Managing Leadership in IT Sector

Dr. M. Veerabhadra Rao[1] , B.V.S.S. Subba Rao[2]

[1]Professor, Department of Business Administration, SRK Institute of Technology, Vijayawada.

[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, SRK Institute of Technology, Vijayawada.

SRK Institute of Technology, Vijayawada

ABSTRACT:

Leadership is a concept that is simple to define but extremely complex to put into practice. It's critical to comprehend what leadership is and the numerous components that make it up. Know who you are and what you can do. To put the areas of leadership into practice once you've grasped them, you'll need to look at yourself and your own capabilities so you can figure out which ones to grow, employ, and avoid in your leadership style. Personality traits will have a significant impact on your leadership, and you should understand how. Development of skills, Any leader will recognize that they can't be what they want to be without a lot of skill improvement. There are always new talents to learn, new ones to build, and refinement to do on the ones you already have, no matter where you are in your leadership abilities. It's important to remember that it's all about people. As a leader, it's critical to understand, appreciate, and manage human nature. Every action you take as a leader must be guided by one important fact: it's all about people. Possibility of Taking Risks, Leaders inspire others to follow them by challenging them to try new things and persevering until they achieve success. To investigate, that willingness to take risks is a vital part of leadership. Accepting Errors Leaders are not better at things than others, are not smarter, are not fortunate, and are not born that way. They may, on the other hand, learn from and accept their mistakes without them impeding their ability to lead. Give Instructions, Leaders can only lead if they provide guidance or set an example for others to follow; otherwise, they are not leading. Humility, Finally, one aspect of leadership that I'd want to discuss is how to achieve all of this while remaining humble. Great leaders are humble in their work, lives, and leadership, which allows them to be leaders long after their time and direct influence has passed.

Keywords: Leadership Styles, Millennials, Transformational Style.

Introduction

Over the next few decades, considerable developments will occur in the field of leadership. We'll shift from a collective leadership model to one in which individuals bear far greater duty and accountability. The future work style will be far more individual-centered than group-centered, with a high level of self-determination and shared-goal teamwork. Throughout most of the twentieth century, leadership courses emphasized directive, authoritarian (or at least top-down) management.

The boss was expected to have all of the answers, or at the very least, know what to do. He, and for the most part, it was generally a man, would instruct people what to do... and they would do what he said. There were strict restrictions in place, and anyone who broke them faced significant repercussions. Most workers, in the spirit of McGregor's Theory X, were considered to be unable to think for themselves and, as a result, need a superior to lead their efforts. The "leader" was occasionally superior in intelligence, experience, skill, understanding, or longevity, but the authority was frequently derived from the job itself.

"Because I'm the boss, you have to do what I say." The directing system became less successful as the nature of work changed, moving away from manual labor and crafts and toward white collar occupations. Some employees had the hubris to imagine that they could think for themselves and manage at least some of their own tasks. The notions linked with McGregor's Theory Y came into play when it was suspected that a different management style would be more suited. While some predicted that the dog's tail would wag, new leaders chose what became known as a democratic leadership style. The movement grew to the point that entire companies attempted to run on a committee basis.

Participative Management

Managers shifted to the middle ground after discovering that neither extreme was truly satisfying. This is where Participative Management comes in. Managers were making decisions once more, but only after consulting with employees who would be affected by the decisions. People felt more included and heard, yet the system was still not working well. It was difficult for most managers to alter their stripes back then because they had been educated to be directive managers.

Throughout most of the twentieth century, the term "leadership" was used interchangeably with "management." Now, great minds began to argue that management and leadership were two separate concepts. It was argued that people followed managers because they were expected to, but they followed leaders because they wanted to.

Why would somebody want to follow another person? Someone who didn't have any sort of authority over them? Rich discussions examined all of the amazing qualities of leaders, and managers began to see themselves as leaders as well as using the power of their position.

The Rise of Teams

"Teams" entered our vernacular of work relationships as people worked together to get things done. The terms "team" and "leader" were combined, and team leadership became the next step on the path from "simply a manager" to something more. Indeed, language such as "supervisors" for front-line supervisors, "managers" for their superiors, and "leaders" for those at the top underscored the higher nature of this thing we called leadership. To be considered a leader, one had to work their way up the corporate ladder. The shift in power occurred when work groups were renamed teams. Because teams needed leaders, leadership language, concepts, and performance flowed down to hierarchical organizations' lowest levels. Anyone can now be a leader. As we transitioned from management to leadership, new vistas opened up... at least in terms of how we communicated. Even today, many employees are managed rather than led.

We had a light bulb moment when we discovered that maybe teams could work without a specific leader guiding them. To the realm of self-directed work teams, welcome. This paradigm, which is still alive and strong in many firms, poses a serious danger to the directive manager. The two conceptions are at odds, raising real concerns about what to deal with all those authoritarian bosses who refuse to transition to more successful human interaction patterns.

For a long time, there was a strong emphasis on team leadership as the pinnacle of the evolutionary cycle. If teams are intact, focused, and valued above individuals, it's a good concept. That is the crux of the issue.

Focus on the Individual

The workforce has evolved, bringing with it new challenges and opportunities. We're transitioning from a team-oriented workplace to one that focuses on the individual performer. Much work will still be done in teams, but those teams will be made up of individuals who are intentionally working to accomplish goals. Individuals and their connections with one another will provide the energy, rather than an external leader.

Attitudes among workers are changing. People in their twenties and early thirties, known as Generation X, are far more self-motivated and autonomous than their forefathers. They have a strong desire for more control, autonomy, and power, which is based on self-leadership. When they understand the desired outcomes, have the means to complete the task, and are left alone to achieve them, they are most productive. They are irritated by excessive supervision, which motivates them to leave firms that limit their ability to operate.

Today's booming economy has spawned so many jobs—far more than can be filled with available workers—that people can easily transfer from one employment to the next. Job-hopping is now practically promoted by society, which has accepted, if not blessed, this movement. Many employees switch employment every two to four years, making long-term cohesive teams rare or unattainable. There is far too much churn for the teams to remain stable with the same membership for an extended period of time.

Facilitative Leadership

As a result of these shifting conditions, leadership will shift to a focus on the person rather than the group. Leaders will facilitate rather than direct or steer. The "facilitative leader" is the next stage in the cycle.

Facilitative leaders will focus on ensuring that everyone of their direct reports achieves peak performance. Assuring that objectives are understood, offering resources, coaching, teaching, encouraging, monitoring, and providing objective feedback are all roles that will be played. (While this description may sound like that of a good boss, this leadership style is not widely used at the moment.)

Individuals will choose to build their own teams, internally driven, to collaborate for results while receiving this coaching. The leader's responsibility will be to equip people to work independently, then to assist them grow and achieve their goals by using their individual abilities.

The facilitative leadership approach will become much more popular in all occupations during the next ten years. Some workers in certain environments will need more assistance, but they will also want to be more accountable for their own performance. The increase of telecommuting will provide the initial impetus for this paradigm, requiring managers to become less infatuated with management ideas and more involved with the principles and tactics of results-oriented leadership.

Processes, product lines, and other inanimate components of economic activity will all be referred to as "management." Anything involving people will

be referred to as leadership, support, or facilitation, which more closely reflects the role's actual task. To refer to someone as a "people manager" is an insult or a suggestion that the leader isn't doing the work that needs to be done.

During the first two decades of the twenty-first century, leaders will place a greater emphasis on training, assisting employees in adapting to new technology in order to complete tasks and increase productivity. Older workers, especially those in their late sixties, seventies, and eighties, will require more close supervision and training.

Self-Leadership

As the next generation of Generation X workers enter the workforce, they will become increasingly self-reliant and self-motivated. Workers from the Millennium Generation will be right behind them, and they will be even more self-reliant. They will respond to—and demand—a far different leadership approach.

Millennials will be more comfortable steering their own lives, despite the educational system's efforts to train them to work in groups. They are more connected via the Internet than they are through personal encounters. These workers will be far more self-assured, self-reliant, and self-motivated than their forefathers in the early days.

Millennials will have a lot in common with the pioneers of the 18th and early 19th centuries who constructed new lives for themselves. They, too, will construct for themselves and their neighbors, combining intellect, imagination, invention, technology, and creativity to create something we can't even imagine now. They'll utilize computers instead of axes and plowshares, and they'll have the same tenacity as the early settlers.

The phrases "leadership" and "management" don't come to mind when we think of the early pioneers. Those trailblazers didn't require supervisors because they were self-motivated and self-sufficient. If they needed assistance, they asked for it and received it in a spirit of collaboration and synergy. In the corporate sphere, a similar mindset prevailed. In the first part of the twenty-first century, expect the same spirit to prevail. The surroundings are very similar.

The strength of home-based enterprises will echo the cottage industries, which served as a foundation for our expanding economy as America was settled. A wide diversity of living and working arrangements will arise, but they will be physically and geographically dispersed. The owners or operators of these enterprises may only see their staff on rare occasions, if at all, and may never meet some of them personally. We anticipate that at least 20% of the working population will be based at home by 2005, and potentially as much as 40% by 2020.

The lack of leadership should not be confused with the style of leadership that requires 'no action.' For example, during the negotiations for India's independence, when Gandhi went on hunger strike and asked for protests to halt, he displayed remarkable leadership - since taking no action was a new direction for the Indian people at the time.

Also, "participative management," as it is commonly known, can be a very effective kind of leadership. A new direction may appear to originate from the group rather than the leader in this technique. The leader, on the other hand, has supported that new course while also instilling ownership in the group - in other words, it is an evolved style of leadership.

Even if he or she hasn't chosen any new direction, an individual might serve as a figurehead for change and be perceived as a leader. This might happen when a group decides to choose a new path on its own and has to announce that decision through a symbolic leader. Nelson Mandela, for example, when imprisoned:

Nelson Mandela continued to develop in power and influence as the anti-apartheid movement's symbolic leader during his imprisonment (when his ability to provide personal, direct leadership was constrained).
Following his release from prison, he showed true leadership by guiding South Africa toward reconciliation rather than retaliation. Leaders don't have subordinates, at least when they're in charge. Many organizational leaders have subordinates, but only as a result of their position as managers. However, if they wish to lead, they must relinquish formal authoritarian authority, because leading entails having followers, and following is always optional.

Charismatic, transformational style

People will not follow you if you tell them what to do. You must persuade them by demonstrating how following them will lead to their heart's desire. They must be interested in following you enough to stop what they're doing and possibly go into danger or situations they wouldn't ordinarily risk.

Leaders with more charm have an easier time attracting supporters to their cause. They frequently promise transformational advantages as part of their persuasion, implying that their followers would not only earn extrinsic rewards but will also become better people.

People focus

Although many leaders have a charismatic approach, it does not necessitate a boisterous personality. They are always good with people, and quiet leadership styles that give credit to others (while taking responsibility for themselves) are particularly effective at instilling the kind of loyalty that great leaders inspire.

Leaders may be skilled with people, but that does not mean they are friendly. They typically maintain a degree of detachment and aloofness in order to maintain the mystique of leadership.

This is not to say that leaders are unconcerned about duties; in fact, they are frequently goal-oriented. They do recognize, however, the value of inspiring others to join them in achieving their goals.

Seek risk

Leaders appeared to be risk-seeking in the same study that showed managers to be risk-averse, while they are not blind thrill-seekers. When pursuing their idea, they expect to run into issues and obstacles along the way that must be overcome. As a result, they are at ease with risk and will identify pathways that others shun as potential chances for profit, and will gladly break rules to get things done. A surprising percentage of these leaders had to overcome some kind of impediment throughout their lives. Some had difficult childhoods, others struggled with dyslexia, while yet others were shorter than the average. This may have instilled in them the mental independence required to go out on a limb and not be concerned with what others think of them.

Conclusion

The path to becoming a better leader is a long one. To assist leaders on their path, the Leadership Development Model and leadership are used. To adopt a more collaborative leadership style, including team-based decision-making. This strategy to managing and engaging the hearts and minds of every individual in working together to achieve excellent care, innovation, and academic brilliance must continue to improve. The Shared Responsibility Leadership Model is a leadership technique that is meant to be used consistently throughout the organization. Some organizations, in contrast to individual leadership, have chosen group leadership. In this case, the group as a whole is led by more than one person. Some businesses have adopted this strategy in the hopes of boosting creativity, cutting expenses, or downsizing. Others may believe that a boss's traditional leadership costs too much in terms of team effectiveness. Leaders that show perseverance, tenacity, and determination, as well as synergistic communication abilities, will inspire their followers to do the same. Good leaders enlist the help of their inner mentors to energise their teams and organizations, and to guide them to success.

References

- http://www.businessweek.com/managing/company/
- http://www.businessweek.com/managing/content/feb2010/ca20100212_978330.htm
- http://managingleadership.com/blog/2007/09/18/fresh-blood/
- http://managingleadership.com/blog/2008/11/06/getting-what-you-pay-for/
- http://www.kenblanchard.com/
- http://www.managingautomation.com/maonline/exclusive/read/Manufacturing_Leaders_Stress_Importance_of_U_S__Competitiveness__BI__Mobility_27756892
- http://www.theglasshammer.com/news/2011/02/25/managing-leadership-styles-and-overcoming-stereotypes/
- http://www.leadership-and-motivation-training.com/managing-change-in-the-workplace.html
- http://executiveeducation.wharton.upenn.edu/open-enrollment/leadership-development-programs/leading-managing-people-program.cfm
- Blake, R.; Mouton, J. (1964). The Managerial Grid: The Key to Leadership Excellence. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co..
- Carlyle, Thomas (1841). On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic History. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin. ISBN 140694419X.
- Fiedler, Fred E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. McGraw-Hill: Harper and Row Publishers Inc..
- Heifetz, Ronald (1994). Leadership without Easy Answers. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. ISBN 0-674-51858-6.
- Hemphill, John K. (1949). Situational Factors in Leadership. Columbus: Ohio State University Bureau of Educational Research.
- Montana, Patrick J.; Bruce H. (2008). Management. Hauppauge, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc. ISBN 0944740049.