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So far the general trend has been to study Leadership styles and Work Motivation of either bosses or of subordinates. However, the nature of the boss-subordinate relationship is such that the two cannot be studied in isolation and independence of each other. Dixit (1971) as quoted by Pandey (1988) has reviewed a large number of studies on employee motivation and behavior. His observation revealed that employee motivation could be better understood if viewed in the interaction context, i.e. the motivation of the individual being determined by his personal needs interacting with the demanding situational forces of the organisations such as informal groups, organisational climate and the immediate supervisor's style. Thus it is evident that an inter-personal perspective needs to be taken into account if the dynamics of leadership and motivation are to be understood. With this perspective, it is the overall aim of this study to explore various leadership styles and the associated motivational patterns, as well as related perceptions of subordinates regarding their managers leadership styles and patterns of need deficiency and importance.

Keeping this perspective in mind, the scope of the present work will be discussed, the broad parameters under study will be identified and the objectives will be set. In the light of each objective, a review of past literature will be undertaken and the related hypotheses will be framed accordingly.
In the course of preliminary study of the parameters being considered, there emerged two interesting aspects which needed exploring. The first of these related to the consonance or otherwise between Western thinking on leadership styles, and the Indian scenario. The four leadership styles of the Situational leadership theory have been taken and compared with those identified by the most widely recognised modern Indian theory of Leadership - the Nurturant Task Model propounded by Sinha (1980) [See Chapter One for detailed account of these theories].

The different leadership styles identified in the Situational Leadership Model and in the Nurturant Task Model are illustrated in the figure below.

**Figure 19: Leadership Styles of the Two Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WESTERN</th>
<th>INDIAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Styles of Situational Leadership Theory</td>
<td>Styles of Nurturant Leader Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S1 - high task, low relationship</td>
<td>Authoritarian (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 - high task, high relationship</td>
<td>Task (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 - low task, high relationship</td>
<td>Nurturant Task (NT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4 - low task, low relationship</td>
<td>Participative (P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureaucratic (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurturant (N)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The idea here was to study the extent of commonality between the American theory and the model researched in the Indian context with the overall objective of understanding the appropriate Western thinking in the Indian Socio-cultural milieu.

The first objective in this regard can thus be stated as:

"TO STUDY THE COMMONALITIES OF WESTERN LEADERSHIP THOUGHT AS REPRESENTED BY THE SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY AND INDIAN THINKING AS REPRESENTED BY THE NURTURANT TASK LEADER MODEL".

(OBJECTIVE I)

With this objective in mind the next step is to examine the exact nature of the relationship between the two theories. The forthcoming section will attempt to review some of the past research in this area and frame the hypotheses regarding the nature of this relationship.
A. HYPOTHESES REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES AS DEFINED IN THE SITUATIONAL LEADERSHIP THEORY AND NURTURANT TASK LEADER MODEL

In the recent past, there can be easily perceived, a clear trend in modern Indian thought on leadership effectiveness indicating general dissatisfaction with the applicability of Western or even Japanese models in this culture. The outcome of this dissatisfaction has been that many independent theorists postulate models of leadership that are researched in the Indian context. The most well-known among these are Sinha’s (1980) model of the ‘Nurturant Task Leader’, Bhagwatwar’s (1989) Growth Vs Comfort Oriented model, Kakar’s (1975) Ideologies of Authority, Daftuar’s (1985) Psycho-Cultural Situational Theory, and Rao’s (et al) Leadership Styles. These have been described and discussed briefly in the first chapter.

It is not the thrust of this study to undertake a detailed in-depth analysis of the various styles as identified by the Western theories versus those identified by the Indian theories. The objective here is to correlate the scores on leadership styles identified by Hersey and Blanchard (1972) using the LEAD(Self) Instrument, with the scores on leadership styles identified by Sinha (1980) using the LBS(I) questionnaire with a view to identifying commonalities between the leadership styles of the Situational Leadership Theory and the Nurturant-Task model. The idea behind this exercise is to form a basis for the analysis and discussion of the major portion of the findings of this study in the context of the Indian socio-cultural milieu.

For this purpose, the dearth of studies relating Western and Indian thought, will make the hypotheses for this section be largely governed by commonsense and logic. It will
also depend upon the factor-analytic study of the Leader Behavior Scale which measures the leadership styles categorised in Sinha’s model (1980) undertaken by Verma (1986)

1) Style 1, Authoritarian, and Task Styles

Style 1 which is high on task-orientation and low on relationship, has been described by the authors Hersey and Blanchard (1972) as .... “efficiency in operations resulting from arranging conditions of work in such a way that human elements interfere to a minimum degree.” Thus, here the concern for task accomplishment assumes maximum importance.

The Authoritarian (F) style as defined by Sinha (1980).... “Shows behavioral manifestations of excessive dependency, strict control of subordinates, strict observance of discipline and task orientation. Similarly, the Task (T) oriented style manifests in ....” emphasis on task performance ..... is controlling, assertive and task-oriented...... driving subordinates towards organisational goals’

The three styles described above are common in one respect. That is, high task-orientation resulting in continual striving of goals Verma (1986) found a high positive correlation between Initiating Structure (which is task-orientation) and Authoritarian and Task dimensions of the LBS instrument (Self-rating). Unexpectedly she also found a negative correlation between Authoritarian style and Task-oriented style. This may be explained by the findings of the factor analysis undertaken by her. Some of the factors in the Task-oriented type were found to be common with Nurturant, Participative and Bureaucratic style. These factors were: subordinate growth orientation, directive leadership and supportive supervision. Therefore the hypothesis will be framed as below.
HYPOTHESIS #1: There will be a positive correlation between Style 1 on the LEAD(Self) instrument and Authoritarian (F) and Task (T) scores on the LBS (I).

2) Style 2, Participative and Nurturant-Task Styles

Style 2 on LEAD Questionnaire has been described by Hersey and Blanchard (1972) as being high on both task-orientation and relationship-orientation. In the words of the authors: "work accomplishment is from committed people, interdependence through a common stake in organisation purpose leads to relationships of trust and respect."

Consonant with the above is the description of the Nurturant-Task and Participative types as given by Sinha (1980) which reads as: "The NT leader provides nurturance and meets the expectations of the subordinates... he, however makes his nurturance dependent upon task, accomplishment and quality performance.... The Participative leader is democratic, permissive, shares in decision making.... In both the styles, it is agreed that high quality work is an essential objective of the group and that care for subordinates is necessary for their growth."

The NT style could be thought of as having factors common to both Nurturant and Task styles. Those two styles and the Participative style have been found by Verma (1986) as having one factor in common that is, subordinate growth orientation. Apart from that, Nurturant, and Task-orientation have the following common factors: directive leadership, supportive supervision and performance orientation. According to Mohan (1987): "The NT Leader appears to fit closely... in terms of the model developed by Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard (1976) to the high task, high relationship quadrant".
The consonance between these styles (Style 2, Nurturant Task and Participative) lies in the fact that all three of them lay emphasis both on people as well as task accomplishment. Thus, a positive correlation between these styles can be postulated. Therefore:

**HYPOTHESIS #2: There will be a positive correlation between Style 2 on the LEAD(Self), Nurturant-Task, and Participative scores of the LBS(I)**

**3) Style 3 and Nurturant Style**

Hersey and Blanchard (1972) define Style 3 as a style where....."thoughtful attention to the needs of the people for satisfying relationships leads to a comfortable and friendly organisation atmosphere and work tempo."

In general consonance with this is Sinha’s (1980) description of the Nurturant Style ..... “a Nurturant leader cares for the well being of his subordinates, show's affection, is committed to their growth. His personal warmth creates a climate of trust and understanding. Verma’s (1986) study found high positive correlations between Consideration (which is people-orientation), Nurturant style, and Participative style on the LBS. Her factor analysis revealed one common factor of subordinate growth orientation, between these two styles.

Thus, in the present study, it is reasonable to expect a positive relationship between these two styles. The next hypothesis hence is :

**HYPOTHESIS #3: There will be a positive correlation between the Style 3 scores on the LEAD(Self) instrument and Nurturant scores on the LBS(I)**
4) Style 4

Style 4 is an 'impoverished' style where....."exertion of minimum effort to get work done and is appropriate to sustain organisational membership". (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972). Thus, Style 4 is low on task-orientation and low on relationship-orientation.

Sinha (1980) in his extensive work done on leadership in India does not refer to a style that is low on both people and task orientation. Similarly, Kakar (1974), a leading exponent in India on authority patterns and leadership behavior, has not come up with any evidence conclusively indicating the manifestation of authority patterns which are delegating or low in both task and people orientation. Rao, et al (1990) too do not refer to any style low on both dimensions. Also Mohan (1987, 1989) in her studies of effective and ineffective leadership styles in bureaucrats, police officers, engineers and educationists, found that most subjects scored zero on this style. The same result was reported by Mohan and Madhok (1989). Gupta (1985) too found that the 'delegation' style of decision making was reported only to the extent of 3.52 percent of the sample studied.

The above review suggests that the delegating style of functioning in terms of low relationship and low task orientation is rather conspicuous by its absence or low profile in the Indian managerial system. In such a situation, it is advisable to formulate a null hypothesis regarding the relationship of Style 4 with the Nurturant Task Model.

**HYPOTHESIS #4: Style 4 scores on the LEAD(Self) instrument will not be related to any of the styles on the LBS(I).**
5) **Bureaucratic style**

Sinha (1980) states that the Bureaucratic orientation runs orthogonal to the Authoritarian-Nurturant Task-Participative dimension of leadership styles. (see Chapter One for details). This means that a particular style may have varying degrees of Bureaucratic orientation. Conceptually, he has suggested that Participative and Nurturant-Task leaders are more likely to be low on Bureaucratic orientation, whereas Authoritarian and Task leaders are likely to be highly bureaucratic.

Weber (1946,1947) suggests that bureaucrats would be impersonal but concerned with task accomplishment while emphasising adherence to systems and procedures.

In the Indian socio-cultural milieu, Verma (1986) found a negative correlation of Participative style with Bureaucratic climate, and a positive correlation of Authoritarian style with Bureaucratic climate. In her factor analysis of LBS(I), some of the factors associated with Authoritarian climate are: restricted role playing, power orientation, and performance orientation. Those associated with Bureaucratic Style are: restricted role playing, directive leadership and impersonal orientation.

Tungar (1980) found that the decision making style of bureaucrats was highly impersonal, with a minimum of participation of subordinates:

It can therefore be hypothesised as follows

**HYPOTHESIS #5 :** Bureaucratic style on the LBS (I) will be:
(i) positively associated with Authoritarian and Task styles of the LBS (I), and Style 1 scores on the LEAD(Self) instrument.
(ii) negatively related with Participative, Nurturant-Task and Nurturant scores of LBS I, and Style 2, and Style 3 of the LEAD(Self) instrument.

The foregoing hypotheses have postulated the similarities between Western thinking and the Indian leadership styles. Keeping this perspective in mind, the next step would be to examine the motivational patterns within the individual as related to his leadership style. The objective that is in mind here, and the various hypotheses that arise from an examination of related issues are discussed in the following pages.
Preliminary examination of related issues raised the question of whether a manager's style of leadership was associated with patterns of certain needs within him. Motivational dispositions of a manager would certainly be associated with his manner of dealing with his subordinate. Thus, the nature of the relationship between the range of leadership styles and the potency of various learned needs needed exploring. The range of leadership style under study are those identified by Hersey and Blanchard (1972) and Sinha (1980), discussed in the previous section. The four needs considered in relation to these leadership styles are taken from Murray's (1938) list of needs and are those that are work related and are crucial in boss - subordinate relationships. They are: 1) $n.Ach$ - according to McClelland (1961), this is the need that drives an individual to work for goal attainment; 2) $n.Aff$ - the boss relates to his subordinate through interpersonal interaction; 3) $n.Nur$ - in the Indian context, the Nurturant-Task style has been proven by Sinha (1980) to be an effective style of functioning, and; 4) $n.Dom$ - the boss is obviously in a position of authority over the subordinate. This study, therefore, purports to investigate whether a particular leadership style would be correlated with a specific pattern of manifestation of these needs in the individual. Thus, objective II may be stated as:

"TO STUDY THE NATURE OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP STYLES EXHIBITED BY MANAGERS, AND THE POTENCY OF VARIOUS NEEDS" (OBJECTIVE II).

The precise nature of the motivational correlates of leadership styles being considered will next be posited in the light of available literature and research.
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A. HYPOTHESES REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATIONAL PATTERNS AND SELF PERCEPTION OF LEADERSHIP STYLES

In this section, various hypotheses relating need patterns in individuals to the leadership styles exhibited by them in their relationships with their subordinates will be built up.

According to Murray (1938) and McClelland, (1961) a person with high \( n.Ach \) likes to take personal responsibility for finding solutions to problems, he tends to set moderate goals in response to concrete feedback and takes calculated risks. Those with a high \( n.Aff \) are compassionate and companionate. Those with a high \( n.Nur \) want to help others, be kind, generous and affectionate. Others, with a high \( n.Dom \) attempt to influence others directly. These motives could manifest themselves to different extents in different leadership styles.

Most of the past research in the area of leadership and motivation has been largely devoted to relating motivational patterns to executive success, or leadership styles to managerial effectiveness. The motivational correlates of different leadership styles as yet have not been through much in-depth research in any exclusive study. Consequently, the review of literature in framing the hypotheses for this section will be largely hypotheticodeductive.
1) Motivational Patterns of Style 1, Task and Authoritarian Leadership Styles

In the first objective, Style 1, Task and Authoritarian styles have been hypothesised to be correlated with each other. On the basis of this comparison, it may be further expected that these styles would be associated with similar patterns of learned needs within the manager. This section will examine past research and postulate the motivational patterns of these styles.

Years of research have shown that people with high \( n.Ach \) tend to act in certain ways. By analogy, one might conceive of their ‘thought-stream’ as showing a high concentration of ‘virus \( n.Ach \)’ and then ask how people with such a high ‘infection level’ tend to act in real life. According to studies summarised in “The Achieving Society” (McClelland, 1961), they display four characteristic modes of acting

1) They tend to set moderate goals for themselves and to work harder when the chances of succeeding are only moderately great.

2) They prefer work situations in which they can take personal responsibility for the performance necessary to achieve the goal.

3) They like to get feedback as to how well they are doing and are responsive to that concrete feedback.

4) They show more initiative in researching their environment.

These characteristics would also be manifested in leader behavior in the form of high task-orientation.
McClelland and Winter (1969) found a high relation between \( n_{Ach} \) and task control. Cartwright and Zander (1960) also state that behavior involved in goal attainment coincides with task orientation and authoritarian behavior. According to Atkinson (1964), the achievement motive is considered to be a disposition to approach goal attainment. Thus Style 1 (High Task/Low Relationship), Task, and Authoritarian styles would be associated with a high \( n_{Ach} \).

Sinha (1980) has related high preference for control over subordinates with Authoritarian and Task styles. Mohan & Brar (1986) found a significant correlation between the need for Power and work efficiency (defined as task accomplishment) which was expected to arise from these high-task oriented styles of management. This preference for control over subordinates studied by Sinha (1980) and Need for Power, studied by Mohan & Brar (1986) would be a manifestation of a desire for dominance. Thus, Style 1, Authoritarian and Task styles would arise from a high need for Dominance. Additionally Mohan & Khanna (1977) found a positive correlation between \( n_{Ach} \) and \( n_{Dom} \) in their study. Therefore, Style 1, Authoritarian and Task styles would be expected to have a positive correlation with these needs.

Style 1, Task and Authoritarian styles are styles that are low on people orientation which is expected to be manifested in low \( n_{Nur} \) and \( n_{Aff} \) which are both social needs. Mohan and Khanna (1977) found a high positive correlation between \( n_{Aff} \) and \( n_{Nur} \) indicating that these needs go with each other in the personality making of an individual and would be present in low degrees in individuals low on people orientation. Since Style 1, Task and Authoritarian styles are low on people orientation it may be expected that people high in these styles would seek out and prefer situations where relationships are impersonal and unimportant. In other words, a negative correlation of these styles which \( n_{Aff} \) and \( n_{Nur} \) may be expected.
HYPOTHESIS #6: Style 1 on the LEAD(Self) instrument, Authoritarian and Task styles on the LBS(I) would have a
(i) positive correlation with \( n.Ach \) and \( n.Dom \)
(ii) negative correlation with \( n.Aff \) and \( n.Nur \)

2) Motivational Patterns of Style 2, Participative and Nurturant Task Styles

Earlier, under Hypothesis # 2, it has been posited that Style 2, Participative and Nurturant Task styles would be correlated with each other.

Since the emphasis of these styles is on task achievement as well as people-orientation, they would logically be associated with people having a combination of high \( n.Ach \) and \( n.Aff \). This has been suggested by Hersey and Blanchard (1980) and is in general agreement with Sinha & Chowdhry (1981) who found that subordinates used the following achievement and affiliation oriented adjectives to describe the Participative and Nurturant-Task leader: active, strong, firm, independent, alert, encouraging, dominant, scientific, extrovert, friendly, and on the whole - good.

The need for Dominance would be expected to be present in a moderate amount in the Nurturant-Task leader, since his behavior is akin to that of an overbearing godfather. He would wield a certain amount of benevolent power and influence over his subordinates. This kind of a dominance would be absent in the Participative leader where there is sharing in decision making powers and a great deal of responsibility is delegated to the group.

Therefore the next hypothesis as to the motivational patterns of Style 2, Participative and Nurturant-Task leaders will be:
HYPOTHESIS #7:

a) Style 2 on the LEAD(Self) instrument, Participative style and Nurturant-Task style will have a low but positive correlation with n.Ach, n.Aff and n.Nur.

b) Nurturant-Task style will have a moderate correlation with n.Dom, whereas Style 2 and Participative style will have a zero correlation with n.Dom.

3) Motivational Patterns of Style 3 and Nurturant Style

In Hypothesis #3, it has been expected that Style 3 and Nurturant style will be positively related since they are both high on relationship and task orientation.

Hersey and Blanchard (1980) have suggested that people high in person-orientation and low in task-orientation seem to be comfortable in providing socio-emotional support but are not comfortable in providing direction and initiating structure. In other words, they would be expected to have a combination high n.Aff and low n.Ach. Argyle (1983) states that a person high in affiliative motivation is likely to seek out and create situations where this need is satisfied. Thus, it can be expected that persons exhibiting S 3 and N. Styles would be high on n.Aff and n.Nur and low in n.Ach.

Need for Dominance would normally be manifested in a high degree of assertion of influence over people, thereby overriding their wishes and needs. This behavior would be contrary to what may be expected of Style 3 and Nurturant style where a great deal of togetherness and friendliness is generated. Thus a negative correlation of these styles with n.Dom may be expected as outlined in Hypothesis #8 below:
HYPOTHESIS #8: Style 3 on the LEAD(Self) instrument and Nurturant style will have a
(i) positive correlation with \( n.\text{Aff} \) and \( n.\text{Nur} \)
(ii) negative correlation with \( n.\text{Dom} \) and \( n.\text{Ach} \)

4) Motivational Patterns of Style 4

In the earlier section, under Hypothesis # 4, it has been discussed how the manifestation of S4 in the Indian context is either absent or very low profile. In the absence of research evidence, a non-directional hypothesis on the motivational patterns manifested in Style 4, will be framed.

HYPOTHESIS #9: Style 4 on the LEAD(Self) instrument will not be related to \( n.\text{Ach} \), \( n.\text{Aff} \), \( n.\text{Nur} \) or \( n.\text{Dom} \).
It is widely recognised that managers can affect the motivation of their subordinates. However, the precise nature of this relationship has not been through much research. In the present study, an attempt has been made to explore the relationship between subordinates’ perception of his boss’s leadership style on one hand, and his need deficiency and need importance on the other hand. The leadership styles considered here are those of the Situational Leadership Theory and Nurturant Task Leader Model defined earlier. The need categories studied are basically those of the Maslow’s Need Hierarchy model. Porter (1961) in his series of studies on job attitudes in management has made a slight modification in the use of Maslow’s classification of needs, which has been adopted in the present study. The physiological needs are not considered since they are presumed to be adequately satisfied. In addition, an extra category of ‘autonomy needs has been inserted between ’esteem and ’actualisation’. Therefore, this study in dealing with need deprivation and need importance of subordinates in the following categories:

1) Safety and Security needs
2) Social needs
3) Esteem needs
4) Autonomy needs
5) Self-actualisation needs
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The manner in which subordinates perception of their bosses relates to the
deficiencies in the satisfaction of these needs, the importance attached to the satisfaction of
these needs and its relations with the subordinatates perception of his boss. These issues
governed the framing of the objective of this section of the study and may be stated as:

“TO STUDY THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SUBORDINATE PERCEPTION OF HIS BOSS’S LEADERSHIP
STYLES ON THE ONE HAND, AND HIS NEED DEPRIVATION
AND IMPORTANCE ON THE OTHER.” (OBJECTIVE III)

The issues that flow from this objective, are discussed in the next section, along
with a review of past research in this area, thereby leading to the framing of the hypotheses.
A. HYPOTHESES REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUBORDINATES PERCEPTION OF LEADERSHIP STYLES AND PERCEIVED NEED DEFICIENCY (OBJECTIVE III)

The effectiveness of individuals occupying leadership positions in organisations is of concern to the organisation, to subordinates and to the leader. The leadership may be helping or hindering the group in achieving its goals. It may be leading to subordinates' satisfaction or to dissatisfaction. It may be leading to group cohesiveness or to disintegration, to greater creativity or to conformity.

Social desirability has traditionally placed higher values on democratic than on authoritarian leadership. The assumption seems to be that “Democracy is better than autocracy because it sounds nicer.” There is a good deal of evidence even in the Indian context to support the contention that democracy is nicer. Investigations in ongoing social and industrial organisations usually find that subordinates have higher morale and need satisfaction under democratic leadership than under autocratic leadership (Lippit & White, 1943; Kakar, 1971; White & Lippit, 1968; Katz, 1949; Bose, 1958; House, 1971; House & Mitchell, 1974; Fleishman & Hunt, 1973; Weed et al., 1976; Latona, 1972; Maier & Sashkin, 1971; Chowdhry, 1953; Bose 1955; Ganguli, 1957a, 1957b, 1961a; Ganguli, Goswami, & Ghosh, 1957; Chatterjee, 1961) In a few exceptional cases where speed and efficiency is demanded, or in a crisis situation, authoritarian leadership can result in greater motivation and morale than democratic leadership (Meade, 1967; Vanden Ban & Thorat, 1969; Gibb, 1969; Rosenbaum & Rosenbaum, 1971). In one study, both instrumental and supportive leadership styles were found to positively affect group arousal and cohesion. (Greene & Schriesheim, 1980).
When leadership behavior is classified as being either task-oriented or people-oriented, it may be expected that the former affects productivity and work-related needs, and the latter affects satisfaction of social needs. However, these effects are not exclusive and are also not simple. They can interact with one another and they can vary with the situation. Fleishman & Hunt (1973) have reviewed a great deal of research on this subject. They found that consideration (people-orientation) increases morale and favourable attitudes on the part of subordinates. The effects of initiating structure (task-orientation) appear to be less consistent. In part, this may be due to the moderating effects of other variables including relationship orientation. Leadership behavior which exhibits little of both dimensions (Style 2) is likely to be effective in achieving productivity, morale and good ratings. (Reitz, 1977)

A great proportion of the literature available, including that reviewed above, is devoted to establishing the relationship between leadership styles and job satisfaction or morale. In most cases, efficiency of task accomplishment was taken as a measure of leader effectiveness. Thus, effects of leadership styles were researched on a 'macro' level. Overall measures of task accomplishment, industrial morale, group cohesiveness, employee attitudes and performance were used. The patterns of fulfillment or deprivation of specific need categories in subordinates as associated with his perception of his boss's leadership styles needs to be explored further. This study, has attempted to relate different leadership styles of bosses with deprivation of specific needs in subordinates. Following are the hypotheses in this regard.
1) Relationship of Style 1, Task and Authoritarian Styles and Need Deficiency

As has been discussed in the first hypothesis, these three leadership styles result from high task-orientation and low people-orientation. Various studies cited above have shown that managers who do not care about their subordinates and are not sensitive to their feelings, would create high levels of need deficiency and job dissatisfaction. A study by Myers (1966) reported that poorly motivated managers described their bosses as 'reducive' i.e. authority oriented, failing to accept conflicting views, discouraging creativity, failing to recognise achievement and stressing failures. Singh, et.al. (1979) and also Singh and Srivastava (1979) have both reported that Authoritarian and Task oriented leadership both lead to lower group morale and lower need satisfaction and thus lower productivity. Amsa and Aithal (1989) have also reported that controlling and non-supportive leadership styles leads to ineffective leadership.

Hackman and Lawler (1971) reported that workers on jobs with few opportunities for social interaction experience less social need satisfaction and vice-versa. Fleishman and Hunt (1973) report that, in their study, those managers who were high in task and low in people orientation were liked least of all.

Thus, the hypothesis may be conceived as under:

Hypothesis #10: Style 1 on the LEAD(Others) instrument, Task and Authoritarian styles on LBS(II) will be positively correlated with high need deficiencies in self actualisation, authority, esteem and social needs.
2) Relation of Style 2, Participative, Nurturant-Task Styles, with Need Deficiency.

Earlier in Hypothesis # 2, it has been posited that S2, P, and NT would be correlated with each other since they are all high on both dimensions of task and relationship. If this is true, then these styles may be expected to show similar patterns of need deficiency in subordinates. A person who is high in task-orientation as well as relationship orientation, is sensitive to his subordinate and responds to his needs, while at the same time emphasising task accomplishment. This would result in high morale and need satisfaction or, in the terminology of this study, low need deficiency. Such a trend was observed in studies by Lippit and White in children (1943); House (1971) House and Mitchell (1974); Downey, Sheridan and Slocum (1975); Katz, Maccoby and Morse (1950); Indik, Seashore and Georgopoulos (1960); Korman (1966); Likert (1961); Fleishman and Harris (1962). Reporting the positive effect of participation in satisfaction and motivation are Coch and French (1948); Maier (1963); Myers (1964 & 1966); Vroom (1964); Sinha (1980); Spinrad (1984); and Agarwal (1988).

When several leadership styles are jointly used, a leader high in both task and people orientation is liked best. (Fleishman & Hunt, 1973; Weed, Mitchell & Moffit, 1976; Katz & Kahn, 1960)

Thus, with the research trend showing an overall positive impact of high people and high task orientation, the eleventh hypothesis is as below.

HYPOTHESIS #11: Style 2 on the LEAD(Others) instrument, Nurturant-Task and Participative styles on the LBS(II) will be negatively related to need-deficiency in self-actualisation, autonomy, esteem and social needs.
3) Relationship Between Style 3, Nurturant Style and Need Deficiency of Subordinates

It can be logically expected that people-oriented styles such as, Style 3, and Nurturant Style would result in high satisfaction of social needs, and partial satisfaction of ego or esteem needs. This has been confirmed by the findings of Downey, Sheridan & Slocum (1975); Katz, MacCoby & Morse (1960); Indik, Seasore & Georgopoulos (1960); Korman (1977); Likert (1961); Myers (1966); Lippit & White (1943). Hersey and Blanchard (1972) have suggested the same outcome but have not confirmed it in any research study. Only one study by House and Dessler (1974) found no clear relationship between people-orientation and job attitudes.

Since Style 3 manifests in close supervisory relationships, the subordinate would feel a deficiency in the satisfaction of autonomy and self actualisation needs. This has, to some extent, been suggested by Hersey & Blanchard (1980).

Therefore, to frame the next hypothesis:

**HYPOTHESIS #12:** Style 3 on the LEAD(Others) instrument and Nurturant style on LBS (II) will be:

(i) positively related to need deficiency in autonomy and self-actualisation needs

(ii) negatively related to need deficiency in esteem and social needs.
4) Relationship Between Style 4 and Need Deficiency of Subordinates.

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1971), when the subordinates exhibit M4 (high) level of task-relevant maturity, it is Style 4 that is the most appropriate for goal attainment. However, as discussed before, in the narrative preceding Hypothesis # 4, it had been suggested that the delegation Style of management is missing in the style range of Indian Managers. Therefore, in this situation, it would lead to deficiencies in fulfillment of autonomy needs and also self-actualisation needs. Thus, S4 may be expected to show a positive correlation with need deficiency and importance in these need categories. To frame the next hypothesis.

Hypothesis # 13 : Style 4 in the LEAD(Others) instrument will show a positive correlation with need deficiency and importance of autonomy and self-actualisation needs.

5) Relationship Between Perceived Leadership Style and Satisfaction of Security Need.

The reason why this section is studying the security need satisfaction separately, is because it is one of the most prepotent needs in human beings as stated by Maslow (1965). Even in the Herzeberg (1966) model, Security is ranked as an important hygiene factor or dissatisfier. More particularly, this need, in the Indian context has been shown to be unique in the average working adult. In the Indian culture Haire, et.al (1966) found that the security need was most satisfied. However, Indian managers rank it as the most important need. This has also been proven in separate researches by Lahiri (1973), Ganguli (1964) Kumar
et al. (1982) and Srivastava (1984). In Western research however, it appears that security is an important motivator for workers and not executives (Blai, 1983; McGregor, 1960; McMurray, 1947; Viteles, 1962). This was held true in one Indian study (Prasad, 1988).

In India, because of the labour legislation and our work culture, a person’s job in any organisation is fairly secure, particularly in the organised sector within which this study is conducted to quote Sharma (1973) “... the basic survival needs are more or less satisfied in the case of the Indian industrial worker. Labour legislation, emergence of strong trade unions and the gradual rise of professional management in India have all contributed to satisfy the safety and security needs of the Indian industrial worker”. Thus, in the absence of any study directly relating leadership styles and perceived job security in India, a non-directional hypothesis could be framed as below:

**HYPOTHESIS #14: Need deficiency for security need will not be related to any particular leadership style.**
IV GAP BETWEEN SELF-RATED LEADERSHIP STYLES AND SUBORDINATE-RATED LEADERSHIP STYLES (OBJECTIVE IV)

In the normal course, it is found that the manager’s rating of his own leadership style is assumed to be a true reflection of reality, whereas, in reality, it is possible that the subordinates opinions are very different. Recognising this fact, Hersey and Blanchard (1971), Sinha (1980) and Rao, et.al. (1990) have designed their questionnaire instruments (LEAD, LBS and LSQ respectively) in two formats. One, a self-rating format where the manager is required to respond to the questions himself and the second, where his subordinate or peers would give their perceptions as to how they think the manager would probably respond. This data on self-perception and subordinate perception has been used differently by these authors.

Hersey and Blanchard (1977) have used the data generated from LEAD(Self) and LEAD (Others) to develop LEAD profiles of managers. They have suggested that LEAD-Other information should be used to provide feedback to managers who can use it for improving their style flexibility and range. Sinha (1980) has analysed LBS-I (Self-rating) and LBS-II (subordinate rating) to report how a manager’s perception of his immediate and top boss’s style influences his own style. (Sinha and Sinha, 1977b).

Rao, et.al. (1990) have also generated self-rated and subordinate rated data from their Leadership Styles Questionnaire. They have however used their instrument as a training aid and have utilised this data to give feedback to managers regarding their subordinate perceptions.
In all these cases, the self and subordinate rated data has been utilised for other purposes. The precise areas of consonance or dissonance have been relatively left unexplored. It is the objective thus to examine these areas of overlap and to find out the nature of this perceptual gap. Therefore, the objective here is stated as below:

“To study the perceptual gap between a manager’s self-rating of his leadership style and his subordinate’s perception of his (the manager’s leadership styles”. (OBJECTIVE IV).

The hypotheses that flow from this objective are framed in the next section.
A. HYPOTHESES REGARDING THE CORRELATION BETWEEN SELF-PERCEPTION OF LEADERSHIP STYLES AND SUBORDINATE PERCEPTION OF LEADERSHIP STYLES

Here, the aim is to identify and subsequently explain the 'gap' between the boss's professed leadership style and the perception of his subordinates. In the ideal situation, it may be assumed that the gap is minimal thus giving high correlation between LEAD(Self) and LEAD(Others) scores on one hand and LBS(I) and LBS(II) scores on the other hand. Thus, the hypotheses for this section will be governed by this logic as follows

HYPOTHESIS #15: There will be a positive correlation between the LEAD(Self) scores and the LEAD(Others) scores.

HYPOTHESIS #16: There will be a positive correlation between the LBS(I) scores and LBS(II) scores.