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In the past seventy years, more than 3,000 leadership studies have been conducted and dozens of leadership models and theories have been proposed. The earliest literature on leadership was concerned almost entirely with theoretical issues. The theory of a concept and research together combine to yield into a problem. Therefore, the theoretical literature can not be neglected.

To give an account of what has happened till date on a concept like leadership is not an easy task. Hundreds of studies have been made on leadership in various parts of the world each year. Still an attempt has been made here to review all areas which are relevant for the present study under the following major heads.

1. Great Man theories
2. Trait theories
3. Behavioral theories
4. Situational or Contingency theories
5. Recent approaches to Leadership
6. Leadership Studies in India, and
7. Indian Approach to Leadership.

1. GREAT MAN THEORY

At first, leaders were thought to be born and not made. This so-called “great person” theory of leadership implies that some individuals are born with certain traits that allow them to emerge out of any situation or period of history to become leaders. This theory focuses attention on the man or woman on the job and not on the job itself. In other words, great person theory studies individual leaders – “leaderships” rather than “leadership”.

Carlyle as a writer on the subject, promoted the notion of “great man theory” in his writings. In his essay on heroes, he tended to reinforce the concept of the leader as a person endowed with unique qualities that capture the imagination of the masses.

The first person who conducted an authentic study of this approach was Galton. Several early theorists influenced by Galton’s study of the hereditary background of great men attempted to explain leadership on the basis of inheritance.

Woods studied fourteen nations over periods of five to ten centuries. The conditions of each reign were found to approximate the ruler’s capabilities. The brothers of Kings (as a result of natural endowment, of course) also tended to become men of power and influence. Woods concluded that man makes the nation and shapes it in accordance with his abilities.

Wiggam, in his work on the theory, advanced the proposition that the survival of the fittest and intermarriage among them produces an aristocratic class differing biologically from the lower classes. Thus, an adequate supply of superior leaders depends upon a proportionately high birth rate among the abler classes.

Drucker, supporting this notion says that leadership is of utmost importance. Indeed there is no substitute for it. But leadership cannot be created or promoted. It cannot be taught or learned.
In the final stages, Great man theory evolved into what is known as "trait theory" of leadership.

2. TRAIT THEORY

Most of the studies in this area have been conducted during the first half of the twentieth century. The theory is simple. If the leader is endowed with superior qualities that differentiate him from his followers, or differentiate an effective leader from an ineffective one, it should be possible to identify these qualities. This assumption gave rise to trait theories of leadership. According to this approach, leadership is a conglomeration of set of personality traits.

Trait theorists early in this century contended that there was a finite set of personal characteristics, inner traits, which distinguished effective from ineffective leaders. Trait theory research began about 1904 and systematically expanded for almost fifty years into a giant body of findings, information and theory. Hundreds of research models and methods were devised over these years to find the sought-after set of leadership traits. Some of the prominent studies are mentioned here.

Perhaps one of the first trait theories came about in ancient Greece at the time of the famous physician named Galen. Galen thought that our personality was a reflection of the four hormones (fluids) that make up our bodies. Yellow Bile – bad temper, irritability (choleric) Black bile—gloomy pessimistic (Melancholic) Phlegm—sluggish, non-excitable (phlegmatic)
Blood—cheerful, passionate (sanguine). If one of these fluids dominated, the personality associated with that fluid would be observed.

According to Allport,⁷ a trait is "... a generalised and focalised neuro-psychic system (peculiar to the individual), with the capacity to render many stimuli functionally equivalent, and to initiate and guide consistent (equivalent) forms of adaptive and expressive behaviour." He distinguished traits and types and said that "unlike traits—types always have a bio-social reference. A man can be said to have a trait but he cannot be said to have a type. Types exist not in people or in nature, but rather in the eye of the observer. Traits, on the contrary, are considered wholly within the compass of the individual. He broadly divides the traits into Cardinal, Central and Secondary traits.

According to E.E.Ghiselli⁸ the search for leader traits was not a total failure and several traits do appear to be modestly associated with leadership. Chief among these traits is intelligence. He says that the people who hold leadership positions tend to be somewhat more intelligent. In his study, he emphasised significant correlations between leadership and traits of intelligence, supervisory ability, initiative, self-assurance and individuality in doing a work but suggested that extremely higher or lower intelligence reduces the leadership qualities.

Fiedler⁹ supported the views of Ghiselli but he had a slightly different argument. He said that 'although intelligence has been shown to correlate only
modestly with leadership leader intelligence and other cognitive attributes can be highly correlated with effectiveness under special circumstances.

In the words of Ralph.M.Stogdill, there are some other traits which have also been linked to successful leaders. According to him the leaders can be characterised by task persistence, self-confidence, tolerance of interpersonal stress, and the ability to influence other people's behaviour.

Henry Fayol in his trait approach identified three qualities: physical qualities such as health, vigour; mental qualities such as ability to understand and learn, judgement, mental vigour and adaptability; moral qualities such as energy, firmness, willingness to accept responsibility, initiative, loyalty, tact and dignity.

Franklin.A.Cole rates the traits of "judgement leadership, intelligence, rationality, and technical competence" high as vital qualities for a leader. He warns that less than broad integrity, rashness and unwillingness to accept responsibility are the key list to watch for.

The ten desirable qualities mentioned by F.W.Taylor are brains, education, energy, grit, special or technical knowledge, honesty, manual dexterity or strength, judgement or common sense, tact and good health. He argued that to find out a person with three of these traits was not too difficult, with five or six more difficult, but with seven or eight almost impossible. Bearing
in mind the difficulties involved in the identification of all or almost all of the traits in one person, Taylor developed the concept of functional foremanship.

Charles Byrd\textsuperscript{14} tested the proficiency of a large number of studies on leadership and drew up lists of the traits they described. He found only 51 percent of the traits which were mentioned in more than four studies. They suggest that the essential characteristics of another leader, which is highly dubious.

Raymond.B.Cattel\textsuperscript{15} in his research isolated 171 traits for leaders to practise, but admitted that most of them elude description.

Mann.\textsuperscript{16} in a survey of research on the relation of personality and small group performance found positive relationships in 71 percent of the studies for intelligence, adjustment, extroversion, dominance, masculinity and sensitivity.

In his study of the government administrators of Washington Thurstone\textsuperscript{17} commented that a successful leader should have the qualities of fluency of speech, ability to evaluate situations and knowledge about work doing.

According to Keith Davis\textsuperscript{18} the traits such as intelligence, social maturity and breadth, inner motivation and drive and human relations attitudes are the key characteristics that are to be shared by most successful leaders.

When Warren Bennis and Bert Nanus\textsuperscript{19} interviewed top executives and gifted entrepreneurs who make things happen in America, they identified four
main competencies common to all leaders: the management of attention, meaning, trust and self.

James M. Konzes and Barry Z. Posner\textsuperscript{20} surveyed over 7500 managers from across the United States during the 1980s to determine the traits they admired in superior leaders. Honesty was selected by 87 percent of the respondents, easily outdistancing the traits like being competent (74 per cent), forward looking (67 percent), inspiring (61 percent) and intelligent (46 percent).

According to John Adair\textsuperscript{21} there are certain qualities which are the hallmark of a successful leader. They are integrity, enthusiasm, warmth, calmness and being tough but fair. He reminds us that it is the 'juxtaposition' of qualities—the pattern of qualities that matters most.

Chester Bernard\textsuperscript{22} lists out five active personal qualities of leaders. They are i) vitality and endurance, ii) decisiveness, iii) persuasiveness, iv) responsibility, and v) intellectual capacity.

In the words of Rodman L. Drake\textsuperscript{23} successful leaders in today's demanding environment tend to share at least eight personal characteristics such as the ability to focus attention, an emphasis on simple values, staying in touch with people, avoiding pseudo professionalism, managing change, selecting people, avoiding "do-it-allies", and facing up to failure.

Rodger D Coons\textsuperscript{24} in his study on the traits of effective leaders said that although leadership research has not revealed a single trait that is possessed
by all successful leaders, a number of characteristics have been identified that are common to many of them. These include verbal fluency, problem-solving ability, insights into group problems, flexibility, intelligence, acceptance of responsibility, social skills and awareness of self and surroundings.

Nation's business survey\textsuperscript{25} compiles a long list of positive factors that some leaders think a successor should have. Intelligence, drive, willingness to work hard and leadership capabilities are some of the traits most frequently mentioned.

Susan Leshnower\textsuperscript{26} studied about the traits that are to be possessed by all leaders. According to her, there are six important qualities without which a person always remains a follower. They are i) creating a vision, ii) communicating effectively, iii) active listening, iv) initiating change, v) risk taking and vi) building trust.

According to Jim Evans\textsuperscript{27} a leader, if he wants to be effective, must cultivate the following ten characteristics. (i) a listening habit, (ii) a learning habit, (iii) a motion habit, (iv) a wow! Habit, (v) a commitment habit, (vi) a confidence habit, (vii) a funny habit, (viii) a vision habit, (ix) a diverse habit and, (x) character

Nichel Maccoby\textsuperscript{28} recommended the four ideal characteristics of a successful leader. According to him, a good leader is one who is protestant or puritan ethic, the craft ethic, the entrepreneurial ethic and the career ethic. He
again says that a leader who is kind, compassionate, generous, gratuitous and loyal can only come up in flying colours.

The concept of leadership explained on the basis of inheritance or personality traits is not free from shortcomings.

Byrd, in a study of trait theory research up to 1940, identified a long list of traits which studies have shown differentiated the leaders and the led, but found that only 5 per cent of the traits were common to four or more of the studies.

Another study by Jennings concluded that fifty years of study have failed to produce one personality trait or set of qualities that can be used to discriminate between leaders and non leaders. As the research progressed, the number of traits of suspected importance began to grow.

According to Stogdill, trait theory suffers from a serious drawback that the personality theorists tended to regard leadership as a one way influence effect, while recognising that the leader may posses qualities differentiating him from followers. They generally failed to acknowledge the reciprocal and interactive characteristics of the leadership situation.

D.L. Cawthon criticised the trait approach on the ground that the results of various studies became increasingly mixed and did not follow a clear pattern.
Rao and Narayana\textsuperscript{33} listed some of the weaknesses of trait theory. They say that it is very difficult to define and measure traits. For example, some of the psychological attributes like intelligence, initiative can not be observed but can only be inferred from the behaviour.

Charles R. Melton\textsuperscript{34} pointed out that the trait theory failed because it is the leadership situation, the leader traits is essential for leadership.

In the words of Huneryag and Henchman,\textsuperscript{35} though a large number of traits have already been discovered, the list grows annually. The cumbersome listing leads to confusion and disputes and provides little insight into leadership. As no two trait lists agree, the net result of these trait approaches on leadership is that of confusion predicated on a foundation of generalities and semantic problems.

Alvor W Gouldner\textsuperscript{36} listed some of the weaknesses of the trait theory. They are (a) Trait lists do not usually indicate the traits which are most important and which are least important, (b) traits, often are not mutually exclusive as for example, in the case of judgement and common sense, (c) trait studies do not distinguish between traits which are needed for acquiring leadership and those which are necessary for maintaining it, (d) trait studies describe but do not analyse behaviour patterns, and (e) trait theory is based on debatable assumptions regarding personality.
James Spots said that leaders can not be markedly different from their followers. Extremes in personality are not usually associated with leadership.

Researchers very often disagree over which traits are most important for an effective leader. There is no universal list of traits for successful leaders.

According to Don Hellriegel and his associates the list of personality traits is painfully long and exhaustive. Although over one hundred personality attributes of successful leaders have been identified, no consistent pattern/patterns have been found.

Even if he is one of the proponents of trait theory John Adair criticises it on the ground that 'even if a list of leadership qualities could be identified the qualities approach does not form the best starting point for leadership training. He remembers the point that there exists apparently little or no agreement on what are the qualities of a leader.

3. BEHAVIOURAL THEORIES

During World War II, the study on leadership took a new significant twist. When it became evident that effective leaders did not seem to have particular set of distinguishing traits, the early interest of trait approach to leadership began to decline and the researchers focused their attention on leaders' actions rather than on their attributes. In other words, rather than trying to figure out who effective leaders are, researchers tried to determine what effective leaders do—how they delegate tasks, how they carry out their tasks and so on.
Researchers were of the opinion that behaviour, unlike traits can be learned. So it followed that individuals trained in appropriate leadership behaviour would be able to lead more effectively. The study of leadership in this phase mainly focused on two aspects of leadership behaviour: leadership styles and leadership functions.

Leadership Styles

Attention to leadership as behavioural category has drawn attention to the importance of leadership style. In simple terms, the leadership style can be defined as the behaviour exhibited by a leader during supervision of subordinates.

Laurie J. Mullins\textsuperscript{40} defined leadership style as "the way in which the functions of leadership are carried out, the way in which the manager typically behaves towards members of the group."

In the words of McGregor\textsuperscript{41} style can be defined as "the method of coping with organisational reality which evolves out of trial and error and is not deliberately adopted or eventually recognised by the leader". The predictable ways of coping with the reality of the work environment according to him may be termed as "managerial styles".

Leaders occupy positions of high status in relation to position of followers. High status positions usually involve wider scopes of authority for decision and initiation of action than are found in subordinate positions.
Because of this, it is said that leadership positions attract persons who enjoy the exercise of power and authority.

The traditionalist school defines authority as "the right to command and to induce compliance".

In the words of Chester Bernard\textsuperscript{42}, authority is "the character of the communication (order) in a formal organisation by virtue of which it is accepted by a contributor to or a member of the organisation as governing the action he contributes". The behavioural school following the influence of Bernard maintained that the leader has authority only to the extent that followers are willing to accept his commands.

Stogdill\textsuperscript{43}, in a study of more than 1700 individuals in formal organisations, found that only 1 in 500 checked the statement "I have no authority whatsoever".

There are many dimensions to leadership and many possible ways of describing leadership styles such as autocratic/dictatorial, benevolent autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire etc. all these classifications have been done taking authority of the leader as the base.

In autocratic or authoritative or nomothetic or directive style, the leader centralises power and decision making in himself and exercise complete control over the subordinates. Under this style, supervision is tight, direct and precise. Decisions are enforced using rewards and the fear of punishment. Full authority
and responsibility are assumed by the leader. When provided, communication tends to be primarily downward. If the authority of the autocratic leader becomes oppressive, subordinates may become insecure and afraid.

Rosenbaum says that under conditions of stress, or when great speed and efficiency are required, autocratic leadership can yield positive outcomes. It can increase productivity and, more surprising, it can also enhance morale too. If the leader is weak and incompetent, this style possesses some advantage and certain disadvantages. The advantages are quick decision making and speedy accomplishment of the task.

An authoritative type of personality has been postulated by Adorno et al. A test (F-scale) is designed to measure authoritarianism. This personality syndrome was characterised as involving political and religious conservatism, emotional coldness, quest of power, hostility towards minority groups, resistance to change, rejection of humanitarian values and the like.

Courtney et al. administered the F scale to a representative sample of the residents of Philadelphia. The subjects scoring highest on authoritarian scale were labouring people with least education. Managers, officials and clerical and a sales people made the lowest score. Professionals, semi professionals and university students scored between these two groups. In a separate study, in experimental groups, it was found that the leaders were significantly more equalitarian than others. Greer interviewed twenty nine leaders in Philadelphia. Their scores on the authoritarian – equalitarian scale
were significantly more than those of non leaders. Tarnapol also obtained similar results.

Sanford administered an authoritarian-equalitarian scale to 963 randomly selected adults in Philadelphia. Those who scored high in authoritarianism wanted a leader to be competent, educated helpful to people, understanding and stern. The low scored and preferred leaders, who were kind, guided by people, one of the people, strong and friendly.

In the words of Jef Harris, autocratic style permits quick decision making and hence can be applied with success in situations where: the subordinated lack knowledge of organisational goals; the subordinates are inexperienced and lack training; the company endorses the fear and punishment as accepted disciplinary techniques; the leader prefers to be active and dominant in decision making; and, there is little room for error in final accomplishment.

**Autocratic style of leadership is not free from disadvantages.**

Basic limitation with this style of leadership is that the subordinates are made aware of what to do but not why. As a result, frustration, low morale and conflict develop very easily. Moreover, autocratic leadership can be only as good as the leader is.

The autocratic leaders may become a benevolent autocrat. Under this style, subordinates are dealt with effectively and they achieve security and
satisfaction. A benevolent autocrat may simply give orders, may use praise and demand loyalty and may make subordinates feel they are actually participating in decision making even though they are doing what the boss wants. Leadership will be more effective in different situations if the autocratic style of leaders is benevolent in their behaviour.

This type of leadership may fetch more fruits than of pure autocratic styles if the work climate demands strong authority.

According to Robert N Mcmury, benevolent autocracy is more realistic and is capable of making the most of a bad situation. He argued that benevolent dictatorship is not only a faster moving but a more effective system of managing an enterprise.

In democratic or participatory style, the focus of power is more with the group as a whole and there is greater interaction within the group. Under this style, subordinates participate in goal setting and problem solving. This participation encourages member commitment to the final decision. The democratic leader creates situations by which individuals can lean, enables people to chat their own performance, allows subordinates to set challenging goals, provides opportunities for improved work methods and job growth and recognise achievements and helps employees learn from error.
Managers practising this style are labelled as 'Theory Y' leaders. The 'Y' according to McGregor\textsuperscript{51} refers to people who like to work and accept responsibility and are liable to exercise ingenuity, creativity and imagination.

Victor Vroom\textsuperscript{52} found that participative leadership has a positive effect only on those individuals with strong non-authoritarian values or high need for independence. Basic problem with the participative leadership style is that it may not yield positive results when the subordinates prefer minimum interaction with the leader.

Keith Davis\textsuperscript{53} is one among those who tried to study the effectiveness of various leadership styles in different situations. He pointed out one of the very important demerits of democratic leadership in saying that over a period of time group members develop a frustrating habit of expecting to be consulted on every issue, even those to which they can not contribute. When they are not consulted, they feel slighted, insulted and become resentful and uncooperative.

Laissez-faire leadership or Free-rein leadership is a rather complete delegation of authority into the hands of the subordinates so that they must plan, motivate, control and otherwise be responsible for their own actions. Laissez-faire leadership (literally known as “allow them to do leadership”), attempts to enforce only very little control over group members or subordinates.
Leadership Continuum Approach

Robert Tannenbaum and Warren Schmidt were the first theorists to describe the various factors that influence a leader's choice of leadership styles. While they personally favoured the employee-centred style, they suggested that a leader consider three sets of "forces" before choosing a leadership style. They are: forces in the manager, forces in the subordinates, and forces in the situation.

Let us see these forces in detail.

i) forces in the manager – how a manager leads undoubtedly will primarily influenced by his or her background knowledge, values and experience, his knowledge of subordinates and his tolerance of ambiguity.

ii) forces in the subordinates- characteristics of subordinates must also be considered before managers can choose an appropriate style. According to Tannenbaum and Schmidt, a leader can allow greater participation and freedom when employees crave independence and freedom of action, want to have decision-making responsibility, identity with the organisational goals, are knowledgeable and experienced enough to deal with a problem efficiently and have experiences that lead them to expect participative management. Whereas leaders may need initially to adopt a more authoritarian style when these conditions are absent.

iii) forces in the situation- finally, a manager's choice of leadership style must address such situational forces as the organisation's preferred style, the size and cohesiveness of a specific work group, the nature of the group's
tasks, the pressure of time, and even environmental factors— all of which may affect organisation members' attitudes and authority.

Later Schmidt and Tannenbaum converted the six stereotypical classes of leader behaviour into a continuum, ranging from high-leader authority on the left side of the continuum to high subordinate freedom on the right end. The continuum was first presented in 1958. Reviewing the model in 1973, Tannenbaum and Schmidt placed two circles around their model to represent the influences on style imposed by the organisational environment and by the social environment.

One of the serious problems of the continuum presented by Tannenbaum and Schmidt is that it supports unidimensional thinking. A boss-centred leader is seen greatly interested in task-oriented activities, but not very concerned with people. An increase in one type of behaviour is automatically seen as a decrease in other type.

Keith Davis criticised the continuum approach on the ground that a manager who becomes more employee-centred does not thereby become task-oriented. Each orientation has an independent orientation and a manager may have both orientations to varying degree.

Ohio State University Studies

During the height of the behavioural phase, dating roughly from the late 1940s to the early 1960s, several large research programmes were conducted
including the Ohio University Leadership Studies, a programme for research, which has received considerable publicity over the years.

The Ohio university leadership studies were organised in 1945, shortly after the Second World War, by Shartle. At that time nothing existed in the way of satisfactory leadership theory. Ohio studies initially concentrated on leadership in military organisations. The studies on the military organisations discovered two dimensions—Consideration and Initiating Structure, which seemed most important in summarising the nature of the subordinate's perceptions about their superior's behaviour toward them. In the 'Initiating Structure' dimension the leader acts to improve the work objectives of the group, and in the consideration dimension the emphasis is on the needs of the followers and an interpersonal relationships. In simple terms, consideration (C) refers to the ability of the leader to establish rapport, mutual respect and two-way communication with employees. Where as Initiating structure refers to the extent to which the leaders' structure and define the activities of subordinates so that organisational goals are accomplished.

During research, the Ohio State scholars have developed the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) that contains 15 items regarding the consideration and an equal number referring initiating structure to describe activities displayed by the leader. The research staff, under the supervision of Fleishman, also developed a leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) that reflects the self-perceptions that the leaders have about their styles of leadership.
A high score on the consideration dimension reflected that the leaders had developed a work atmosphere of mutual trust, respect for subordinates' feelings, good superior-subordinate rapport and effective two-way communication.

A high score on the initiating structure indicated that the leader structured their attainment of objectives. Low scores on the consideration and initiating structure shared the opposite or lower behaviours in the respective components of each dimension.

Joseph Rost criticized Ohio State studies by saying that the two important dimensions of the theory "consideration" and "initiating structure" and other two-dimensional variables failed to either explain or predict leadership behaviour.

**Michigan University studies**

A similar concept was developed by Michigan University Studies in the year 1947. Extensive analysis of their research findings reveal that leadership is the bipolarization of employee-oriented and production-oriented behavioural traits—i.e., concern for people and concern for tasks.

Michigan study revealed the fact that production-centred managers set rigid work standards organized tasks down to the last detail. Prescribed work methods to be followed and closely supervised employees work. Employee-centred managers encouraged employee participation in goal setting and other
work decisions and helped ensure high performance by inspiring trust and respect.

The studies found that the most productive work groups tended to have leaders who were employee-centred rather than production-centred. They also found that the most effective leaders had supportive relationships with their employees, tended to depend on group rather than individual decision making and encouraged employees to set and achieve high performance goals.

One conclusion of the Ohio state and Michigan Studies is that leadership style might not be unidimensional. Both task orientation and employee orientations are not only possible but crucial to superior performance. It is interesting to discuss the similarities of both these studies. Both have accepted that leader behaviour is more complex than the oversimplified dichotomy of task and maintenance-oriented behaviour. These two theories have identified and stressed performance – production emphasis at Ohio and goal emphasis or high standards of production performance at Michigan and both found that the pattern of behaviour of effective leaders definitely varied with the situation.

According to Fiedler, Consideration and Initiation of Structure are not independent dimensions. It is extremely difficult for a given person to be both production-oriented and employee-oriented.
Korman criticises these theories by saying that C and IS are not such significant leader behaviours as previously assumed. There is no significant relationship between leader behaviour and such measures like productivity.

Favouring the contingency theory – which acknowledges the reciprocal and interactive characteristics of the leadership situation - Steven Kerr et al. say that the leader behaviour model suggested by the Ohio scholars is an oversimplification of reality. They further say that “the effects of both C and IS are situationally determined.

Managerial Grid Theory

The most remarkable step towards the understanding of behavioural aspects of leadership was the formulation of a much better theory called 'Managerial Grid' theory Robert Blake and Jane S Mouton, which was developed in the year 1964. This theory helps in measuring the leaders' relative concern for people and tasks, and reflects the bi-dimensional nature of leadership. It is a trade marked and widely recognised typology of leadership styles. This theory has been restated in 1978 and in 1985 and represented as the 'leadership grid' figure in the year 1991 by Robert Blake and Anne Adams McCanse.

Managerial grid theory identifies a range of management behaviours based on the various ways the task-oriented and employee-oriented styles (each expressed on a continuum in a scale of 1 to 9) can interact with each other.
Style 1.1 management at the lower left-hand corner of the grid, is impoverished management—low concern for people and low concern for tasks and production. This style is sometimes called as laissez-faire management because the leader does not take a leadership role.

Style 1.9 management is 'country club management'—high concern for employees but low concern for production. It's opposite 9,1 management is task or authoritarian management—high concern for production and efficiency but low concern for employees. Style 5,5 is middle of the road management—an intermediate amount of concern for both production and employee satisfaction.

Style 9,9 called team or democratic management—a high concern for both production and employee morale and satisfaction. The presence of this category contrasts with the earlier assumption that leaders had to have one orientation or the other. Blake and Mouton argue strongly that style 9, 9 is the most effective management style. They believe this leadership approach will in almost all situations, results in improving performance, low absenteeism and turnover and high employee satisfaction.

Managerial grid theory is widely used even today in various industrial and non industrial organisations for determining the effective leadership behaviour.

The 1991 edition of the grid also covers two additional styles; 9+9 paternalism and opportunism in addition to the styles mentioned earlier i.e. the impoverished manager (1,1 rating), the authority-compliance manager(9,1
rating), the country club manager (1,9 rating), the middle of the road manager (5,5 rating) and the team manager (9,9 rating).

In 9+9 paternalistic management, reward and approval are granted to people in return for loyalty and obedience; and punishment is threatened for the failure to comply.

In opportunistic management, organisational performance occurs according to a system of exchanges whereby effort is given only for an equivalent measure of the same. People adapt to the situation to gain maximum advantage of it.

He believes, it undoubtedly lends itself supremely well to training programmes. He reminds us saying that although its relevance in real life issues is less sure, in presenting a sophisticated learning package the grid provides many potential applications for those who wish to study organisation development.

4. SITUATIONAL OR CONTINGENCY THEORIES

According to majority of the researchers on the topic of leadership during the late sixties, the results of the trait and behavioural approaches of leadership were not satisfactory. The major limitation with the earlier trait and behavioural approaches is that they are universal approaches and they search for a magic key to leadership that is devoid of situational context, follower behaviour and personality. Therefore, after the trait approach proved to fell short of being an
adequate overall theory of leadership and behavioural approaches showed that effective leadership depended on many variables, such as organisational culture and the nature of tasks, attention turned to the situational aspects of leadership.

In this context James Owens\(^{64}\) says that fifty or more years of intensive research efforts found leadership as a universal set of either traits or behaviors non-existent. Finally, the situation factor had to be faced directly.

Situational theories are otherwise called contingency theories. The term ‘contingency’ literally means that ‘something dependent on another uncertain event’. Therefore we can say, ‘leadership effectiveness’ as per this theory is depended on certain internal and external factors. Researchers called these factors as ‘situational variables’. This approach was initially called ‘Zeitgeist\(^{65}\) (a German word meaning “spirit of the time”).

Current leadership research is almost entirely situational. Researchers, in this phase are working towards identifying those factors in each situation that influenced the effectiveness of a particular leadership style. Besides, this approach examines the interrelationships among leaders and subordinate behaviors or characteristics and the situations in which the parties find themselves. This can clearly be seen in the work of researchers such as F.E. Fiedler\(^{66}\), who outlined one of the first situational models.
Fiedler's Contingency Model

Fiedler is usually credited with the first major studies to use situation as a main factor. He, along with his colleagues at the University of Illinois has developed a situational theory. His contingency model is one of the most serious and elaborates situational theories in leadership literature. The contingency model attempts to rectify the inherent deficiencies of trait and behavioural theories.

Fiedler's theory strongly suggests that people become leaders not only because of the attributes of their personality or attributes of power and perception style but also because of various situational factors and the interaction between the leaders and the situation.

Contingency theory specifies the conditions under which a particular style will be effective. Fred. E. Fiedler et al. developed the most widely researched and quoted contingency model, which holds that the best style of leadership is determined by the situation in which the leader is working.

Fiedler developed the so called contingency model of leadership effectiveness in order to test the hypothesis he had formulated from his previous research findings. The contingency theory classifies situations into three categories: high control, moderate control, and low control. (An earlier version of the model used the term Favorability instead of control, because an easily controlled situation is favorable to the leader.) The control classifications
are determined by rating the situation on its three dimensions such as (i) leader-member relations, (ii) task structure and (iii) position power.

Depending on the 'high' and 'low' categories of the situational variables mentioned above, Fiedler developed eight possible combinations ranging from highly favorable or highly controllable to highly unfavorable or highly uncontrollable situations.

A favorable situation is where the leader-member relations are good, the task is highly structured and the leader has enormous power to exert influence on the subordinates. New version of the theory termed this situation as a 'high-control' situation because an easily controllable situation is favorable to the leader.

At the other extreme, an 'unfavorable' or 'uncontrollable' situation is where the leader's power is weak, relations with members are poor and the task is unstructured and unpredictable.

Fiedler argues that relationship oriented or permissive style is best when the situation is moderately favourable or moderately unfavourable. When the situation is highly favourable or highly unfavourable, a task-oriented style produces the desired performance.

What differentiates Fiedler's model from the others is the measuring instrument he used. Fiedler measured leadership style on a scale that indicated "the degree to which a man described favourably or unfavourably his least
preferred co-worker (LPC) measures leadership by developing two testing techniques (1) Least preferred co-worker (LPC), preference rating made by people in a group as to those with whom they would least like to work, and (2) Assumed similarity between opposites (ASO). Similarity rating based on the degree to which leaders perceive group members to be like themselves on the assumption that people will like the best and work best with those who are perceived as most like themselves. First, leaders are asked to think of a person with whom he has worked least well. They are then asked to describe this person on a series of bipolar objective scales.

In this bipolar scale, '8' represents the most favourable perception of one's least preferred co-worker and '1' the reverse. The leader's responses so measured are then totalled and arranged. High LPC leaders tend to be friendly, considerate and employee-oriented; low LPC are task-oriented, objective and impersonal.69

A major contribution of Fiedler's work is that it has prompted others to conduct studies about the contingency nature of leadership.

Andrew J. Drubin70 says that the contingency theory has alerted leader to the importance of sizing up the situation to gain control. For instance, an unfavourable situation could be made more favourable by granting the leader more position power or by increasing task structure. The contingency theory can provide a few useful suggestions for becoming a more effective leader.
Oven's\textsuperscript{71} survey of hundreds of practicing managers is one of many reality-oriented confirmations of the contingency thesis. These managers expressed a virtual consensus based on their actual experience; each situation they handled demanded a different leadership style. No single style could suffice under varying conditions day-by-day, even minute-by-minute and compared different personalities and mood among their employees, routine processes versus changing or sudden deadlines, new and ever-changing government regulations and paperwork, ambiguous roles of workers, wide ranges in job complexity from simple to innovation-demanding, changes in organizational structure and markets and task technologies and so on.

Despite its potential advantages, the contingency theory is too complicated to have much of an impact on most leaders.

Andrew J Drubin\textsuperscript{72} has pointed that a major problem centres on matching the situation to the leader. In most situations, the amount of control the leader exercises varies from time to time. For example, if a relationship motivated leader were to find the situation becoming too favourable for exercising control, it is doubtful that he or she would be transferred to a less favourable situation or attempt to make the situation less favourable.

J.C. Campbell et al\textsuperscript{73} viewed that out of all the three variables, task structure is the only important situational factor. He also pointed out that some of Fiedler's research findings are statistically not significant.
Hodgets and Atmaw argued that Fiedler could not explain why the same style is appropriate and works equally in both favourable and unfavourable situations.

R.J. House and et al. found in many studies that workers in routine jobs resented a task-oriented boss, whose orders were redundant and unnecessary for workers who could do the routine jobs in their sleep and exhibited higher satisfaction and productivity with an employee-oriented leader.

Almost all of the researchers who have reviewed the Fiedler's theory show positive conclusions. L.H. Peters and et al. says that there is considerable evidence to support at least substantial parts of Fiedler's model.

Rice criticises the Fiedler's model by saying that the logic underlying the LPC is not well understood and studies have shown that respondent's LPC scores are not stable.

Schnin and Kebanoff points out a serious limitation of contingency theory in saying that the variables are complex and difficult in practise to determine how good the leader-member relations are, how structured the task is and how much position power the leader has.

Path-Goal theory

Another situational leadership theory is the path-goal theory, a derivative of Vroom's expectancy motivation theory and somewhat more elaborate than fielder's contingency models. This model was developed by Robert House and
Martin G. Evans. It takes into account the personality characteristics of subordinates as well as situational variables. It is based on the situation, like the contingency model, rather than on a single type of leadership. Path goal theory gets its name from the assumption that effective leaders can enhance subordinate motivation by 1) clarifying the subordinate's perception of work goals, 2) linking meaningful rewards with goal attainment, and 3) explaining how goals and desired rewards can be achieved. In short, leaders should motivate their followers by providing clear goals and meaningful incentives for reaching them. Path goal theorists believe that motivation is essential to effective leadership.

According to the two path goal theorists, leaders can enhance motivation by increasing the number and kinds of personal pay-offs to subordinates for work-goal attainment and making paths to these pay-offs easier to travel by clarifying the paths, reducing roadblocks and pitfalls, and increasing the opportunities for personal satisfaction enroute.

Path-goal theory suggests that leaders should motivate subordinates by clarifying the path to personal rewards that results from attaining work goals. The path is clarified by eliminating confusion or conflicting ideas that the subordinate may hold. As per this theory, the leader should (i) clear paths, (ii) clarify goals, (iii) provide support, and (iv) provide rewards, analyse the situation, task and employee's needs.

Personal characteristics of subordinates, environmental pressures, and demands on subordinates will all vary from situation to situation. Thus, path
goal proponents believe that managers need to rely contingently on four different leadership styles:\footnote{81}

**Directive**: Tell people what is expected of them and provide specific guidance, schedules, rules, regulations and standards.

**Supportive**: Treat subordinates as equals in a friendly manner while striving to improve their well-being.

**Participative**: Consult with subordinates to seek their suggestions and then seriously consider these suggestions when making decisions.

**Achievement-oriented**: Set challenging goals, emphasize excellence, and seek continuous improvement while maintaining a high degree of confidence that subordinates will meet different challenges in a responsible manner.\footnote{82}

The path goal theory is currently in the stage of infancy, backed by a relatively little research. Some researchers report that workers on highly structured tasks have high job satisfaction when their leader uses a supportive style. Conversely, workers on highly unstructured tasks are more productive when the leader uses a directive style but do not necessarily report more satisfaction.

Andrew Szlegyi and Henry Sims\footnote{83} criticised that path goal theory is a complicated situational theory. Empirical testing becomes difficult because of methodological complexities.
Some researchers like Weed, Mitchell etc., do not conform some of the findings of House. They find that the entire theory to be sketchy in nature, requiring further refinement.

Another serious limitation is that the path goal theory is a post hoc theory in the sense that some of the research evidence supporting the theory was also used to construct it.

In their 1988 book, Victor Vroom and Arthur Jago firmly criticise the path goal theory because it fails to take into account the situation with in which managers decide to involve employees. In their efforts for finding a solution for this, they extend the classic Vroom-Yetton model of situational leadership to include a concern for both the quality and the acceptance of decisions.

In spite of all these criticisms, House’s model is appreciated on the ground that it not only attempts to suggest what type of leader may be effective in a given situation but also attempts to explain why the leader is effective.

**Life Cycle Theory**

The life cycle theory of Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard reflects a systematic conceptualisation of situational factors as related to leadership behaviour. It is based on a curvilinear relationship between task and relationships and maturity of followers. The Life Cycle theory focuses on followers ignoring other situational factors like supervision, job demands, time element, and organisation etc. While all these situational variables are equally
important, the emphasis in situational leadership is one the behaviour of a leader in relation to followers. This is probably due to the fact that followers in any situation are vital, not only because individually they accept or reject the leader, because as a group they actually determine whatever personal power the leader may have.

The Life Cycle theory is based on an inter-play among three variables—task behaviour, relationship behaviour and the maturity of the followers.  

(a) Task behaviour: It is seen in terms of the amount of guidance and direction a leader gives.  
(b) Relationship behaviour: It is determined by socio-emotional support provided by the leader.  
(c) Maturity of followers: It is reflected by the readiness level exhibited by subordinates in performing a given task.

The crux of the Life Cycle theory is ‘the maturity of the followers’. It is the social benchmark of choosing the appropriate style. Maturity is defined here in terms of achievement motivation, i.e., the ability and willingness of people to take responsibility for directing their own behaviour. Ability refers to the knowledge and skill of the follower to do the job which is called job maturity. Willingness refers to the psychological maturity and has much to do with confidence and commitment of the follower.

The life cycle theory suggests that the leader behaviour, to be effective, must change as followers mature. Accordingly, as the level of maturity of one's followers continues to increase appropriate leader behaviour not only requires less and structure(task) but also less and less socio-emotional support.
Beginning with structured task behaviour, which is appropriate for working with immature people, life cycle theory suggests that leader behaviour moves from (1) high task-low relationships behaviour to (2) high task-high relationship and (3) high relationships-low task behaviour to (4) low task-low relationships behaviour, one's followers progress from immaturity to maturity.

Hersey and Blanchard explain four styles of leadership that match different maturity levels of subordinates.

(a) Telling (S1). Where followers are both unable and unwilling to do the job, they require specific directions as to what, how, when to do various tasks. It thus emphasises directive behaviour and involves high task-behaviour and low-relationship behaviour.

(b) Selling (S2). For members of moderate maturity who are unable but willing to do the job, leader behaviour must be both supportive and directive. It is because the followers are confident but lack skills. This style involves high task behaviour and high-relationship behaviour.

(c) Participating (S2). Here employees are able but unwilling to do the job and they require adequate motivational force. Leader opens the door to support the followers. Leader is facilitating and communicating. It involves high relationship and low task behaviour.

(d) Delegating (S4). Here the employees have both the job maturity and psychological maturity. They hardly require a guidance and direction
becomes redundant. Low relationship and low task behaviour is the appropriate style here.

The maturity continuum is divided into four levels: low (M1), Low to moderate (M2) to high (M3) and high (M4). The terms telling (S1), selling (S2), participating (S3) and delegating (S4) are leadership style designations. The appropriate leadership style for all four of the maturity designations correspond to the leadership style designations. Low maturity requires a telling style, and low to moderate maturity requires a selling style and so on.

Criticism on the theory mainly centred round the problem faced by leaders in changing their style in accordance with the increase in the maturity of the subordinates. Even without any empirical support the life cycle theory gave a new dimension to leadership research and widely influenced in the training curriculum for executives in organisations.

Vroom Yetton and Jago's Decision Making Models

In their 1988 book, Victor Vroom and Arthur Jago\textsuperscript{87} firmly criticise the path goal theory because it fails to take into account the situation with in which managers decide to involve employees. In their efforts for finding a solution for this, they extend the classic Vroom-Yetton model of situational leadership to include a concern for both the quality and the acceptance of decisions.

The decision making model of Vroom, Yetton and Jago indicates different kinds of situations in which various degrees of participation by
subordinates is appropriate. They contend that the effectiveness of leaders is largely reflected in their track record of making right decisions. It is in the light of this decision making this model was developed. Since it is developed around the idea that different degrees of participation are appropriate to different type of problems, it is widely known as “decision-participation model.” According to Vroom and Yetton such terms as “concern for production”, and “concern for people” and task orientation or inter personal orientation are too imprecise to be operational.

The original Vroom Yetton model was developed in 1973 to help managers decide when and to what extent they should involve employees in solving a particular problem.

This model isolated five styles of leadership that represent a continuum from authoritarian approaches (AI, AII), to consultative (CI, CII), to a fully participative approach (GII). The letter in the code identify the leadership practise. A stands for Autocratic, C stands for Consultative, and G stands for Group.

They introduced a decision tree on the top of which seven questions are presented. The manager first of all asks the first question A, if the answer is ‘yes’ then he asks the question ‘B’; if the answer is ‘no’ he asks question ‘D’. In this way the person using the decision tree works across it as the questions are answered. At the end of every terminal node, corresponding number designating the problem type given. Vroom and Yetton have presented a key
solutions kit' to the problem types. In fact, a key idea in this decision making model is the feasible set of solutions for the problems.

In this way, the appropriate situation and the leadership style can be easily identified by the leader using the decision-participation model of Vroom and Yetton. The five leadership styles mentioned by them are:

Al-Managers solve the problem or make the decision themselves, using information available at that time.

All- Managers obtain the necessary information from subordinates, then decide on the solution to the problems themselves. They may or may not tell subordinates what the problem is when they request information. The role played by subordinates in making the decision is clearly one of providing the necessary information to managers rather than generating or evaluating alternative solutions.

Cl- Managers share the problem with relevant subordinates individually, getting their ideas and suggestions without bringing them together as a group. Then the managers make the decision, which may or may not reflect subordinates' influence.

CII- Managers share the problems with the subordinates as a group, collectively obtaining their ideas and suggestions. Then they make the decision, which may or may not reflect subordinates' influence.
GII- Managers share a problem with subordinates as a group. Managers and subordinates together generate and evaluate alternatives and attempt to reach agreement (consensus) on a solution. Managers do not try to influence the group to adopt their preferred solution, and they accept and implement any solution that has the support of the entire group.

More recent work by Vroom and Jago\textsuperscript{69} has resulted in a revision of this model. The new model retains the same five alternative leadership styles but expands the contingency variables to twelve, ten of which are answered along a five point scale.

The Vroom Yetton and Jago\textsuperscript{69} model is appreciated on the ground that it provides simple guidelines for "when to involve subordinates".

Victor Vroom et al. conducted a study and examined 181 actual decision making situations. The study revealed that when managers made decisions using the processes within a feasible set, they were rated as more successful than when they used processes outside the feasible set.

C. Margeriosn and R. Glube\textsuperscript{91} have studied 45 retail firms in the cleaning industry and supported the Vroom Yetton model. Their test of the model revealed "store managers who exhibited conformity to Vroom-Yetton model of leadership prescriptions had more productive operations and more satisfied subordinates than the managers exhibiting less conformity to the model."
Vroom, one of the proponents of the model, also went on to test the model. Vroom\textsuperscript{52} while testing the model, has asked over a thousand managers to recall a problem they had encountered and to state the style they have used. His data revealed that there is bigger difference within managers than there are between managers.

The theory is not free from criticism like any other situational theory of leadership.

One of the weaknesses\textsuperscript{93} pointed on this theory is the "time criterion" the proponents have employed to predict various alternatives.

According to Stephen P Robbins\textsuperscript{94}, the revised leader-participation model is very sophisticated and complex, which makes it impossible to describe.

Another limitation of this model pointed out by Field\textsuperscript{95} is that it has a number of methodological problems which may reduce the utility of the model.

5. RECENT OR CONTEMPORARY APPROACHES TO LEADERSHIP

A review of literature on any concept can be concluded by seeking to state if it continues to be relevant and substantiating how. In this sense, the literature review on leadership can be concluded by referring to some of the recent approaches. The four recent approaches of leadership are attribution theory, charismatic theory, transactional and transformational theory, and visionary leadership.
a) Attribution theory of leadership

Attribution theory of leadership proposes that leadership is merely an attribution that people make about other individuals. This model suggests that a leader's judgement about employees is influenced by the leader's interpretation of the employee's performance.

Kelley's says that Attribution theory has been proposed to develop explanations of the ways in which we judge people differently depending on what meaning we attribute to a given behaviour. A leader obtains information about employees and their behaviours through daily observations of their work.

R.G. Lord et al. in their work suggested that by using the attribution framework, researchers have found that people characterise leaders as having such traits as intelligence, outgoing personality, strong verbal skills, aggressiveness, understanding, and industriousness.

G.N. Powell proves in his study that the high-high leader (high on both initiating structure and consideration) to be consistent with attributions of what makes a good leader.

J. Pfeffer makes an interesting point in the attribution theory of leadership literature while saying that effective leaders are generally considered consistent or unwavering in their decisions.

Academic world is waiting for further elaborate study in this area.
b) Charismatic Theory of Leadership

Charismatic leadership theory is an extension of attribution theory because it says that followers make attributions of heroic or extraordinary leadership abilities when they observe certain behaviours. Studies on charismatic leadership have, for the most part, been directed to identifying those behaviours that differentiate charismatic leaders from their non-charismatic counterparts. Several authors have attempted to identify personal characteristics of the charismatic leader.

One of the notable early contributions to systematic analysis of the theory is Robert J. House's\textsuperscript{100} theory of Charismatic Leadership.

The Charismatic theory of Robert House\textsuperscript{101} (Path-goal fame) uses both traits and behaviour. He defines Charismatic leaders as those "who by force of their personal abilities are capable of having a produced and extraordinary affection followers." House's theory suggests that charismatic leaders have very high levels of referent power and that some of that power comes from their need to influence others. The charismatic leader has "extremely high levels of self-confidence, dominance, and a strong conviction in the moral righteousness of his/her beliefs"—or at least the ability to convince the followers that he or she possesses such confidence and conviction.\textsuperscript{102} The concept of charisma is related to symbolic leadership, which is instrumental in shaping and transforming the culture of organizations, that is the values, beliefs and expectations that organizational members are expected to share. It is the
charismatic leader who is most often the subject in debates as to whether leaders are categorically different from managers or not.

House suggests that charismatic leaders communicate a vision or higher level ("transcendent") goal that captures the commitment and energy of the followers. They are careful to create an image of success and competence and to exemplify in their own behavior the values they espouse. They also communicate high expectations for followers and confidence that followers will perform unto those expectations.

Warren Bennis, after studying 90 of the most effective and successful leaders in the United States, found that they had four common competencies: they had a compelling vision or sense of purpose; they could communicate the vision in clear terms that their followers could readily identify with; they demonstrated consistency and focus in the pursuit of their vision; and they know their own strengths and capitalized on them.

The most comprehensive analysis of the charismatic theory has been completed by Conger and Kanungo at McGill University. Among their conclusions, they propose that charismatic leaders have an idealized goal that they want to achieve, a strong personal commitment to their goal, are perceived as unconventional, are assertive and self-confident, and are perceived as agents of radical change rather than managers of the status quo.
c) Visionary Leadership

Even though the term 'vision' is one of the major components of charismatic theory, Visionary leadership goes beyond charisma. M. Sashkin\textsuperscript{105} defined visionary leadership as the "ability to create and articulate a realistic, credible, attractive vision of the future for an organization or an organizational unit that grows out of and improves upon the present."

Snyder and Graves argues that vision is "the glue that binds individuals into a group with a common goal... when shared by employees,[it] can keep an entire company moving forward in face of difficulties, enabling and inspiring leaders and employees alike."\textsuperscript{106}

The case in favour of visionary leadership has been made by many writers. One of the most pertinent point made about visionary leadership is by Bert Nanus\textsuperscript{107} He says that "the 21st century organisation virtually demands visionary leadership. It cannot function without it, for an organisation driven by accelerating technological change, staffed by a diverse, multicultural mix of highly intelligent knowledge workers, facing global complexity, a vast kaleidoscope of individual customer needs, and the incessant demands of multiple constituencies would simply self-destruct without a common sense of direction".

d) Transformational and Transactional theory

Transformational and transactional theories are developed by taking behavioural theories as the base. James McGregor Burns\textsuperscript{108} is supposed to be
the first researcher who attributed these two styles of leadership. Burns is to
leadership studies as Peter Drucker is to management and Sigmund Freud is to
psychology. In his book, 'Leadership', Burns draw a distinction between
transactional and transformational leadership. He placed transformational
leaders on top of transactional leadership. Burns says "the reciprocal process of
mobilizing, by persons with certain motives and values, various economic,
political, and other resources, in a context of competition and conflict, in order to
realize goals independently or mutually held by both leaders and followers." In
short, Burns characterized leadership as a process and not person. He
characterised transformational leaders as 'visionaries who challenge people to
achieve exceptionally high levels of morality, motivation, and performance'.

Burns says only transformational leaders are capable of charting
necessary new courses for modern organisations because they are the masters
of change. Bernard M Bass, a distinguished leadership researcher, dedicated
his important book 'Leadership Beyond Expectations' to Jim Burns. Bass credits
Burn's seminal 1978 Leadership with the surging interest in both leadership
research and leadership studies.109

Burns challenged researchers to abandon the leader-focused model and
to take up the study of leadership aimed at "realizing goals mutually held by
both leaders and followers." To do so, he suggested, involves greater attention
to the role of followers as well as the motivations of potential opponents and
competition from other actors.
Bass’s theory of Transformational Leadership

In his explorations of the concept of transformational leadership, Bernard M. Bass has contrasted two types of leadership behaviours: transactional and transformational. Transactional leaders determine what employees need to do to achieve their own and organisational objectives, classify those requirements, and help employees become confident that they can reach their objectives by expending necessary efforts. In contrast, transformational leaders, “motivate employees to do more than they originally expected to do” by raising their sense of the importance of and value of their tasks, by getting them to transcend their own self-interests for the sake of the team, organisation, or larger policy, and by raising their need level to higher order needs, such as self-actualisation.

Bass sees leadership as concerned with influencing the attitudes, abilities, and behaviours of followers. In this sense it is transformational for the people and their organisation. Transformational leaders try to elevate the needs of the followers in line with the leaders’ own goals and objectives. Leadership in this connection has a change of behaviour orientation. It is paying attention to the individual by understanding and sharing his or her need for development. This model suggests that we attain excellence through trained, committed people who have come to accept and equally value the leaders’ vision of excellence.

Based on the premise that the pressure for basic organizational change will intensify and not diminish, transformational leadership, not transactional
management is required for revitalizing the organizations. Ultimately, it is up to the leaders to choose the right kind of leadership and corporate lifestyle.

According to Bass, transformational leadership occurs when a leader transforms, or changes his or her followers in three important ways that together result in followers trusting the leader, performing behaviours that contribute to the achievement of organisational goals, and being motivated to perform at a high level.

Extending the work of Burns, Bass more recently emphasised the importance of ‘charisma’ in transformational leadership. He says that transformational leaders rely heavily on ‘referent power’. After revealing these facts about leadership, he rounded Burn’s distinction between transactional and transformational leaders in the light of his revealing. He says that transactional leaders contracts exchange of rewards for effort, promises rewards for performance, recognises accomplishments, watches and searches for deviations from rules and standards, takes corrective action, intervenes only when the standards are not met, abdicates responsibilities and avoids making decisions. Transformational leaders, on the other hand provides vision and sense of mission, instils pride, gains respect and trust, communicates high expectations, uses symbols to focus efforts, expresses important purposes in simple ways, promotes intelligence, rationality and careful problem solving, gives personal attention, treats each employee individually and coaches and advises them.
In short, the transactional leaders monitor people so that they do the expected, according to plan. In contrast, transformational leaders inspire people to do the unexpected, above and beyond the plan. This difference can mean the difference between maintaining the status quo and fostering creative and productive growth.

Transformational leaders also influence their followers through developmental consideration. 'Developmental consideration' includes not only the consideration behaviour (which indicates a leader's concern for followers' well-being) but also behaviour through which a leader provides support and encouragement to followers and gives them opportunities to develop and grow on the job by acquiring new skills and capabilities. Transformational leadership is often distinguished from transactional leadership. Transactional Leadership occurs when a leader motivates followers by exchanging rewards for high performance and noticing and reprimanding subordinates for mistakes and substandard performance. Transformational leaders may also engage in transactional leadership (for example, by rewarding high performers with high salaries). But they go one step further by actually inducing followers to support their vision, put aside self-interest for the sake of the group and the organisation, and take responsibility for helping to solve problems. In the process, subordinates grow and develop more than they would working under a leader who engages exclusively in transactional leadership.
Joseph Seltzer and Bass\textsuperscript{114} have said that the distinction is not between bad and good leaders—both are needed today. This is where transformational leadership theory effectively combines the behavioural styles and situational approaches. To the traditional behaviour patterns of initiating structure and consideration have been added charismatic and other behaviours.

Available laboratory and field research evidence generally supports the transformational leadership pattern.

Jane M Howell and Peter J Frost\textsuperscript{115} lamented the fact that leaders tend to perform better and to report greater satisfaction than those of transactional leaders.

Noel M. Itchey and David Ulrich\textsuperscript{116} favoured transformational leadership and pointed out certain qualities of transformational leaders. They say that transformational leaders must make difficult decisions quickly. They need to know when to push and when to back off. Finally, transformational leaders are often seen as creators of their own luck. These leaders seize opportunities and know when to act so that casual observers may perceive luck as a plausible explanation for their success; whereas, in reality it is a transformational leader who knows when to jump and when not to jump.

Research on transformational leadership is in its early stages, so it would be premature to try to evaluate fully the merits of Bass's theory. Some preliminary studies\textsuperscript{117} however, suggest that transformational leadership may
spur followers on to higher levels of performance while enhancing their personal development and job satisfaction.

6. LEADERSHIP STUDIES IN INDIA

The literature reviewed so far related to studies outside India. There has been very little research on the various dimensions of leadership styles and decision making in Indian organizations when compared to western countries like USA or Canada. But almost all of the studies took western theories as the base for either proving or disproving various notions.

In India, under the theme of leadership, broadly work has been done on the following areas:

1. Measurement of leadership behaviour
2. Leadership training
3. Theories of leadership / styles of leadership
4. Effects of leadership styles—comparative studies, and
5. Rural leadership

However the studies that have been reported deal with (i) identifying the decision-making style of Indian managers, and (ii) investigating the relationship of leadership methods and person-centered variables to morale and productivity.

SriVastava \(^{119}\) said in this context that many of the papers written on leadership in India seem to be armchair monologues and a few are based on concrete data. However, these are in as much as they pave some way for conceptual clarity. He compares the manager and leader and says that it is
frequent and still seems to be an unsettled problem as evidenced by articles titled 'Manager – Is he a leader?'

Prof. Yadukul Bhushan\textsuperscript{120} concludes his study on leadership by saying that ‘teaching leadership skills is wasteful.’ Teaching and learning are not equated. For a better understanding of what the teachers of leadership teach, the taught portion should be reduced and the leaders should become coaches.

Dwelling on the qualities of leadership, Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam\textsuperscript{121}, the former Principal Scientific Adviser to the Government of India and now the President of India, says “it does not matter whether you are a manager, a teacher, or a nation builder, you must possess leadership qualities.” He continues to comment on the topic that “a true leader takes the blame for failure while attributing success to his team”. According to him, an inevitable trait that must be possessed by any leader is ‘integrity’. About this trait he had this to say – “if you have integrity nothing else matters, if you don’t have integrity nothing else matters”.

According to Major General Virendra Singh\textsuperscript{122} the basic essential characteristics of a leader are: professional knowledge, organising and influencing ability and moral courage. The most popular methods used in identification of leadership characteristics are written examinations, psychological tests and personal interviews. Leadership qualities should be developed in individuals, right from infancy through school and college to on-the-job training in later life. (Empirical)
Kapur\textsuperscript{123} says that the success of a manager as a leader depends on his personal qualities. A dynamic leader is one who has the ability to undertake challenging tasks, to organise, to inspire confidence and to plan for the future. He is a student of Psychology, men of decision and open to new ideas. (Empirical)

According to T.N.Seshan,\textsuperscript{124} the former Chief Election Commissioner of India, the traits that must be possessed by any eminent leader are i) vision, ii) courage, iii) decisiveness, iv) stamina, v) integrity, and vi) compassion.

Amin\textsuperscript{125} conducted a study on the traits and behavior of a jobber who is liked by the workers. The data was collected from the jobbers through an unstructured interview. They were asked what type of jobbers workers liked. The following qualities of the jobbers were reported to be necessary for a successful jobber: viz. high technical knowledge and ability to coordinate supply of materials, well behaved, courteous and straightforward person, with a persuasive approach to workers. He was not expected to pass on his duties to the workers under him but was expected to give freedom to workers in their work. Also he was not expected to take workers to higher authorities in case of disputes.

The review of the majority of the leadership studies in India will provide an idea about the leadership styles and behaviour of superiors and subordinates under Indian conditions both in the public and private sectors.
Myers conducted interviews with industrialists, government officials, labour leaders and managers in both Indian and foreign owned firms. His findings resulted in the conclusion that much Indian top management are relatively authoritarian in their relationships with lower management and labour.

Chatterjee et al conducted a study on 12 selected supervisors in a metal factory to find out the characteristics of effective supervision. Their study showed that an effective supervisor had concern for production and paid equal attention to the welfare of the workers. The effective supervisors were concerned about poor performance but helpful in correcting it. They put less pressure and accepted suggestions of workers. Also they had favorable attitude of giving recognition for good work and to team spirit and group-cohesiveness in their work group.

The findings of the study conducted by Chowdhary and et.al., suggest that the source of the sanctioning authority, the organizational distance between leaders and non-leaders, the isolation of the leader, the sense of success, security and personal worth are interrelated concepts and that these influence the type of leadership to be found in elected and non-elected groups. The present study was aimed at analyzing leader and non-leader behavior in two elected and two non-elected groups. Data were collected from four groups and analyzed according to Bale's categories of interaction-process analysis.
L. I. Bhushan\textsuperscript{129} conducted a field study to examine the effect of personal factors in the determination of leadership choice. A sample of 100 individuals was randomly drawn from different age groups, sex, and educational status. It was found that persons of middle age and with higher education and those coming from urban areas had significantly greater preference for democratic style of leadership. Sex of the person was not found to be important in this regard.

U.P. Dhingra\textsuperscript{130} examined participative pre-disposition or otherwise of managers in the public sector industry in India. A Personal values questionnaire was administered to randomly selected sample of 265 managers working in the public sector industries in India. It was found that only 16.23\% of the managers studied had a clear participative pre-disposition the rest of them had non-participative pre-disposition and they belonged to the higher level among the managers at the top. Staff managers were more participative than those holding line.

Indian managers were described as most autocratic as compared to managers in twelve other countries including Germany, Austria, Scandinavia, Britain, United States, Netherlands, Japan and France.

Bass and Berger\textsuperscript{131} in an international study found that salient for Indian managers, compared with the rest of the sample, was their concern for rules and their dependence on higher authority. Indian managers saw themselves as least co-operative with peers. They relied more on authority than persuasion.
B.L. Jaggi\textsuperscript{132} made a study of 120 managers and concludes that the prevailing leadership styles appear to range between benevolent autocracy and the consultative type. The study also indicates that the leadership style is associated with various factors such as age of the executives, their positions and functions and the size of the organisation. Thus, younger managers are less authoritarian, management in bigger sized companies are least authoritarian and manages in production and technical areas are more authoritarian.

The study by P. Singh and G. S. Das\textsuperscript{133} on 280 managers from two public sector units and four private sector units shows that bureaucratic style is the most predominant one which is in order by the benevolent autocrat, the developed and the democratic.

G. Rangaswamy et al.\textsuperscript{134} in his study of leadership behaviour of 56 top-level managers has found that Indian managers are more employees oriented as compared with their American counterparts. Though this result is quite unexpected, he explains that this is due to the influence of the peculiar Indian culture and religion heritage the advantage of which are helpfulness and peaceful co-operation.

A.P. Singh and DM Pestonjee\textsuperscript{135} investigated the influence of supervisory behaviour on job satisfaction of workers. They attempted in their study to ascertain whether there was any significant difference in job satisfaction among
workers under two different styles of supervision i.e., employee-oriented and production-oriented types. The study was carried out at RajHarra Iron. Sixteen first level supervisors and 100 rank and file workers participated in the investigation. The research found that the level of overall job satisfaction of workers under employee oriented supervision was significantly higher in comparison to the overall job satisfaction under production oriented supervisors.

In a study by Ganguly of leadership behaviour in a state-owned engineering factory, the prevailing pattern ranged midway between the bureaucratic and the autocratic that is between the impersonal and the assertive superior. Though a majority of the managers preferred the 'autocratic' style, and an interesting finding of the study was that almost one-third of the workers (31%) also indicated their preference for autocratic leadership.

Bhushan conducted a field study to examine the effect of personal factors on the determination of leadership choice. A sample of 100 subjects was randomly drawn from different age, sex and educational status. A Likert-type five-point leadership Preference Scales was developed to assess the individual's preference for authoritarian or democratic form of leadership. It was found that persons of middle age and higher education, and those coming from the urban area had significantly greater preference for democratic style of leadership. Sex of the person was not found to be important in this regard.

In another study, Dhingra examined participative predisposition, or otherwise, of managers in the public sector industry in India. A personal value
questionnaire was administered to a randomly selected sample of 265 managers working in the public sector industry in India. It was found that only 16.23 percent of the managers studied had a clear participative predisposition. The rest of them had either non-participative or mixed predisposition. The incidence on non-participative predisposition was found to be higher among the managers at the top-level and 'staff' managers were more participative as compared to those holding 'line'.

The attitudes of supervisors towards production and employees were studied to assess the influence of some personal factors. On their styles Gopalkrishna and Hafeez\(^{139}\) a 34 item questionnaire was administered to 42 supervisors from 2 factories, aiming at differentiating the employee-oriented supervisors from production-oriented supervisors. Data on a few personal characteristics of the supervisors were also obtained. Negative correlations were found between employee-oriented attitude and age and experience of the supervisors. The correlation between salary and education was positive.

Kakar\(^{141}\) carried out a study in the general workshop of a large engineering concern in Western India. Twenty-nine subordinates from the first-level supervisors, designated as assistant foremen in the organization hierarchy, and their 11 superiors from the second-level supervisors were selected to comprise the sample. The assumption for the study was that high affiliation of the superior and, more importantly, a high degree of control exercised over task performance (authoritarian style) would tend to have a
positive relationship with subordinate performance, and satisfaction in work. The findings of the study did not support this assumption. Employee-orientation was found to be significantly related to subordinate work satisfaction and performance. The degree of task control exercised by the superior had a significant negative relationship both with satisfaction and performance.

Singh and Pestonjee investigated about the influence of supervisory behaviour on the job satisfaction of workers. They attempted in their study to ascertain whether there was any significant difference in job satisfaction of workers working under two different styles of supervision, i.e., employee-oriented and production-oriented types. It was found that the level of overall job satisfaction of workers under employee-oriented supervision was significantly higher in comparison to the overall job satisfaction under production-oriented supervision.

Another study testing the hypothesis that the supervisory practices characterized by participative style are more satisfying to employees than those characterized by directive style, was conducted in teaching and research organization in Ahmedabad by Saiyadai. A sample of 76 employees was selected and questionnaires were administered to them. The results of the study indicated that a style characterized by flexible, responsive and considerate of the needs of subordinates (participation style) induces greater satisfaction compared to the one which is production – oriented, rigid and inconsiderate of the feelings of the employees.
Kumar and Bohra\textsuperscript{143} concluded from their study of job satisfaction and workers perception of the organization climate that the perceived organisational climate tended to significantly affect the job satisfaction of the workers. The sample for this questionnaire - based investigation comprised of sixty workers belonging to three industrial units in the private sector. It was found that workers who perceived the existing organizational climate as democratic experienced higher job satisfaction than workers perceiving same climate as autocratic.

Malavya.P\textsuperscript{144} studied the relation of perception of participation in decision-making with job satisfaction, job effectiveness and personality structure. The study was conducted in the two textile units of a group of textile mills in Gujarat. The sample comprised of 189 supervisory personnel of spinning, weaving, wet-processing, engineering and cloth departments. A positive relation ‘between’ ‘participation’ – satisfaction and ‘participation – effectiveness’ was found. The group higher on perception of participation was more satisfied and more effective. Except hierarchy level, no other bio-data variable-age, education, experience in the unit and salary was found to be a correlate of participation.

Chatterjee and James\textsuperscript{145} explored the relationship between effectiveness of supervision and the supervisor’s behavioural orientation. Twelve superiors from a private metal process factory were studied. The results did not clearly favor any particular orientation on the part of effective supervisors. The general finding was that the effective supervisors had concern for production and paid
equal attention to the welfare of workers, and promoted group cohesiveness in the work group.

England conducted a study on a sample of 623 managers from private sector organizations in India to examine their values. It was found that groups of people in one organizational environment do not play as significant a part in the value system of Indian managers as in the case with the managers from other countries. Similar observations regarding this lower participative orientation of Indian managers have been made by other researchers who used different samples and measurement approaches.

James, E.V and Kanungo selected a total of 61 supervisors from three engineering factories to study supervisory practices. Poor ratings were obtained for measuring efficiency: each supervisor was asked to mention three supervisors in their factory who were considered most efficient. The supervisors were classified into "efficient" and "less efficient" on the basis of weighted scores. The purpose of this study was to find the aspects of supervisory practices related to supervisory efficiency. The efficient supervisors were found to have more human relations, skill, and initiative in solving problems than the less efficient supervisors.

A Research was conducted by S.D Punekar and M.G.Savur on white-collar employees' relations with their supervisors in different organisations such as banks, insurance companies, manufacturing firms, government offices, a state-owned Public Utility Company and an educational institution. It was found
that only three supervisors out of 73 believed that subordinates can work without supervisors and only six thought that giving responsibility to the white-collar employees is the best way to get the work done. Most superiors (70%) impressed the belief that subordinates can only work with supervision and have no sense of responsibility.

Jawahari Lal Gupta\textsuperscript{149} conducted a study on leadership styles and power sharing in business enterprises on 128 series executives from sixteen large public limited companies in the private sector with their registered office in and around Mumbai. Gupta arrived at the conclusion that managers use different methods of influence and power sharing with subordinates depending on the requirement of the situation. An important factor influencing the style seems to be their assessment of subordinates skills and compliance.

C.N. Daftuar\textsuperscript{150} developed a psycho-cultural situational model for leadership suited to Indian conditions and tested it with eleven organisations. This model is presented in the form of an equation as follows:

\[
EWC = f [EL + (EP+R)]
\]

Where EWC is effective work climate and EL stand for effective leadership. The effective leader follows an effective leadership. The effective leader following an effective punishment and reward (EP+R) strategy will be successful on Indian organisations. The model defined EL as a combination of authoritative style (A), small amount of participation (p) and a nurturant outlook (N) that is EL = (A, P+N).
P. Kumar and C. Bohra\textsuperscript{151} in their study of job satisfaction and workers perception of the organisation climate concluded that the perceived organisation climate tended to affect significantly the job satisfaction of the workers. It was found that workers, who perceived the existing organisational climate as democratic, experienced higher job satisfaction than workers who perceived the same climate as autocratic.

Rustam. S. Davar\textsuperscript{152} introduces a new model of leadership called the "3-D" model. The components of the "3-D" model are:

- The Task Orientation,
- The People Orientation, and,
- Assertiveness.

He defined the first two components of his model as done by other scholars. But the third variable- 'assertiveness'- added by him is a unique one. He used the term 'assertiveness' to meant to describe the extent of control the leader or individual tries to exercise over both the followers as well as the situations in which the leadership is exercised. Assertiveness, he says, is thus a positive quality or trait. he classified the variable into two heads such as i) Low assertiveness and ii) high assertiveness or aggressiveness.

Ramalingam\textsuperscript{153} conducted an empirical study of leadership potential of the employees of the ten selected public sector undertakings of Kerala. In his study, he says that there are no set methods and clear cut formulae to determine leadership potential either in public or private sector undertakings. After a close perusal of various theories, models, approaches and research
studies on leadership and the characteristic features of the State owned manufacturing public sector undertakings, he identified seven variables with 46 sub-components which influence and condition leadership potential. He defines 'leadership potential' in his study report as "the possible, practicable or attainable leadership efficacy latent in the employees of an enterprise". A Leadership Potential Rating Schedule and Predicted equations on the leadership potential of the employees of the PSUs is developed by him as the basis of the empirical study conducted on 820 employees of the select Public Sector Undertakings of Kerala.

It would seem evident from the above review that most of studies on leadership in India put a restriction on arriving at any generalized conclusion. From the available evidence, however, only these tentative conclusions can be drawn that Indian managers' dominant orientation is authoritarian, and there exists a positive relationship between participative leadership style and morale and satisfaction.

Indian culture has been shown as one of the important causes for the undue dependence on autocratic leadership by the Indian leaders.

Singh\(^\text{154}\) says that the sociologists have described Indian adult society as authoritarian and hierarchical. According to this view the manager in India is a creature of the family, where he has spend his earliest years as a child in the 'nest warmth' of a close relationship with his parents, a relationship which leads to a long period of dependency. Authoritarianism is only on observed of
dependence which socialization in an extended family system commonly fosters in one’s personality.

Chattopadhyaya\textsuperscript{155} illustrates that this thinking has found support in some studies of cultural aspects of Indian family, as also in the observations made by a number of authors.

Kalra\textsuperscript{156} reported the results of a survey investigation about the views and attitudes of managers about participation. Seventy five per cent of the managers studied expressed satisfaction with the decisions in which subordinates were not involved and only 29 per cent of the subordinates were in favour of participative decision-making. The author ascribed this attitude to the forces in the Indian culture suggesting that in a majority of cases, parents do not consult children or encourage them to participate in important family decisions. A manager acts like a traditional father and expects obedience from his subordinates.

One can point out some weaknesses in the existing literature on leadership in Indian context. The research on leadership in Indian context has been meager, the rest of the international literature also suffers from some inadequacies such as, in spite of the basic agreement on various leadership styles represent different degrees of subordinate influence and participation, there have been very few efforts to develop and apply measures based on a complex typology of decision procedures. The measures that have been used in field research, so far, are simple rating scales indicating with degree of
overall subordinate influences as computed by some averaging procedure. In very few studies, attempts have been made to assess managerial decision behaviour in relation to specific, typical organizational decisions. Questionnaire based studies have usually preferred very broad questions dealing with general rather than specific decision-making situations. Although there has been much discussion in the literature of the constraints and demands placed on the leader by his situation, the relation between situational, structural and person-centered variables, and leader decision-making has been adequately investigated.

7. INDIAN APPROACH TO LEADERSHIP

Take any concept related to modern human life. No doubt, one will see an Indian approach to that concept. But this approach is very different from that of others because it gives importance to practical aspects of life. Medical science is the best example for this. India contributed an internationally accepted method of treating diseases which is popularly called 'Ayurveda' [which means the knowledge or science of life.] Similarly, we have Arthasasthra, given by Koutilya, which literally means 'the science of wealth', is a holistic text that can definitely guide a nation to achieve economic prosperity. All these scriptures give every advice with practical examples.

In the modern management, the qualities of leaders such as the physical, psychological, economical, social and educational bases of the leader are focused. No doubt, these parameters vary from individual to individual and issue to issue. Hence no theoretical capsule can solve the leadership efficiency
problem. But certain guidelines or advises can be given to a leader such as a broad direction to be followed, caliber and qualifications required etc. this is what the modern management experts and books are trying to do. Almost exactly in the same way ancient Indians handled the science of management or leadership. Therefore we can say that the ancient (Indian) approach to management or leadership is a wonderful approach and it is a highly useful tool for any aspiring leader who wants to become a leader and for any leader who wants to be effective in his operations.

N.Gopalakrishnan\textsuperscript{157}, an ardent believer of the Indian approach, a renowned management scholar and Secretary of the Indian Institute of Scientific Heritage (IISH), says “our ancestors gave every advice with an illustration. Perhaps that is why these advises still remembered as ‘SUBHASHITAM’ which means ‘good words or advice’.” He continues that “the management books are generally classified as ‘NEETISARAMS’, which means ‘the essence of justice’. Bharthruhari’s ‘Neetisatakam’ (AD 700) is an exceptionally great and meritorious book in these approaches.”

From the above explanation, it is clear that the literature review on leadership will be incomplete as long as the Indian approach to it is not studied.

Bhagavat Gita is also helpful in providing certain guidelines to those who want to become leaders.
Sivaraman\textsuperscript{158} is right when he says that the Gita is meant for the management of one’s life as a whole.

S. K. Chakraborty\textsuperscript{159} asks if Radhakrishnan can be challenged for importing his modernity of thought to interpret the Gita, and then what prevents someone else from challenging more strongly the queer misinterpretations of the Gita by importing neo-moderns like Maslow and Drucker, respectable though they are in their own spheres?

The Gita itself says: \textit{shraddha mayoyam purusha}, i.e. man is made up with the stuff of faith.\textsuperscript{160}

Gandhi\textsuperscript{161} himself had warned young India against the tendency to reject the works like the Gita which crystallize the experiences of so many Rishi who were by no means superstitious.

From the above discussions it is clear that ignoring the holistic texts of our country by any scholar on any subject is a depraved act, especially by Management scholars.

No doubt, a scripture is comprised of sermons by great people who lived during a particular era. Therefore we can say that whatever we accumulate as information for our intellectual growth, all that were given by those eminent leaders who helped the nation for its advancement. When we talk about leadership literature in this sense, the name that immediately strikes one is
Swami Vivekananda, who himself is a role model for any leader in any sphere of life.

Vivekananda stresses the 'impersonal' orientation of a leader. The expectations of organizational members regarding fairness, objectivity, integrity, consistency and the like in the course of hundreds of daily decision-making issues—often trivial, at times momentous—can be ensured only by impersonality in the leader’s mental domain. This does not mean disinterested apathy or indifference. It means that, like Buddha, if necessary, even the leader’s own son Rahula can be publicly chastised and debarred from functioning in the organization if found falling short of the norms and standards laid down for all.\(^{62}\)

Recently the theme of charismatic leadership appears to be gaining renewed attention. Hater and Bass have differentiated between 'transformational' and 'transactional' leadership. The former inspires response levels higher than those expected in a calculus of give-and-take, while the latter struggles for contingent \textit{quid pro quos} of performance against rewards. The first basis of 'transformational leadership' is therefore stated by them to be 'charisma', whereby the leader instills pride, faith, a sense of mission and the like. Clearly, for Vivekananda, it was absolute unselfishness, combined with an all-embracing, divinized love which could, nonetheless, permit sensitive personalized consideration without causing mistrust in others.\(^{63}\)
We must remember that the authentic Indian model of leadership has always been that of the rajarshi—(Raja + Rishi). For, as Dharmapal clarifies so well, etymologically *Rishi* has three concurrent meanings: an eternal traveler, a piercer of the veil of darkness, and a seer of totality.  

**Conclusion**

Although the field of leadership research has developed more slowly than many of us anticipated, it still yields useful information for managers both in understanding the dynamics of the leadership role and enhancing its effectiveness within their organizations.

Like motivation, leadership is not about absolutes or formulas and, as such, is likely to continue as a significant issue in management in the foreseeable future, especially in light of globalization, downsizing and the imperative to effectively lead and motivate a diverse workforce, constantly exposed to an increasingly turbulent external environment.

Navigating through the various research findings and theories on leadership discussed so far, it is evident that there is no comprehensive theory which encompasses all the independent variables or sub-components that determines the effectiveness of the leadership. James is right when he says ‘leadership is one of the most observed and least understood phenomenon on earth’. The research studies on leadership in Government departments and public offices, especially, revenue collecting department – Commercial Taxes Department (CTD), has not so far been attempted in India. This piece of
research work attempts to fill this research gap by taking all relevant variables and sub-components from the various research findings so far discussed so as to identify and analyze the leadership potential of the employees of the Commercial Taxes Department of Government of Kerala.
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