
GLOBAL TRANSFORMATION OF STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP AND ITS IMPACT ON ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN CORPORATE SECTOR- A CASE STUDY OF MSEDCL

Dr. Prashant R. Gulhane

Associate Professor

Women's College of Arts & Commerce, Nagpur

Abstract: This study is conducted in area of strategic leadership and concentrates on the distribution system of company mainly in the field of finance, administration, productivity and personnel control. These strategic leadership based practices have been studied and evaluated from the point of view of their usefulness to the higher management for exercising complete control over the working of the MSEDCL. The higher management of mahavitaram includes Chief Engineers and Superintending Engineers at the strategic level, and Assistant Executive Engineers at the strategic level, Assistant Executive Engineers at managerial, and Assistant Executive / Junior Engineers at the operational level.

Keywords:

INTRODUCTION

Since the mid-1980's a growing body of leadership research has focused on strategic leadership, in contrast to managerial and visionary leadership. It focused on how top leadership makes decisions in the short term that guarantees the long-term viability of the organisation. The best performing organisations are consciously strategic in their leadership planning. These top leaders also have the ability to align human resources in an effective way directly to the business strategy. It is observed that only a few scattered efforts have made in the field of strategic leadership in large govt. organizations, and whatever little was done remained confined to the macro level only. Organizational levels have not been in depth. Thus it is felt that there is need for case practices of strategic leadership in specific organization, so as to understand the practices being adopted there. This will help to point out coming and suggest improvement to make the systems in various sub systems as well as in whole organizations. The present study is a step in this direction. Electricity is a leading public Utility and it is a socially desirable institution like justice, defense and transport for which there is no direct demand but on which the entire structure of organized society demands.

second, electricity being a public utility, the efficiency of MSEDCL has a great bearing on the working of various organized and thus has a multiplier effect on economy of the state as a whole. The company has introduced computerization in some of its sub-system, the impact of which on productivity is too studied. From the discussions, it emerges that the study of strategic leadership in MSEDCL is quite relevant.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The present study has been confined to Maharashtra state electricity Distribution Company only distribution system of the company is selected because of its complexity and direct contact with consumer. Geographically the distribution system of the MSEDCL throughout the entire state has been covered which is divided into the fourteen zones. Each zone is divided in to circle and each circle in to divisions and further each division is divided in to sub-divisions. All the managers working at the three levels viz. strategic planning level, managerial control level and operational control level, have been made to constitute the population for the study.

OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

To study the success and failures of Strategic Leadership practices.

A) Success Factors

	Factors	SA	A	NAND	D	SD
1	Timely and effective decision making	143	125	27	40	25
2	Control by exception	144	127	30	30	29
3	Accounting system which supports control	131	137	49	24	19
4	Participation by employees in standard	110	139	53	31	27
5	Motivations of employees	113	140	52	35	20
6	Using adequate controlling technique	111	126	58	44	21
7	Sounds communication system	104	131	62	41	22
8	Sounds reporting system	104	139	65	34	18
9	Well planned productivity control system	102	131	62	40	25
10	Management awareness towards the need	103	151	49	32	25
11	Proper delegation of responsibility	93	138	67	36	26
12	Clear cut organization structure	94	120	75	44	27

13	Trained manpower	81	140	70	39	30
14	Top management involvement	59	93	85	80	43

Table no. 1 Table for distribution of responses

When response for Agree (A) and Strongly Agree (SA) taken together				
	Factors	SA	A	SA+ A
1	Timely and effective decision making	143	125	268
2	Control by exception	144	127	271
3	Accounting system which supports control	131	137	268
4	Participation by employees in standard	110	139	249
5	Motivations of employees	113	140	253
6	Using adequate controlling technique	111	126	237
7	Sounds communication system	104	131	235
8	Sounds reporting system	104	139	243
9	Well planned productivity control system	102	131	233
10	Management awareness towards the need	103	151	254
11	Proper delegation of responsibility	93	138	231
12	Clear cut organization structure	94	120	214
13	Trained manpower	81	140	221
14	Top management involvement	59	93	152

Table no 2: Table for distribution of responses

From the above tables, the major factors which are responsible for success of Strategic leadership are-

- Accounting system which supports control
- Management awareness towards the need
- Sounds communication system
- Timely and effective decision making
- Control by exception

Thus there are different success factors for the success of strategic leadership.

B) Failure Factors

	Failure Factors	SA	A	NAND	D	SD
1	Responsibility centers are provided but responsibility accounting is not done	100	150	52	31	27
2	MSDCL is a government undertaking	118	125	57	39	21
3	Lack of trained and professional staff	109	135	64	34	18
4	Government rules, regulations and restriction	129	117	44	43	27
5	Restrictive behavior of management to change	94	125	60	58	23

6	Work is not divided into responsibility centers	79	131	81	43	26
7	Lack of employees interest	77	132	65	51	35
8	Inadequate finance	83	111	81	53	32
9	Inadequate MCS as per the requirements of the distribution table	60	88	72	89	51
10	No reward and punishment system	73	59	69	102	57

Table no. 3 Table for distribution of responses

When response for Agree (A) and Strongly Agree (SA) taken together				
	Factors	SA	A	SA+ A
1	Responsibility centers are provided but responsibility accounting is not done	100	150	250
2	MSDCL is a government undertaking	118	125	243
3	Lack of trained and professional staff	109	135	244
4	Government rules, regulations and restriction	129	117	246
5	Restrictive behavior of management to change	94	125	219
6	Work is not divided into responsibility centers	79	131	210
7	Lack of employees interest	77	132	209
8	Inadequate finance	83	111	194
9	Inadequate MCS as per the requirements of the distribution table	60	88	148
10	No reward and punishment system	73	59	132

Table no 4: Table for distribution of responses

From the above table, the major factors which are responsible for failure of Strategic leadership are-

- Responsibility centers are provided but responsibility accounting is not done.
- MSDCL is a government undertaking
- Lack of trained and professional staff
- Government rules, regulations and restriction

Thus there are different failure factors for the success of strategic leadership.

CONCLUSION

The implications of the findings of this study suggest that there is a positive relationship between strategic leadership and strategic alignment in MSEDCL. However, the relationship is not directly proportionate, but shows that top leadership have a higher level of confidence

in their performance on the six critical criteria than is reflected in the experience at organisational level by its employees. The benefit of this research is that it indicates areas that could be further explored as possible opportunities for improving performance in companies. The main conclusion is that the critical criteria are important in high performing companies. Strategic leadership is the determinant factor in high-performing organisations.

REFERENCE

- [1] Albert, S., & Whetton, D.A. 1993. Organisational identity. In L.L. Cummings and B.M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organisational behavior*. Vol. 7:263-295.
- [2] Amos, T. 2007. Strategic leadership: key driver for strategic implementation. *Management Today*.
- [3] Antonic, B. & Hisrich, R.D. 2001. Entrepreneurship: Construct refinement and cross-cultural validation. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16:495-527.
- [4] Babbie, E. & Mouton, J. 2003. *The practice of social research*. South African Edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- [5] Bailey, C. & Clarke, M. 2000. How do managers use knowledge about knowledge management? *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 4(3):235-243.
- [6] Baker, S., Barrett, A. & Himelstein, L. 1997. Calling All Nerds, *Business Week*, March 10: D1, D10.
- [7] Barney, J.B. 1986b. Strategic Factor Markets: Expectations, Luck and Business Strategy. *Management Science*, 32(10): 1231-1242.
- [8] leadership in organisational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 637-647.
- [9] Cooper, D R. & Schindler, P S. 2006. *Marketing research*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [10] Dostal, E. 2004. *Biomatrix: A systems approach to organisational and societal change*. SUN Press, Stellenbosch.
- [11] Drucker, P.F. 1997 (a). The next 20 years, *Executive Upside*, 3(3).

-
- [12] Finkelstein, S & Hambrick, D.C. 1996. Strategic leadership: top executives and their effects on organisations. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.
- [13] Foster, R. & Kaplan, S. 2001. Creative Destruction: From "built to last" to "built to perform". London: Financial Times Prentice
- [14] Hall.
- [15] Freedman, M. 2003. The Art and Discipline of Strategic leadership. Tata McGraw-Hill.
- [16] Fulmer, R.M. & Bleak, J.L. 2007, Strategic Leadership: Developing strategic leadership with lessons from the best. Graziadio Business Report, 10(3): 7-13.
- [17] Gamble, P R. & Blackwell, J. 2002. Knowledge Management: A state of the art guide. London: Kogan Page.
- [18] Gardner, H. 1985. The Mind's new science: A History of cognitive revolution. New York: Basic Books.
- [19] Gary, J. 2005. Foresight in Strategic leadership. PeakFeatures. From www.JayGary.com.
- [20] Ghoshal, S., & Bartlett, C. A. 1995. Changing the role of top management: Beyond structure to processes. Harvard Business Review, 73(1): 86-97.
- [21] Greenleaf, R. 2006. Servant Leadership. The international journal of Servant Leadership, Vol. 1, No. 1. Spokane: WA.
- [22] Hambrick, D.C. 1989. Guest editor's introduction: Putting top managers back in strategy picture. Strategic Management journal, 10: 5-15.
- [23] Hambrick, D.C., & Masin, P. 1984. Upper echelons: The organisation as a reflection of its top managers. Academy of Management Review, 9: 193-206.
- [24] Hedlund, G. 1994. A model of knowledge management and the n-form corporation. Strategic management Journal, Special issue 15: 73-90.
- [25] House, R.J. 1977. A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt & L.L
- [26] Larson (Eds.), Leadership: The cutting edge (pp. 189-207). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
-