

A CASE STUDY ON LEADERSHIP ROLE IN NGO SECTOR REFERENCE TO NAGAPATTINAM DISTRICT

A. GEORGE^{a1} AND K.V.R. RAJANDRAN^b

^{ab}Research Scholar, Department of Management Studies, Periyar Maniammai University, Vallam, Thanjavur, India

ABSTRACT

The case study presents details of a leadership role and its impact in NGO sectors. NGOs are conscious efforts made to promote and support livelihood opportunities for a large number of people. These interventions may involve various segmented and also sector / sub – sector approaches. Which cover whole region/ sub – region the segmented approach focuses attention on specific group /sub – group (include vulnerable section such as women, tribes). NGOs in Nagapattinam District depend on the Tsunami rehabilitation work and women and children related activities mainly made up. NGOs try to improve the livelihood and status in that leadership how places a major role and impact it.

KEYWORDS: Leadership, Impact, Role, Livelihood, NGO

Many of would agree that life is ambiguous and NGO should follow the ambiguous, the study of leadership in organizations has approach a leader suppose to know what is going to happen next, and a effective leaders can eliminate the ambiguity in the of organization. Traditional views of leadership grow out of the long-held view of organizations as equilibrium-seeking systems whose futures are knowable and arrived at by leaders who plan interventions and control behaviors (Stacey, 1992; Wheatley, 1999). However, in recent years complexity theory has made its way into organizational science, challenging this linear, mechanistic view of organizations with analogies from the physical sciences of systems whose future states are unpredictable and full of surprise (Anderson, 1999; McKelvey, 1999; Richardson and Cilliers, 2001).

A central principal of complexity theory is emergent self-organization, whereby systems achieve order because multiple local agents interact and those interactions produce unintended outcomes without the intervention of a central controller (Chiles, Meyer, & Hench, 2004). Thus, organizations take on properties and structures that are unexpected (McKelvey & Lichtenstein, in press) because people and groups interact and the results of those interactions produce perpetual novelty. If leaders cannot predict and control the organization's future and what the role of leadership and leader

In this study the review of existing leadership literature, however, confirms that most approaches to the study of leadership emphasize the role of leaders in directing organizations towards seemingly knowable and controllable futures and we rely with qualitative theory development approach (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2003) and with support of Marion & Uhl-Bien's (2001) notion that complex leaders enable rather than control desirable futures.

LITERATURE REVIEWS

The leadership topic remains popular in spite of all criticism from organizational scholars. For example, Kerr & Jermier (1978) minimized the significance of leadership by identifying “substitutes” for leadership. after, twenty-seven years later, publications like Harvard Business and others to considerable space to articles on leadership, such as a recent paper by Quinn (2005) who identified the qualities that enable one to enter the “fundamental state of leadership.” later, authors such as Collins (2001) argue that organizational greatness is due to one fundamental ingredient, Kotter (1985, 1990, 1996) argues it is leaders who make organizational transformation happen by directing the change. While organizational scholars continue to debate how important leadership is, the emerging view of organizations as complex adaptive systems challenges the fundamental premise of what leadership is. Comparing the assumptions of traditional theories of leadership with those of a complexity theory view of leadership can find.

Complexity Theory

Complexity theory developed in the physical sciences people were attempting to understand the complexity of nature, and increasingly found linear models to be ineffective in capturing the complex and emergent nature of phenomenon (Ashby, 1962; Holland, 1995; Kauffman, 1995; Prigogine, 1997). Some of the characteristics of complex adaptive systems include: (1) They are made up of many agents who act and interact with each other in unpredictable ways, (2) They are sensitive to changes in initial conditions, (3) They adjust their behavior in the aggregate to their environment in un-predictable ways, (4) They oscillate between stability and instability, and

(5) They produce emergent actions when approaching disequilibrium. Additionally, complex systems are dynamic and non-linear, and rarely explained by simple cause-effect relationships. Observing that emergence and perpetual novelty exist throughout nature gave rise to the identification of common characteristics of complex adaptive systems because “in our world we discover fluctuations, bifurcations, and instabilities at all levels” (Prigogine, 1997, p. 55).

Traditional Theory

The traditional view of organizations is based on the idea that the world is knowable because it is a kind of mechanical system in which discernable forces and basic laws of motion are in operation (Capra, 1996; Stacey, 1995). From this view, organizations consist of highly prescribed rule sets, hierarchical authority structures and formalized control which are intended to simplify the organization’s operations and made it simple, and well defined manner. Traditionally, organizations seek order and leaders are expected to achieve stability by reducing complexity through codification (Boisot & Child, 1999), solving problems using reductionist rather than holistic thinking, understanding critical cause and effect linkages (Ashmos, Duchon, McDaniel, & Huonker, 2002), and engaging in complex planning for a world they believe is predictable (Wheatley, 1999). From this view, leaders try to control the future by acting now to reduce complexity and uncertainty and directing followers towards highly prescribed future states.

The study of leadership has been an important part of traditional organizational science for decades, yet disappointing to many because of the proliferation of leadership theories with no universally accepted theoretical framework for understanding leadership. It is beyond the scope of this paper to review the entire literature on leadership (see Hunt, 1999). Thus, leaders who are generally defined as those who exercise intentional influence over people to channel and facilitate collective tasks in order to achieve organizational goals and create desired knowable future (Yukl, 2002) states through direction and control.

Emergent Non Government Organization

In narration a complex systems have many characteristics and System-level order emerges because of interactions among entities with individual schemas at a lower level in the system (Anderson, 1999), that is, nested systems (Ashmos & Huber, 1987). NGO system thus complex systems are characterized as non-linear because the components that comprise them are

constantly interacting with each other through a web of feedback loops (Anderson, 1999; Stacey, 1995). Thietart & Forgues (1995, p.21–22) describe the non-linear nature of interactions in organizations, which give rise to emergent, unknowable futures: Multiple organizational actors, with diverse agenda, inside and outside the organization, try to coordinate their actions to exchange information and to interact in other ways and they do all this in a dynamic manner, i.e. yesterday’s action which activates a reaction of today, which may lead to a new action for tomorrow.

A small fluctuation in one part of the system can bring unexpected changes to other parts of the system. The story of the flap of a butterfly’s wings in one part of the world creating a storm in another part of the world (Lorenz, 1963) is often used to illustrate the concept that small fluctuations in some variables can have profound and unpredictable effects on other variables. Maguire & McKelvey (1999) argue that when organizations move away from stability and into the “region of complexity,” adaptive tensions give rise to emergent NGO.

Traits vs. Behaviors

In some of the earliest research on leadership, scholars sought that what ‘special’ traits were associated with leader effectiveness at bringing about change and achieving organizational goals (Steers et al., 1996). Traits included physical, social, and mental ability and leaders were distinguished from subordinates because they gave directions that were then followed by subordinates. Then leadership focused on behaviors of successful leaders - what leaders actually do to bring as change. The right combination of task orientation and people orientation are in order to determine what made for successful leaders (Fleishman and Harris, 1962; Likert, 1961). Contingency theories of leadership (e.g. Fiedler, 1967) followed the trait and behavioral theories and suggested that situations determine which leadership trait or behavior is appropriate and effective in directing the organization.

Styles

Style of a person places a vital role in leadership. The path-goal theory (House, 1971) suggested, that the leader convey his/her style depending upon whether employees need clarity about goals / path and expectations towards achieving the goals and expectations. Thus, the leader decide what style of leading to be – autocratic, instrumental, supportive, participative, or achievement-oriented.

Recently, the literature on leadership style includes two distinct styles transformational and transactional. A transformational style motivates and influences followers to work for collective goals by going beyond current norms and inspiring subordinates to transcend their self interest for the sake of the organization. Leaders using this style with persuasive symbols, images, and visions of the future to influence subordinates (Bass, 1985; Bass et al., 1987; Burns, 1978). A transactional leadership, presents leaders as influencing employees primarily by providing material rewards in return for their efforts and it contrast to transformational. Transactional leaders work within the established organizational framework (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) a leader using a transactional style, his/her clarifies work to be accomplished, uses rewards as reinforcement.

The leadership style in commonly with the trait and behavior theories of leadership the assumption that leaders actively create planning, directing, organizing, and controlling to reach Organizational goal. (Marion and Uhl-Bien, 2001; Stacey, 1992; Wheatley, 1999).

Leaders as Enablers

Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) review the literature complex leaders enable rather than control futures by cultivating conditions where others can produce innovations that lead to productive. They argue, "Leaders cannot control the future (e.g., determinism) because in organizations' unpredictable and sometimes unexplainable internal dynamics will determine future conditions" (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001, p. 391). Thus, Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001), as well as other complexity scientists (Maguire and McKelvey, 1999; Regine and Lewin, 2000), call for reconsideration of traditional approaches to leadership. They suggest an alternative focus on leadership where leaders enable rather than control, where power derives from the leaders' ability "to allow" rather than to direct (Regine & Lewin, 2000), and where people in the organization remain engaged and connected (Knowles, 2001).

Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) also argue that effective leaders recognize the importance of interactions, correlation, and unpredictability among ensembles or aggregates of individuals. Complex leaders enable interactions but they do not direct them. Instead, they allow them to emerge through engaging in non-linear processes (Regine & Lewin, 2000). In addition, complex leaders enable emergence by becoming catalysts for actions, and function as "tags" (Holland, 1995; Marion and Uhl-Bien, 2001). Tags enable or speed up specific behaviors by directing

attention to what is important and providing meaning to events. Tags are important for understanding the role leaders can play in influencing their organizations. For example, Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001, p. 398) describe the role that Martin Luther King, Jr. played in the civil rights movement: he "did not create the civil rights movement; rather he catalyzed its development." In other words, he was a tag for the civil rights movement.

METHODS

We used a qualitative approach to observe the complex interactions and behaviors that characterize complex adaptive systems and their leaders. However, we did not begin originally with these intentions. Instead, we began our case study with a focus on reviewing the decision-making process at a local organization NGO (South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies -SIFFSs). Formally viewed SIFFSs specially in nagapattinam District. During December 2004 the Tsunami made havoc, where the poor fishermen were affected at large. The NGO get into it and worked for the society. There were two important tasks 1. Immediately establish families among those who lost their partners/ children during tsunami and 2. To facilitate their livelihood. It was observed that young widows were successfully got remarried and NGO provide many Boats for their livelihood. After many years of service from the society, whether SIFFSs successful or unsuccessful.

Area of the Study

Nagapattinam is a coastal district. It was most affected district in Tamilnadu from Tsunami. There are many NGOs in Nagapattinam and also many NGOs relocated here after Tsunami.

Population & Data Collection

Convenient sampling is adopted for the present study. The researcher selected the 40 respondent of South Indian Federation of Fishermen Societies – SIFFSs

Our data came from three sources: (1) open-ended interviews with 30 representatives from heads — including the field officers (i.e., leaders), employees, and volunteers, (2) open-ended interviews with 10 representatives of the downtown community and (3) secondary sources such as newspaper articles, internal documents, websites, and informal observations. Semi-structured interviews with individual respondents represented the primary source of data.

Statistical Techniques

Researcher used triangulated data with multiple methods of analysis, such as narrative analysis, and visual mapping.

Data Analysis

The researcher analysis the impact of leadership that on the transformation at NGO analytic approach is appropriate for organizing longitudinal data, especially when based on a single case of abundant information (Langley, 1999). Researcher reviewed each interview transcript sentence by sentence and identified all quotations associated with the overall theme of leadership. Then coded the quotations into three leadership categories: 1) leader encourages innovation, 2) leader is sense maker, and 3) leader is part of destabilizing things. These categories and definitions emerged as key elements of leadership following our overall review of the leadership quotations and our intimate prior experience with the impact of leadership in emergent radical change. These category definitions were used for coding purposes once definitional consensus was achieved.

Triangulation of data provided us confidence in the validity of our study and data collection processes. Wherever possible, we triangulated data obtained from interviews, observations, documents, and other secondary sources. Our reporting includes only data that were substantiated across multiple information sources. We also triangulated data using multiple methods of analysis, such as narrative analysis, and visual mapping. The Four leaders at reviewed our final analysis, confirmed what we had found, and offered additional insights and details. This review by the organizational leaders provided a final check on the accuracy of our findings.

FINDING AND CONCLUSION

To understand exactly what the leaders’ roles were in bringing about the transformation if they did not originate the idea, construct the vision, and inspire others to follow. The results of our qualitative analysis revealed three mechanisms that the leaders used as enablers of emergent self-organization: (1) disrupting existing patterns, (2) encouraging novelty, and (3) sensemaking. We describe these mechanisms below and in Table 1.

Table 1: The role of leaders as enablers in emergent, self-organization

Mechanisms used by complex leaders	Actions taken by complex leaders	Propositions	Managerial implication
Disrupt existing patterns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create and highlight conflict • Acknowledge uncertainty 	Complex leaders enable emergent futures by disrupting patterns through the use of conflict and uncertainty; whereas traditional leaders create knowable futures by minimizing conflict and eliminating uncertainty.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders destabilize rather than stabilize organizations.
Encourage novelty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish simple rules • Promote non-linear interactions 	Complex leaders become enablers of emergent, NGO’s by encouraging innovation through simple rules, non-linear interactions whereas traditional leaders operate as controllers by leading through command and control.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders encourage innovation rather than innovate.
Act as sensemakers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create correlation through language • Accept the role of ‘tag’ 	Complex leaders become enablers of emergent, NGO’s by being sense makers through correlation and becoming tags; whereas traditional leaders operate as controllers by directing order.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders interpret emerging events rather than direct events. • Leaders manage words rather than manage people.

The characteristics of complex systems, whose central feature is emergent, NGO behavior, raise significant questions about the role of leadership in such systems. Traditional theories of leadership focus on the

leader’s role in determining future desired states and directing organizational action to achieve those desired states. However, complexity science suggests that future desired states are unknown because they emerge

from the ongoing interactions and self-organizing of agents within the system. In this research, we examined empirically the role of leadership in self-organizing systems. We agree with Marion & Uhl-Bien (2001) that traditional theories of leadership need to be re-visited in light of more recent understandings of organizational behavior offered by complexity science. Their notion that leaders enable rather than direct change is appealing and we offer some initial empirical support in this qualitative study of leaders as enablers.

One of the unique features of the organization we studied was that four people shared the top leadership role. The field officers had different management styles and in fact at times seemed to offer the organization what Maguire & McKelvey (1999) called “both Old and New Science.” In other words, organizations probably need some parts to be stabilized so that the creative innovators can work around them.

This study had some limitations. Like, although they offer collect detail of organizational phenomenon, they are also limited in their approach. Our findings suggest that if leaders push the system into confuse, other do not pay attention to the non-linear interactions it fail to provide meaning to the change. And do not use language effectively, that the emergent innovation will likely fail. However, that may not be the case. Researchers need to give attention to successful versus unsuccessful emergence and the associated leadership practices.

REFERENCES

- Anderson R., 1999. Complexity theory and organization science, *Organization Science*, **10**(3):216–232.
- Ashby W., 1962. Principles of the self-organizing system. In: H. Von Foerster and G. Zopf, Editors, *Principles of self-organization: Transaction of the University of Illinois Symposium*, Pergamon Press, London pp. 255–278.
- Ashmos D.P., Duchon D., McDaniel R.R. and Huonker J.W., 2002. What a mess! Participation as a simple managerial rule to ‘complexify’ organizations, *Journal of Management Studies*, **39**(2):189–206.
- Ashmos D.P. and Huber G.P., 1987. The systems paradigm in organization theory: Correcting the record and suggesting the future, *Academy of Management Review*, **12**(4):607–621.
- Bass B.M., 1985. *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*, Free Press, New York.
- Bass B.M., Avolio B.J., and Goodheim L., 1987. Biography and the assessment of transformational leadership at the world-class level, *Journal of Management*, **13**(1):7–19.
- Boisot M. and Child J., 1999. Organizations as adaptive systems in complex environments: The case of china, *Organization Science: A Journal of the Institute of Management Sciences*, **10**(3):237–252.
- Bonabeau E. and Meyer C., 2001. Swarm intelligence: A whole new way to think about business, *Harvard Business Review*, **79**(5):106–114.
- Burns J.M., *Leadership*, Harper and Row, 1978. New York.
- Capra F., 1996. *The web of life*, Anchor Books Doubleday, New York.
- Chiles T., Meyer A. and Hench T., 2004. Organizational emergence: The origin and transformation of Branson, Missouri’s musical theaters, *Organization Science*, **15**(5):499–519.
- Collins J., 2001. Level 5 leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve, *Harvard Business Review*, **79**(1):66–76.
- Conger J., 1991. Inspiring others: The language of leadership, *Academy of Management Executive*, **5**(1):31–45.
- Duimering P.R. and Safayeni F., 1998. The role of language and formal structure in the construction and maintenance of organizational images, *International Studies of Management and Organization*, **28**(3):57–85.
- Dutton J. and Heaphy E., 2003. The power of high-quality connections. In: K. Cameron, J. Dutton and R. Quinn, Editors, *Positive organizational scholarship*, Berrett-Koehler, San Francisco.
- Eisenhardt K.M., 1989a. Building theories from case study research, *Academy of Management Review*, **14**:532–550.
- Eisenhardt K.M., 1989b. Making fast strategic decisions in high-velocity environments, *Academy of Management Journal*, **32** (3):543–576.
- Fiedler F.E., 1967. *A theory of effective leadership effectiveness*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Fiol C.M., 2002. Capitalizing on paradox: The role of language in transforming organizational

- identities, *Organization Science*, **13**(6):653–666.
- Fleishman E. and Harris F., 1962. Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover, *Personnel Psychology*, **15**:43–56.
- Gioia D.A., 1986. Symbols, scripts, and sensemaking: Creating meaning in the organizational experience. In H. P. Sims, Jr., D. A. Gioia, and associates (eds.), *The thinking organization*. San Francisco: Jossey–Bass.
- Gioia D.A. and Thomas J.B., 1996. Thomas, Identity, image and issue interpretation: Sensemaking during strategic change in academia, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **41**:370–403.
- Goodwin B., 2000. Out of control into participation, *Emergence*, **2**(4):40–49.
- Holland J.H., 1995. *Hidden order*, Addison–Wesley Publishing, Reading, MA.
- House R.J., 1971. A path goal theory of leader effectiveness, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **16**(3):321–339.
- Hunt J.G., 1999. Transformational/charismatic leadership's transformation of the field: A historical essay, *The Leadership Quarterly*, **10**(2):129–144.
- Isabella L.A., 1990. Evolving interpretations as a change unfolds: How managers construe key organizational events, *Academy of Management Journal*, **33**(1):7–41.