

Exploring Leadership Styles Adopted By the Top and Middle Level Leaders from the Hospital Industry in Pune City

Preeti Goel*

Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Dhanalakshmi Srinivasan College of Arts and Science for Women, Perambalur, Tamil Nadu

research@dcollege.ac.in

ABSTRACT

The point of the investigation was to look at the authority styles embraced by the top and center level heads of the medical clinics in Pune city and give contributions to upgrade the administration style of the emergency clinic pioneers. Five exploration questions were tended to in this investigation. A blended strategy study configuration was utilized for this examination. The top and center level pioneers from the clinic and lodging industry partook in this examination. Quantitative information was gotten by 41 top and center level pioneers from both the ventures without anyone else announcing strategies and subjective information was acquired by up close and personal meeting method from 20 pioneers. Quantitative information was examined with the assistance of rates and chi square test. Subjective information was examined by topical investigation and results were blended during the translation and revealing period of the examination. Results indicated blended administration style should be embraced by the medical clinic top and center level pioneers. The Hospital business needs authority preparing and advancement of their top and center level pioneers when contrasted with the lodging business. Clinical educational program likewise expected to teach initiative parts in their undergrad or postgraduate courses.

Keywords: Middle Level, Hospital Industry

INTRODUCTION

Paper includes a historical overview of leadership, types of leadership styles, background of the research topic, a statement of the research study, and gives brief about how the study was carried out.

Historical overview of leadership

A pioneer, supporter, and authority terms are unique in relation to one another. Louis Allen revealed that —A pioneer is one who controls and coordinates other people. Individuals who

take part in initiative are called as pioneers, and those toward whom authority is coordinated are called as supporters. The two chiefs and adherents are included together in the authority interaction. Pioneers need adherents and devotees need pioneers. Pioneer can't be called as a 'leader' without having supporters. Rost (1991) characterized initiative as the workmanship or interaction of impacting individuals with the goal that they will endeavor energetically and excitedly towards the accomplishment of gathering objectives. Though, Chester Barnard detailed that, —leadership is the nature of conduct of people whereby they manage individuals or their exercises in getting sorted out endeavors.

As indicated by Antonakis, et al. (2003) initiative can be characterized as, " the idea of the affecting cycle—and its resultant results—that happens between a pioneer and devotees and what this meaning for measure is clarified by the pioneer's dispositional qualities and practices, adherent discernments and attributions of the pioneer, and the setting where the impacting interaction happens" (Antonakis, et al. 2003, Pg 5). Bennis (1959) expressed that —of all the dim and perplexing regions in social brain science, initiative hypothesis without a doubt fights for top designation. Also, incidentally, likely more has been composed and less is thought about administration than about some other point in the conduct sciences (pp. 259-301) (as referred to by Antonakis, et al., 2003 pg 4). "A typical conviction is that authority is crucial for successful authoritative and cultural working. Authority is not difficult to distinguish in situ; in any case, it is hard to characterize unequivocally. Given the mind boggling nature of authority, a particular and generally acknowledged meaning of initiative doesn't exist and may never be discovered". Previously a mentioned meaning of administration was commonly characterized by the characteristics, characteristics, and practices of a pioneer. Another significant part of administration is that authority and force are associated. Various forces lead to various authority and administration style. Force can be isolated essentially under two classes, one individual force and other is positional force. Figure 1 addresses the force and it's connection of it to the pioneer and his/her administration. At the point when adherents like the pioneer and they follow the pioneer it is called as a 'referent power'. At the point when information and abilities of the pioneer impact individuals it is called as 'expert power'. 'Legitimate power' comes from the position chief holds in the general public, or in the association. 'Reward power' signifies individual has ability to compensate others. 'Coercive power' is limit of the pioneer to rebuff others. Figure 1 portrays force and its connection to the pioneer and administration.

| Type of power | Description of leaders and their leadership |
|------------------|--|
| Referent power | Based on followers' identification and liking for the leader e.g. a teacher who is adored by students has referent power |
| Personal Power | |
| Expert power | Based on followers' perception of the leader's competence, knowledge and skills e.g. other surgeons will listen to a surgeon who did 10,000/- surgeries on 'X' organ as they consider him/her subject expert. |
| Legitimate power | Associated with having status or formal job authority. e.g. A judge who administers sentences in the courtroom exhibits legitimate power. |
| Position Power | |
| Reward power | Derived from having the capacity to provide rewards to others. e.g. A supervisor who gives rewards to employees who work hard is using reward power |
| Coercive power | Derived from having the capacity to penalize or punish others. e.g. A supervisor penalizes employees for being late to work is using coercive power. |

Figure 1: Leadership and the power

These forces are reflected even in the set of experiences. There is a long standing history of human conduct connected to initiative. It is essential for group building and comprehension. Administration has an old authentic setting. Table 1 presents a characteristic history of authority portrayed by Vugt, et al. (2008). These creators have introduced a speculative depiction of how administration rehearses developed throughout the span of non-human to human primate history. They have depicted four phases of history of authority: stage 1-pre-human initiative, stage 2-Band and ancestral administration, stage 3-Chiefs, rulers, and warlords, stage 4-State and business administration. Vugt et al (2008) referred to that the —first (and by a wide margin the longest) stage stretched out from the rise of early people around 2.5 million years back until the finish of the last ice age, around 13,000 years prior. During this stage, the Pleistocene time, people lived in seminomadic agrarian groups and factions comprising of 50–150 generally hereditarily related people. Extrapolating from agrarian proof, creators gathered that day to day environments in the climate of transformative adaptedness (EEA) were generally populist, with no formalized influential position. The best trackers and champions, purported Big Men, practice unbalanced impact on collective choice making, however their force is restricted to their space of mastery and aggregated level of trust" (pg187). "Predominance chains of command were the standard in primate gatherings; for early people, coordinated effort among subordinates turned around this strength pecking order and brought about a majority rule authority style that may have existed for almost 2.5 million years (Vugt, et al.,2008, pg 188).

Table 1: A natural history of leadership

| Stage | Time period | Society | Group size | Leadership structure | Leader | Leader-follower relations |
|-------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | >2.5 million years ago | Prehuman | Any size | Situational or dominance hierarchy | Any individual or alpha | Democratic or despotic |
| 2 | 2.5 million to 13,000 years ago | Hominid bands, clans, tribes | Dozens to hundreds | Informal, situational, prestige based | Big man, head man | Egalitarian and consensual |
| 3 | 13,000 to 250 years ago | Chiefdoms, kingdoms, warlord societies | Thousands | Formal, centralized, hereditary | Chiefs, kings, warlords | Hierarchical and unilateral |
| 4 | 250 years ago to the present | Nations, states, businesses | Thousands to millions | Structural, centralized, democratic | Heads of state, managers, executives | Hierarchical but participatory |

Adopted from Vugt, et al.(2008) "Leadership, followership, and evolution- some lessons from the past" American Psychologist, 63(3), 187.

Afterward, —social structures changed drastically starting with the improvement of agribusiness toward the finish of the last ice age around 13,000 years prior. Agribusiness and trustworthy food supplies empowered gatherings to settle and populaces to develop dramatically. Without precedent for mankind's set of experiences, networks amassed surplus assets, and pioneers assumed a critical part in their reallocation. As people group developed, so did the potential for inside and between-bunches strife. Pioneers gained additional ability to manage such dangers, which brought about more formalized position structures that prepared for the principal chiefdoms and kingdoms.

The fourth administration period relates generally to the start of the Industrial Revolution nearly 250 years back. Networks converged into states and countries, and enormous organizations grew, all of which had suggestions for initiative practices. Residents of states and workers in associations are moderately liberated from the predations of their chiefs and may surrender to different states or associations. This opportunity moves the overall influence away from leaders and produces conditions more associated, however not same, to the converse strength progressive system of the climate of transformative adaptation (Vugt, et al. 2008, pg 188). To recap, —Leadership turned out to be more refined during the climate of developmental transformation because of difficulties related with the developing size and intricacy of gatherings and the certainty of contention both inside and between gatherings. The advancement of psychological limits remarkably language, hypothesis of brain, and culture encouraged huge scope initiative. Agrarian information proposed that administration in the climate of developmental variation was consensual, majority rule, and brief.

The formalized administration structures that arose after the rural transformation are novel and possibly struggle with our developed authority brain research. The Industrial Revolution assisted free with peopling from overbearing warlords, yet the scale, intricacy, and type of contemporary associations present novel difficulties to our intrinsic authority psychology (Vugt, et al. 2008, pg 189). It implies initiative started with the cavern inhabitants who had an alpha male and a little progressive framework. Afterward, administration started to have a political part with little leaders of autonomous social orders. In India, this was obviously present in the 2-3 rd century BC with amazing rulers making enormous domains, for example, the Guptas and Moryas.

The initiative in India required coaches and rulers had mentorship of minister and sages who recommended strict services. This prompted the standing framework in Hinduism. Strict initiative came from Buddha and Mahavir. In present day India, administration prompted the expulsion of the British and Independent vote based system. This was driven by Mahatma Gandhi, one of the world's most noteworthy scholars. Political authority came from appealing rulers, for example, Indira Gandhi. Another type of initiative came from the Industrial administration needs of a developing economy in India. While this was typically chosen by an interaction in the Board of various ventures, it was much of the time a family based result. Subsequently, the House of Tatas, Ambanis, Birlas had pioneers from inside the starting family. Emergency clinic administration in a little clinic was every now and again a clinical expert who needed to learn the board and driving his group at work by experimentation. It was distinctly with companies and the development of public medical clinics that got important to have all around prepared pioneers.

In nineteenth century center was around the pioneer and their authority. Numerous researchers have worked in their life on investigating more about initiative. Verifiable point of view of administration and authority speculations of nineteenth century is as per the following: In 1922, Max Weber referenced that pioneers had power by righteousness of position. In the nineteenth century the idea of the —great man hypothesis ruled initiative field of work. Its center conviction was that a couple of men had certain attributes which had a chronicled effect (Maslanka, 2004). For instance, authority was clarified by the interior characteristics with which an individual is conceived (Bernard, 1926 as referred to by Horner, 1997, pg 270). "A subsequent significant push took a gander at pioneer practices trying to figure out what effective pioneers do, not, what they look like to other people. These examinations started to take a gander at pioneers

with regards to the association, recognizing the practices leaders" display, that increment the viability of the organization. In the 1920-1930s quality hypothesis was overwhelming the comprehension of authority. As indicated by this hypothesis, it zeroed in on the quality people have to separate him/her as a pioneer from nonleaders. These include inalienable characteristics that people have for instance, individual, physical, and social credits. It brought up the issue with regards to whether pioneers are conceived, or people can create themselves to be pioneers.

In 1938, Chester Bernard characterized administration as —The capacity of a better than impact the conduct of subordinates and convince them to follow a specific course of action. Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) examined the contrast between dictatorial, majority rule and free enterprise administration. Later Robert Tannenbaum and Warren Schmidt came out with an exemplary Harvard Business Review article qualified 'How for Choose Your Leadership Style'. In 1948, Ralph Stodgill and his group led Ohio State and University of Michigan considers, which revealed two parts of administration conduct for example starting design and thought. In 1964, Robert Blake, Shephard and Jane Mouton's built up a Managerial Grid model. They changed the measurements from starting construction and thought to worry for creation and worry for individuals. In 1967, Fred Fiedler built up the Contingency Theory of Leadership which discusses pioneer's conduct as per circumstances. In 1972, Hersey and Blanchard utilized the term 'Situational Leadership'. The Vroom-Yetton hypothesis (1973) depicted how a pioneer settles on a choice in a given conditions regardless of the supporters inclusion, their ability and limit. In 1974, House and Mitchell proposed Path objective hypothesis, which focuses on how pioneer associate with their devotees to arrive at their own, proficient and authoritative objectives. In 1976, Linden and Graen, started pioneer part trade hypothesis. This hypothesis clarifies the idea of the connection among pioneers and adherents and what this relationship means for the initiative cycle.

Consumes, in 1978 proposed conditional authority hypothesis which depended on trade of remuneration for the work. While, in 1985, Bass further built up crafted by Burns and proposed groundbreaking administration which accentuation on inspiration of supporters to meet the objectives. Gardner (1990)" starts to challenge the possibility that authority exists inside a solitary assigned individual and a circumstance. All things being equal, he positions initiative as pushing toward and accomplishing a gathering objective, not really in light of crafted by one talented individual (for example the pioneer) but since of crafted by numerous individuals from the gathering. In addition to the fact that leadership requires somebody who helps set the course and push the gathering ahead while filling in as an asset, yet it includes the commitments of other incredible masterminds and practitioners, admittance to the correct assets, and the social organization of the gathering. Manz and Sims likewise offer an amended, integrative viewpoint on authority. Utilizing the expression "Super Leadership," they tested the customary worldview of initiative as one individual planning something for others (Manz and Sims, 1991). All things considered, they recommended that another model exists for initiative today: "the most proper pioneer is one who can lead others to lead themselves. To put it plainly, Antonakis, et al. (2003) introduced eight schools of authority speculations to be specific: Trait, Behavioral, Contingency, Contextual, Skeptics, Rational, New Leadership, and Information - Processing.

As per Trait school of administration individual has some acquired qualities which separated pioneers from non-pioneers (pg.6). In 1950s, Behavioral school of administration arose. This featured pioneer's conduct for their supporters. College of Michigan and Ohio State investigates

supported this thought of social initiative. This way of thinking underlined that authority depends on the circumstance. Afterward, Relational school of Leadership dominated. This anxieties connection between the pioneer and their supporters (pg8). In late 1980s, Skeptics of Leadership school arose with the possibility that what chiefs do is generally insignificant and that pioneer appraisals may reflect basically the verifiable administration hypotheses that people convey—in their heads. This way of thinking likewise brought up that authority rating depends on the things comprised in the information assortment instrument which is planned by the specialist dependent on the pioneers ascribes as opposed to zeroing in on the result of the initiative. In mid 1980s, Information-Processing school of initiative arose. "The focal point of this school was principally on arrangement why a pioneer is legitimized by ideals of the way that their qualities coordinate the prototypical assumption that adherents have of the pioneer" (Antonakis, et al. 1990, pg 9). The New Leadership School, is otherwise called Neo-alluring Transformational/Visionary Leadership. Bass (1985) dealt with groundbreaking/visionary initiative considered school and further this work was carried on by his partner Avolio. This way of thinking features visionary, rousing pioneer's conduct, changes their adherents' conduct, which urges devotees to display their capability to give a valiant effort. Recorded viewpoint of administration shows numerous initiative styles have arisen. Caimir 2001 characterized administration styles as—a example of accentuations, recorded by the recurrence or power of explicit initiative conduct or mentalities, which a pioneer puts on the distinctive authority functions. The specialized information on administration styles encourages a pioneer to comprehend the qualities and contrasts of each style; notwithstanding, it is dependent upon the pioneer to pick a suitable initiative style and actualize that viably practically speaking. Sorts of administration styles are examined in the following area.

Types of Leadership styles:

A numbers of leadership styles are reported in the literature however this section mainly focuses on ten leadership styles including autocratic, democratic, bureaucratic, charismatic, laissez faire, transactional, transformational, situational, coaching, and visionary leadership styles. This section mainly informs characteristics, advantages, disadvantages of these styles.

Autocratic leadership style:

A pioneer who rehearses a despotic administration style rules dynamic and give next to no extension for others to give any information sources. The pioneer directs at each progression and supporters need to follow it with no inquiry or contention. This style is regularly utilized in the military setting and where others' information sources are not expected or required. Notwithstanding, there are numerous impediments of this style. Absolutist authority generally prompts significant degrees of truancy and staff turnover and less fulfillment among workers. Then again, imperious administration can be advantageous when representatives are untalented and need control since it is contended that the benefits of control may exceed the weaknesses. This style is likewise significant when work should be done quick or in a restricted time.

Democratic leadership style:

Popularity based administration style is otherwise called participative authority style (Arab, A.; Tajvar, M.; Akbari, F., 2006). Popularity based authority displays a totally differentiating system

than that of absolutist administration. The vote based pioneer urges others to share their thoughts and perspectives and afterward the pioneer settles on the choice. Since others are esteemed in this style, fulfillment of adherents is more noteworthy when contrasted with dictatorial authority. Moreover supporters feel that they are in charge of their own fate, so they are inspired to buckle down by something beyond a monetary prize. It is contended that majority rule authority style is advantageous when one has part of the data, and others have different parts. So when you don't know it all, you can take help of others information and abilities to comprehend a superior picture or the marvels. Consequently, it is of shared advantage; it permits colleagues to feel significant and turn out to be important for dynamic and permits the pioneer to comprehend alternate points of view and settle on better choices. The impediment is on the grounds that others sees are empowered, dynamic may take a more extended time and there might be tumult and strife in dynamic.

Bureaucratic leadership style:

Bureaucratic leadership style follows rules and regulation. Bureaucratic leaders strictly adhere to policies and procedures by themselves and make others do the same. In short they 'work by the book'. It can be argued that this style is rigid in the sense policies and norms must have been written in the past, as circumstances changes policies and norms need to be modified accordingly. However literature reports that this style is beneficial to follow safety procedure, handling equipments and large financial outlays.

Charismatic leadership style:

Charming pioneers have an air around them. This might be because of their character, their devotion, their vision, their earnestness, their correspondence, their insight and abilities or skill in the field and the manner in which they introduce themselves before individuals. Charming pioneers move, propel interest and enthusiasm in their groups and they are the main thrust in the association. Charming pioneers accept more in themselves than in their groups. They assume liability, and are focused on their work.

According to the supporters, achievement is straightforwardly associated with the presence of the magnetic pioneer. Different ascribes featured about charming authority are this administration style wins the help and upgrades dedication of devotees. They are visionary, motivational and certain. Such pioneers can persuade and haggle better. They deal with devotees needs, approach supporters with deference and make excitement in the representatives. Alluring authority impacts devotees inwardly (Gibson, J.W., Hannon, J.C., Blackwell, C.W., 1998). The disadvantage of this initiative style is that pioneers accept more in themselves as opposed to their devotees along these lines there might be a trust issue. Four sorts of magnetic administration have been examined by Steyer, J. (1998): For instance, legend (chivalrous allure), father (paternalistic mystique), friend in need (preacher appeal), and lord (magnificent moxy). Magnetism can be looked from both the points from the pioneers perspective for example characteristics showed by the pioneers, or conduct of the pioneer (target insight) and from the adherents perspective for example impression of the pioneer by the supporters (abstract insight). In this way Steyer has talked about four methodologies of charming administration: —i) pioneer focused, ii) devotee focused, iii) interdependency arranged, and iv) setting centered (Steyer, 1998 pg 809). Note that mystique must be assessed from both the sides. Interdependency model of alluring authority talks

about cooperation from pioneers just as devotees sides for charming communication. It is identified with the connection among pioneer and devotees. Proof shows that magnetic pioneers detailed in the writing need not be charming. This is appeared in the overview directed by Gibson, J.W., Hannon, J.C., and Blackwell, C.W. (1998). Review was directed to investigate if 23 notable characters had mystique. These characters were from legislative issues, military, corporate world, religion, sports and amusement. Overview was directed on 111 respondents including workforce and understudies from USA. The outcome affirmed that most of respondents scored, just 50% of the characters were alluring.

At the point when creators posed an inquiry whether charming administration is consistently something to be thankful for just 30% reacted to this as being 'True'. That implies the larger part (70%) couldn't help contradicting the assertion. Not all pioneers receive charming authority style as detailed in the writing. For instance, American CEOs don't have magnetic administration style (Gibson, Hannon, and Blackwell, 1998). Is the 'charisma' acquired or charming credits be obtained? Gibson, Hannon, and Blackwell, (1998) feel it remains in the center, some character characteristics should be acquired though different credits can be procured. Further they add that 70% of respondents from their examination felt that alluring administration ascribes can be learned. These creators refers to that an individual needs to create alluring ascribes like discourse examples of a magnetic pioneer, and be all the more sincerely expressive, use neurolinguistic programming and use humor. When can alluring administration be helpful? Gibson, Hannon, and Blackwell (1998) refers to that —according to House (1992), charm matters most in new companies, turnarounds, or at whatever point a business (or group) is experiencing fast, capricious change. House accepts that when conditions are questionable, charming managers prod subordinates to work far in excess of what was required. Appealing pioneers can be named corporate saints fit for performing wonders; they are regularly answerable for arranging corporate turnarounds, dispatching new endeavors, rousing authoritative restoration, and impacting people to accomplish greatest execution levels.

CONCLUSION

Right now the medical clinic industry from the Pune city is experiencing a change in outlook bringing corporate chains of emergency clinics into Pune. This is significantly changing the design and elements of the clinic business. In this way to suit such assorted, dynamic and complex requirements of the clinic business, medical clinic pioneers need to embrace reasonable administration styles to arrive at the hierarchical objectives. Be that as it may, writing investigated didn't reveal insight into which initiative styles should be embraced by the top and center level pioneers from the emergency clinic industry, or whether there is a need to take in authority and administration styles from other industry pioneers particularly for instance from the lodging business. This was not satisfactory from the assessed writing. Henceforth the point of the investigation was to analyze the initiative styles received by the top and center level pioneers from the emergency clinic industry from Pune city.

REFERENCES

1. Agin, E. and Gibson, T. (2010), "Developing an innovative culture" T+ D, 52-55. Ah-kee, Elliott and Khan, A., (2015) "Incorporating medical leadership and management into

- the UK undergraduate medical curriculum" *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 6, pp. 507–508.
2. Ahn, Mark J.; Adamson, John S.A.; Dornbusch, D., (2004) "From leaders to leadership managing change" *The Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 10(4), pp. 112–123.
 3. Alimo-metcalfe, B. & Alban-metcalfe, J., (2005) "Leadership: Time for a New Direction?" *Leadership*, 1(1), pp. 51–71.
 4. American College of Healthcare Executives Report (2012) "A Comparison of the Career Attainments of Men and Women Healthcare Executives. Division of member services, Research" American college of healthcare executives, pp. 1-73.
 5. American college of healthcare executives (2006) "A comparison of the career attainment of men and women healthcare executives. Executive summary" 1-64. www.ache.org full report. Revision 2 American college of healthcare executives, (1997) "Closing the gender gap in healthcare management".
 6. Anon, (2011) "Improving Leadership Stability in Healthcare Organizations CEO Circle White Paper". Anon, (2015) "Hospitals without leadership". *The British Medical Journal*, 1(5119), pp. 426–427.
 7. Available at: <http://www.jsor.org/stable/25386592>. Anseel, F., Lievens, F., Schollaert, E., and
 8. Choragwicka, B., (2010), "Response rate in organizational science, 1995-2008: A meta-analytic review and guidelines for survey researchers" *J Bus Psychol*, 25, pp. 335-349.
 9. Antonakis, J., Avolio, B.J. & Sivasubramaniam, N., (2003) "Context and leadership: an examination of the nine-factor full-range leadership theory using the Multifactor leadership questionnaire". *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, pp. 261–295.
 10. Antonakis, J., Cianciolo, A.T. & Sternberg, R.J., (2003) "Leadership past, present and future" pp. 3–15.
 11. Appelbaum, S.H., Audet, L. & Miller, J.C., (2003) "Gender and leadership? Leadership and gender? A journey through the landscape of theories". *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(1), pp. 43–51.
 12. April, S., Arendt, W. & Gregoire, M., 2004. Leadership behaviors in undergraduate hospitality management and dietetics students.