

Expression of Dissatisfaction in Relation to Managerial Leadership Strategies and Its Impact in Information Technology Organizations

Harold Andrew Patrick

Abstract:

The study emphasizes on IT managers' leadership strategies and what influence these leadership strategies have on IT employees expression of dissatisfaction. The dependent variable was response to dissatisfaction; Leadership strategies adopted by IT managers and Leadership strategies impact were the independent variables. Three standardized, valid and reliable tools were adopted to collect data. Respondents were drawn from Indian, Indian multinational and multinational IT companies. The article maps the behavioral variations and their implications in IT organizations based on leadership strategies/impact and response to dissatisfaction. The major findings indicate that in IT organizations prescriptive strategies were engaged more than restrictive strategies. The leadership strategies have a constructive impact on IT employees. The most preferred expression to dissatisfaction was voice i.e. constructive and active way to express dissatisfaction. The detail findings and implications are discussed in the article in detail.

Keywords: *Employee dissatisfaction, Leadership Strategies, organizational behaviour, Human resources management, Expression of dissatisfaction.*

1. Introduction

Leaders inspire and stimulate others to achieve worthwhile goals. Most definitions of leadership emphasize; Firstly, leadership is a social influence process and cannot exist without a leader and one or more followers. Secondly, leadership elicits voluntary action on the part of followers. Finally, leadership results in followers' behaviour that is purposeful and goal-directed in some sort of organized setting. Although leadership is the most frequently studied topic yet the precise nature of leadership and its relationship to key criterion variables such as subordinate satisfaction, commitment, and performance is still uncertain, to the point where Fred Luthans, in his book 'Organizational Behaviour' (2005), said that "it [leadership] does remain pretty much of a 'black box' or unexplainable concept."

Leadership Strategies: The literature generally suggests that effective leaders express their need for power and influence in ways that benefit the organization.

The learning strategies action, thinking, and accessing others are significant in predicting transformational leadership but learning through feeling is not a significant predictor. There was no difference between men and women in the use of learning strategies and transformational leadership. Gentry et al (2011) found the biggest gaps among generations in leading employees, change management, and building and mending relationships. Most of the recent literature review highlights the fact that freeing, autonomous, interdependent and prescriptive leader behavior creates the right climate for employees to be more able, willing, agile and ready to engage in meaningful and innovative behaviors at the workplace. Arie et al (2007) job satisfaction of subordinates was found to be higher when the style of strategic influence practiced by their supervisor fit their regulatory mode orientation. Bono et al (2007) found employees who regulated their emotions experienced decreased job satisfaction and increased stress, but those with supervisors high on transformational leadership were less likely to experience decreased job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction: Job satisfaction has the potential to affect a wide range of behaviours in organizations and contribute to employees' levels of wellbeing. In the west

research has indicated a decline over the past decade Korentz (2003) and dissatisfaction was with companies promotion, bonus policies, pension and health plans Bachman (2005). Employees with high job dissatisfaction exhibited the highest creativity when continuance commitment was high and when (1) useful feedback from coworkers, or (2) coworker helping and support, or (3) perceived organizational support for creativity was high Zhou and George(2001). The rationale for measuring job satisfaction through action tendencies is that positive and negative emotional experiences associated with job will evoke respectively approach - avoidance action tendencies Alt Powell (2006). Perry and Mankin (2007) examined the interrelationships among employee trust in the chief executive of the organization, trust in the organization and work satisfaction. Rao et al (2005) found organizational culture to significantly affect how employees view their organizational responsibilities and their job satisfaction. Thomas and Au (2002) found cultural groups responded differently to low job satisfaction with exit, voice, loyalty, or neglect. Daley (1992) found a challenging job and a collegial workgroup tend to enhance voice and loyalty while minimizing tendencies lean toward exit and neglect behaviours. Rusbult et al (1988) found high satisfaction and investment encouraged voice and loyalty and discouraged exit and neglect.

Need and Rationale for The Present Study

The emphasis on leadership and dissatisfaction in IT organizations has not been methodologically researched and its implications scantily available in India. Very few studies have been done internationally on these variables individually. The present study is a serious attempt to understand and explore in the Indian IT context the behavioral variations and their implications that these variables have on employees. The insights will contribute towards the basic understanding of the leadership strategies and how these strategies impact employees in IT organizations. It is an earnest attempt to bridge the gap especially in this area by highlighting the relevance and importance of leadership to management, individual, and organizations and hoping this study will initiate a series of serious and productive discussions on the subject. The study will bring in sharp focus the major challenges in these

behavioural domains encountered and the solutions that will aid IT organizations to deal more scientifically in increasing their effectiveness.

The major objective of the study was to find out the leadership strategies adopted by managers and the impact it has in the IT organizations. The study also investigates the relationship between leadership strategies/impact and expression of dissatisfaction.

Method

Operational definitions of the variables under investigation: Leadership/Impact® The definitions given by Cooke (1997) from the manual Leadership/Impact®-measuring the impact of leaders on organizational performance was adopted in this study. Leadership Strategies : The extent to which managers personally act in Prescriptive versus Restrictive ways. Prescriptive Leadership Strategies – those techniques that guide or direct the activities and behaviors of others toward goals, opportunities, and methods for task accomplishment. Restrictive Leadership Strategies – those that constrain or prohibit activities and behaviours with respect to goals, opportunities, and methods for task accomplishment. Impact on Others : The extent to which managers motivate or drive people to behave in Constructive versus defensive ways. Constructive Impact on Others - Motivate people to think and behave in Achievement-oriented and cooperative ways that emphasize growth and development. Defensive Impacts on Others - Drive people to think and behave in either aggressive or passive ways to protect their status and position. Passive/Defensive Impact - Possibly inadvertently, these leaders adopt strategies that lead others to feel insecure or apprehensive, controlled and constrained, and uneasy about interpersonal relations within the organizations. Aggressive/Defensive Impact - Directly or indirectly, these leaders exhibit strategies that lead others to feel anxious about their status and influence, worry about how they look relative to others, and fixate on short-term (and sometimes irrelevant) performance criteria. Responses to Job Dissatisfaction - The definitions given by Rusbult and Lowery (1985) were adopted. Exit: Behavior directed towards leaving the organization, looking for a new job as well as resigning. Voice: Actively and constructively attempting to improve conditions like suggesting improvements and discussing problems with superiors. Loyalty: Passively but optimistically waiting for conditions to improve like speaking up for the organization in the face of external criticism and trusting the organization and its management. Neglect: Passively allowing conditions to worsen like chronic absenteeism, lateness, reduced efforts including error rates.

Sample Size

515 IT employees from 87 Indian, Indian multinational corporations and multinational IT companies were surveyed for the study. The sample was drawn from all the three levels of management. 305 IT employees from the junior level executives, 148 from the middle level managers and 62 from the senior level management were administered the questionnaire. Respondents who have worked for at least one year and have known their boss for at least one year were included for the present study. The stratified random sampling technique was adopted for the present study. Employees with minimum one year work experience and have known their boss for one year were only asked to fill the questionnaire. Two standardized, reliable and valid tools - Robert A. Cooke's (1996) Leadership/Impact® instrument and response adopted by employees to express dissatisfaction was developed by the researcher based on the model developed by Rusbult and Lowery (1985) were adopted.

Sample Profile

Respondents were drawn from 87 I.T companies. Entry level managerial level (59.2%), followed by middle level (28.7%) and top management (12%). For most respondents this was their first organization (43.5%) followed by one organization already worked for (20.8%), two organizations already worked for (16.7%), three organizations already worked for (13.2) and the maximum was eight organizations already worked for (0.6%). 30.1% were female and 69.9% were male respondents. The maximum was in the age group 21-25 yrs (48.3%), followed by 26-30 yrs (30.1%), 31-35 yrs (13.4%), only 0.2% were drawn from the above 50 yrs age group. The highest education level attained was bachelor degrees (60.6%) followed by masters degree (33%), Diplomas (3.7%), and other qualifications that include certificate and diplomas and degrees outside the formal educational structure. The marital status was that 69.1% were single, followed by married (29.7%) and the least were in the others category (1.2%) i.e. divorcees, widows or widowers. The work experience of the respondents show that most respondents had 1-3 yrs (40.8%) experience followed by 1 yr experience (16.5%), 3-5 yrs (16.3%), 5-7 yrs (9.7%), above 11 yrs (8%), 9-11 yrs (4.7%) and the least 7-9 yrs (4.1%) work experience. The majority had known their boss for 1 yr (45.8%) followed by 1-3 yrs (42.9%), 3-5 yrs (6.4%), above 11 yrs (1.9%), 5-7 yrs (1.6%), 7-9 yrs (1.2%) and the least being 9-11 yrs (0.2%).

Results

Manages often adopted strategies which guide or direct the activities and behaviours of their subordinates toward goals, opportunities, and methods (Prescriptive Mean = 3.49). Prescriptiveii leadership provides subordinates a direction to channel their efforts, leader acts as a model regarding how things should be done, engages in positive reinforcement to encourage the repetition of desired behaviors, and sets parameters specifying subordinates sphere of influence.

Sometimes managers adopted strategies which constrain or prohibit activities and behaviours with respect to goals, opportunities, and methods (Restrictive Mean = 3.04). Restrictiveii leadership provides subordinates directions that should not be pursued, the leader acts as a model regarding behaviors to be avoided, leader engages in negative feedback to discourage the repetition of undesired behaviors, and sets parameters restricting subordinates sphere of influence.

When the mean is 4.0 and above the prescriptive strategies are said to be strong and do have a constructive impactiii on others. When the mean is 2.0 – 2.5 the restrictive strategies are strong and will have defensive impact on others. When the restrictive and prescriptive strategies are equal then they cancel out each other and this will decrease the constructive impact and increase the passive/defensive impact on others. However when both restrictive and prescriptive strategies are weak then these behaviours are not exhibited by managers in IT organizations.

IT managers leadership strategies to a great extent has a constructive impact (Mean = 3.37) on others i.e. it motivates employees to think and behave in achievement-oriented and cooperative ways that emphasize growth and development. This was followed by defensive impact (Mean = 2.79) i.e. drive people to think and behave in either aggressive or passive ways to protect their status and position. The leadership strategies have a moderate passive/defensive impact on subordinates i.e. possibly inadvertently; these leaders adopt strategies that lead others to feel insecure or apprehensive, controlled and constrained, and uneasy about

interpersonal relations within the organizations. They also have a moderate aggressive/defensive impact (Mean = 2.75) i.e. directly or indirectly, these leaders exhibit strategies that lead others to feel anxious about their status and influence, worry about how they look relative to others, and fixate on short-term (and sometimes irrelevant) performance criteria.

Table 1 Indicating the relationship between responses towards dissatisfaction and variables.

Table1: Indicating the Frequency and percentage on the response to job dissatisfaction items.

Response to Dissatisfaction	EXIT		VOICE		LOYALTY		NEGLECT	
	FQ	%	FQ	%	FQ	%	FQ	%
Job Satisfaction Items	FQ	%	FQ	%	FQ	%	FQ	%
Job security	121	23.5	211	41.0	147	28.5	36	7.0
Interest (from intrinsic aspects of job)	31	6.0	301	58.4	159	30.9	24	4.7
Opportunity for advancement	52	10.1	292	56.7	153	29.7	18	3.5
Appreciation from management	50	9.7	243	47.2	192	37.3	30	5.8
Company policies and management practices	49	9.5	239	46.4	184	35.7	43	8.3
Intrinsic aspects of job (excluding ease)								
	38	7.4	284	55.1	160	31.1	33	6.4
Salary	99	19.2	254	49.3	132	25.6	30	5.8
Supervision	55	10.7	282	54.8	148	28.7	30	5.8
Social aspects of job	48	9.3	266	51.7	161	31.3	40	7.8
Working conditions (excluding hours)	42	8.2	276	53.6	173	33.6	24	4.7
Communication	22	4.3	300	58.3	161	31.3	32	6.2
Hours (from working conditions)	59	11.5	274	53.2	150	29.1	32	6.2
Ease (from intrinsic aspects of job)	43	8.3	281	54.6	156	30.3	35	6.8
Benefits	62	12.0	240	46.6	188	36.5	25	4.9
Fair treatment	89	17.3	243	47.2	152	29.5	31	6.0

IT employee's most preferred response to dissatisfaction was voice followed by loyalty, exit and neglect was least preferred. This pattern was observed on all the fourteen items except communication item where neglect is preferred after voice and loyalty and exit was least preferred. Exit was mostly preferred when dissatisfaction was with job security (23.5%), salary (19.2%), and fair treatment (17.3%) and least preferred when dissatisfied with communication (4.3%), interest (from intrinsic aspects of job) (6%), and intrinsic aspects of job (excluding ease) (7.4%). Voice was most preferred response to dissatisfaction for interest (from intrinsic aspects of job) (58.4%), communication (58.3%), and opportunity for advancement (56.7%) and lesser preferred response towards job security (41%), company policies and management practices (46.4%) and benefits (46.6%). Loyalty was the most preferred response to appreciation from management (37.7%), benefits (36.5%) and company policies and management practices (35.1%) and was preferred lesser for salary (25.6%), job security (28.5%) and supervision (28.7%). Neglect response was preferred as a response to company policies and management practices (8.3%), social aspects of job (7.8%) and job security (7%) and least preferred for opportunity for advancement (3.5%), interest (from intrinsic aspects of job), working conditions (excluding hours) (4.7%) and benefits (4.9).

The chi square indicating the strength of relationship between variables, that is, 245.394, more the value higher the relationship between two variables. Since Sig. Value is less than .01 the relationship is statistically significant.

H1: There will be no significant relationship between leadership strategies and leadership impact in IT organizations. The results shown in Table I of the Appendix indicate that the null hypothesis H1 is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted that there was significant relationship between leadership strategies and leadership impact in IT organizations.

It was found that Restrictive (.480**) leadership strategies were positively correlated to Constructive leadership strategy impact. Restrictive leadership strategy was positively correlated to Passive/Defensive (.424**) and Aggressive/

Defensive (.428**) defensive.

The strongest correlation was found between Prescriptive leadership strategy and Constructive impact (795**).

H2: Leadership strategies of managers have no influence on the leadership impact on employees in IT organizations.

The results shown in Tables II,III and IV of the Appendix indicate that the null hypothesis H2 is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is accepted. Leadership strategies of managers did influence the leadership impact on employees in IT organizations.

Prescriptive and Restrictive leadership strategies significantly influenced Constructive impact. Prescriptive leadership strategy had the strongest influence followed by Restrictive leadership strategy. Together these two variables explained 98.5% (R Square = .985) of the variation in the Constructive impact on respondents and the model was found to be significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

Prescriptive and Restrictive leadership strategies significantly influenced Passive/Defensive impact. Restrictive leadership strategy had the strongest influence. Prescriptive leadership strategy had a Negative influence on Passive/Defensive impact. Together these three variables explained 96.5% (R Square = .965) of the variation in the Passive/Defensive impact on respondents and the model was found to be significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

It was found that Restrictive, Prescriptive leadership strategies significantly influenced Aggressive/Defensive impact. Restrictive leadership strategy had the strongest influence. Prescriptive leadership strategy had a Negative influence on Aggressive/Defensive impact. Together these two variables explained 96.2% (R Square = .962) of the variation in the Aggressive/Defensive impact on respondents and the model was found to be significant at the 0.01 level of significance.

H3: Leadership strategies' impact on employees does not affect the expression of job dissatisfaction of employees in IT organizations.

Results from Table V of the Appendix indicate that H3 is rejected as leadership strategies did affect the expression of job dissatisfaction of employees. Standard Canonical Discriminant Function - stepwise discriminant analysis was performed to identify which Independent variables distinguished and affected response to dissatisfaction with reference to job satisfaction dimensions.

The pattern of response to dissatisfaction towards job security was that (all variables remaining unchanged) when managers used higher restrictive leadership strategy respondents were more likely to choose the neglect response. Higher passive/defensive impact on respondents, they were more likely to choose the loyalty response -interest (from intrinsic aspects of job). When managers experienced higher aggressive/defensive impact, they were more likely to choose the neglect response (opportunity for advancement). Higher passive/defensive impact on respondents, they were more likely to choose the exit response. When managers used prescriptive leadership strategy, respondents chose loyalty response appreciation (from management). When managers used higher restrictive leadership strategy respondents were more likely to choose the exit response (company policy and management practices). When managers used higher constructive impact on respondents, they were more likely to choose the neglect

response for intrinsic aspects of job (excluding ease). When employees experienced higher passive/defensive impact, they were more likely to choose the exit response (social aspects of job). When employees experienced passive/defensive impact they were more likely to choose the exit response for working conditions (excluding hours). When employees experienced higher passive/defensive impact they were more likely to choose the exit response (communication). When employees experienced higher constructive impact they were more likely to choose the neglect response (from intrinsic aspects of job). The pattern of response to dissatisfaction towards salary, supervision, hours (from working conditions), benefits and fair treatment was mixed.

Discussion

Leadership strategy: Prescriptive and restrictive leadership strategies significantly influenced constructive impact. Managers today apart from guiding and directing need to in some way engage in transforming, shaping or influencing the organizational context of members and the ways in which they approach their work and interact with one another. Managers potentially have numerous tools at their disposal for increasing their effectiveness. The most important tool revolves around the strategy, skills and behaviours that have been shown through research to be related to measures of leadership performance. Prescriptive strategies generally are more effective than restrictive strategies. It serves to define a direction for the system, establish structures for organization learning and adaptation, and support processes for problem solving and the integration of organizational components. They create and reinforce an organizational culture that communicates constructive norms and expectations to members.

Leaders with constructive impact motivate people to think and behave in achievement oriented and cooperative ways that emphasize growth and development. The benefits are better performance, higher levels of personal satisfaction and lower levels of stress. Leaders with defensive impact drive people to think and behave in either aggressive or passive ways to protect their status and position. Effective leaders organizationally tend to be visionary and future oriented, promoting empowerment and productivity, bringing out the best in people and concerned with long-term performance. Personal effectiveness of leaders is viewed as relaxed and at ease, ready for promotion to a higher level, accepting of feedback, and interested in self-development.

Improve leadership effectiveness by having a more constructive and less defensive impact by emphasizing prescriptive over restrictive strategies. Processes to increase the understanding/awareness of managers of their impact they currently are having on others should be mirrored. These include the degree to which they rely on prescriptive and restrictive strategies. The roots of this approach is grounded in the classic works of Rensis Likert, Douglas McGregor, Warren Bennis (1985) and James O'Toole (1995).

Both prescriptive and restrictive strategies reflect and effect leadership and the fact is that leaders use a combination of prescriptive and restrictive strategies. IT employees are knowledge workers, able and willing to engage in task accomplishment indicating high maturity. In a context like this it is desirable that leaders adopt prescriptive rather than restrictive strategies as they are more functional in IT organizations. This in turn will increase the constructive impact on IT employees.

The methods to be used by leaders in IT organizations to move the organization and its members towards the desired state of future affairs are by providing employees with – a direction to channel their efforts, provide for models regarding how things should be done, engaging in positive reinforcement to encourage the repetition of desired behaviours and communicate a set of parameters specifying their sphere of influence. The restrictive strategies are usually used for reasons such as ease of implementation, time pressures, and the capabilities and diagnostics of those being led. It also increases defensive behaviours by employees. Processes to engage in are to recollect the past, determine what one wants in the future, prepare a vision statement, act on one's intuition, test basic beliefs, and look into the future (Kouzes and Posner, 1995). Methods such as reversal, use of analogies, challenging of assumptions, choice of entry points etc. (de Bono, 1970) are helpful.

Restrictive strategies may be implemented to correct deviations, to discourage undesirable behaviours, to keep problem solving on-track and rational, or to achieve administrative efficiencies. They do have a desired effect on a short run. In the long run their effects are unanticipated and counterproductive leading to a passive and aggressive culture which will interfere with the employees and managers performance. These behaviours will lead managers to use more directive and restrictive leadership tactics and less supportive ones which are less dependent on the situation.

Leadership impact: As constructive impact significantly influenced working conditions, (excluding hours), social aspects of job, supervision and other job satisfaction dimensions, managers in IT can increase their constructive impact when they move towards a defining/envisioning and facilitating/creating a setting and move away from constraining behaviours. They have an impact on employees' self-actualizing behaviours when they move away from vertical and toward lateral/stimulating thinking behaviours and move away from constraining and toward facilitating/creating a setting behaviours.

Response to dissatisfaction: IT organizations need to pay closer attention to the diversity of the workforce and design company policies that increases inclusion and reduces discrimination in the workforce regarding recruitment, selection, induction and socialization, training and development, career and succession planning, promotion and transfer policies, pay and benefits administration, challenging jobs and work design, opportunities to engage in decision making, autonomy and freedom to plan and execute work, empowerment and participation, employee welfare and involvement programs, employee engagement and talent acquisition programs, performance management systems and healthy employer-employee relations, and finally the exit process. All these processes and policies need to be fair to all employees irrespective of the diversity. This will increase the commitment and loyalty of employees and they will be able to engage in active and constructive ways in responding to dissatisfaction. Increases constructive impact on employees and reduce defensive impact. These will certainly decrease the level of dissatisfaction of IT employees and create a psychologically non-threatening work environment which will increase the likelihood of IT employees choosing voice and loyalty as responses to dissatisfaction more frequently and not exhibiting exit and neglect responses when dissatisfied.

Limitations of the study: The self-report of leadership strategies and impact and response to dissatisfaction that

were taken from each respondent present the problem of common method variance. This problem is reduced as the reliability and validity of the instruments were found to be high. Genuineness in self-report is taken for granted in the present study like in any other surveys and interviews. The scope of the present study can be extended to do a path analysis among the variables.

Suggestions for further research: This study should be replicated in other sectors to ascertain if the findings hold true in all organizations. Attempts should be made to obtain measures of exogenous and endogenous variables at different periods of time on leadership strategies and impact, and response to dissatisfaction. Other models and relationships can be developed and tested and critical human resource management and organizational behaviour variables can be investigated as Dependent variables.

Conclusion: The findings of the present study pinpoint certain relevant conclusions, particularly focusing on the centrality of leadership as critical Independent variable affecting the response to dissatisfaction of IT employees. The study indicated that Prescriptive leadership strategy had a Constructive impact on employees; organizations need to nurture and imbibe as part of their organization culture the behaviours that reinforce Prescriptive leadership behaviours and decrease Restrictive leadership strategy so that Passive/Defensive and Aggressive/Defensive behaviours are reduced. The employee's response to dissatisfaction was more Active and Constructive when the use of Prescriptive leadership strategy and Constructive impact was more. Therefore organizations need to create shared meaning among their managers to engage in these behaviours more. Organizations need to factor in demographic differences while planning and executing manpower, recruitment, training, and development policies Career and succession plans, empowerment and involvement programs, benefits and compensation policies, safety, health and welfare programs and any other policies introduced should ensure that diversity of the workforce needs to be taken care of and should be perceived as fair to all groups of knowledge workers.

References

Agrusa, E. D. (2010). Exploring the relationship of learning of learning strategies and transformational leadership for business managers. University of Southern California). Pro-Quest Dissertations and Theses,99.

Alt Powell, E. (2006), 'Fewer people mean doing more with less', The Houston Chronicle, January 23, p. D1, D4.

Ballinger, G. A., & Schoorman F. D. (2007), 'Individual reactions to leadership succession in Workgroups', Academy of Management Review, Vol. 32(1), 118-136.

Bajpai, N., & Srivastava, D. (2004), 'Sectorial comparison of factors influencing job satisfaction in Indian banking sector', Singapore Management Review, 26(2), 89- 99.

Boies, K., Lvina, E,&Martens, M. L. (2010), 'Shared leadership and team performance in a business strategy simulation', Journal of Personnel Psychology, Vol. 9(4), 195-202.

Bono, J.E., Foldes, H. J., Vinson, G., & Muros, J. P. (2007), ' Workplace emotions: The role of supervision and leader-

ship', Journal of Applied Psychology, September, Vol. 92, Issue 5, 1357-1367.

Blank, Warren, B., Weitzel, J. R., & Green, S. G. (1990), 'A test of the situational leadership Theory',Personnel Psychology, 43, 579-597.

Caryl E. Rusbult, C. E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Mainous III, A. G (1988). Impact of Exchange Variables on Exit, Voice, Loyalty, and Neglect: An Integrative Model of Responses to Declining Job Satisfaction,The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 31,(3).

Colbert, A. E., & Witt, L. A. (2009), 'The role of goal-focused leadership in enabling the expression of conscientiousness', Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 94(3), May, 790-796.

Clements,C & Washbush BJ, (1999) 'The two faces of leadership: considering the dark side of leader-follower dynamics', Journal of Workplace Learning', Vol. 11, 5, 170 - 176

Cooke, R. A. (2008). Leadership/Impact® Feedback Report. Plymouth, MI, USA: Human Synergistics International.

Dale, K., & Fox, M. L. (2008), 'Leadership style and organizational commitment: Mediating effect of role stress', Journal of Managerial Issues, Spring, Vol. 20 (8), 109-130.

Daley, D. M. (1992), 'When bureaucrats get the blues: a replication and extension of the Rusbult and Lowery analysis of federal employee responses to job dissatisfaction, Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, J-PART, Vol. 2(3), July, 233-246.

Luthans, F. (2002), 'The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior',Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23: 695-706.

Fix, B., & Sias, P. M. (2006), Person-Centered communication, leader-member exchange, and employee job satisfaction. Communication Research Reports, Vol. 23(1), January, 35-44.

Frank, D., Wilfred, H., & Zong, D. (2007), 'The impact of effective strategic planning and leadership on employee satisfaction', Competition Forum, Vol. 5, Issue 1, 243-252.

Farrell, D. (1983). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect as responses to job dissatisfaction: a multidimensional scaling, The Academy of Management Journal, December, Vol. 26(4), 596-607.

Gentry, W. A., Griggs, T. L., Deal, J. J., Mondore, S. P., & Cox, B. D. (2011), 'A comparison of generational differences in endorsement of leadership practices with actual leadership skill level', Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, Vol. 63(1), March, 39-49.

Hunter, S. T., Thoroughgood, C. N., Myer, A. T., & Ligon, G. S. (2011), 'Paradoxes of leading innovative endeavours: Summary, solutions, and future directions', Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, Vol. 5(1), February, 54-66.

- Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: Lessons for management leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 231-241.
- Korentz, G. (2005). U. S. job satisfaction keeps falling. *The Conference Board Reports Today*, The Conference Board, February 28, <http://www.conference-board.org/utilities/pressPrinterFriendly.cfm?pressID=2582>.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B.Z. (1995), 'The Leadership Challenge', Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Krishnan, V. R., & Arora, P. (2008), Determinants of transformational leadership and organizational citizenship behaviour. *Asia-Pacific Business Review*, January - March, Vol. 4(1), 34-43.
- Madlock, P. E. (2008), The link between leadership style, communicator competence, and employee satisfaction. *Journal of Business Communication*, Vol. 45(1), 61-78.
- Manning, T. T. (2002). Gender, managerial level, transformational leadership and work satisfaction. *Gender in Management*, 17(5), 207-216. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/213153678?accountid=38885>
- Lapierre, L. M. & Hackett, R. D. (2007), 'Trait conscientiousness, leader-member exchange, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour: A test of an integrative model', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80: 539-554.
- Likert, R. (1967) *The Human Organization: Its management and value*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- Patrick, H. A (2012). Influence of power bases on leadership strategies adopted by managers' in *Information technology organizations*, *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol 4, No. 11, 94-100.
- Perry, R., & Mankin, L. (2007). Organizational trust, trust in the chief executive and work satisfaction. *Public Personnel Management*, 36(2), 165-179.
- Rusbult, C. E., Farrell, D., Rogers, G., & Mainous III, A. G. (1988), Impact of exchange variables on exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: An integrative model of responses to declining job satisfaction. *The Academy of Management Journal*, September, Vol. 31(3), 599-627.
- Rusbult, C. E., & Lowery, D. (1985). When bureaucrats get the blues: Responses to dissatisfaction among federal employees. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15: 80-103.
- Schulte, M., Ostroff, C., & Kinick, A. J. (2006), 'Organizational climate systems and psychological climate perceptions: A cross-level study of climate-satisfaction relationships', *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 79, 645-671.
- Suar, D., Tewari, H. R., & Chaturbedi, K. R. (2006), 'Subordinates' perception of leadership styles and their work behaviour', *Psychology and Developing Societies*, Vol. 18(1), 95-114.
- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S., & Peng, A. C. (2011), 'Cognition-based and affect-based trust as mediators of leader behaviour influences on team performance', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, March, Abstract.
- Sosik, J. J., and Cameron J. C. (2010), 'Character and authentic transformational leadership behaviour: Expanding the ascetic self toward others'. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, Vol. 62(4), December, 251-269.
- Stenmark, C. K., Shipman, A. S., & Mumford, M. D. (2011), 'Managing the innovative process: The dynamic role of leaders'. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, Vol. 5(1), February, 67-80, Abstract.
- Thomas, D. C and Au, K. (2002), 'The Effect of Cultural Differences on Behavioral Responses to Low Job Satisfaction', *Journal of International Business Studies* Vol. 33, No. 2 (2nd Qtr., 2002), pp. 309-326.
- Turnley, W. H.; Feldman, D. C. (2000), 'Re-examining the Effect of Contract Violations: Unmet Expectations and Job Dissatisfaction', *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21: 25-42. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200002)21:1<25::AID-JOB2>3.0.CO;2-Z
- Vecchio, R. P., Justin, J. E. & Pearce, C. L. (2008), 'The utility of transactional and transformational leadership for predicting performance and satisfaction within a path-goal theory framework'. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81: 71-82.
- Wallace, J. C., Johnson, P. D., Mathe, K., & Paul, J. (2011), 'Structural and psychological empowerment climates, performance, and the moderating role of shared felt accountability: A managerial perspective'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, March, Abstract.
- Withey & Cooper (1989), 'What's loyalty? Employee responsibilities and Rights', 5(3), 231-240.
- Yaffe, K., & Kark, R. (2011), 'Leading by example: The case of leader OCB'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, March, Abstract.
- Zhang, Z., & Peterson, S. J. (2011). 'Advice networks in teams: The role of transformational leadership and members' core self-evaluations', *Journal of Applied Psychology*, April, Abstract.
- Zhou, J and George, J. M. (2001), 'When job dissatisfaction leads to creativity: Encouraging the expression of voice', *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(4), 682-696.

Appendix

Table I Indicating Pearson correlations among leadership strategies adopted by managers and its impact in IT organizations

Leadership Strategies	Leadership Strategies Impact ^a					
	Constructive	Sig.	Passive/Defensive	Sig.	Aggressive/Defensive	Sig.
Prescriptive leadership strategy	.795**	.000	.009	.415	-.065	.072
Restrictive leadership strategy	.480**	.000	.424**	.000	.428**	.000

* Significant at the 0.05 level. ** Significant at the 0.01 level.
 aFrom Leadership/Impact® Feedback Report by R.A. Cooke, Human Synergistics. Copyright © 2008 by Human Synergistics International. Adapted by permission

Table II indicating Model Summary of squared multiple correlations of Leadership Strategies (Prescriptive and Restrictive) with Constructive leadership impact

Model	R	R Square(a)	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
	.992(d)	.985	.985	.42790

d Predictors: prescriptive, restrictive

Table III indicating Model Summary of squared multiple correlations of Leadership Strategies (Prescriptive and Restrictive) with Passive/Defensive leadership impact

Model	R	R Square(a)	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
	.983(d)	.965	.965	.53101

d Predictors: restrictive, prescriptive

Table IV indicating Model Summary of squared multiple correlations of Leadership Strategies (Prescriptive and Restrictive) with Aggressive/Defensive leadership impact

Model	R	R Square(a)	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
	.981(f)	.962	.962	.55028

f Predictors: restrictive, prescriptive

Table V Indicating discriminant analysis for managerial leadership strategies, and leadership impact) and response to dissatisfaction on dimensions

Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients	Unstandardized Coefficients	Unstandardized canonical discriminant coefficients			%ACCURATE
JOB SECURITY						
	Function		Function		Function	
	1		1		1	
Restrictive Strategies	-.890	Restrictive Strategies	-1.849	Neglect	-.974	73.5
INTEREST (from intrinsic aspects of job)						
Passive/Defensive	.875	Passive/Defensive	1.602	Loyalty	.250	54.7
OPPORTUNITY FOR ADVANCEMENT						
Aggressive/Defensive	.971	Aggressive/Defensive	1.783	Neglect	1.289	78.4
APPRECIATION (from management)						
Passive/Defensive	-.714	Passive/Defensive	-1.328	Exit	-.866	70.4
Prescriptive	-.626	Prescriptive	-.904	Loyalty	-.224	56.4
COMPANY POLICY AND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES						
Restrictive	1.000	Restrictive	1.961	Exit	-.242	60.9
INTRINSIC ASPECTS OF JOB (excluding ease)						
Constructive	1.038	Constructive	1.394	Neglect	1.027	77.5
SOCIAL ASPECTS OF JOB						
Passive/Defensive	.525	Passive/Defensive	.819	Exit	.479	75.6
WORKING CONDITIONS (excluding hours).						
Passive/Defensive	-.800	Passive/Defensive	-1.274	Exit	-.627	77.3

COMMUNICATION						
Passive/Defensive	-.648	Passive/Defensive	-1.005	Exit	-1.223	85.2
EASE (from intrinsic aspects of job)						
Constructive	-.683	Constructive	-1.022	Neglect	-.572	69.2

From Leadership/Impact® Feedback Report by R.A. Cooke, Human Synergistics. Copyright © 2008 by Human Synergistics International. Adapted by permission.

Dr. Harold Andrew Patrick
 Associate professor and Head - OB and HRM
 Institute of Management
 Christ University
 haroldpatrick@christuniversity.in
 haroldpatrick@hotmail.com