

**EMPLOYEES' PERCEPTION OF
LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOUR IN RETAIL
BANKING**

DOLLY WANJAU

Mini-dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences (Business School) in fulfilment of the partial requirements for the degree of Masters in Business Administration at the North-West University

Supervisor: Ms Retha Scholtz

June 2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

'TO GOD BE THE GLORY AND THE HONOUR'

I am deeply indebted to my MBA advisor, without whom this dissertation would not be possible. Wilma Pretorius, thank you for holding my hand, massaging my ego, and soothing my nerves throughout this process, every word and advice meant a great deal. You always believed in me and never wavered in your support of what I was doing. Prof Leon Coetzee, thank you for the hard work you put into reviewing and critiquing my materials, although we were not able to finish the work together. I am grateful. Retha Scholtz, my supervisor, thank you for helping me put this process and product into perspective. You assured me that the corrections and revisions would result in a better product in the end. You were correct. Again, thank you, Retha & Prof. Jan du Plessis, thank you for hanging in there with me, being willing to read my documents, and offering your support. Fhatuwani, you are a true friend, and I am truly grateful for your positive words of encouragement.

I must also acknowledge the support and help of my very special little brother Simon; thanks so much for doing my statistics and always being there for me from the beginning to the end. This goes to Florence; you are such a special friend to me. We began this journey together and are finishing together; you played a 'mother, sister role' throughout this course. Life has a way of bringing the right people together, at the right time, for the right reasons. Florence, you have been and will continue to be my true buddy and partner in the learning process.

I am also profoundly thankful for my husband's support. Jackson, you tolerated my many hours of studying and you made me keep going when I wanted to give up. Thank you, my darling, I love you. To my three little daughters, Donna, Ruth and Catherine, thanks so much, my angels, for understanding mama's busy schedules, all the hugs and kisses took me a long way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgement	2
Abstract	6
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	7
1.1 Introduction to the study	7
1.2 Effectiveness of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours	8
1.3 Perception of leadership behaviour	9
1.4 Problem statement	10
1.5 Objectives of the study	11
1.6 Clarification of concepts of the study	12
1.6.1 Key concepts	12
1.6.2 The following terms are used interchangeably for the purpose of this study	12
1.7 Scope and focus of the study	13
1.8 Objective of the study	13
1.9 Environment of the study	14
1.10 Assumption of the study	14
1.11 Methodology	14
1.12 Structure of the research report	15
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	16
2.1 Foundation of study	16
2.2 Early descriptions of relations-oriented and task-oriented Leadership behaviours	18
2.3 Research supporting relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours	20
2.4 Linking relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours	20
2.5 Linking relations-oriented behaviour, task-oriented behaviour and LBDQ	21

2.5.1	Relations-orientated leadership behaviour subscales	23
2.5.1.1	Representation	23
2.5.1.2	Persuasiveness	23
2.5.1.3	Tolerance of freedom	23
2.5.1.4	Integration	24
2.5.1.5	Superior orientation	24
2.5.2	Task-oriented leadership behaviour	24
2.5.2.1	Demand reconciliation	24
2.5.2.2	Tolerance of uncertainty	25
2.5.2.3	Role assumption	25
2.5.2.4	Production emphasis	25
2.5.2.5	Predictive accuracy	26
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		27
3.1	Introduction	27
3.2	Research design	27
3.3	Sampling strategy and sample	27
3.4	Data collection process	28
3.5	The measuring instrument – Quantitative	29
3.6	Data analysis	30
3.7	Summary	31
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS		32
4.1	Introduction	32
4.2	Descriptive statistics for leadership behaviour	32
4.3	Summary	40
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENATION		41
5.1	Introduction	41
5.2	What are the employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours?	41
5.3	Future research	42

5.4	Recommendations	42
-----	-----------------	----

REFERENCES		44
-------------------	--	-----------

APPENDICES		50
-------------------	--	-----------

LBDQ XII Questionnaire		50
------------------------	--	----

Manual for the Leader Behaviours Description Questionnaire		55
--	--	----

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.5: Linkages between Relations-Oriented Behaviour, Task-Oriented Behaviour and LBDQ Questionnaire Questions	23
Table 4.1: Descriptive Statistics: Representation	33
Table 4.2: Descriptive Statistics: Demand reconciliation	33
Table 4.3: Descriptive Statistics: Tolerance of Uncertainty	34
Table 4.4: Descriptive Statistics: Persuasiveness	35
Table 4.5: Descriptive Statistics: Initiation of Structure	35
Table 4.6: Descriptive Statistics: Tolerance of Freedom	36
Table 4.7: Descriptive Statistics: Role Assumption	37
Table 4.8: Descriptive Statistics: Consideration	38
Table 4.9: Descriptive Statistics: Production Emphasis	38
Table 4.10: Descriptive Statistics: Predictive Accuracy	39
Table 4.11: Descriptive Statistics: Integration	39
Table 4.12: Descriptive Statistics: Superior Orientation	40

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine how subordinates describe their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviours and to understand the employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours in retail banking.

The 100 item LBDQ XII instrument employed was focussed on describing relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours. This questionnaire has been used in several countries to study leadership behaviour as mentioned in Littrell (2002), and has also been used in South Africa by Littrell and Nkomo (2005).

Research participants in the research included 288 employees in Retail Banking in Johannesburg. These employees were located at Head Office in Johannesburg.

The research findings on how the subordinates describe their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviour in retail banking, suggest that retail banking leaders were perceived by their subordinates as exhibiting both relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour. This explains why there was very little difference in the mean scores of all twelve subscales of the LBDQ Questionnaire. According to Klimoski and Hayes (1980), a similar pattern of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour was observed in a production department of a large-processing firm. The study concluded that performance and job satisfaction were enhanced if the supervisors demonstrated the behaviours that were both task centred and supportive. However, mean scores for other items of the subscales suggest some need for improvement.

CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction to the study

Over the years, leadership has been studied extensively in various contexts and with various theoretical foundations. While leaders have been traditionally seen in many cultures as those who have been advantaged by their heritage, current theorists and researchers view leadership as a set of learned behaviours (Bernard, 1926; Blake, Shepard, & Mouton, 1964; Drath & Palus, 1994; Fiedler, 1967; House & Mitchell, 1974). Indeed, 'no other role in organizations has received more interest than that of the leader' (Schwandt & Marquardt, 2000:177). The early examination of leadership behaviours included a separation of those behaviours into relations-oriented and task-oriented categories.

Relations-oriented leadership behaviours focus on the quality of the relationship with followers, whereas, task-oriented leadership behaviours focus on the task to be accomplished by followers (Bass, 1990a). Over the years, researchers have used various terms to describe relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours. Descriptions of terms relating to relations-oriented leadership behaviours by several researchers have included "consideration" (Hemphill, 1950), "building mutual trust" (Misumi, 1985), "participatory decision-making" (Ouchi, 1981), "interaction-oriented" (Bass, 1967), "concern for people" (Blake & Mouton, 1964), "people centred" (Anderson, 1974) and "leadership" (Zaleznik, 1977). Conversely, task-oriented leadership behaviour has included "initiating structure" (Hemphill, 1950), "defining group activities" (Fleishman, 1951), "concerned with production" (Blake & Mouton, 1964), "achievement oriented" (Indvik, 1986), "goal emphasizing" (Bowers & Seashore, 1966), and "management" (Zaleznik, 1977). Bass and Avolio (1995, 1997) describe relation-oriented leadership behaviours as *idealized influence (attributed)*, *idealized influence (behavioural)*, *individualised consideration*, *intellectual stimulation* and *inspirational motivation*. Their task-oriented

descriptions include contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive). Leaders may exhibit other behaviours than the above discussed namely, *laissez-faire* (Bass & Avolio, 1995, 1997).

While researchers argue for the distinctiveness of their terminology, the terms are nonetheless inter-related or inter-linked to each other. For example, transformational leadership and transactional leadership have been linked to leadership and management (Bass, 1985), respectively. Relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours have, respectively, been linked to consideration and initiating structure (Bass, 1990a), and consideration and initiating structure have further been linked to transformational leadership and transactional leadership (Seltzer & Bass, 1990).

For the purposes of this dissertation, the terms relations-oriented and task-oriented will be used to distinguish between leadership behaviours. Some cases in which these distinctions occur include consideration and initiating structure, transformational and transactional, and democratic and autocratic.

1.2 Effectiveness of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour

Regardless of the terminology, researchers have continuously focused on the effectiveness of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour. Research findings regarding the two types of behaviour vary, but studies have supported the effectiveness of leadership that exhibits both, individually and also in combination (Bass, 1990a).

In general, these are some of the examples supporting the effectiveness of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour. Transformational leadership is expected and found to lead to more positive effects on subordinates than transactional leadership (Butler Jr, Cantrell & Flick 1999). Fiol, Harris and House (1999) noted that theories emphasizing transformational leadership have been subjected to more than 100 empirical tests. Collectively, the findings of these studies demonstrate that transformational leaders have positive effects on their organisations and followers, with effects sizes ranging from 0.35 to 0.50 for organisational performance, and from 0.40 to 0.80 for effects on followers

satisfaction, commitment and organisational identification (Fiol et al, 1999). Butler, Cantrell and Flick (1999) reported that the leadership behaviour of individualised support and intellectual stimulation resulted in higher levels of job satisfaction. Furthermore, there is evidence that both positive endorsement and the positive effects of this type of leadership are found in a wide range of countries (Bass, 1997; Den Hartog, Van Muijden & Koopman., 1997).

Examples of findings supporting the effectiveness of task-oriented leadership behaviour can be found in Patchen (1962). Patchen reported that obtaining rewards for followers had a positive effect on job performance. Larson, Hunt and Osborn (1974) found correlations between initiating structure and performance. Brown and Dodd (1999) discovered that contingent reward leadership behaviour resulted in greater satisfaction with supervisors and higher levels of productivity.

Examples of research supporting the effectiveness of both combined leadership behaviour types come from Klimoski and Hayes (1980), who found that both leadership styles applied together correlated positively with job performance and job satisfaction. Thite (1999) discovered that managers who exhibit charisma, idealised influence, intellectual stimulation, individualised consideration as well as contingent reward and active management-by-exception leadership behaviour were perceived better managers by their followers.

These various research findings demonstrate the broad impact of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour, but the effectiveness of a leader depends on the perception of leadership behaviour by employees or subordinates.

1.3 Perception of leadership behaviour

Forsyth, Heiney and Wright (1997) suggest that it is observer perception, and not actual behaviour that creates biased evaluations for leaders. In this manner, the Implicit Leadership Theory (ILT) proposes that the evaluation of leadership behaviour is not an objective process (Rush, Thomas & Lord, 1977). Regardless of a leader's actual behaviour,

the observer's constructed perception influences how a leader will be evaluated (Rush et al, 1977). For example, Rush et al (1977) found that limited information of a leader yielded the same results on the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire Form XII (LBDQ XII) as studies that used full descriptions of leaders (e.g. Schriesheim & Stogdill, 1975). Rush et al (1977) found that observers essentially projected attributes onto the managers about whom they were given limited information. In limited information scenarios, effects of actual behaviour are reduced, thus allowing individual perceptions of leaders to emerge (Lord & Maher, 1990; Rush et al., 1977). These results demonstrate that observer perception significantly affects the evaluation of a leader's actual behaviour. Since perception is not necessarily congruent with actual behaviour, leaders are vulnerable to biased evaluations. Thus, the evaluation of leadership stems from the traits and characteristics that an observer believes a leader should possess, rather than the actual behaviours that a leader exhibits (Lord, DeVader & Alliger., 1986). Consequently, role expectancies may be contributing to the discrepancy between the perception of behaviour and actual behaviour of leaders (Cecil, Paul & Olins, 1973; Holmes & Stubbe, 2003). Therefore the purpose of this study is to determine how the subordinates describe their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviour and to understand the employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour in a retail banking environment. This offers a means to further explore the subject of leadership behaviours.

1.4 Problem statement

Researchers have advocated the value of employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour. Investigations into the impact of how employees perceive the leadership behaviour of their supervisors, both in terms of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour, reveal varying degrees of effectiveness. Therefore, employees' perceptions directly impact upon both of the relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours.

Consequently, determining how the subordinates describe their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviour and understanding the employees' perceptions of their immediate

supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour in a retail banking environment, is an important undertaking.

1.5 Objective of the study

The objective of the study is to determine what the employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour are.

For both research questions, relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour were measured as representing the following dimensions of Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire Form XII (LBDQ XII):

Relations-Oriented Leadership Behaviour

- a) Representation
- b) Persuasiveness
- c) Tolerance of freedom
- d) Consideration
- e) Integration
- f) Superior orientation

Task-oriented Leadership Behaviour

- a) Demand reconciliation
- b) Tolerance of uncertainty
- c) Initiating of structure
- d) Role assumption
- e) Production emphasis
- f) Predictive accuracy

1.6 Clarification of concepts of the study

1.6.1 Key concepts

- **Leadership:** Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives (Yukl, 2006).

1.6.2 The following terms are used interchangeably for the purpose of this study

- **Relations-oriented Leadership:** This leadership style is whereby the leader is totally focused on organising, supporting and developing the people in the leader's team. A participative style, it tends to lead to good teamwork and creative collaboration (Bass, 1985).
- **Task-oriented Leadership:** A highly task-oriented leader focuses only on getting the job done, and can be quite autocratic. He or she will actively define the work and the roles required, put structures in place, plan, organise and monitor. However, as task-oriented leaders spare little thought for the well-being of their teams, this approach can suffer many of the flaws of autocratic leadership, with difficulties in motivating and retaining staff (Bass, 1985).
- **Consideration Behaviour:** These types of behaviour indicates mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and his group. This dimension appears to emphasize deeper concern for group members' needs and includes such behaviour as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication. (Fleishman & Harris, 1962:43-44).
- **Initiating Structure Behaviour:** This includes behaviour in which the supervisor organises and defines group activities and his relation to the group. Thus, he defines the role he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production. This dimension seems to emphasize overt attempts to achieve organisation goals (Fleishman & Harris, 1962:43-44).
- **Transformational Leadership:** Bass (1990b) defines Transformational Leadership as: (a) idealized influence (attributed and behaviour): provides vision and sense of

mission, instils pride, gains respect and trust, (b) inspirational motivation: communicate high expectations, use symbols to focus efforts, express important purposes in simple ways, (c) intellectual stimulation: promotes intelligence, rationality, and careful problem solving, (d) individualized consideration: gives personal attention, treats each employee individually, coaches, advises.

- **Transactional Leadership:** Bass (1990a) defines Transactional Leadership as: (a) contingent reward: contracts exchange rewards for effort, promises rewards for good performance, recognizes accomplishments, (b) management-by-exception (active): watches and searches for deviations from rules and standards, takes corrective action (c) management-by-exception (passive): intervenes only if standards are not met.

1.7 Scope and focus of the study

The study discusses the employees' perception of leadership behaviour of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour, as well as reviews by researchers, and the leadership behaviour perceived by the employees as effective and efficient, according to the various leadership behaviour research.

1.8 Objectives of the study

The main purpose of this study was to determine how the subordinates describe their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviour and thereto, to understand employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour.

1.9 Environment of the study

The study was conducted within a South African based financial institution (“the Bank”) at their Head Office based in Johannesburg. The population sample used was the membership of employees of the Bank based at Head Office, which comprises middle and junior management staff. The total population was 500 employees and the sample was 288 subordinates. A quantitative research methodology was employed. The researcher assumes that the reader understands the macro and micro-environment of South Africa.

1.10 Assumption of the study

Forsyth, Heiney and Wright (1997) suggest that it is observer perception, not actual behaviour that creates biased evaluations for leaders. In this manner, the Implicit Leadership Theory (ILT) proposes that the evaluation of leadership behaviour is not an objective process (Rush, Thomas, & Lord, 1977). Regardless of a leader’s actual behaviour, the observer’s constructed perception influences how a leader will be evaluated (Rush et al, 1977). For example, Rush et al (1977) found that limited information of a leader yielded the same results on the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire Form XII (LBDQ XII) as studies that used full descriptions of leaders (e.g. Schriesheim & Stogdill, 1975). Rush et al (1977) found that observers essentially projected attributes onto the managers about whom they were presented with limited information. In limited information scenarios, effects of actual behaviour are reduced, thus allowing individual perceptions of leaders to emerge (Lord & Maher, 1990; Rush et al 1977). These results demonstrate that observer perception significantly affects the evaluation of a leader’s actual behaviour. Since perception is not necessarily congruent with actual behaviour, leaders are vulnerable to biased evaluations.

1.11 Methodology

The quantitative research method was used, as this provided the researcher with the advantage of knowing clearly, in advance what to look for. Quantitative research is used to answer questions about characteristics among measured variables with the purpose of

explaining, predicting, and controlling phenomena. This approach is sometimes called the traditional, experimental, or positivist approach (Leedy & Armrod, 2005:94).

This type of research involves identifying the characteristics of an observed phenomenon. Descriptive research is designed to “describe, rather than explain a set of conditions, characteristics, or attributes of people in a population based on a measurement of a sample” (Alreck & Settle, 1985:408). Isaac and Michael (1981) contend that descriptive research is often used to describe existing phenomena, identify problems, or justify current conditions and practices.

Data was collected via the 100-item LBDQ XII questionnaire which was administered to the subordinates to describe the behaviour of their leaders.

1.12 Structure of the Research Report

Chapter 1 provides a brief introduction and the objective of the research, followed by problem statement and the research question. It further discusses the importance, environment and methodology of the study undertaken.

Chapter 2 lays the theoretical foundation of the study leading to the research topic and reviews of existing literature on various forms of leadership behaviour.

Chapter 3 discusses the research methodology undertaken. Chapter 4 presents the results obtained by the researcher while Chapter 5 reflects the discussion and conclusion of the study.

The next chapter, namely Chapter 2, provides a literature review on various forms of leadership behaviour and the employees’ perception of leadership behaviour.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The 100-item LBDQ XII questionnaire was used in this study to determine how the subordinates describe their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviours and thereto, to understand employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour.

Research examining leadership behaviour was pioneered in the 1950s and 1960s at the Ohio State University (Bensimon, Neumann & Birnbaum, 1989; Yukl, 1989). The personnel Research Board of the Ohio State University, as one of the Ohio State Leadership Project studies, developed the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) at a time when little in the way of leadership theory existed (Halpin & Winer 1957; Stodgill, 1963; Yukl, 1989). Since the development of the LBDQ, much of the research on leadership behaviour has followed the pattern established by the pioneering research at the institution (Yukl, 1989). The study of these behaviour types has resulted in many contributions to the leadership literature (Bass, 1990a). One important contribution has been to use relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership to differentiate and explain different types of leadership behaviour as measures of individual and organisational effectiveness.

The LBDQ was established as a method whereby group members would be able to describe the leader behaviour of designated leaders in formal organisations (Halpin & Winer, 1957; Stodgill, 1963). The LBDQ contained items describing the manner in which a leader might behave, along with the respondent rating of the way in which the leader is perceived to engage in each type of behaviour (Halpin, 1957). The 12 LBDQ XII subscales represent a complex and varied pattern of leadership behaviour described as follows (Stodgill, 1963): (see Appendix 1)

- Representation measures to what degree the manager speaks as the representative of the group.
- Demand reconciliation reflects how well the manager reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system.
- Tolerance of uncertainty depicts to what extent the manager is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or getting upset.
- Persuasiveness measures to what extent the manager uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions.
- Initiation of structure measures to what degree the manager clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.
- Tolerance of freedom reflects to what extent the manager allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action.
- Role assumption measures to what degree the manager exercises actively the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others.
- Consideration depicts to what extent the manager regards the comfort, well-being, status and contributions of followers.
- Production emphasis measures to what degree the manager applies pressure for productive output.
- Predictive accuracy measures to what extent the manager exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcomes accurately.
- Integration reflects to what degree the manager maintains a closely-knit organisation; resolves inter-member conflicts.
- Superior orientation measures to what extent the manager maintains cordial relations with superiors, has influence with them; is striving for higher status.

The two broadly defined dimensions of behaviour were established as encompassing a wide variety of leader characteristics. Those dimensions were Initiating Structure and Consideration (Charters, 1963; Gorton & Snowden, 1993; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill, 1955; Stodgill, 1963; Yukl, 1989, Fleishman, 1953; 1957). Fleishman and Harris (1962) defined consideration and initiating structure as follows:

“Consideration”: Includes behaviour indicating mutual trust, respect, and a certain warmth and rapport between the supervisor and the group. This dimension appears to emphasize deeper concern for group members’ needs and includes such behaviour as allowing subordinates more participation in decision making and encouraging more two-way communication.

“Initiating Structure”: Includes behaviour in which the supervisor organises and defines group activities and his relation to the group. Thus, he defines the role he expects each member to assume, assigns tasks, plans ahead, establishes ways of getting things done, and pushes for production. This dimension seems to emphasize overt attempts to achieve organisation goals (Bass, 1985:43-44).

This separation of leadership behaviour into two distinct constructs marked the beginning of a continuing effort to describe leadership behaviour as an either/or phenomenon. This is considered to be the ‘classic’ among leadership dichotomies (Denison, Hooijberg, & Quinn, 1995, Bensimon et al, 1989; Yukl, 1989), Consideration and Initiating Structure also provided the framework for characterizing leadership behaviour as either relations-oriented or task-oriented.

The examination of leadership from dual perspectives has been seen throughout history and the above researchers have primarily characterized leadership under the umbrella of relations-oriented and task-oriented behaviour, which are considered active forms of leadership (Bass, 1990a). That is, leaders take a proactive approach when performing their roles. Conversely, leaders may perform in a reactive manner. Another approach to leadership involves being inactive. These leaders abdicate their responsibilities and avoid making decision (Bass, 1990a): this form of leadership is considered *laissez-faire*.

2.2 Early descriptions of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours

In differentiating between relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership, early researchers attempted to identify the types of behaviour that fit each category. In addition to the traditional terms of relations-oriented and task-oriented, these early researchers used terms

such as authoritarian, autocratic, directive, and democratic to draw distinctions among the leadership behaviour types.

For instance, Lewin and Lippitt (1938) undertook a study of several groups, composed of five members each, of fifth and sixth graders. Their goal was to investigate the types of behaviour that distinguished authoritarian/autocratic (task-oriented) groups from democratic (relations-oriented) groups. They found that authoritarian/autocratic (task-oriented) leadership behaviour involved a focus on goals and tasks, as well as denying others involvement in the decision-making process. Contrarily, democratic (relations-oriented) leadership behaviour included praise, invitation to participate, and encouragement.

Nelson (1949; 1950) also studied democratic (relations-oriented) leadership. However, he juxtaposed democratic (relations-oriented) leadership with leadership behaviour that was directive, regulative, and manipulative (task-oriented). Two conclusions that Nelson drew from his studies of leadership styles of 220 foremen in a manufacturing organisation were that (a) task-directed leadership behaviour involved initiating structure, providing information about tasks, issuing rules, and threatening punishment for disobedience; and (b) democratic leadership behaviour included two-way interactions with workers and an emphasis on human relations.

Fleishman's (1953) conclusions regarding the relations-oriented versus task-oriented dimensions of leadership evolved from his validity and reliability studies on the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), which measured the two constructs of consideration and initiating structure. Consideration included relations-oriented behaviour such as: expresses appreciation, considers subordinates feelings, and provides rewards for a job well-done. Initiating structure included task-oriented behaviour such as: offers approaches to problem solving, tries out new ideas, and makes task assignments.

Stogdill (1963) also investigated the types of behaviour that represented consideration and initiating structure. He included the following in his descriptions: (a) consideration (relations-oriented) regards comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers, and

(b) initiating structure (task-oriented) applies pressure for product output, clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. In a further discussion of Consideration and Initiating Structure, Akhtar & Haleem (1979:90) offered the following comment regarding the variety of terms: “*Review of the literature in this area brings to light a few facts. Firstly, ‘employee-oriented’, ‘employee-centred’, ‘supportive’, and ‘considerate’ are various terms that have been used interchangeably. Similarly, ‘production-centred’, ‘job-centred’, and ‘initiating structure’ have been used.* (pp. 90).”

2.3 Research supporting relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours

Klimoski and Hayes (1980) researched task-oriented versus relations-oriented leadership in the production department of a large information-processing firm. After examining the relationships among effort, performance, and satisfaction of 241 assistants, they concluded that all three outcomes were enhanced if the supervisors demonstrated behaviour that was both task centred and supportive. In a study of situational leadership, Hambleton & Gumpert (1982) found that when the supervisors of 189 employees applied the Hersey & Blanchard (1982) model, the job performance of those employees increased. Furthermore, they concluded that supervisors made determinations about the amount of structure support versus emotional support that was needed based on the maturity of the employee.

Butler Cantrell, and Flick (1999) found a positive relationship between transformational leadership and satisfaction with supervisors and trust. MacKenzie (2001) reported a strong direct and indirect relationship with performance and transformational leadership. Hoover (1991) revealed that transformational leadership was positively correlated with perceptions of superiors’ effectiveness. Yammarino, Spangler and Bass (1993) discovered correlations between performance and transformational leadership.

2.4 Linking relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours

While researchers argue for the distinctiveness of their terminology, the terms and concepts upon which those terms are based are related to each other. This means that researchers use different terms to talk about the same concepts.

One broad example that supports this position comes from *Bass & Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership*. Part V of this VII part book is devoted to discussions, theories, models, research, and concepts surrounding **leadership** and **management**. Within the broad categories of leadership and leadership versus management, Bass (1990a) includes specific chapters addressing the following: leadership versus management, autocratic/authoritarian versus democratic/egalitarian leadership; consideration versus initiating structure; and *laissez-faire* leadership versus motivation to manage.

In each chapter, Bass (1990a) presents theories, concepts and research that emphasize the thread connecting relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour to all other types of leadership. This is the case for even the primary category of leadership and management.

Another specific connection among terms or concepts is demonstrated by Seltzer & Bass (1990) who reported that consideration and initiating structure were linked to transformational leadership and transactional leadership.

These various research findings demonstrate the broad impact of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour, but the effectiveness depends on the perception of leadership behaviour by employees or subordinates.

2.5 Linking relations-oriented behaviour, task-oriented behaviour and LBDQ-questionnaire questions

The LBDQ was established as a method whereby group members would be able to describe the leader behaviour of designated leaders in formal organisations (Halpin, 1957; Stodgill, 1963). The LBDQ contained items describing the manner in which a leader might behave, along with the respondent rating of the way in which the leader is perceived to engage in each type of behaviour (Halpin, 1957). The LBDQ has 12 subscales of leadership behaviour shown as follows:

- Representation

- Demand and Reconciliation
- Tolerance of Uncertainty
- Persuasiveness
- Initiation of Structure
- Tolerance of Freedom
- Role Assumption
- Consideration
- Production Emphasis
- Predictive Accuracy
- Integration
- Superior Orientation

Of 12 subscales, the two broadly defined dimensions of behaviours were established as encompassing a wide variety of leader characteristics according to the literature review; those dimensions were Initiating Structure and Consideration (Charters, 1963; Gorton & Snowden, 1993; Halpin & Winer, 1957; Hemphill, 1955; Stodgill, 1963; Yukl, 1989; Fleishman, 1953). In their conclusions, the researchers included the following in their descriptions: (a) consideration (relations-oriented) regards comfort, well-being, status, and contributions of followers, and (b) initiating structure (task-oriented) applies pressure for product output, clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected.

For the other 10 dimensions in this study, the researcher has used own insight from the questions of the LBDQ (see Appendix 1) for each dimension to link each question to either relations-oriented leadership or task-oriented leadership behaviour as depicted in Table 2.5 below:

Table 2.5: Link between relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour

Relations-oriented leadership behaviour	Task-oriented leadership behaviour
1. Representation	6. Demand Reconciliation
2. Persuasiveness	7. Tolerance of uncertainty
3. Tolerance of freedom	8. Role assumption
4. Integration	9. Production emphasis
5. Superior orientation	10. Predictive accuracy

2.5.1 Relations-Oriented Leadership Behaviour Subscales

2.5.1.1 Representation

According to the LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2), representation by definition measures the degree to which the leader speaks as the representative of the group. All the five questions of this dimension (Q1, Q11, Q21, Q31, and Q41) relates to the leader being a representative of the group; thus this reflects the leader focused on good teamwork which is more relations-oriented than task-oriented.

2.5.1.2 Persuasiveness

LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2) describes persuasiveness as measuring to what extent the leader uses persuasion and argument effectively by exhibiting strong convictions. The ten questions included in this dimension (Q3, Q13, Q23, Q33, Q43, Q53, Q63, Q73, Q83 and Q93) describe the relationship whereby the leader’s arguments are convincing, skilful as well as being a very persuasive talker. Therefore, the dimension was grouped as relations-oriented.

2.5.1.3 Tolerance of freedom

LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2) defines tolerance of freedom as reflecting the extent to which the leader allows followers scope for initiative, decision making and action-taking. The ten questions of this dimension (Q5, Q15, Q25, Q35, Q45, Q55, Q65, Q75, Q85 and Q95) focus on the quality of the relationship between the leader and the followers, establishing mutual trust and participatory decision-making, as well as democratic,

intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation. Misumi (1985) describes relations-oriented behaviour as leaders who exhibit leadership behaviour which include building mutual trust and concern for people.

2.5.1.4 Integration

According to the LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2) integration reflects the degree to which the leader maintains a closely-knit organisation whilst resolving inter-member conflicts. Only by the definition this dimension describes relation rather than task all the five questions (Q19, Q39, Q69, Q79 and Q99) included in this subscale focus on the leaders maintaining a close-knit team ensuring that the group works as a team and settles conflicts as and when they occur as a team. In their research, Blake and Mouton (1964) describes relations-oriented leader behaviour as including concern for people and an emphasises on employees' needs and teamwork.

2.5.1.5 Superior orientation

The LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2) refers to superior orientation as measuring the extent to which the leader maintains cordial relations with superiors and has influence with them, whilst always striving for higher status. The ten questions of this dimension (Q10, Q20, Q30, Q40, Q50, Q60, Q70, Q80, Q90 and Q100) portray relations whereby the leaders are highly thought of by their superiors and they have the ability to influence others easily, thus grouped as relations-oriented leadership behaviour.

2.5.2 Task-oriented leadership behaviour

2.5.2.1 Demand reconciliation

The LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2) defines demand reconciliation as reflecting how well the leader reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system. The five questions included in this dimension (Q51, Q61, Q71, Q81 and Q91) describe situations pertaining to tasks within a group. The emphases on this dimension are on the job being

done and putting structures in place. Therefore, the dimension was grouped as task-oriented leadership behaviour.

2.5.2.2 Tolerance of uncertainty

LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2) defines tolerance of uncertainty as depicting the extent to which the leader is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or getting upset. The ten questions included in this dimension (Q2, Q12, Q22, Q32, Q42, Q52, Q62, Q72, Q82 and Q92) put emphasis on activities performed by the group in order to achieve organisational goals. The dimension was grouped as task-oriented leadership behaviour.

2.5.2.3 Role assumption

LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2) defines role assumption as measuring the degree to which a leader exercises his/her leadership role actively within the group rather than surrendering leadership to others. The ten questions included in this dimension (Q6, Q16, Q26, Q36, Q46, Q56, Q66, Q76, Q86 and Q96) describe the leader being in control and easily recognised as the leader of the group. This is an authoritative type of leadership which is referred as task-oriented leadership behaviour.

2.5.2.4 Production emphasis

LBDQ Manual (see Appendix 2) defines production emphasis as measuring the degree to which the leader applies pressure for productive output. The ten questions included in this dimension (Q8, Q18, Q28, Q38, Q48, Q58, Q68, Q78, Q88 and Q98) describe situations pertaining to tasks and time within a group. The emphases of this dimension are on the output and time. In previous research of consideration and initiating structure, Akhtar and Haleem (1979:90) offered the following comment regarding the variety of terms: *“Review of the literature in this area brings to light a few facts. Firstly, ‘employee-oriented’, ‘employee-centred’, ‘supportive’, and ‘considerate’ are various terms that have been used interchangeably. Similarly, ‘production-centred’, ‘job-centred’, and ‘initiating structure’*

have been used. (pp. 90).” Therefore the dimension was grouped as task-oriented leadership behaviour.

2.5.2.5 Predictive Accuracy

LBDQ questionnaire Manual (see Appendix 7.2), defines predictive accuracy as measuring how leaders exhibit foresight and the ability to predict outcomes accurately. The five questions included in this dimension (Q9, Q29, Q49, Q59 and Q89) describe outcomes pertaining to a group’s tasks. The emphases on this dimension are on the planning and accuracy in completion of the tasks assigned to the group. The dimension was grouped as task-oriented leadership behaviour.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine how the subordinates describe their immediate supervisor’s leadership behaviour and thereto, to understand employees’ perceptions of their immediate supervisor’s relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The quantitative research method was used, as this provided the researcher with the advantage of knowing clearly, in advance, what to look for. Quantitative research is used to answer questions about characteristics among measured variables with the purpose of explaining, predicting, and controlling phenomena. This approach is sometimes called the traditional, experimental, or positivist approach (Leedy & Ormrod, 2005:94).

3.2 Research design

This type of research involves identifying the characteristics of an observed phenomenon. Descriptive research is designed to “describe, rather than explain a set of conditions, characteristics, or attributes of people in a population based on a measurement of a sample” (Alreck & Settle, 1985:408). Isaac and Michael (1981) contend that descriptive research is often used to describe existing phenomena, identify problems, or justify current conditions and practices.

3.3 Sampling strategy and sample

A sample is a part of something larger, called a population; the latter is the totality of entities in which we have an interest, i.e. the collection of individuals, objects or events about which we want to make inferences (Diamantopoulos & Schelgelmilch, 2005:10).

While the employees of the Bank at the Head Office in Johannesburg constitute the population which comprises approximately 500 employees in that particular office, the sample was restricted to the Bank’s middle and junior management staff situated in Head

Office, which comprises approximately 288 employees. As this represents the main concentration of the Bank's South African business, it is believed that it is also representative of the characteristics of the population and a conclusion was drawn with regard to the entire population. The unit of analysis was employees of the bank (middle and junior management staff).

A non-probability sampling method was used to select the participants. According to Leedy and Ormrod, (2005) in non-probability sampling, the researcher has no way of forecasting or guaranteeing that each element of the population will be represented in the sample. Furthermore, some members of the population have little or no chance of being sampled. However, the respondents were selected according to specified quotas and stratified according to business units in Head Office in order to arrive at a fairly representative sample.

The actual sample was stratified according to business units (Human resources, Retail Banking, Business banking, and more). Through the leaders, 288 subordinates were handed the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).

3.4 Data collection process

The 100-item LBDQ XII questionnaire was administered to the subordinates to describe the behaviour of their leaders.

Data were collected via questionnaires. The researcher hand-delivered the questionnaires (see Appendix 1) which contained a self-addressed return envelope through the managers. All employees were invited to participate. The questionnaires were distributed to 288 employees and 54 questionnaires were returned which constituted a 19% response rate.

3.5 The measuring instrument – quantitative

The following measurement tool was used:

- The 100-item 12 LBDQ XII instrument was used to describe the leader behaviour. This questionnaire has been used in several countries to study leadership behaviour as mentioned in Littrell, (2002) and has also been used in South Africa by Littrell and Nkomo (2005). It is a well accepted and validated measure of leader behaviour. Originating in the Ohio State University studies in the late 1940s, this instrument was developed to obtain descriptions of the leadership behaviour of a superior as perceived by his or her subordinates (Stogdill, 1963) and it has been used widely to describe leadership behaviour. Initially, two basic constructs of leadership behaviour were included in this instrument; “consideration” and “initiation of structure”. But later, the LBDO was revised to include 12 subscales of leadership behaviours which are discussed in detail in chapter 2 and named LBDQ XII.

The advantages of utilising a questionnaire according to Burns (2000):

- It was less expensive to administer than face-to-face interviews particularly when responses from a large, dispersed population were desired.
- The instructions and questions asked were simple and the purpose of the research was explained clearly in print.
- Each respondent was sent the identical set of questions, phrased in exactly the same way. This resulted in better standardisation, particularly through the use of a structured instrument, which meant higher reliability.
- Errors resulting from the recording of responses were reduced.
- The respondents were free to answer in their own time and at their own pace.
- Fear and embarrassment, which could result from direct contact, was avoided.
- The problem of non-contact with the respondent (i.e. the respondent is unavailable when the interviewer is available) was overcome.
- The questionnaire guaranteed confidentiality and, hopefully, elicited more truthful responses.

The disadvantages of utilising a questionnaire according to Burns (2000) were that:

- There were difficulties in securing an adequate response. The response rates were lower than if the interview method was used.
- All questionnaires were not returned, so the likelihood of biased sampling exists as non-respondents may differ significantly from respondents.
- Respondents may have been limited from providing free expression of opinions as a result of instrument-design considerations.
- The respondent's motivation for answering the questionnaire is unknown.

The LBDQ XII was administered in English. The subjects described their leader's behaviour on 100 items on a 5-point Likert scale with the anchors: 5=Always, 4=Often, 3=Occasionally, 2=Seldom, 1= Never. The 12 Subsets of the 100 items define the leader behaviour factors, consisting of five or ten items per factor (Stogdill, 1963).

3.6 Data Analysis

Data Analysis is the process of turning data into information that in turn can serve to develop concepts, theories, explanations or understanding (Lancaster, 2005).

The purpose of analysing the data is to find meaning in the data, and this is done by systematically arranging and presenting the information. It has to be organised so that comparisons, contrasts and insights can be made and demonstrated. But the data is categorised not just to count occurrences. Instead, it is categorised to permit analysis and comparison of meanings within a category (Burns, 2000).

Descriptive statistics means and standard deviations are provided for each subscale scores of the instruments. Inspection of these will reveal data patterns and enable the researcher to describe what the current status is in terms of the constructs measured. This was described in terms of the implications for the statistics of leadership behaviour in the Bank. It answers two of the questions of this study, namely:

- How do the subordinates describe their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviour in retail banking?

- What are employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour?

3.7 Summary

Chapter 3 discussed the research methodology of the study. In the next chapter the results of the empirical research are presented.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

This chapter contains the results of the study and the statistical analysis used to answer the research questions. The chapter concludes with a summary of the findings.

The study was done in a retail bank Head Office in Johannesburg. The population and same details are discussed in chapter 3. The data for the study was collected via questionnaires. The researcher hand delivered the questionnaires (see Appendix 1) which contained a self addressed return envelope through the managers. All employees were invited to participate. The questionnaires were distributed to 288 employees and 54 questionnaires were returned which constituted a 19% response rate.

The subordinates were required to score their leaders according to their perception of their leaders' behaviour on a five point Likert scale, where 5=Always, 4=Often, 3=Occasionally, 2=Seldom, 1= Never.

4.2 Descriptive statistics for leadership behaviour

Tables 4.1 to 4.12 contains six relations-oriented subscales and six task-oriented subscales. Descriptive statistics was used as the way to examine the data. The mean and standard deviation of each question of the twelve subscales was calculated from the responses obtained from the subordinates. The mean scores for the data ranged from 4.31 to 3.9, the questions with low scores were negative questions; if a reverse score was built, all the scores would fall in the same range. The results are interpreted as follows:

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics: Representation

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q1	Acts as the spokesman of the group	54	4.04	0.82
Q11	Publicises the activities of the group	54	3.72	1.07
Q21	Speaks as the representative of the group	54	4.11	0.82
Q31	Speaks for the group when visitors are present	54	3.80	1.03
Q41	Represents the group at outside meetings	54	4.00	0.97

Representation measuring the degree to which the leader speaks as the representative of the group, showed a pattern of the data as per Table 4.1 with a mean scores range of 4.11 to 3.72 which suggests that a leader often speaks or acts on behalf of the group or as the representative of the group, especially in situations where visitors are around and in outside meetings. He considers himself as part and parcel of the group.

Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics: Demand reconciliation

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q51	Handles complex problems efficiently	54	3.89	0.98
Q61	Gets swamped by details	54	2.57	1.14
Q71	Gets things all tangled up	54	1.85	1.09
Q81	Can reduce a madhouse to system and order	54	3.70	1.00
Q91	Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her	54	1.87	1.05

Demand Reconciliation, reflecting how well the leader reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to the system, as per Table 4.2 above, the results reveal the highest mean score in this subscale as 3.89 and 3.70 for the two positive questions; the other three questions scored low due to the questions being negative. Otherwise, if a reverse score validation was built into the instrument the mean scores would have been with the range of the highest to the lowest. These results indicate that leaders try to handle complex situations in such a manner so as to avoid chaos and maintain order in all situations pertaining to the tasks within the group.

Table 4.3: Descriptive statistics: Tolerance of uncertainty

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q2	Waits patiently for the results of a decision	54	3.48	0.91
Q12	Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next	54	2.87	1.17
Q22	Accepts defeat in stride	54	3.11	1.08
Q32	Accepts delays without becoming upset	53	2.98	0.97
Q42	Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments	54	3.13	1.17
Q52	Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty	54	3.26	1.08
Q62	Can wait just so long, then blows up	54	2.00	1.03
Q72	Remains calm when uncertain about coming events	54	3.56	0.96
Q82	Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs	54	3.48	0.82
Q92	Worries about the outcome of any new procedure	54	2.50	1.13

Tolerance of uncertainty depicting the extent to which the leader is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without becoming anxious or upset, as per the results in Table 4.3 ranged from 3.48 to 2.00, the positive questions had higher means than the negative questions indicating that leaders can wait patiently for results of decisions without becoming anxious or upset.

Table 4.4: Descriptive statistics: Persuasiveness

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q3	Makes pep talks to stimulate the group	54	3.63	1.15
Q13	His/her arguments are convincing	54	3.83	0.93
Q23	Argues persuasively for his/her point of view	54	3.83	0.95
Q33	Is a very persuasive talker	54	3.85	1.04
Q43	Is very skilful in an argument	54	4.04	1.01
Q53	Is not a very convincing talker	54	1.93	1.21
Q63	Speaks from a strong inner conviction	54	3.85	1.07
Q73	Is an inspiring talker	54	3.74	1.28
Q83	Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage	54	3.46	1.00
Q93	Can inspire enthusiasm for a project	54	3.85	1.02

Persuasiveness, measuring to what extent the leader uses persuasion and argument effectively by exhibiting strong convictions, reported mean scores range of 4.04 to 3.46 for the nine questions; the lowest mean score was 1.93 which scored low because it is a negative question (see Table 4.4 above). The results indicate that leaders often have convincing arguments and argue persuasively, speaking from a strong inner convictions. They are seen to influence people easily.

Table 4.5: Descriptive statistics: initiation of structure

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q4	Lets group members know what is expected of them	54	4.24	1.01
Q14	Encourages the use of uniform procedures	54	3.93	1.01
Q24	Tries out his/her ideas in the group	54	3.94	0.88
Q34	Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group	54	4.06	1.05
Q44	Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done	54	3.67	0.89
Q54	Assigns group members to particular tasks	54	3.74	1.01
Q64	Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood	54	3.96	1.01
Q74	Schedules the work to be done	54	3.48	1.22
Q84	Maintains definite standards of performance	54	3.94	0.90
Q94	Asks that group members follow standard rules and regulations	54	3.91	0.85

Initiation of structure measures the degree to which the leader clearly defines roles and lets followers know what is expected of them. As per Table 4.5 above the dimension reported a mean scores range of 4.24 to 3.48. The results indicates that leaders often let group members know what is expected of them and ensures that the task is understood and that there are clear performance standards in place.

Table 4.6: Descriptive statistics: Tolerance of freedom

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q5	Allow the members complete freedom in their work	54	3.93	1.18
Q15	Permit the members to use their own judgment in solving problems	54	4.02	1.16
Q25	Encourages initiative in the group members	54	4.13	1.10
Q35	Let the members do their work the way they think best	54	3.74	1.12
Q45	Assigns a task, then let the members handle it	54	3.96	0.78
Q55	Turn the members loose on a job, and let them go to it	54	3.35	1.03
Q65	Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action	54	2.22	1.27
Q75	Allows the group a high degree of initiative	54	3.89	1.08
Q85	Trust members to exercise good judgement	54	3.93	1.01
Q95	Permits the group to set its own pace	54	3.35	1.14

Tolerance of freedom reflects the extent to which the leader allows followers scope for initiative, decision-making and action taking. As depicted in Table 4.6 above the results of this dimension reported a highest mean scores range of 4.13 to 3.35; due to Q65 being a negative question it scored the lowest with a mean score of 2.22. The results on average indicate that leaders allow group members complete freedom in executing their tasks. Leaders encourage initiative and allow group members to use judgement in resolving complex problems.

Table 4.7: Descriptive statistics: Role assumption

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q6	Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group	54	2.02	1.19
Q16	Fails to take necessary action	54	1.69	0.93
Q26	Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group	54	2.39	1.28
Q36	Lets some members take advantage of him/her	54	1.81	0.93
Q46	Is the leader of the group in name only	54	1.98	1.17
Q56	Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm	54	2.04	1.20
Q66	Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep	54	2.35	1.20
Q76	Takes full charge when emergencies arise	54	4.19	0.85
Q86	Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership	54	3.56	1.02
Q96	Is easily recognised as the leader of the group	54	4.13	1.01

Role assumption, measuring the degree to which the leader exercises leadership role actively within the group rather than surrendering it to others, as per Table 4.7 above, this dimension reported low mean scores ranging from 2.35 to 1.69 due to most of the questions being negative, although, the three positive questions had higher mean scores of 4.19 to 3.56. The results indicate that leaders do not permit others to take advantage of them and in most cases they can be easily identified as the leader in the group.

Table 4.8: Descriptive statistics: Consideration

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q7	Is friendly and approachable	54	3.98	1.16
Q17	Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group	54	3.06	1.28
Q27	Puts suggestions made by the group into operation	54	3.67	1.08
Q37	Treats all group members as his/her equals	54	3.67	1.27
Q47	Gives advance notice of changes	54	3.56	1.06
Q57	Keeps to himself/herself	54	2.07	1.21
Q67	Looks out for the personal welfare of the group members	54	3.70	1.21
Q77	Is willing to make changes	54	4.04	0.87
Q87	Refuses to explain his/her actions	54	2.04	1.12
Q97	Acts without consulting the group	54	2.54	1.27

Consideration depicts the extent to which the leader regards the comfort, well-being, status and contributions of followers. This dimension as per above Table 4.8 reported mean scores range of 4.04 to 2.07. The results indicate that leaders treat all group members as equals. They often look out for the personal welfare of the group members and will seldom act without consulting them.

Table 4.9: Descriptive statistics: Production emphasis

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q8	Encourages overtime work	54	2.41	1.16
Q18	Stresses being ahead of competing groups	54	3.33	1.26
Q28	Needles members for greater effort	54	3.44	1.02
Q38	Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace	54	3.87	1.05
Q48	Pushes for increased production	54	3.85	0.94
Q58	Asks the members to work harder	54	3.41	1.11
Q68	Permits the members to take it easy in their work	54	2.69	1.02
Q78	Drives hard when there is a job to be done	54	4.31	0.77
Q88	Urges the group to beat its previous record	54	3.69	1.15
Q98	Keeps the group working up to capacity	54	3.69	0.89

Production emphasis measures the degree to which the leader applies pressure for productive output. As per Table 4.9 above the results reported mean scores range of 4.31 to 2.41. The results indicate that leaders ensure that tasks are completed timeously by encouraging group members to work harder and smarter without encouraging or making provision for overtime.

Table 4.10: Descriptive statistics: Predictive accuracy

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q9	Makes accurate decisions	54	3.80	0.86
Q29	Seems able to predict what is coming next	54	3.31	0.84
Q49	Things usually turns out as he/she predicts	54	3.26	0.91
Q59	Is accurate in predicting the trend of events	54	3.50	0.75
Q89	Anticipates problems and plans for them	54	3.81	0.83

Predictive accuracy, measures how leaders exhibit foresight and the ability to predict outcomes accurately. As per Table 4.10 above the results reported a mean scores range of 3.80 to 3.26. The results indicate that leaders often make accurate decisions and are very proactive in anticipating problems, thus allowing group members ample time to plan for unforeseen events.

Table 4.11: Descriptive statistics: Integration

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q19	Keeps the group working together as a team	54	4.00	1.03
Q39	Settles conflicts when they occur in the group	54	3.76	1.03
Q69	Sees to it that the work of the group is co-ordinated	54	3.76	1.01
Q79	Helps group members settle their differences	54	3.67	1.10
Q99	Maintains a closely knit group	54	3.85	1.02

Integration reflects the degree to which the leader maintains a closely-knit organisation whilst resolving inter-member conflicts. As per Table 4.11 above the results reported

mean scores range of 4.00 to 3.67. The results indicates that leaders maintain a close-knit team by ensuring that the group works as a team and settle conflicts as and when they occur.

Table 4.12 Descriptive statistics: Superior orientation

Question	Leader :	n	Mean	Std. Deviation
Q10	Gets along well with the people above him/her	54	4.26	0.96
Q20	Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority	54	4.00	0.89
Q30	Is working hard for a promotion	54	3.35	1.26
Q40	His/her superiors act favorably on most of his/her suggestions	54	3.78	0.90
Q50	Enjoys the privileges of his/her position	54	3.59	1.17
Q60	Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members	54	3.70	1.04
Q70	His/her word carries weight with superiors	54	3.98	1.02
Q80	Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors	54	3.59	1.00
Q90	Is working his/her way to the top	54	3.85	1.04
Q100	Maintains cordial relations with superiors	54	3.94	0.94

Superior orientation, measures the extent to which the leader maintains cordial relations with superiors and has influence with them, whilst always striving for higher status. As per Table 4.12 above the results reported mean scores range of 4.26 to 3.35. The results indicate that leaders are highly thought of by their superiors and they have the ability to influence others easily.

4.3 Summary

The chapter presented the results of the empirical research. Descriptive statistics were used in the analysis. The next chapter is the final chapter of the study. It presents the discussion, conclusions and recommendations that can be drawn from the research results.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

There are many factors that influence perceptions of leadership behaviour: age, sex, race, personality, attitudes, climate, culture and values (Meyer & Allen, 1997). However, some researchers suggest that even though other factors are involved in leadership behaviour in an organisation, probably the most reflective is how employees feel about leaders and the behaviour they exhibit (Lord et al., 1986).

Relations-oriented leadership behaviours focus on the quality of the relationship with followers, whereas, task-oriented leadership behaviour focus on the task to be accomplished by followers (Bass, 1990a). Blake and Mouton (1964) reported that managers who displayed a combination of relations-oriented and task-oriented behaviours advanced more quickly in careers than managers with other styles.

5.2 What are the employees' perceptions of their immediate supervisor's relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviours?

Based on the findings from descriptive statistics analysis (see Table 4.1 to 4.12), both relations-oriented and task-oriented subscales had relatively high mean scores ranging from 4.00 to 3.50. Although, those subscales questions which had low mean scores had negative questions, which means if a reverse score validation was built into the instrument, these questions would have given similar results like the rest of the questions. Representation (relations-oriented) and Initiation of structure (task-oriented) subscales had the highest mean scores of 3.9 (see Table 4.1 and 4.5). Persuasiveness (relations-oriented)

and Production emphasis (task-oriented) followed very closely with a mean score of 3.8 (see Table 4.2.4 and 4.2.9). This study revealed that the retail banking employees described their immediate supervisors' leadership behaviour as exhibiting both relations-oriented and task-oriented; this is explained by the mean scores ranging from 4.00 to 3.50. However, it is important to note that some items included in some of the subscales were negatively stated evidenced by lower mean scores in those items, but with a validation of a reverse score on these items the results would be similar.

The research findings for how the subordinates describe their immediate supervisor's leadership behaviour in retail banking, suggest retail banking leaders were perceived by their subordinates as exhibiting both relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour. This explains why there was very little difference in the mean scores of all twelve subscales of LBDQ. According to Klimoski and Hayes (1980), a similar pattern of relations-oriented and task-oriented leadership behaviour was observed in a production department of a large-processing firm, and concluded that performance and job satisfaction were enhanced if the supervisors demonstrated the behaviours that were both task centred and supportive. However, mean scores for other items of the subscales suggest there are a need for improvement.

5.3 Future research

Empirical research on the perceptions of leader behaviour by their subordinates has been scarce, especially in South African Financial Services. Therefore, it is recommended that further research be carried out because of the limited scope of the study which only focussed on a small group of people in one financial institution.

5.4 Recommendations

The results of this study suggest that feedback from subordinates should be a part of an organisation's leadership performance assessment program. Such feedback provides useful information for leadership development purposes and may help in closing the gap between actual and desired performance. Although feedback from superiors and clients was not

included in this study, such feedback also provides valuable information and would be useful in improving leadership and, ultimately, organisational performance. The differences in perception uncovered in this study certainly are not limited to leader-subordinate interactions. Future research is recommended to look at the two-way effect of the differing perceptions of both leaders and subordinates.

Training in performance evaluation and supplying feedback to and receiving feedback from others would be a valuable component in any leadership development course or program. Such programs are already included in university business presentation course, are often included in courses that incorporate group work, and could easily be added to a management communication curriculum. Since task-oriented behaviour emerged as an interesting leadership behaviour in this study, researchers and practitioners alike might also take a new look at the role of a leader in the organisation. It also might be the time to revisit and update the leadership styles in the organisation through such studies. Organisations leverage on leadership to achieve organisational goals, and strategies would provide competitive advantage for any organisation, because it is not enough for a leader to articulate an appealing vision; he must also convince and motivate his followers in attaining it.

REFERENCES

- Akhtar, S. & Haleem, A. 1979. Differences between newly-promoted supervisors and workers with regard to 'consideration' and 'initiating structure'. *Journal of Psychological Research*, 24(2), 90-95.
- Alreck, P.L. & Settle, R.B. 1985. *The survey research handbook*. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin.
- Anderson, D. 1974. Leadership effectiveness in education as related to congruence between human behaviour types and leadership styles. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 34, 6887.
- Barnard, J. 1991. The information environments of new managers. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 28, 312-324.
- Bass, B. 1960. *Leadership, psychology, and organizational behaviour*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Bass, B. 1967. Some effects on a group of whether and when the head reveals his opinion. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 2, 375-382.
- Bass, B. 1985. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. 1990a. *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. 3rd Ed. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bass, B. 1990b. From transactional to transformational leadership: learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
- Bass, B. 1998. *Transformational leadership: industrial, military, and educational impact*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. 1990. *Transformational leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. 1995. *MLQ Multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. & Avolio, B. 1997. *Full range leadership development: Manual for the multifactor leadership questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bass, B. & Barret, G. 1981. *People, work and organizations: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Bensimon., E.A., Neumann, A. & Birnbaum, R. 1989. Making sense of administrative leadership: The "I" word in higher education. (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1) Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
- Berman, S. J. & Hellweg, S.A. 1989. Perceived supervisor communication competence and supervisor satisfaction as a function of quality circle participation. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 26, 103-122.
- Bernard, L. 1926. An introduction to social psychology. New York, NY: Holt.
- Blake, R. & Mouton, J. 1964. The managerial grid. Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Brown, F. & Dodd, N. 1999. Rally the troops of make the trains run on time: The relative importance and interaction of contingent reward and transformational leadership. *Leadership & Organizational Development*, 20(6), 291-299.
- Burns, R.B. 2000. Introduction to research methods. 4th Ed. London: Sage Publications.
- Butler, J., Jr., Cantrell, S. & Flick, R. 1999. Transformation leadership behaviours, upward trust, and satisfaction in self-managed work teams. *Organization Development*, 17(1), 13-25.
- Cartwright, D. & Zander, A. 1960. Group dynamics-research and theory. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Cecil, E.A., Paul, R.J. & Olins, R.A. 1973. Perceived importance of selected variables used to evaluate male and female job applicants. *Personnel Psychology*, 26, 397-404.
- Charters, W.W. (1963). The Social background of teaching. In N.L. Gage (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 715 – 813). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Den Hartog, M., Van Muijen, J. & Koopman, P. 1997. An analysis of the MLQ. *Transactional versus transformational leadership*. 70, 19-43.
- Denison, D., Hooijberg, R. & Quinn, R. 1995. Paradox and performance: toward a theory of behavioural complexity in managerial leadership. *Organization Science*, 6(5), 524-540.
- Diamantopoulos, A. & Schlegelmilch B.B. 2005: *Taking the Fear out of Data Analysis*. London: Thomson Learning.
- Downey, H., Sheridan, J., & Slocum, J. 1975. Analysis of relationships among leader behaviour, subordinate job performance and satisfaction: A path goal approach. *Academy of Management*, 18, 253-262.
- Dunham, R., Grube, J. & Castaneda, M. 1994. Organizational commitment: The utility of an integrative definition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 370-380.

- Dunteman, G. & Bass, B. 1963. Supervisory and engineering success associated with self, interaction, and task orientation scores. *Personnel Psychology*, 16, 13-22.
- 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. & Carli, L.L. 2003. The female leadership advantage: An evaluation of the evidence. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, (807-834). 49
- Eagly, A.H. & Karau, S.J. 2002. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109(3), 573-598.
- Eicher, J. 1998. Leader-Manager Profile. King of Prussia, NJ: HRDQ.
- Fiedler, F. E. 1967. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Fleishman, E. 1951. Leadership climate and supervisory behaviour. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.
- Fleishman, E. 1953. The description of supervisory behaviour. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 37, 1-6.
- Fleishman, E. 1957. A leader behaviour description for industry. In R. Stogdill & A. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behaviour: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Fleishman, E., & Harris, E. 1962. Patterns of leadership behaviour related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personnel Psychology*, 15, 43-56.
- Forsyth, D.R., Heiney, M.M. & Wright, S.S. 1997. Biases in appraisal of women leaders. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 1, 1, 98-103
- Gorton, R.A. & Snowden, P.E. 1993. School leadership and administration. WI: Brown & Benchmark.
- Halpin, A. & Winer, B. 1957. A factorial study of the leader behaviour descriptions. In R. Stogdill & A. Coons (Eds.), *Leader behaviour: Its description and measurement*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research.
- Hambleton, R. & Gumpert, R. 1982. The validity of Hersey and Blanchard's theory of leader effectiveness. *Group and Organization Studies*, 7, 225-242.
- Heilman, M.E., Block, C.J. & Martell, R.F. 1995. Sex stereotypes: do they influence perceptions of managers? *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 10, 237-252
- Hemphill, J. (1949). The leader and his group. *Journal of Educational Research*, 28, 225-229.

Hemphill, J. 1950. Leader behaviour description. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Personnel Research Board.

Hemphill, J.K. 1955. Leadership behaviour associated with the administrative reputation of college departments. *The journal of education psychology*, 48(7), 385-401.

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. 1982. Management of organization behaviour: utilizing human resources (4th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hodge, J. 1976. The relationship between styles of supervision and need satisfaction of two levels of management employees. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 37, 1987.

Holmes, J. & Stubbe, M. 2003. "Feminine" workplaces: stereotype and reality. In J. Holmes & M. Megerhoff (Eds.), *The Handbook of Language and Gender* (573-99).

Hoover, J. D. 1991. Transformational and transactional leadership: An empirical test of a theory. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

House, R. J., & Mitchell, R. R. 1974. Path-goal theory of leadership. *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3(4), 81-98.

Indvik, J. 1986. Path-goal theory of leadership: A meta-analysis. Paper presented at the *Academy of Management*, Chicago, Ill.

Isaac, S. & Michael, W.B. 1981. Handbook in Research and evaluation (2nd ed). San Diego, CA: EDITS.

Klimoski, R. & Hayes, N. 1980. Leader behaviour and subordinate motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 33, 541-555.

Lancaster, G. 2005. Research methods; management research methods. Business Research Methods, Business Consultants: Elsevier.

Lancaster, G. 2005. Research methods in management – a concise introduction to research in management and business consultancy. Elsevier. Butterwoth-Heinemanns: Burlington.

Larson, L., Hunt, J. & Osborn, R. 1974. Correlates of leadership and demographic variables in three organizational settings. *Journal of Business Research*, 2, 335-347.

Leedy, P.D. & Armrod, J.E. 2005. Practical research. 8th ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Upper Saddle River .

Lewin, K. & Lippitt, R. 1938. An experimental approach to the study of autocracy and democracy: A preliminary note. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271-301.

Littrell R.F. 2002. 'Desirable leadership behaviours of multi-cultural managers in China'. *Journal of Management Development*, 21(1): 5-74.

Littrell, R.F. & Nkomo, S.M. 2005. 'Gender and race differences in leader behaviour preferences in South Africa', *Women in Management Review*, 20(8): 562-580.

Lord, R.G, Fotti, R.J. & DeVader, C.L. (1984). A test of leadership categorization theory: Internal structure, information processing, and leadership perceptions. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 34, 343-378.

Lord, R.G. & Maher, K.J. 1990. Perceptions of leadership and their implications in organizations. In Carroll, J.S. (ed.) *Applied Psychology and Organizational Settings*. Hilldale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Lord, R.G., DeVader, C.L., & Alliger, G.M. 1986. A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalizations procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 3, 402-410.

MacKenzie, J. M. 2001. Transformational and transactional leadership and salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 29(2), 115-134.

Misumi, J. 1985. *The behavioural science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Nelson, C. 1949. *The development and evaluation of a leadership attitude scale for foremen*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Nelson, C. 1950. Differential concepts of leadership and their function in an industrial organization. Paper presented at the Paper, *American Psychological Association*, State College, PA.

Ouchi, W. 1981. *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Patchen, M. 1962. Supervisory methods and group performance norms. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7, 275-294.

Richmond, V. P., Wagner, J.P. & McCroskey, J.C. 1983. The impact of perceptions of leadership style, use of power, and conflict management style on organisational outcomes. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 27-36.

Rush, M.C., Thomas, J.C. & Lord, R.G. 1977. Implicit leadership theory: a potential threat to the internal validity of leader behaviour questionnaires. *Academic Press* 93-110.

Schriesheim C. A. & Stogdill, R.M. 1975. Differences in factor structure across three versions of the Ohio state leadership scales. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, (189-206)

Schwandt, D. & Marquardt, M. 2000. *Organizational Learning: from world-class theories to global best practices*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press LLC.

- Seltzer, J. & Bass, B. 1990. Transformational leadership: beyond initiation and consideration. *Journal of Management*, 16(4), 693-703.
- Shipper, F., & Neck, C. P. 1990. Subordinates' observations: feedback for management development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 1, 371-385.
- Stogdill, R. 1963. Manual for the leader behaviour description questionnaire-form XII. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Stogdill, R.M., & Coons, A.E. 1957. Leader behaviour: its description and measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University.
- Thite, M. 1999. Identifying key characteristics of technical project leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development*, 20(5), 253-261.
- Wilson, C. L., O'Hare, D. & Shipper, F. (1990). Task cycle theory: The process of influence. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of leadership* (pp. 185-204).
- Williams, S. L., & Huminert, M.L. 1990. Evaluating performance appraisal instrument dimensions using construct analysis. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 27, 117 - 133.
- Yammarino, F., Spangler, W. & Bass, B. 1993. Transformational leadership and performance: A longitudinal investigation. *Leadership Quarterly*, 4, 81-102.
- Yukl, G.A. 1989. *Leadership in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Yukl, G. 2006. *Leadership in Organisations*. 6th Ed. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River.
- Zaleznik, A. 1977. Managers and leaders: Are they different? *Harvard Business Review*, 55(5), 67-80.

Appendix 1

1 Questionnaire - The 100-item 12 LBDQ XII Measurement Tool

LEADER BEHAVIOUR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – FORM XII

Purpose of the Questionnaire

On the following pages is a list of items that may be used to describe the behaviour of your direct leader. Although some items may appear similar, they express differences that are important in the description of leadership. Each item should be considered as a separate description. This is not a test of ability or consistency in making answers. Its only purpose is to make it possible for you to describe, as accurately as you can, the behaviour of your direct leader.

1. READ each item carefully.
2. THINK about how frequently your direct leader engages in the behaviour described by the item.
3. DECIDE whether he/she (5) always (4) often (3) occasionally (2) seldom (1) never acts as described by the item.
4. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the numbers (5 4 3 2 1) following the item to show the answer you have selected.
5. MARK your answers as shown in the example below.

Example: Often acts as described	5	4	3	2	1
Example: Never acts as described	5	4	3	2	1

5 = Always 4 = Often 3 = Occasionally 2 = Seldom 1 = Never

1. Acts as the spokesman of the group	5	4	3	2	1
2. Waits patiently for the results of a decision	5	4	3	2	1
3. Makes pep talks to stimulate the group	5	4	3	2	1
4. Lets group members know what is expected of them	5	4	3	2	1

5. Allows the members complete freedom in their work	5	4	3	2	1
6. Is hesitant about taking initiative in the group	5	4	3	2	1
7. Is friendly and approachable	5	4	3	2	1
8. Encourages overtime work	5	4	3	2	1
9. Makes accurate decisions	5	4	3	2	1
10. Gets along well with the people above him/her	5	4	3	2	1
11. Publicises the activities of the group	5	4	3	2	1
12. Becomes anxious when he/she cannot find out what is coming next	5	4	3	2	1
13. His/her arguments are convincing	5	4	3	2	1
14. Encourages the use of uniform procedures	5	4	3	2	1
15. Permits the members to use their own judgement in solving problems	5	4	3	2	1
16. Fails to take necessary action	5	4	3	2	1
17. Does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of the group	5	4	3	2	1
18. Stresses being ahead of competing groups	5	4	3	2	1
19. Keeps the group working together as a team	5	4	3	2	1
20. Keeps the group in good standing with higher authority	5	4	3	2	1
21. Speaks as the representative of the group	5	4	3	2	1
22. Accepts defeat in stride	5	4	3	2	1
23. Argues persuasively for his/her point of view	5	4	3	2	1
24. Tries out his/her ideas in the group	5	4	3	2	1
25. Encourages initiative in the group members	5	4	3	2	1
26. Lets other persons take away his/her leadership in the group	5	4	3	2	1
27. Puts suggestions made by the group into operation	5	4	3	2	1
28. Needles members for greater effort	5	4	3	2	1
29. Seems able to predict what is coming next	5	4	3	2	1
30. Is working hard for a promotion	5	4	3	2	1
31. Speaks for the group when visitors are present	5	4	3	2	1
32. Accepts delays without becoming upset	5	4	3	2	1
33. Is a very persuasive talker	5	4	3	2	1
34. Makes his/her attitudes clear to the group	5	4	3	2	1
35. Lets the members do their work the way they think best	5	4	3	2	1

36. Lets some members take advantage of him/her	5	4	3	2	1
37. Treats all group members as his/her equals	5	4	3	2	1
38. Keeps the work moving at a rapid pace	5	4	3	2	1
39. Settles conflicts when they occur in the group	5	4	3	2	1
40. His/her superiors act favourable on most of his/her suggestions	5	4	3	2	1
41. Represents the group at outside meetings	5	4	3	2	1
42. Becomes anxious when waiting for new developments	5	4	3	2	1
43. Is very skilful in an argument	5	4	3	2	1
44. Decides what shall be done and how it shall be done	5	4	3	2	1
45. Assigns a task, then lets the members handle it	5	4	3	2	1
46. Is the leader of the group in name only	5	4	3	2	1
47. Gives advance notice of changes	5	4	3	2	1
48. Pushes for increased production	5	4	3	2	1
49. Things usually turn out as he/she predicts	5	4	3	2	1
50. Enjoys the privileges of his/her position	5	4	3	2	1
51. Handles complex problems efficiently	5	4	3	2	1
52. Is able to tolerate postponement and uncertainty	5	4	3	2	1
53. Is not a very convincing talker	5	4	3	2	1
54. Assigns group members to particular tasks	5	4	3	2	1
55. Turns the members loose on a job, and lets them go to it	5	4	3	2	1
56. Backs down when he/she ought to stand firm	5	4	3	2	1
57. Keeps to himself/herself	5	4	3	2	1
58. Asks the members to work harder	5	4	3	2	1
59. Is accurate in predicting the trend of events	5	4	3	2	1
60. Gets his/her superiors to act for the welfare of the group members	5	4	3	2	1
61. Gets swamped by details	5	4	3	2	1
62. Can wait just so long, then blows up	5	4	3	2	1
63. Speaks from a strong inner conviction	5	4	3	2	1
64. Makes sure that his/her part in the group is understood	5	4	3	2	1
65. Is reluctant to allow the members any freedom of action	5	4	3	2	1
66. Lets some members have authority that he/she should keep	5	4	3	2	1

67. Looks out for the personal welfare of the group members	5	4	3	2	1
68. Permits the members to take it easy in their work	5	4	3	2	1
69. Sees to it that the work of the group is co-ordinated	5	4	3	2	1
70. His/her word carries weight with superiors	5	4	3	2	1
71. Gets things all tangled up	5	4	3	2	1
72. Remains calm when uncertain about coming events	5	4	3	2	1
73. Is an inspiring talker	5	4	3	2	1
74. Schedules the work to be done	5	4	3	2	1
75. Allows the group a high degree of initiative	5	4	3	2	1
76. Takes full charge when emergencies arise	5	4	3	2	1
77. Is willing to make changes	5	4	3	2	1
78. Drives hard when there is a job to be done	5	4	3	2	1
79. Helps group members settle their differences	5	4	3	2	1
80. Gets what he/she asks for from his/her superiors	5	4	3	2	1
81. Can reduce a madhouse to system and order	5	4	3	2	1
82. Is able to delay action until the proper time occurs	5	4	3	2	1
83. Persuades others that his/her ideas are to their advantage	5	4	3	2	1
84. Maintains definite standards of performance	5	4	3	2	1
85. Trusts members to exercise good judgement	5	4	3	2	1
86. Overcomes attempts made to challenge his/her leadership	5	4	3	2	1
87. Refuses to explain his/her actions	5	4	3	2	1
88. Urges the group to beat its previous record	5	4	3	2	1
89. Anticipates problems and plans for them	5	4	3	2	1
90. Is working his/her way to the top	5	4	3	2	1
91. Gets confused when too many demands are made of him/her	5	4	3	2	1
92. Worries about the outcome of any new procedure	5	4	3	2	1
93. Can inspire enthusiasm for a project	5	4	3	2	1
94. Asks that group members follow standard rule and regulations	5	4	3	2	1
95. Permits the group to set its own pace	5	4	3	2	1
96. Is easily recognised as the leader of the group	5	4	3	2	1
97. Acts without consulting the group	5	4	3	2	1

98. Keeps the group working up to capacity	5	4	3	2	1
99. Maintains a closely knit group	5	4	3	2	1
100. Maintains cordial relations with superiors	5	4	3	2	1

To assist the researcher, please be so kind to answer these demographic questions:

1. Your gender (circle one) Female Male
2. Your race (circle one) African Coloured Indian White
3. Name your superior (Optional):

_____.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

Appendix 2

MANUAL FOR THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – FORM XII

An Experimental Revision Ralph M. Stogdill

**Fisher College of Business
The Ohio State University**

1963

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – Form XII

The Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire, often referred to as LBDQ, was developed for use in obtaining descriptions of a supervisor by the group members whom he supervises. It can be used to describe the behaviour of the leader, or leaders, in any type of group or organization, provided the followers have had an opportunity to observe the leader in action as a leader of their group.

Origin of the Scales

The LBDQ grew out of work initiated by Hemphill (10). Further development of the scales by the staff of the Ohio State Leadership Studies has been described by Hemphill and Coons (13). Shartle (16) has outlined the theoretical considerations underlying the descriptive method. He observed that “when the Ohio State Leadership Studies was initiated in 1945, no satisfactory theory or definition of leadership was available.” It was subsequently found in empirical research that a large number of hypothesized dimensions of leader behaviour could be reduced to two strongly defined factors. These were identified by Halpin and Winer (9) and Fleishman (3) as Consideration and Initiation of Structure. The two factorially defined subscales, Consideration and Initiation of Structure, have been

widely used in empirical research, particularly in military organizations (5, 6), industry (2, 3, 4), and education (6, 8, 12). Halpin (7) reports that “in several studies where the agreement among respondents in describing their respective leaders has been checked by a ‘between-group vs. within-group’ analysis of variance, the F ratios all have been found significant at the .01 level. Followers tend to agree in describing the same leader, and the description of different leaders differ significantly.”

The Development of Form XII

It has not seemed reasonable to believe that two factors are sufficient to account for all the observable variance in leader behaviour. However, as Shartle (16) observed, no theory was available to suggest additional factors. A new theory of role differentiation and group achievement by Stogdill (17), and the survey of a large body of research data that supported that theory, suggested that a number of variables operate in the differentiation of roles in social groups. Possible factors suggested by the theory are the following: tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, tolerance of member freedom or action, predictive accuracy, integration of the group, and reconciliation of conflicting demands. Possible new factors suggested by the results of empirical research are the following: representation of group interests, role assumption, production emphasis, and orientation toward superiors.

Items were developed for the hypothesized subscales. Questionnaires incorporating the new items were administered to successive groups. After item analysis, the questionnaires were revised, administered again, reanalyzed, and revised. Marder (14) reported the first use of the new scales in the study of an army airborne division and a state highway patrol organization. Day (1) used a revised form of the questionnaire in the study of an industrial organization. Other revisions were employed by Stogdill, Goode, and Day (20, 21, 22) in the study of ministers, leaders in the community development, United States senators, and presidents of corporations. Stogdill (18) has used the new scales in the study of industrial and governmental organizations. Form XII represents the fourth revisions of the questionnaire. It is subject to further revision.

Definition of the Subscales

Each subscale is composed of either five or ten items. A subscale is necessarily defined by its component items and represents a rather complex pattern of behaviors. Brief definitions of the subscales are listed below:

1. **Representation** – speaks and acts as the representative of the group. (5 items)
2. **Demand Reconciliation** – reconciles conflicting demands and reduces disorder to system. (5 items)
3. **Tolerance of Uncertainty** – is able to tolerate uncertainty and postponement without anxiety or upset. (10 items)
4. **Persuasiveness** – uses persuasion and argument effectively; exhibits strong convictions. (10 items)
5. **Initiation of Structure** – clearly defines own role, and lets followers know what is expected. (10 items)
6. **Tolerance and Freedom** -allows followers scope for initiative, decision and action. (10 items)
7. **Role Assumption** – actively exercises the leadership role rather than surrendering leadership to others. (10 items)
8. **Consideration** – regards the comfort, well being, status, and contributions of followers. (10 items)
9. **Production Emphasis** – applies pressure for productive output. (10 items)
10. **Predictive Accuracy** – exhibits foresight and ability to predict outcome accurately. (5 items)

11. **Integration** – maintains a closely knit organization; resolves inter-member conflicts. (5 items)

12. **Superior Orientation** – maintains cordial relations with superiors; has influence with them; is striving for higher status. (10 items)

Scoring Key

The subject indicates his response by drawing a circle around one of the five letters (A, B, C, D, E) following an item. As indicated on the Scoring Key, most items are scored:

A	B	C	D	E
5	4	3	2	1

A circle around A gives the item a score of 5; a circle around B gives it a score of 4; and a circle around E gives the items a score of 1.

The 20 starred items on the Scoring Key are scored in the reverse direction, as follows:

A	B	C	D	E
1	2	3	4	5

In use at the Bureau of Business Research, the score is written after each item in the margin of the test booklet (questionnaire).

Scoring Key

*Starred items are scored 1 2 3 4 5

All other items are scored 5 4 3 2 1

1	22	*42	*62	82
2	23	43	63	83
3	24	44	64	84
4	25	45	*65	85
5	*26	*46	*66	86
*6	27	47	67	*87
7	28	48	*68	88
8	29	49	69	89
9	30	50	70	90
10	31	51	*71	*91
11	32	52	72	*92
*12	33	*53	73	93
14	34	54	74	94
15	35	55	75	95
*16	*36	*56	76	96
17	37	*57	77	*97
18	38	58	78	98
19	39	59	79	99
20	40	60	80	100
21	41	*61	81	

Record Sheet: Scoring the Subscales

The assignment of items to different subscales is indicated in the Record Sheet. For example, the Representation subscale consists of items 1, 11, 21, 31, and 41. The sum of the scores for these five items constitutes the score for the subscales Representation. The score for Demand Reconciliation consists of the sum of the scores assigned to items 51, 61, 71, 81, and 91. The score for Tolerance of Uncertainty consists of the sum of the scores on items 2, 12, 22, 32, 42, 52, 62, 72, 82, and 92. By transferring the item scores from the test booklet to the Scoring Sheet, it is possible to add the item scores quickly to obtain an accurate score for each subscale.

LBDQ Form XII – RECORD SHEET

		Total
1. Representation	1__ 11__ 21__ 31__ 41__	()
2. Reconciliation	51__ 61__ 71__ 81__ 91__	()
3. Tol. Uncertainty	2__ 12__ 22__ 32__ 42__ 52__ 62__ 72__ 82__ 92__	()
4. Persuasion	3__ 13__ 23__ 33__ 43__ 53__ 63__ 73__ 83__ 93__	()
5. Structure	4__ 14__ 24__ 34__ 44__ 54__ 64__ 74__ 84__ 94__	()
6. Tol. Freedom	5__ 15__ 25__ 35__ 45__ 55__ 65__ 75__ 85__ 95__	()
7. Role Assumption	6__ 16__ 26__ 36__ 46__ 56__ 66__ 76__ 86__ 96__	()
8. Consideration	7__ 17__ 27__ 37__ 47__ 57__ 67__ 77__ 87__ 97__	()
9. Production Emph	8__ 18__ 28__ 38__ 48__ 58__ 68__ 78__ 88__ 98__	()
10. Predictive Acc	9__ 29__ 49__ 59__ 89__	()
11. Integration	19__ 39__ 69__ 79__ 99__	()
12. Superior Orient	10__ 20__ 30__ 40__ 50__ 60__ 70__ 80__ 90__ 100__	()