Role of Leadership in Organizational Performance: A Review Study

Anurag Singh,
Faculty, Department of Business Management,
Sri Vishwnath P.G. Collage, Kalan, Sultanpur (U.P)
anuragsingh_hrd@rediffmail.com
Mo-09451160699

Dr. Amit Kumar Singh,
Faculty, Department Of Management,
Mizoram University, Aizawl
amitmzu@indiatimes.com
Mo-09436390574

ABSTRACT

Leadership is an international phenomenon which is also very popular domain among the behavioral science. Leadership emergence depends on ability to recognize what followers want in different situations and the function of the leader to maintain group structure and goal direction for reconciling conflicting demands arising outside the group. Through extensive literature survey of different researcher it is found that Instead of focusing on their own goals leaders must focus in building relationships with followers to benefit their collective goals. Leaders should focus on subordinates capability and behavior for performance. In this research article researcher tried to explore different types of leadership styles and their effects on organizational performance

Key Words
Leadership, Commitment, Job Satisfaction, group cohesiveness, Path-goal theory

1. INTRODUCTION

The phenomenon called leadership is associated with human civilization from its very beginning. This subject has long excited interest among people; some to lead and many to follow. The term leadership portrays an image of powerful, dynamic individual who command victorious armies, direct corporate empires or shape the course of action. The fascination with leadership may be because it touches everyone's life. Leaders like Julius Caesar, Alexander the Great, Samrat Ashok built great empires. Leaders like Gandhi, inspire intense fervor and dedication from the mass. Statesman like Winston Churchill, Indira Gandhi shaped the future course of nation's they belonged to. Much of the history describes the story of military, political, religious and social leaders.

The changes in the new economic world stimulated by aggressive, capable competitors are redefining the empire in terms of market economies. The flatter, fleeter, and empowered organizations of today are breeding a generation of managers who embody the new paradigms of leaderships as team builders, facilitators and coaches. Leader is making what you believe in happen. Efforts of courageous men and women making what they believed in happen under extremely challenging conditions is the essence of leadership.

Leadership has been defined in terms of individual traits, leader behaviour, interaction patterns, role relationships, follower perceptions, and influence on task culture. Leadership has been studied using both qualitative and quantitative method in variety of groups and organizations.

Research Objectives-
The main objective of this paper is to find out common types of leadership executed by the managers in the organizations s and their effect in organizational performance.

Methodology
In present study researchers used the narrative literature review methods for describing the current status of leadership behavior in focus areas of inquiry

Types of leadership -
Leadership is perceived by different researchers by different ways like Yukl (1989) supported that when managers are involved in persuading a group to meet its objectives, they are involved in leadership. When leaders are involved in the process of planning, organizing, staffing and controlling, they are involved in management. Both processes involve influencing a group of individuals towards goal attainment.

In 1915, Conway mentioned three types of crowd leader viz. Crowd-compeller, Crowd-exponent and Crowd-representative. Bogardus (1918) suggested four types of leaders:

a. The autocratic type who rises to office in a powerful organisation;
b. The democratic type who represents the interests of a group;
c. The executive type who is granted leadership because he can get things done; and

d. The reflective intellectual type who may find it difficult to recruit a large following.

Sanderson and Nafe (1929) have proposed four types of leaders: the static, the executive, the professional and the group leaders. Further Pigors (1936) has observes that leaders in group-work tend to act either as (1) master, or (2) educator.

Levive (1949) has identified four types of leaders. The charismatic leader helps the group rally around a common aim, but tends to become dogmatically rigid. The organisational leader highlights and tends to drive people to effective action. The intellectual leader usually lacks skill in attracting people. The informal leader tends to adopt his style of performance to group needs. Harding (1949) enumerated twenty types of educational leaders as follows: autocrat, cooperator, elder statesman, eager bearer, pontifical, muddled, loyal staff man, prophet, scientist, mystic, dogmatist, open-minded, cynic, optimist and democrat.

Haiman (1951) suggested that five types of leaders are needed in a democracy. These are: (1) the executive, (2) the judge, (3) the advocate, (4) the expert and (5) the discussion leader.

Getzels and Guba (1957) proposed three types of leadership; of these two are associated with separate dimensions of group activity. Nomothetic leadership is involved with roles and expectations, which defines the normative dimensions of activity in social systems. Ideographic leadership is associated with individual needs and dispositions of members, which define the personal dimensions of group activity. Synthetic leadership reconciles the conflicting demands arising from the two contrasting systems within a group.

Cattell (1954) explored four types of leaders in experimental groups. These are; (1) Persistent momentary problem solvers, high in interaction rate, (2) Salient leaders picked up by observers as exerting the most powerful influence on the group, (3) socio-metric leaders-nominated by their peers and (4) elected leaders-attaining office by election.

Blake,Mouton and Bidnell (1962) observed country club management, impoverished management, middle of the road, team management and task management as leadership types, In a program of research conducted by McClelland and his colleagues (McClelland & Boyatzis, 1982, McClelland & Burnham, 1976). Leader motives were measured with a projective test. The three motives investigated were need for power, need for achievement, and need for affiliation. Their research also found that leaders with a socialized power orientation use their influence to build subordinate commitment to organisational goals, and they seek to empower and develop subordinates by using more consultation, delegation, and coaching.

2. Effect of Leadership on Organizational Functioning

Another study conducted by Miner and his colleagues (Berman & Miner, 1985; Miner, 1978) reveals that positive attitude towards authority figures are important because a manager who resents authority figures in unlikely to maintain effective relations with superior and develop the upward influence necessary to carry out position responsibilities.

The findings of Zaccarro, Foti, & Kenny (1991) shows that leadership emergence depends jointly on the ability to recognize what followers want in different situations and the flexibility to respond approximately to follower expectations in different situations.

Several researchers have classified leadership on the basis of functions, which a leader performs. Krech and Crutch field (1948) proposed a number of leadership function. These are executive, planner, policy maker, "expert" external group representative, controller of internal relationships, purveyor of rewards and punishments, arbitrator and mediator, exemplar, symbol of the group, surrogate, for individual responsibility, ideologist, father figure and scapegoat.

Stogdill (1959) suggested that it is the function of the leader to maintain group structure and goal direction and to reconcile conflicting demands arising outside the group. Since the personality trait approach had proved less significant it was felt that an attempt should be made to study the behaviour rather than the traits of leaders.

Hemphill and his associate (1951) at the University of Maryland, developed a list of approximately 1,800 items describing different aspects of leaders behaviour. However 150 items were found on which sorters were agreed to subscale for assigning an item. These items were used to develop the first form of the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (Hemphill, 1950; Hemphill and Cooris, 1957).

Several factor analytic studies conducted by Haplin and Winer (1957) of the item Inter-correlations produced two factors identified by Hemphill as "consideration" and "Initiation of Structure" in interaction. The behavioral approach emphasized what leaders and managers actually do on the job and the relationship of this behaviour to leader effectiveness

In Japan, 30 years of research on performance- oriented (task) and maintenance –oriented (people) behaviour by

leaders found more consistent evidence that both types of behaviour are necessary for leadership effectiveness (Misumi, 1985; Misumi & Peterson, 1985) Yukl (1989) exposed in his study that though certain task –oriented and people-oriented behaviour is essential for any leader, but the comparative importance of specific forms of this behaviour differs from situation to situation.

Pioneering studies by social scientists Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) and Coch and French (1948) more narrowly defined aspect of leadership such as consulting with subordinates individually or making joint decisions with item as a group. The findings from descriptive case studies of effective managers have been more consistency supportive of the benefits of participative leadership as appeared from the studies of Bradford & Cohen (1984); Kanter (1983); Kouzes & Posner (1987); Peters & Austin, (1985), Peters & Waterman (1982). Their research found that effective manager used a substantial amount of consultation and delegation to empower subordinates and give them a sense of ownership for activities and decisions. Manz & Sims in 1987 and 1989 found that the effectiveness of power sharing and delegation tends to be supported also by research, on self-managed groups.

Podsakoff, Todor, Grover, and Huber (1984) found that praise and contingent rewards usually increase subordinate satisfaction and performance. The importance of recognition and appropriate rewards has been noted also in descriptive studies of leadership in effective organisations by Peters & Austin (1985) and Peters & Waterman (1982).Clarifying is the primary component of initiating structure. It is related to managerial effectiveness by setting specific, challenging but realistic goals as reported by Yukl, Wall and Latham (1990). Moreover Locke & Latham (1990) gave the evidence that goal setting by a manager result in better subordinate performance than no goals.

Power possessed by a leader is important for influencing subordinates. According to Danserean, Graen & Haga (1975); Graen & Cashman (1975) studies on leader-member exchange theory (LMX) describes how leader develop different exchange relationships overtime with different subordinates. Kotter (1985), Yukl (1989); Yukl & Taber (1983), in their studies highlighted that effective leaders rely on a combination of power sources. Further some theorists such as McCall (1978), Sayles (1979) proposed that the manner in which power is exercised largely determines whether it results in enthusiastic commitment, passive compliance, or stubborn resistance.

Influence is a fundamental to leadership. The use of multiple tactics to influence subordinates was evident in the research by Yukl et al (1991) which showed that most effective tactic for obtaining target commitment, and inspirational appeals; the least effective tactics were pressure, coalition tactics and legitimating tactics.

3. Leaders Relationship and Performance

Burns (1978) emphasized power from a relationship stand point. According to it, power is not an entity that leaders use one or others to achieve their own ends, but instead it occurs in relationships and should be used by leaders and followers to benefit their collective goals.

Researcher at the University of Michigan explored leadership behaviour, giving special attention to the impact of leaders behaviours on the performance of small groups. The Michigan researchers in their initial studies, conceptualized employee and production orientations are at the opposite ends of a single continuum. Later studies of Kahn (1956) showed that when the two behaviours were treated as independent orientations, leaders were seen as being able to be oriented to both production and employees at the same time.

Blake and Moutan (1985) indicated that a person habitually has a leading grid style, which he or she uses in most situations, and a backup style. The backup style is what the leader returns to when under compression, when the usual way of achieving things do not work.

Extensive research conducted by Stewart (1976, 1982) using observation, interviews, and diaries to describe managerial behaviour. According to her work, a managing pattern of interactions and amount of time spent with subordinates, peers, superiors and outsiders depends on the nature of the work and whether it is self-generating or reactive, repetitive or variable, uncertain or predictable, fragmented or sustained, hurried or unhurried. Stewart concluded that the core demands of managerial jobs have important implications for selection and promotion decision, since different patterns of traits and skills.

Hunt & Osborn (1982) emphasized the influence of the influence of macro-level situational determinants on a manager's behaviour. These situational variables include level of authority in the organisation, size of work unit, function of work unit, technology centralization of authority, lateral interdependence, and forces in the external environment. The micro-level situational variables such as task complexity, task interdependence among subordinates, subordinate goal orientation, and group cohesiveness also influence leader's behaviour.

Research on what motivates employees and the need for the leader to motivate subordinates to accomplish designated goals lead to the work of Evans (1970), House (1971), House and Dessler (1974), and House

and Mitchell (1974) in form of Path-goal theory. It focused on the goal of leadership as a way to enhance employee performance and employee satisfaction by focusing on employee motivation. According to Indvik (1986), leaders try to enhance subordinates goal attainment by providing information or rewards in the work environment; they provide subordinates with the elements they think that their subordinates need to reach their goals.

According to House and Mitchell, leadership generates motivation when it increases the number and kinds of payoffs that subordinates receive from their work. Leadership also motivates when it makes the path to the goal clear and easy to travel through coaching and direction, when it removes obstacles and road blocks to attaining the goal and when it makes the work itself more personally satisfying. This approach has examined directive, supportive, participative and achievement – oriented leadership behaviours. The directive and supportive leadership style is similar to the "initiating structure" and "Consideration behaviour" as described in the Ohio State studies.

4. Leadership and Supervision

The significance of Path-goal theory as marked by House and Mitchell is that leaders may exhibit any or all of the four styles with various subordinates and in different situations. Path-goal theory is not a traits approach that locks leaders into only one kind of leadership; leaders should adapt their style to the situation or to the motivational needs of the subordinates.

The researchers have focused on subordinates needs for affiliation, preferences for structure, desires for control, and self perceived level of task ability. These characteristics as well as many others, determine the degree to which subordinates find the behaviour of a leader an immediate source of satisfaction or instrumental to some future satisfaction. Task characteristics also have a major impact on the way leaders behavior influences the motivation of subordinates task the formal authority system of the organisation, and the primary work group of subordinates.

A special focus of Path-goal theory is on helping subordinates to overcome obstacles, which leads to increase in subordinates' expectations to complete the task and increase their sense of job satisfaction. Because, the obstacles in the work setting which gets in the way of subordinates. Specially, obstacles create excessive uncertainties, frustrations, or threats for subordinates.

House (1996) published a reformulate path-goal theory that extends his original work to include eight classes of leadership behaviours. Besides four leadership behaviours discussed earlier, new behaviours include work facilitation, group-oriented decision process, work-group representation and networking and value-based leader behaviour.

Meyor (1968) studied two organisations, one managed according to McGregor's Theory Y, and the other according to theory X. it was found that workers under the more permissive (theory Y) type of management reported higher responsibility, risk, reward, warmth and they identified item that were suggestive of group cohesiveness and member satisfaction. Solem (1959) found that full delegation (permissiveness) results in decisions of better quality and higher satisfaction than a more restrictive form of discussion leadership.

The behaviour of the supervisor has been assumed to determine the subsequent satisfaction of the viable there is some evidence, meager though it may be to suggest that satisfaction of subordinate and supervisory style may not be a matter of one to one relationship as advocated by Haythron (1958). Lawler and Hall (1979) have suggested that people differ as a function of their background. The degree to which they get involved in their jobs is a function of this difference, other things remaining constant. In this direction, Runyon (1973) has found those employees who were characterized by internal locus of control experienced greater satisfaction with directive supervisor. In other words, it is suggested that a given supervisory style may induce satisfaction among some but not all subordinates.

Goswami and Ghosh (1957) have made elaborate studies on the pattern of effective supervision and have brought out a number of papers and monographs. Ganguli (1964) has reported that 46.9 percent of the manager and 3.10 per cent of workers of a factory preferred autocratic organisational climate while only 12.30 percent of the managers preferred democratic climate. The existing environment was perceived to be autocratic by 51 per cent of the managers and 43.6 percent of the workers.

Sequeira (1962 a, 1962 b), who worked with Ganguli, has outlined the characteristics of the effective supervision. He has come to the conclusion that effective supervisory practice is less ambiguous and less relative. The main criteria seem to be the level of supervisor in the hierarchy. Bhatt and Pathak (1962) found high intelligence and dependability as important perceived characteristics of effective supervision.

Indian management is generally believed to be autocratic with subordinates closely supervised by their superiors and only a limited degree of participation is

allowed to the subordinates. Myers (1960) from his interview with industrialists, government officials, labour leaders, and managers in both Indian and foreign owned organisations, concludes that barring a few most Indian top managers are relatively authoritarian in there, relationships with lower management and labour. Similar result has also been highlighted by Ganguli (1964) in his study of leadership behaviour in a state-owned engineering company. Rangaswamy (1976) in his study of leadership behaviour of 56 top level managers has found that Indian managers are more employee-oriented as compared to American counterpart.

Yet, in another study, Lal (1983) found evidence of Consultation in Indian managers. The results showed that department heads used prior consultation (35.02 percent) in most cases followed by joint decisionmaking (29.56 per cent). Delegation to subordinates was indicated by only 3.52 percent of the respondents. Further, the direct subordinates rating corresponding to exactly with those of department heads rating in their rankings.

The study conducted in Indian organisation by Saiyadain (1974) confirmed that the supervisory practices that are characterised by participative style are more satisfying to employees than those characterised by directive style.

A study conducted in Modi Rubber Limited by Pal and Vasudeva (1989) showed that workers working under relationship oriented supervisors experience significantly a greater degree of satisfaction than their counterparts working under task oriented supervisors. This was further supported by another study of 33 regional managers from the Pharmaceuticals industry by Singh & Sengupta (1997).

Hingar (1986) in her study on leadership style and job satisfaction among executives found the bureaucratic style was found to be significantly correlated with the efficiency of superior and the efficiency of the organisation. The values of multiple correlations indicate that effectiveness of subordinates, efficiency of division and efficiency of the organisation are significantly influenced by the leadership styles. The authoritarian style was found to be negatively correlated with the effectiveness of subordinates. Besides, its trend of correlation with other variables of effectiveness was found to be negative. Therefore, the study concluded that some of the variables of effectiveness viz. effectiveness of superior in terms of his administrative and other abilities, efficiency of division and positively influenced by bureaucratic, nurturant, participative and task-orientation styles of leadership, whereas the authoritarian style of leadership is having a negative impact on the different variables of effectiveness. Also

no significant difference in leadership style was found when these were judged by thee leader himself and when these were judged by their subordinated.

5. Conclusion

Leadership is a key process which governs the whole organization and as well deciding the organizational growth so it's necessary to be appropriate leadership in an organization. Through different review of literature, Researcher focused on different leadership styles, process and function and they use it in different framework. Instead of focusing on their own goals leaders must focus in building relationships with followers to benefit their collective goals. Leaders should focus on subordinates capability and behavior for performance, like Meyor (1968) used it on the basis of X and Y theory and House (1996) used it on the basis of path goal theory and so on but somewhere researcher have common opinion on effect of leadership, contains whatever be, somewhere researcher have identified that leadership process of manager is depend upon follower and situational variables.

References

- Bennis, W. G. & B. Nanus. *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge.* New York: Harper & Row, 1985.
- Berman, F.E. & J.B. *Miner Motivation to manager at the top executive level:* A test of the hierarchic role-motivation theory. *Personal psychology* 38, (1985): 377-391.
- Bhatt, L. J. and N. S. Pathak *'a study of functions of supervisory staff and characteristics essential for success as viewed by a group of supervisors'* Manas 9, (1962), 25-31.
- Blake, R.R. & J.S. Monton, *The management Grid III.* Houstan, TX: Gulf Publishing, 1985.
- Blake, R.R., Jane S. Mouton, and A.C. Bidwell. *"Managerial Grid". Advance Management*, 1 (1962): 12-15.
- Bogardus, E.S. *Essentials of Social Psychology.* Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1918.
- Bradford, D.L. & A.R. Cohen. *Managing for excellence; the guide to developing high performance organizations.* New York: Wiley, 1984.
- Burns, J.M. *Leadership.* New York: Harper & Row, 1978.
- Cattell, R.B. and Stice, G.F. "Four Formulae for selecting Leaders on the Basis of Personality". Human Relations, 7 (1954),b 493-507.
- Coch, L. & J.R.P French. Jr. *Overcoming resistance to change. Human Relations* 1, (1948): 512-532.
- Conway, M. *The Crowd in Peace and War.* New York: Longmans Green, 1915.
- Coons. *Leader Behaviour: Its Description and measurement.* Columbus: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research, 1957.
- Dansereau, F. Jr., G. Graren, & W.J. Haga. *A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations*: A longitudinal investigation of the role of making process. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance* 13, (1975): 46-78.
- Evans, M.G. *"The effects of supervisory behaviour on the path-goal relationship". Organizational behaviour and Human Performance* 5, (1970): 277-298.

- Ganguli, H. C. S*tructure and Process of Organisation. Bombay: Asea publishing, 1964.*
- Getzels, J.W. and E.G. Guba. "*Social Behaviour and the Administrative Process.*" School Review 55, (1957): 423-441
- Graen, G. & J.F. Cashman A *role making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach.* In J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership frontiers. Kent, O.H.: Kent State University Press, 1975.
- Haiman, F.S. *Group leadership and Democratic Action.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Halpin, A.W. and B.J. Winer, "*A Factorial study of the leader Behaviour Descriptions*", in R.M. Stogdill and A.E. Coons. *Leader Behaviour: Its Description and Measurement* Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1957.
- Harding, L.W. "*Twenty One Varieties of Educational Leadership.*" Educational Leadership 6, (1949): 299-302.
- Haythorn, W. ' *the effect of varying combination of authoritarian and equalitarian leaders and followers'* journal of abnormal and social psychology, 52, 1958. 210-219.
- Hemphill, J K J. and A.E. Cons. *"Development of the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire"*, in R.M. Stogdill and A.E.
- Hemphill, J.K., Seigel, and C.W. Wesite, *"An Exploratory study of Relations between. Perceptions of Leader Behaviour, Group characteristics and Expectations Concerning the Behaviour of Ideal Leaders"*. Unpublished report. Columbus: Ohio State University, Personal Research Board, (1951).
- Hingar, A. *Leadership styles and Job satisfaction*, Jaipur: Printwell Publishers, 1986
- House, R.J. "*Path-goal theory of leadership*: Lessons Legacy and a reformulate theory." *Leadership* Quarterly 7(3), (1996): 323-352
- House, R.J. "*Q path-goal theory of leader effectiveness.*" Administrative Science Quarterly 16, (1971): 321-328.
- House, R.J., & G. Dessler. *The path-goal theory of leadership; Some post loc and a priority tests.* In J. Hunt & L. Larson (Eds.), *Contingency approaches in leadership.* Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1974.
- House, R.J., & R.R. Mitchell, "*Path-goal theory of leadership*". *Journal of Contingency Business* 3, (1974): 81-97.
- Hunt, J.G. & R.N. Osborn. *Toward a macro-oriented model of leadership: An odyssey.* In J.G. Hunt, U. Sekaran., & C. Schriesheirn (Ed), *Leadership: Beyond establishment views*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982
- Indvik, J. "*Path-goal theory of leadership: A meta-analysis*". Proceedings of the Academy of Management Meeting, (1986).
- Kahn, R.L. "*The prediction of productivity*". *Journal of Social Issues* 12, (1956): 41-49.
- Kanter, R.M. The change masters New York: Simon & Schuster, 1983.
- Kotter, J.P. *Power and influence: beyond formal authority.* New York: Free Press, 1985.
- Kouzes, J.M. & Posner, B. Z. *The leadership challenges: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass, 1987
- Krech, D. and R.S. Crutchfield. *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1948.
- Lal, J. *'Leadership Style and Decision Making: the Indian Context'* Indian management, , 22 (12), 1983, 13-17 and 28.
- Lawler, E. F. and D. T. Half *'Relationships of Job Characteristics to Job Involvement, Satisfaction and Intrinsic Motivation'* Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 1979. 305-312

- Levine, S. "*An Approach to Constructive leadership*". Journal of Sociological Issue 5, (1949): 46-53.
- Lewin K., R. Leppitt & R.K. White. "*Patterns of aggressive behaviour in experimentally created social climates*". Journals of Social Psychology 10, (1939): 271-301.
- Locke, E. & G.P. Lathan *A theory of goal setting and task performance.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice –Hall, 1990.
- Manz, C.C. & H.P. Sims Jr. "*Leading workers to lead themselves:* The external leadership of self-managing work teams." Administrative Science Quarterly 32, (1987): 106-128
- McCall, M.W. *"Power, influence and authority: The hazards of carrying a Sword.*" (Tech. Rep. No. 10). Greensboro, NC: Centre for creative Leadership. (1978)
- McClelland, D.C. & D.H. Burnham "*Power is the great motivator." Harvard Business Review*, (March-April, 1976): 100-110.
- McClelland, D.C. & R.E. Boyatzis. "*Leadership motive pattern and long term success in management*". *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 67, (1982): 737-743.
- Measures of leadership. West Orange, N.J.: Leadership Library of America, (1990).
- Miner, J. B. "*Twenty years of research on role motivation theory of managerial effectiveness*". *Personal psychology* 31, (1978): 739-760.
- Misumi, J. & M. Piterson "*The performance-maintenance (PM) theory of leadership*: Review of a Japanese research program". Administrative Science Quarterly 30, (1985) 198-223.
- Misumi, J. *The behavioural science of leadership: An interdisciplinary Japanese research program.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1985 multiple group situations". *Journal of Applied Psychology* 76, (1991):179-185.
- Pal, M. and P. Vasudeva. *'Supervisory Style and Situational Favourableness as Related to Workers, Job Satisfaction'.* Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 24 (3), 1989. 289-294
- Peters, T. J. & N. Austin, *A passion for excellence: The leadership difference.* New York: Random House, 1985
- Peters, T.J., & R. H. Waterman, Jr. *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies.* New York: Harper & Row,1982.
- Podsakoff, P.M. et al. "*Situational moderators of leader reward and punishment behaviour*: Fact or Fiction?*" Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance* 34, (1984): 21-63.
- Rangaswami, G. and D. Helmick *'A Comparative Study of Indian and American Executives' Leadership Styles'* Indian Administrative and Management Review, (July-September, 1976).
- Runyson, R. E. *'Some Interactions between Personality Variable and management style'* Journal of Applied Psychology, 57, 1973. 288-294
- Saiyadain, M. S. '*Personality Predisposition and Satisfaction with Supervisory Style.* Indian journal of industrial relations, 10, 1974. 153- 161.
- Sanderson, D. and R.W. Nafe. *Studies in Rural Leadership*. Social Soc. Amer Publication, 1929.
- Sayles, L.R. *What effective managers really do and how they do it.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979
- Sequeira, C. E. *'Characteristics of an Effective Superior',* Manas 9. (1962 a) 1-12.
- Sequeira, C. E. *'Factions of a Supervisor'* Indian Journal of Applied Psychology, 1 (1962 b) 46-57.
- Singh R. and S. Sengupta. *'Leadership: a Style or an Influence Process.* Indian Journal of Industrial Relation, 33 (3), 1997. 265-286

- Solem, A. R. A*n evaluation of two attitudinal approaches to delegation. Journal of Applied Psychology 42, (1958. 36-39.*
- Stewart, R. *Choices for the manager: A guide to understanding managerial work.* Englewood cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1982.
- Stewart, R. *Contrasts in management. Maidenhead*, Berkshire, England; McGraw-Hill U.K., 1976.
- Stogdill, R.M. *Individual Behaviour and Group Achievement*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Yukl, G. "*Managerial leadership*: A review of theory and research." Journal of Management 15, (1989): 251-289.
- Yukl, G. "*Managerial leadership*: A review of theory and research." Journal of Management 15, (1989): 251-289.
- Yukl, G. A. *Leadership in organizations* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989.
- Yukl, G. and T. Taber "*The effective use of managerial power". Personnel* (1983, March-April): 37-44
- Yukl, G., et al. *"Multi-method research on the consequences of using different influence tactics with subordinates, peer and superior."* Unpublished manuscript. SUNY, Albany, NY. (1991).
- Yukl, G., S. Wall & Lepsinger R. "*Preliminary report on validation of the management practices survey",* in K.E. Clark M.B. Clark (Eds.),
- Zaccaro, S.J., R.J. Foti & D.A. Kennny, "*Self –monitoring and traitbased variance in leadership*: An investigation of leader flexibility across
- Zaleznik, A. "*Managers and leaders;* Are they different*?" Harvard Business Review* 55(5), (1977): 67-78..