



Research Paper-Education

A study of leadership behaviour and its impact on working style of employee in private Bank

Dr. Aprajita

1. Introduction

Leadership behaviour is the characters and actions that make a person very effective as a leader. This behaviour is the process by which a person can guide, direct and influence the work of others to meet specific goals. These actions and different strategies could be learned to increase the effectiveness of those around them. Individuals use these behaviours to motivate people into action when they have a vision for an organization, a product or a group of people.

2. Effective Leadership Behaviour

Good leadership behaviour is crucial in order to become someone who inspires and leads people to maximize efficiency and to achieve the goals of the organization.

A list leadership behaviour is mentioned below:

1. Be honest
2. Be confident in decision
3. Be approachable
4. Provide objective feedback
5. Lead by Example
6. Create a reward program for staff members
7. Change how you approach your work
8. Address potential issues they become problems
9. Pay attention to the needs of individual employees and try to meet them
10. Encourage creativity by keeping lines of communication

3. Variables of the study

1. Independent variables

Level of leadership behaviour

- a) High
- b) Medium
- c) Low

1. Dependent variables

Working style of bank employees

4. Objectives

1. To study the leadership behaviour of employees of private banks.
2. To study the working styles of employees of private banks.
3. To study the effect of leadership behaviour of employees on their working styles.

5. Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between mean scores of working style inventory of high and medium level leadership behaviour.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between mean scores of working style inventory of high- and low-level leadership behaviour.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference between mean scores of working style inventory of medium and low-level leadership behaviour.

6. Research Method

In present research, the researcher studied the impact of leadership behaviour on working style of bank employees of private banks. The researcher constructed Leadership Behaviour Inventory and Working Style Inventory. These inventories were given to the employees of private banks. To collect this information, the researcher used survey method.

7. Sample of the study

The researcher selected 70 employees from different branches of following four banks.

Table 1.0 :Sample of the Study

No.	Bank	Subjects
1	ICICI	23
2	HDFC	18
3	INDUSIND	12
4	AXIS	17
Total		100

8. Research Tools

1. Leadership Behaviour Inventory
2. Working Style Inventory

The researcher constructed Leadership Behaviour Inventory and Working Style Inventory. In each inventory, there were 30 items.

9. Procedure of Data Collection

The researcher visited every bank and got permission for data collection from bank manager. At specific time determined with bank manager, the researcher gave inventory to the bank employees. They very explained about details of both the inventory. The bank employees filled both the inventories and returned it to the researcher.

10. Techniques of Data Analysis

The researcher constructed hypotheses which were checked using t-test.

11. Results of t-tests

H₀₁ There is no significant difference between mean scores of working style inventory of high and medium level leadership behaviour.

Table 2.0 Mean, SD, SED and t-value of bank employees having

Leadership Behaviour	N	M	SD	SED	t	Significance
High	17	52.53	6.31	2.01	3.63	0.01
Medium	32	45.23	7.42			

df	0.01	0.05
47	2.68	2.01

From above table, the mean score obtained in working style inventory by employees having high and medium leadership behaviour are 52.53 and 45.23 respectively. The standard deviations are 6.31 and 7.42, standard error of deviation is 2.01 and calculated t-value is 3.63.

For, $df=47$, table t-values are 2.68 at 0.01 level and 2.01 at 0.05 level. Calculated t-value more than table t-values at both the levels. Thus, hypothesis is rejected and there is a significant difference between mean scores of employees having high and medium leadership behaviour.

Moreover, mean score of employees having high level of behaviour is more than that of mean score of employees having medium level of behaviour. Thus, it is said that the employee having higher leadership behaviour has good working style than that of employee having medium leadership behaviour.

H₀₂ There is no significant difference between mean scores of working style inventory of high and low level leadership behaviour.

Table 3.0 :Mean, SD, SED and t-value of bank employees having

Leadership Behaviour	N	M	SD	SED	t	Significance
High	17	52.53	6.31	1.94	7.95	0.01
Low	21	37.11	5.47			

df	0.01	0.05
36	2.72	2.03

From above table, the mean score obtained in working style inventory by employees having high and low leadership behaviour are 52.53 and 37.11 respectively. The standard deviations are 6.31 and 5.47, standard error of deviation is 1.94 and calculated t-value is 7.95.

For, $df=36$, table t-values are 2.72 at 0.01 level and 2.03 at 0.05 level. Calculated t-value more than table t-values at both the levels. Thus, hypothesis is rejected and there is a significant difference between mean scores of employees having high and low leadership behaviour.

Moreover, mean score of employees having high level of behaviour is more than that of mean score of employees having low level of behaviour. Thus, it is said that the employee having high leadership behaviour has good working style than that of employee having low leadership behaviour.

H₀₃ There is no significant difference between mean scores of working style inventory of medium and low level leadership behaviour.

Table 4.0 Mean, SD, SED and t-value of bank employees having

Leadership Behaviour		N	M	SD	SED	t	Significance
Medium		32	45.23	7.42	1.77	4.59	0.01
Low		21	37.11	5.47			

df		0.01	0.05
51		2.68	2.01

From above table, the mean score obtained in working style inventory by employees having medium and low leadership behaviour are 45.23 and 37.11 respectively. The standard deviations are 7.42 and 5.47, standard error of deviation is 1.77 and calculated t-value is 4.59.

For, $df=51$, table t-values are 2.68 at 0.01 level and 2.01 at 0.05 level. Calculated t-value more than table t-values at both the levels. Thus, hypothesis is rejected and there is a significant difference between mean scores of employees having medium and low leadership behaviour.

Moreover, mean score of employees having medium level of behaviour is more than that of mean score of employees having low level of behaviour. Thus, it is said that the employee having medium leadership behaviour has good working style than that of employee having low leadership behaviour.

12. Findings

1. The employee having higher leadership behaviour has good working style than that of employee having medium leadership behaviour.
2. The employee having high leadership behaviour has good working style than that of employee having low leadership behaviour.
3. The employee having medium leadership behaviour has good working style than that of employee having low leadership behaviour.

13. Conclusion

In present study, the researcher studied the impact of leadership behaviour on working style of bank employees. The researcher constructed a Leadership Behaviour Inventory and a Working Style Inventory. The researcher selected a sample of 70 bank employees from four different private banks. After study, it was revealed that the employee having higher leadership behaviour has a good working style than that of employee having lower leadership behaviour.

References

1. Anderson, J.C. and Gerbing, D.W.: 1988, 'Structural Equation Modelling in Practice: A Review and Recommended Two-step Approach', *Psychological Bulletin* 103, 411-423.
2. Bagozzi, R.P. and Yi, Y.: 1988, 'On the Evaluation of Structural Equations Models', *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science* 16(1), 74-94.
3. Caldwell, C., Hayes, L. A., Karri, R., and Bernal, P.: 2008, 'Ethical Stewardship - Implications for Leadership and Trust', *Journal of Business Ethics* 78, 153-64.
4. Ferrell, O. C.: 2004, 'Business Ethics and Consumer Stakeholders', *Academy of Management Executive* 18(2), 126-29.
5. Maxham, J. G. and Netemeyer, R. G.: 2003, 'Firms Reap What They Sow: The Effects of Shared Values and Perceived Organizational Justice on Customers' Evaluations of Complaint Handling', *Journal of Marketing* 67, 46-62.
6. Politis, J. D.: 2001, 'The Relationship of Various Leadership Styles to Knowledge Management', *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal* 22(8), 354-64.
7. Taly, D., Kass, N., and Shamir, B.: 2004, 'The Emotional Bond: Vision and Organizational Commitment among High Tech Employees', *Journal of Organizational Change Management* 17(2), 126-43.
8. Yaniv, E. and Farkas, F.: 2005, 'The impact of person-organisation fit on the corporate brand perception of employees and customers', *Journal of Change Management* 5(4), 447-62.