 1981); the process by which an agent induces a subordinate to behave in a desired manner (Bennis, 1959); the presence of a particular influence relationship between two or more persons (Hollander and Jullian, 1969); directing and coordinating the work of group members (Fiedler, 1967); an interpersonal relationship in which others comply because they want to, not because they have to (Merton, 1969); transforming followers, creating visions of the goals that may be attained, and articulating for the followers the way to attain these goals (Bass, 1985; Tichy and Devanna, 1986); the process of influencing an organised group toward accomplishing its goals (Roach and Behling, 1984); actions that focus

resources to create desirable opportunities (Campbell, 1991); the leaders job is to create conditions for the team to be effective (Ginnett, 1996); etc. According to Andrew (1998), some view leadership as the personal relationship between the individual and the group; others as the process of striving toward common goals and values; still others, as aspects of behaviour, whether desired and in control of the individual or, alternatively, reactive and driven by forces in the environment.

The common characteristic that can be found in many of the definitions is the 'influence', exerted by the leader. That is, he tries to influence the behaviour of others in a specific direction.

### **III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Leadership is the crucial issue in all organizations, as every manager has to deal with this aspect in order to succeed in the organizational mission. Though there are many independent theories on leadership, no single theory is relevant to all the situations. Thus, the search for understanding new dimensions of leadership has been continuing.

Normally the success and failure of organizations have been attributed to the effectiveness of leaders in organizational setting. As such the topic of leadership welcomes the research studies without limitations so as to add a new dimension to leadership theory and practice.

This is due to the fact that each organization has its own personality. That is, organizations vary widely both structurally and functionally. As such, the specific findings of one research in a particular area and in a particular organization may not be totally relevant to other organizations. Hence, there is a need for the investigation of the problem like Leadership. The present empirical research study of Government General Hospital (G.G.H.) addresses to this issue.

**Objectives of the Study:** To study the leadership styles as perceived by leaders in Government General Hospital in relationship with Socio Economic and Organization Position variables.

**Hypotheses:** Keeping in view of the objectives of the study the following Hypotheses were formulated in order to test them in the light of interpolation and inferences drawn from the data.

1. There is no significant inter relationship among the Socio Economic and Organization Position variables of employees in Government General Hospital.
2. There is no significant relationship between Socio Economic and Organization Position variables and leadership styles of employees in Government General Hospital.
3. There is no significant relationship among leadership styles of employees in Government General Hospital.

### **Methodology**

The study is mainly based on primary data. The primary data are collected from the employees of service organizations in Government General Hospital in Chittoor district, A.P., by making personal visits through a schedule prepared for this purpose. The variables undertaken for the study are Socio-economic organization position (SEOP) variables viz., age, designation, length of service, educational qualifications economic background, social economic background and family profession. The leadership styles were measured in two ways i.e., as judged by leader himself (leader's self-perception) and as judged by his immediate subordinates (subordinate's perception on superior style). For the analysis of leadership styles of doctor, managers, and assistant officers level employees, leader's self perception was used and whereas in analyzing for assistant officers and clerical staff level employees, subordinate's perception on superior styles was used. Five leadership styles as judged by leader himself and as judged by his subordinate's viz., Authoritarian, Participative, Bureaucratic, Task-orientation and Nurturant leadership styles were taken for the study.

### **Sampling**

The census method has been used for the study. At the first stage, select organizations in Government General Hospital Head quarter in Chittoor, have been taken for the study. In all the Government General Hospital head quarter, there are 300 employees among which 34 per cent (103) in three layers, consisting of 56 doctors, 27 assistant officers and 20 clerical staff. In Government General Hospital the universe of the study was 103 people belonging to three functional levels of employees, viz., Higher, Middle and Low level. In order to facilitate our analysis, the middle level employees are taken as a common factor. This has been considered desirable due to the fact that the middle level personnel form the linking pin between the higher and the lower levels. Notably, a middle level employee plays a senior as well as the subordinate in his role-set.

### **Analysis of Leadership Styles**

This research paper presents the leadership self perception about their style and the relationship between leadership styles and leaders self perception of higher and middle level organizations employees in Government General Hospital. Statistically Pearson product moment co-efficient of correlation is applied. The correlations among selected socio-economic organization position variables were computed. Following this, the correlations of SEOP variables with leadership styles and leader's self perception were computed. In addition, correlations were computed among five leadership styles viz., F, P, B, T and N.

In this research the presentation and discussion of the data pertains to the following:

1. Inter-correlation among SEOP variables of Government General Hospital employees at different levels.
2. Inter-correlation between SEOP variables and Leaders self perception of Leadership styles of Government General Hospital.
3. Inter-correlation of leadership styles as perceived by the leaders of Government General Hospital.

**Government General Hospital**

For the inter-correlation, the degree of freedom (d.f.) is N-2. In Government General Hospital, higher and middle levels of employees stood 83 where N=83, the d.f.=83-2=81. for 83 d.f. the entries at 0.01 and 0.05 by linear interpolation are 0.537 and 0.423 respectively (for three decimals). The correlation values with two stars are significant at 0.01 level and those with one star of 0.05 level.

**S.E.O.P. VARIABLES OF GOVERNMENT GENERAL HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES**

Table 1 Inter-correlation among SEOP variables of Government General Hospital employees N=103

Sl. No	SEOP Variables	Level	Age	Experience	Educational Qualifications	Economic Background	Social Background	Father profession
1	Level	----	-0.185	0.758**	0.866**	0.212	-0.226	0.434*
2	Age		----	0.638**	-0.231	0.342	0.142	-0.084
3	Experience			----	0.135	-0.241	-0.164	0.091
4	Educational Qualifications				----	0.882**	0.182	-0.216
5	Economic Background					----	0.092	-0.018
6	Social Background						----	-0.471*
7	Father profession							----

Source: Compiled from field survey.

Table 1 presents the inter-correlations among Socio-economic organization position (SEOP) variables viz., level, age experience, educational qualifications, economic background, social background and family profession, received for the group of higher, middle and low level Government General Hospital employees.

The first variable ‘level’ was significantly and positively correlated with ‘experience’ (r=0.758, p<0.01) significantly that the persons who are at the higher level are in greater experience. ‘Level’ was also significantly and positively correlated with ‘educational qualifications’ (r=0.866, p<0.01) significantly that the persons who are at the higher level are in higher educational qualifications. ‘Level’ was also significantly are positively correlate with ‘family profession’ (r=0.434, p<0.05) signifying that the persons at the level are with better family profession background.

The second variable age was significantly and positively correlated with ‘experience’ (r=0.638, p<0.01) indicating that higher the age, greater the experience.

‘Educational qualifications’ was significantly and positively correlated with ‘economic background’ (r=0.882, p<0.01) indicating that higher the educational qualifications, greater the economic background.

‘Social background’ was significantly but negatively correlated with ‘family profession’ (r=-0.471, p<0.05) indicating that higher the social background, lesser family profession.

None of the other SEOP variables, however, were not found to be significantly inter-correlated. They are rather, independent of each other.

Hence, the null hypothesis of “there is no significant inter relationship among the socio-economic and organizational position variables of employees in Government General Hospital” is rejected in case of level Vs experience, level Vs educational qualification, level Vs family profession, age Vs experience, educational qualifications Vs economic background and social background Vs family profession and is accepted in all other cases.

**SEOP VARIABLES AND LEADER’S STYLES OF SELF PERCEPTION OF GOVERNMENT GENERAL HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES.**

Table 2 Inter-correlation between SEOP variables and leader’s self perception of Leadership styles of Government General Hospital employees. N=83

Sl.No	SEOP Variables	Leader’s self perception styles				
		Authoritarian	Participative	Bureaucratic	Task-orientation	Nurturant
1	Level	-0.123	0.448*	0.124	0.148	0.539**
2	Age	0.112	-0.108	0.048	0.029	-0.148
3	Experience	0.192	0.850	-0.129	0.099	0.035
4	Educational Qualifications	-0.114	0.104	-0.626**	0.291	0.148
5	Economic Background	0.194	-0.906**	0.118	0.082	-0.143

6	Social Background	-0.134	0.004	-0.103	0.704**	-0.044
7	Father profession	0.192	-0.094	0.048	-0.321	-0.222

Source: Compiled from field survey

Table 2 presents the inter-correlation between socio-economic organization position (SEOP) variables and five leadership styles perceived by higher and middle levels of Government General Hospital employees.

The correlation between 'level' and 'participative' style of leader's was found to be significantly positive ( $r=0.448$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) indicating that the 'participative' style increase with the increase of level. 'level' was significantly and positively correlated with 'nurturant' style ( $r=0.539$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) indicating that the nurturant style increase with the increase of level.

'Education' was significantly but negatively correlated with 'bureaucratic' style ( $r= -0.626$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) indicating that the bureaucratic style decreases with the increase of educational qualifications of persons.

'Economic background' was highly significantly but negatively correlated with 'participative' style ( $r= -0.906$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) indicating that the bureaucratic style decreases with the increase of economic background of persons.

'Social background' was significantly and positively correlated with 'task-orientation' style ( $r=0.764$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) indicating that the task-orientation style increases with the increases of social background of persons.

None of the other SEOP variables, however, were not found to be significantly correlated with other leadership style of self perception.

Hence, the null hypothesis of "there is no significant relationship between socio-economic and organizational position variables and leadership styles of employees in Government General Hospital" is rejected in the case of level Vs participative; level Vs nurturant, educational qualifications Vs bureaucratic, economic background Vs participative and social background Vs task orientation styles and is accepted in all other cases.

#### LEADER'S STYLES OF SELF PERCEPTION OF GOVERNMENT GENERAL HOSPITAL EMPLOYEES

Table 3 Inter-correlation among leader's self perception of Leadership styles of Government General Hospital employees. N=83

Sl.No	Leader's self perception styles	Leader's self perception styles				
		Authoritarian	Participative	Bureaucratic	Task-orientation	Nurturant
1	Authoritarian	----	0.137	0.214	- 0.047	0.833**
2	Participative		----	0.138	0.435**	0.465*
3	Bureaucratic			----	0.529**	- 0.162
4	Task-orientation				----	0.248
5	Nurturant					----

Source: Compiled from field survey

Table 3 presents the inter-correlations perceived by higher and middle levels of Government General Hospital employees.

The 'authoritarian' style was correlated with 'nurturant' style significantly and positively ( $r=0.833$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) indicating that nurturant style increases with the increase of authoritarian style.

The 'participative' style was correlated significantly and positively with 'task-orientation' style ( $r=0.435$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) and with 'nurturant' style ( $r=0.465$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) indicating that 'task-orientation' and 'nurturant' styles increases with the increase of participative style.

The 'bureaucratic' style was significantly and positively correlated with 'task-orientation' style ( $r=0.529$ ,  $p<0.01$ ) indicating that task-orientation style increases with the increase of bureaucratic style.

Hence, the null hypothesis of "there is no significant relationship among leadership styles of employees in Government General Hospital" is rejected in the case of authoritarian Vs nurturant, participative Vs task-orientation, participative Vs nurturant and bureaucratic Vs task-orientation styles and is accepted in all other cases.

#### IV. FINDINGS

##### The following are the major findings of leadership styles of self perception

1. A significant relationship among SEOP variables of employees in Government General Hospital is found in the case of level Vs experience, level Vs educational qualifications, level Vs family profession, age Vs experience, educational qualifications Vs economic background, social background Vs father profession and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.
2. A significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles of employees at higher and middle levels in Government General Hospital is found in the case of level Vs participative, level Vs nurturant, educational qualifications Vs bureaucratic, economic background Vs participative, social background Vs task-orientation styles and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

3. A significant inter relationship among leadership styles of employees in Government General Hospital is found in the case of authoritarian Vs nurturant, participative Vs task-orientation, participative Vs nurturant, bureaucratic Vs task-orientation, styles and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

## V. CONCLUSION

The analysis of self perception in Government General Hospital reveals that at officers' level, the dominant leadership style is nurturant, followed by 'task-orientation', 'participative', 'bureaucratic' and 'authoritarian' styles (according to scores of Leadership Self Perception).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Ansari M.A. "Need for Nurturant-Task Leaders in India: Some empirical evidence," *Management and Labour Studies*, 11,1, (1986).
- [2] Bass B. M., *Leadership, Psychology and Organizational Behaviour*, Harper, New York, 1960.
- [3] Bennis W.G. "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behaviour: The Problem of Authority," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 4, 1959.
- [4] Campbell D.P. *Campbell Leadership Index Manual*, National Computer System, 1991.
- [5] Carter L.F. "Leadership and Small Group Behaviour," in M. Sheriff and M.O. Wilson, eds., *Group Relations at the Crossroads*, Harper, 1953.
- [6] Douglas McGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, McGraw-Hill International Book Company, New York, 1960.
- [7] Fiedler F.E, *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1967.
- [8] Gibb C.A. "Leadership," in G. Lindzey and others., *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Addison-Wesley, Mass, 1954.
- [9] Ivancevich, Donnelly and Gibson, *Management Principles and Functions*, Fourth edition, All India Traveller Brook seller, Delhi, 1991.
- [10] J. M. Burns, *Leadership*, Harper and Row, New York, 1978.
- [11] James Owen, "The Uses of Leadership Theory", *Michigan Business Review*, Vol.25, No.1, January, 1973.
- [12] Kakabadse, Andrew, "Leadership for the Third Millennium," *Essence of Leadership*, International Thompson Publishing, 1998.
- [13] Levinson H. Men, *Management and Mental Health*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1968.
- [14] McGregor D., *The Human Side of Enterprise*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.
- [15] Ordway Tead, *The Art of Leadership*, McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc. New York, 1953.
- [16] Robert Tannenbaum, R. Weschier and Fred Massarik, *Leadership and Organisation: A Behavioural Science approach*, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1961.
- [17] Tichy N.M. and Devanna, M.A., *The Transformational Leader*, Wiley, New York, 1986.
- [18] Vroom V.H., *The Search for a Theory of Leadership in Contemporary Management: Issues and View Points*, Ed. Joseph W. McGuire, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1974.