Motivational Training Programme: Effects on the Development of Leadership Styles in Agricultural Scientists

Neeraj Singh[1], B.P. Sinha[2] and K. Vijayaragavan[3]

1. Scientist, IIVR, Varanasi, 2. Former Prof. & Head,Agril. Ext. IARI, New Delhi,
3. Pricipal Scientist, Agril. Ext. IARI, New Delhi

ABSTRACT

Leadership style helps in not only achievement of organizational goals but also will release energies for personal growth and development. The over all picture that emerges from the present study is that majority of the scientists did not seem to believe in authoritarian or dominative type of leadership at least at cognitive level. The experimental and control group respondents differ significantly on dominative and motivating empowering leadership styles i.e., *the control group respondents had a higher level of dominative leadership style and lower level of enabling leadership value/style as compared to the experimental group respondents. Thus, it seems that training has created a lasting impact on the agricultural scientists which appears affecting their work life situation also.*

Key words: *Leadership; Training; Agricultural Scientists*

Agricultural scientists including extension officials are in leadership positions and their styles affect farmers and others with whom they work. Such styles represent the functionaries, which in turn may result in achievement of not only the goals of the organization but also will release energies for personal growth and development. A popular classification of leadership includes autocratic, democratic and laissez faire types. But they are seldom accepted as watertight compartments. Tannon Baum and Schmitt (1958) proposed that the continuum of leadership behavior based on combinations of leadership authorities and freedom. In the present study, however, leadership values/styles of farm scientists has been taken into account in the context of their working with farmers as well as their subordinates in the organization. These four styles or leadership values studied are directive, prescriptive, facilitative and enabling in nature and effect.

The directive and prescriptive type of leadership envisages controlling others' behaviour or action in the leader's way. The leader in this case dominates the action situation and objectifies others. Hence these together represent "Dominative leadership values/style (DOLS)". The other style is educative in nature, which tries to ensure

Action is to be taken on the initiative of the actor but in accordance with the norm set or the process deemed fit by the leader. Hence, there is an implicit attempt to patronize one's behavior. Hence, this pattern was named as "Patronizing Educative style of leadership (PAED)". The last style is enabling in nature, which basically addresses itself to develop capabilities in the people so that they may initiate action with full autonomy. This infact generates abilities or create power in people to enable him to take action and then mobilize him to realize this power. Hence this style was named as "Motivating Empowering Leadership Style (MOEM)".

METHODOLOGY

The present study was experimental in nature based on training programme "Motivation for work, empowerment and development", organized by Division of Agricultural Extension, IARI, New Delhi with an exumption that the agricultural scientists/extension officials in particular reinforce dominative behavior among their clients through institutionalized extension activities. The participants of the motivational training programme who were forty in number were agricultural scientists from ICAR institutes and SAUs, selected for present study and for seeing the impact, a similar group from ICAR institutes and SAUs were selected as control group, *i.e.*, those not subjected to any motivational training programme. Data from the experimental group were collected after six months of training to see the effects of training in actual working conditions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A perusal of data reported in Table 1 reveals that 15 respondents were at middle level in two styles and at lower level on the third and six respondents were at the middle level on all the three styles. But it is quite interesting to note that about 62 per cent of them were very low on dominative style and 40 per cent of them were very high on motivating empowering style of leadership. The two extremes of the leadership style, which are mutually exclusive, are quite prominent in this study. It is very important and highly desirable that agricultural scientists

should not be authoritarian or dominative while carrying out development or extension activities. This will help his clients to acquire necessary abilities to take initiative and march on the path of development by his own choice rather than on the direction of others.

Table 1. The respondents (trainees) level on the three leadership styles.

Dominative	Facilitative	Enabling	f
Low	Low	High	10
Low	Medium	High	5
Low	Medium	Medium	10
High	Low	Medium	2
Medium	Medium	Medium	6
Medium	Low	Medium	5
Medium	High	Low	1
Medium	Low	High	1
		Total	40

Table 2. Dimensions of leadership style scores obtained by experimental and control group of agricultural scientists.

Dimensions	Frequency	
	Experimental Group (N=40)	Control Group (N=40)
Dominative Leadership Values/Style (DOLS)		
0 - 2	25(62.50)	15 (37.50)
3 - 5	13 (32.50)	21 (52.50)
6 - 8	02 (05.00)	04 (10.00)
Mean	2.250	3.150
SD	1.597	1.657
Range	0 to 6	0 to 6
t value	– 2.47* (P > .01)	
Patronizing Educative Leadership Values/Style (PAED)		
0 - 2	18 (45.00)	23 (57.50)
3 - 5	21 (52.50)	16 (40.00)
6 - 8	01 (02.50)	01 (02.50)
Mean	2.600	2.550
SD	1.464	1.154
Range	0 to 6	1 to 6
t value	.17^{NS}	
Motivating Empowering Leadership Values/Style (MOEM)		
0 - 2	01 (02.50)	07 (17.50)
3 - 5	23 (57.50)	22 (55.00)
6 - 8	16 (40.00)	11 (27.50)
Mean	5.175	4.300
SD	1.781	1.977
Range	1 to 8	0 to 8
t value	2.08* (P > .041)	

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

Further, the data reported in Table 2 present the leadership scores obtained by the experimental and control group respondents. There is significant difference between the two groups of respondents with regard to their leadership styles. The control group respondents had a higher level of dominative leadership style and lower level of enabling leadership style as compared to the experimental group respondents. It may be mentioned here that the leadership values/styles of experimental group respondents were measured on fourth day of the training programme and by that time they were already exposed to several learning processes regarding social achievement and influence motivation, etc., which are so relevant to the leadership styles. It is, therefore, possible that this difference between the two groups of respondents might have been caused by these training inputs/interventions.

The overall picture that emerged from the above analysis was that majority of the scientists had medium to high level of enabling leadership style. They did not seem to believe in authoritarian or dominative type of leadership at least at cognitive level. It is important to understand that it was only respondents' behaviuor as obtained in response to the instrument. When the same respondents were later subjected to some simulation games for behavioural changes, during the training processes, a contrary image seemed to emerge.

Table 3. Dimensions of leadership style scores obtained by experimental group - during training and after six months of training programme.

Dimensions	Frequency of Experimental Group	
	During Training (N=20)	After Six Month (N=20)
Dominative Leadership Values/Style (DOLS)		
0 - 2	11 (55.00)	15 (75.00)
3 - 5	08 (40.00)	05 (25.00)
6 - 8	01 (05.00)	00 (00.00)
Mean	2.250	1.550
SD	1.832	1.356
Range	0 to 6	0 to 5
t value	1.37^{NS}	
Patronizing Educative Leadership Values/Style (PAED)		
0 - 2	08 (40.00)	10 (50.00)
3 - 5	11 (55.00)	10 (50.00)
6 - 8	01 (05.00)	00 (00.00)
Mean	2.850	2.400
SD	1.348	1.569
Range	0 to 6	0 to 5
t value	.97^{NS}	
Motivating Empowering Leadership Values/Style (MOEM)		
0 - 2	01 (05.00)	0 (00.00)
3 - 5	12 (60.00)	9 (45.00)
6 - 8	07 (35.00)	9 (45.00)
9 - 11	00 (00.00)	2 (10.00)
Mean	4.950	6.050
SD	1.73	1.669
Range	1 to 8	3 to 9
t value	- 2.05* (P=. 048)	

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages.

During tower building exercise, they were found to be quite dominative, and directive in their orientation towards subordinates. They seemed to be direct towards objectifying their subordinates with complete disregard of their potential and need for autonomy. When their behavioural data were processed and reflected back, they were quite amazed on their own dissonance. May be that the training interventions made during the earlier four days might have moulded their thought process towards enabling type of orientation towards others, but conversion of the thought into behaviour is a time taking process. Creation of such cognitive dissonance between "thoughts" or "desirable" and actual behaviour was an important element of the training strategy designed to accelerate the process of behavioural change.

The scientists of the experimental group checked the same leadership style questionnaire six months after the training. The questionnaire was sent to all the forty respondents of experimental group for this but only twenty scientists returned the filled in questionnaire. The data in Table 3 show the leadership style of the 20 scientists of experimental group during the training and after six months of training programme. It is interesting to note that there was a change in their orientation to leadership styles. The shift has taken place in case of all the three styles, but it is substantial and also statistically significant only in case of motivating empowering (enabling) leadership style.

CONCLUSION

It is evident that the movement towards motivating empowering (enabling) type of leadership style is continuing after the training. Similarly there is a movement away in dominative type of leadership style though it is statistically not significant. Thus the training seems to have created a lasting impact on the agricultural scientists, which appears affecting their work life situation also. This may be reinforced through exposing them to another such training course or a course suitably designed for them to enhance the impact to register a difference, which may be statistically significant.

REFERENCES

1. Bartley, N. L. (1987) Relationship of leadership style, gender, personality, and training of outward Bound instructors and their course outcomes. Dissertation abstracts international, A Humanities and Social Sciences. 48: 11, p. 2979.
2. Mehta, P. (1994) Social Achievement Motivation: Needs, Values and Work organization, Concept Publishing Co., New Delhi
3. Singh, Neeraj (1997) Motivating and Empowering Agricultural scientists for facilitative and people oriented development activities- An action research, Ph.D thesis submitted to I.A.R.I., New Delhi.