Lesson-23
Leadership Models

Learning Objective
This lesson will examine different models of leadership styles.

Tridimensional Grid
Reddin conceptualized a three-dimensional grid. It is also known as 3-D management. This leadership style borrows some of the ideas from managerial grid. Three-dimensional axes represent task-orientation, relationship-orientation and effectiveness. By adding an effectiveness dimension to the task-oriented and relationship-oriented behavior dimensions, Reddin has integrated the concept of leadership styles with the situational demand of a specific environment.

Task orientation (TO) is defined as the extent to which a manager directs his/her subordinate’s efforts toward goal attainment. Planning, organizing and controlling characterize it. Relationship orientation (RO) is defined as the extent to which a manager has personal relationships. It is characterized by mutual trust, respect for subordinate’s ideas and suggestions and their feelings. Effectiveness is defined as the extent to which a manager is successful in his position. When the style of a leader is appropriate to a given situation, it is termed as effective. When the style is inappropriate to a given situation, it is termed as ineffective. Thus, the difference between effective and ineffective styles is often not the actual behavior but the appropriateness of the behavior to the environment in which it is used.

The degree of TO or RO, or a combination of both, is used by leaders. On this basis, basically there are four styles as shown in figure 23.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High</th>
<th>Related</th>
<th>Integrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Orientation</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23.1: Relationship and Task Orientation

These four styles represent four basic types of behavior. The separated manager is concerned with correcting deviations. He/she writes rules and policies and enforces them. The related manager accepts others as he/she finds them, does not worry about time, sees
the organization as a social system, likes to work with others and obtains cooperation of others by setting examples. Dedicated manager is domineering, interested only in production and does not identify with subordinates. Such a person cannot work without power. The integrated manager gets oneself and other people involved with the organization. There is free two-way communication and strong identification and emphasis on teamwork. It is important understand that a particular style can be effective in one situation but not in others. Thus, each one of these styles has a less effective as well as a more effective equivalent. This is depicted in figure 23.2.
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Figure 23.2: Tridimensional Grid

Thus, the four basic styles result into eight styles. These eight styles are resultants of the eight possible combinations of task-orientation, relationship-orientation and effectiveness as shown in figure 23.3.
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Figure 23.3: More and less effective styles
The above figure indicates the following as ineffective styles:

1. Deserter-- Such leaders have low task and low people orientation and is completely alienated from organizational life. They avoid involvement; does not want to take responsibility and has low commitment. They believe in minimal output and works to rule.

2. Missionary-- They show exclusive interest in harmony. Such leaders believe in easy life, avoid conflicts and do not take initiative. Their objective is to keep their colleagues, subordinates and superiors happy.

3. Autocrat-- Such leaders are concerned with the immediate jobs and have no concern for others. Their decisions are unilateral and centralized. They believe in suppressing, demand obedience of authority and rely more on negative motivation.

4. Compromiser-- Such leaders use a high task and relationship orientation in situations that may not require high concentration. They are either poor decision-makers or avoid making decisions completely. They are weak and yielding and allow various pressures in the situation to influence them too much.

The four corresponding effective styles are as follows:

1. Bureaucrat-- Such a leader has high orientation toward organizational rules and regulations. They are impersonal and are less-task and relationship-oriented. They produce only few ideas and do not take initiative.

2. Developer-- They tend to display implicit trust in people, relies on high relationship orientation and less task orientation. They believe in commitment to work, openness, freedom to act, self-expression and development of subordinates.

3. Benevolent autocrat-- These are directive manager who know what they want and often get it without creating resentment. They are high task and less people oriented. They adopt positive economic motivation for getting things done and follow feudalistic approach in managing the organization.

4. Executive-- They have a high task and high relationship orientation in a situation where such behavior is appropriate. They emphasize on team management. They regard task as interdependent and integrated. The style acts as a powerful motivational instrument in the organization. This is a democratic leadership style.

The three-dimensional model recognizes that a manager may use more than one style and no single style is suggested to be appropriate in all situations. This gives a clear picture of the managerial world. It is assumed that all the styles have an equal chance of being used. Therefore, if a sufficiently large number of managers in a sufficiently diverse number of situations were tested, an equal number of each style would be obtained.
Fiedler’s Contingent Model

Fiedler’s contingency model of leadership has a basic contention that the appropriateness of leadership styles depends on their matching with situational requirement. Taking clues from the situational approach that leadership effectiveness is situational, Fiedler along with his associates made an attempt to identify the situational variables and their relationship with appropriateness of leadership styles. Fiedler’s model consists of three elements. These are as follows:

- Leadership styles
- Situational variables
- Interrelationship

Leadership Styles

Fiedler has identified leadership styles on two dimensions- task-directed and human relations oriented. Task-directed style is primarily concerned with the achievement of task performance. The leader derives satisfaction out of the task performance. Human relations style is concerned with achieving good interpersonal relations and achieving a position of personal prominence. Fiedler used two types of scores to measure the style adopted by a leader. These are scores on least preferred co-worker (LPC) and scores on assumed similarity (AS) between opposites. Rating on least preferred coworker was based on an individuals’ liking or disliking of working with other individuals in the group and measured on sixteen items such as pleasant-unpleasant, friendly-unfriendly, accepting-rejecting etc. Rating on assumed similarity is based on the degree to which leaders perceive group members to be like themselves. The scores on two ratings has very high positive correlation.

Situational Variables

As discussed in the previous section, there may be many situational factors affecting leadership effectiveness. Based on this, Fiedler has identified three critical dimensions of situation which affect a leader’s most effective style. These are as follows:

- Leader’s position power
- Task structure
- Leader-member relations

Leader’s position power-- This is determined by the degree to which leaders derive power from the position held by them in the organization which enables him to influence the behavior of others. In the case of a manager, it is authority delegated to him/her. As Fiedler points out, a leader with a clear and considerable position power can more easily obtain following than one without such power.

Task structure-- Task structure refers to the degree to which the task requirements are clearly defined in terms of task objectives, processes and relationship with other tasks.
When the tasks are clear, the quality of performance can be more easily controlled and group members can be held responsible for performance.

Leader-member relations-- It refers the degree to which followers have confidence, trust and respect in the leader. Fiedler has considered this dimension as the most important for the leaders as their position, power and task structure are subject to control by the organization and these can be prescribed. However, the leaders have to build their relations with the group members all by themselves. If the group members have positive thoughts about the leader, leadership becomes more effective.

All these situational variables taken together may define the situation as favorable or unfavorable. Favorable and unfavorable situations have been presented in figure 23.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader-member relations</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task structure</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position power</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Task structure          | High | Low  |
| Position power          | Strong | Weak |
| Cells                   | 3   | 4   |

| Task structure          | High | Low  |
| Position power          | Strong | Weak |
| Cells                   | 5   | 6   |

| Task structure          | High | Low  |
| Position power          | Strong | Weak |
| Cells                   | 7   | 8   |

Note: Very favorable and Very unfavorable

Figure 23.4: Favorableness/Unfavorableness of Situation

A very favorable situation is cell 1 where leader-member relations are good. The task is highly structured and the leader has enormous position power to influence his/her subordinates. At the other extreme, a very unfavorable situation is cell 8 where leader-member relations are poor. The task is highly unstructured and leader’s position power is weak. Between these two extremes, the degree of favorableness varies.

Relation between styles and situation

Fielder feels that the effectiveness of leadership style depends on the situation. For example, he says that the group performance will be contingent upon the appropriate matching of leadership style and the degree of favorableness of the group situation for the leader, that is, the degree to which the situation provides opportunities to the leader to influence his group members.

Appropriateness of leadership styles in different situations is represented in figure 23.5.

(The figure will be provided by the instructor in the classroom.)

Figure 23.5: Fiedler model of leadership
Thus, task-directed and human relations-oriented styles tend to be effective in different situations.

1. Task-directed leadership style tends to be better in group situations. These are either very favorable or very unfavorable to the leader.

2. Human relations-oriented leadership style tends to be present in group situations that are intermediate in favorableness.

Fiedler has provided the reason for this phenomenon. He says that in the very favorable conditions in which the leader has power, informal backing and a relatively well-structured task, the group is ready to be directed. In this case, the group expects to be told what to do. Consider the captain of an airliner in its final landing approach. We would hardly want the pilot to turn to his/her crew for a discussion on how to land.

As an example of why the task-oriented leader is successful in a highly unfavorable situation, Fiedler gives the following example:

“…the disliked chairman of a volunteer committee which is asked to plan the office picnic on a beautiful Sunday. If the leader asks too many questions about what the group ought to do or how he should proceed, he is likely to be told that we ought to go home.”

The leader who makes a wrong decision in this highly unfavorable situation is better off than the leader who makes no decision at all. Similarly, human relations leader is more effective in intermediate range of favorableness of situation because he/she can get the work done by using interpersonal skills more than insisting on the work itself. An example of such a situation is the typical committee or a unit which is staffed by professionals. In such a situation, the group members may not wholly accept the leader, the task may not be completely structured and the leader may not have adequate authority. In this case, the person has to rely more on persuasion and interpersonal relations to get the work done.

**Implications of Fiedler’s Model**

Fiedler’s model offers a number of implications. The model provides a promising breakthrough in leadership research. Various research studies in leadership have been conducted based on this model and they support the model. It has been commented that this model is and will probably remain a rich source of leadership. It is seen effective from the viewpoint of organizational implications.

Fiedler’s model offers the following two implications:

1. No leadership style is appropriate for all situations. Therefore, there is nothing like the best style. The managers can adopt the leadership styles according to the requirement of a particular situation.
2. There is a need for matching leaders and job situations to achieve organizational effectiveness. Fiedler says that if we wish to increase organizational and group effectiveness, we should learn not only how to train leaders more effectively but also how to build an organizational environment in which the leader can perform well.

**Criticism of the Model**

When the model was first published, it attracted a lot of criticisms. Such initial criticism is quite usual with any new concept which departs from the usual practices. The criticisms commented on the defective research methodology and lack of comprehensive situational variables. Some of these criticisms are valid while many others are superfluous. For example, much criticisms of research methodology do not hold good. Fiedler’s model has considered only limited situational variables. In fact, there are many more variables than what the model has taken into account. Further, Fiedler’s model seems to be reverting back to a single continuum of leadership style. It suggests that there are only two basic leadership styles. Most studies indicate that leadership styles can be plotted on two axes. Thus, it is not necessary that a leader, who is high on one dimension, is low on other dimension. Rather, a combination of the two is found. In spite of these criticisms, the model has its relevance.

**Hersey-Blanchard’s Situational Model**

Hersey-Blanchard’s situational leadership model takes a different perspective of situational variables as compared to Fiedler’s model. Heresy and Blanchard feel the model is not based on empirical studies. The leader has to match the leadership style according to the needs of maturity of subordinates which moves in stages and has a cycle. Therefore, this theory is also known as life-cycle theory of leadership. There are two basic considerations in this model. These are leadership styles and maturity of subordinates.

**Leadership Styles**

Leadership styles may be classified into four categories based on the combination of two considerations. These are as follows:

- Relationship behavior
- Task behavior

Relationship behavior is determined by socio-emotional support provided by the leader. Task behavior is seen in terms of the amount of guidance and direction provided by the leader. Combination of these two dimensions results into four leadership styles as shown in figure 23.6.
High relationship and low task
Low relationship and low task
Low Task behavior
High

Figure 23.6: Leadership behavioral styles

Subordinate’s Maturity

Maturity in this model has been used in the context of ability and willingness of the people for directing their own behavior. It is not strictly in accordance with the immaturity-maturity theory of Argyris. Ability refers to the knowledge and skills of an individual to do a particular job. It is termed as job maturity. Willingness refers to the psychological maturity and has much to do with confidence and commitment of the individual. These variables of maturity should be considered only in relation to a specific job to be performed. That is to say, an individual or a group is not mature or immature in any total sense. People are more or less mature in relation to a specific task, function or objective. This is what leaders attempt to accomplish through their efforts. In addition to assessing the level of maturity of individuals in the group, he/she has to assess the maturity level of the group as a whole. This is particularly true if the group interacts frequently together in the same work area. When both components of maturity-ability and willingness are combined, we get the following four combinations:

- Low ability and low willingness-- Low maturity
- Low ability and high willingness-- Low to moderate maturity
- High ability and low willingness-- Moderate to high maturity
- High ability and high willingness-- High maturity

Combining Leadership Styles and Maturity

We can combine leadership styles and maturity and choose the leadership style which is appropriate at a given level of maturity. This helps in arriving at a relationship between the two as shown in figure 23.7.

(The figure will be provided by the instructor in the classroom.)

Figure 23.7: Hersey-Blanchard’s model of situational leadership styles

Thus, there are four leadership styles, each being appropriate to a specific level of maturity. The four leadership styles are as follows:
• Telling
• Selling
• Participating
• Delegating

Telling-- Sometimes the subordinates have low maturity level. This means that they neither have the ability nor the will to do a task on their own. They need to be told about an appropriate leadership style to follow. It emphasizes on directive behavior, involves high task behavior and low relationship behavior.

Selling-- This style is appropriate for subordinates of moderate maturity who have high willingness but lack in ability. The subordinates require both supportive and directing behavior which is marked by high task and high relationship behavior.

Participating-- Subordinates with moderate to high maturity, who have ability to do but lack willingness, require high external motivating force. In such a situation, participating leadership style with low task behavior and high relationship behavior is more appropriate.

Delegating-- This style is appropriate for subordinates with high maturity. They have both the ability and willingness to work. Such people hardly require any leadership support. The most appropriate leadership style in such a situation is delegating. It involves low task behavior and low relationship behavior.

**Implications of the Model**

Hersey-Blanchard’s model is simple and intuitively appealing and accents an important contingency variable. This contingency variable is an employee’s capability related to a specific task. This variable is sometimes overlooked. The model suggests that the maturity level of the subordinates and the group has an important bearing for leadership behavior. As the maturity level changes, there should be corresponding change in leadership behavior. Managers with faith in participative leadership style have received this model with jubilation and assert that it helps them to determine as to what they should do and in what circumstances. The model has provided training ground for developing people in organizations.

The model, however, has some shortcomings. There has not been much research evidence to support or reject the applicability of the model. It could not arouse enough interest in researchers. Therefore, it has not gained popularity. Another deficiency in the model is that only one aspect of the total situation of leadership, that is maturity level of employees, has been taken into consideration to judge the leadership effectiveness. Therefore, this model does not truly reflect situational leadership.

**Path Goal Model of Leadership**
Robert House and others have developed a path-goal model of leadership initially presented by Evans. Though the concept of path-goal was presented in 1957, it could not catch much attention. Path-goal model of leadership is basically a combination of situational leadership and Vroom’s expectancy theory of motivation. Like other situational theories, path-goal model attempts to predict leadership effectiveness in different situations. According to this model, the main function of a leader is to clarify and set goals with subordinates. They help them to find the best path for achieving the goals and to remove the obstacles in their performance and satisfy their needs. This goal-path process is depicted in figure 23.8.

(The figure will be provided by the instructor in the classroom.)

Figure 23.8: Path-Goal Leadership Process

In providing this path-goal process, the leader adopts different leadership styles based on the situations. A combination of these two leadership styles and situations helps the employees in achieving the goals.

**Leadership Styles**

The leader may adopt one of the four styles depending on the situation. These are directive or instrumental, supportive, participative and achievement-oriented:

1. Directive-- The leader gives subordinates specific orders and makes it clear what is expected of them; his focus is on planning, organizing, coordinating and controlling the activities of the subordinates.

2. Supportive-- The leader shows friendly behavior to the employees; he shows his concern for their needs and welfare; creates pleasant organizational climate.

3. Participative-- The leader makes the decisions with active participation of the employees; shares information with them and seeks suggestions from them.

4. Achievement-oriented-- The leader sets challenging goals, seeks improvement of performance by displaying confidence in the abilities of the subordinates.

**Situational Variables**

While exercising leadership styles, the leader must consider two groups of situational variables-characteristics of subordinates and work environment.

**Characteristics of Subordinate**

There are three important variables in each employee relevant to effectiveness of leadership-- locus of control, willingness to accept influence, and self-perceived task ability. Locus of control refers to alternative beliefs whether the employee’s
achievements are the product of his own efforts (internal locus of control), or the result of outside forces (external locus of control). Willingness to accept influence refers to the degree of willingness or unwillingness of an employee to accept influence of others. Self-perceived task ability refers to whether the employee has ability to perform the task or not.

**Work Environment**

Work environment consists the nature of task, formal authority system, and work group. Nature of job refers, here, as the degree of structuring of the job. The task may be either structured or unstructured. A structured task is well defined in terms of the activities involved, authority and responsibility associated with, the task, and the type of organizational relationships. Unstructured task lacks all these. Formal authority system refers to the degree of authority delegated to the leader for influencing subordinates. Work group refers to the type of group in the organization the employee belongs to.

Various situational variables and leadership styles and their effectiveness have been presented in table 23.1 below.

Table 23.1: Leadership styles and situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership styles</th>
<th>Situations in which appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Positive effect on satisfaction and expectancies of subordinates working on unstructured task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Positive effect on satisfaction of subordinates working on dissatisfying, stressful or frustrating task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>Positive effect on satisfaction of subordinates who are ego-involved with non-repetitive task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement oriented</td>
<td>Positive effect on the confidence that the efforts will lead to effective performance of subordinates working on ambiguous and non-repetitive task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theory proposes that there is nothing like the best leadership style which is appropriate in all situations. Appropriate style is one that helps the subordinates cope with the environmental ambiguity. A leader who is able to reduce uncertainties of the
task and sets clear paths is considered to be satisfying because he increases the expectations of the subordinates that their efforts will lead to desired results.

Path-goal theory makes great sense for academic research and practicing managers. However, the theory lacks empirical supports. First, enough researches have not been carried to validate the propositions of the theory. Second, many research findings have given contrasting results. Nevertheless, the theory has opened a new approach requiring serious thinking in this direction.

**Successful Leadership vs. Effective Leadership**

An individual attempts to affect the behavior of another through the exercise of leadership. The response of the other person or subordinate may be either compatible with the expectations of the leader or otherwise. Further, the compatible response may be the result of either the impact of leader’s appropriate style or because of position power. In case of the former, the leader is effective as subordinate sees his own needs being accomplished by satisfying the goals of organization and the leader. In the latter case, the leader is successful in getting compatible behavior but he has done this because of his position. In this case the leader is successful but not effective. Thus, a distinction can be made between successful and effective leadership.

Success has to do with how the individual or group behaves; effectiveness describes the internal shape or predisposition of an individual or a group and thus is attitudinal in nature. An individual interested only in success tends to emphasize his position power and uses close supervision. On the other hand, if he intends to be effective, he will depend on his personal power characterized by more general supervision. The position power can be delegated downward in the organization; the personal power cannot be delegated, but is generated upward from below through follower acceptance. The successful or effectiveness is not either or position, however, rather these can be in-the form of a continuum ranging from very successful to very unsuccessful or very effective to very ineffective as shown in figure 23.9.

![Successful and effective leadership continuum](image)

Thus, a manager can be successful but ineffective having only a short-run influence over the behavior of others. On the other hand, if a manager is both successful and effective, his influence tends to lead to long-run productivity. However, it should be emphasized
that successful and effectiveness framework is a way of evaluating the response to a specific behavioral response and not of evaluating performance over time. Total performance is the result of a host of factors and not of leadership alone, hence can be evaluated in the light of these factors.

**Leadership Styles in Indian Organizations**

In the first instance, Indian management is generally believed to be autocratic with subordinates closely supervised by their superiors and only a limited degree of participation is allowed to the subordinates. However, the real situation in this context can be appreciated only when a detailed account of various practices is taken for consideration. Fortunately, some empirical studies are available in these contexts which do not necessarily support the traditional view rather they present a mixed note.

The review of various studies fails to give a generalized result. The findings are too diverse, sometimes even contradictory. It indicates the absence of a clear-cut direction in the managerial behavior thereby reflecting a lack of managerial conviction and values. Since, managerial styles are determined by a host of factors such as forces in superiors, subordinates, and situations, it is unlikely to expect a uniform leadership style. Indian work organizations, from this point of view, can be classified into three parts which have some distinctive features and consequently the different leadership styles. Such classification may be as follows:

(a) Family managed traditional organizations.
(b) Professionally managed Indian organizations and foreign-owned organizations.
(c) Public sector organizations.

In family-managed traditional organizations, the most prevalent style is autocratic. Sons and grandsons of the entrepreneurs are automatically promoted without any consideration to efficiency or overall suitability. Thus, there is management by inheritance or management by chromosomes with the result that these organizations are highly centralized in their organizational structure and are authoritarian in their approach. In many such organizations, a certain amount of the paternalistic attitude prevails. The proprietary character of business and large-scale participation of family members in it have made the attitude of the head of the business, who is also the head of the family, highly paternalistic. The same paternalistic attitude extends to the employees and has developed a set of values in an employer vis-à-vis his employees. At the initial stage, authoritarian style is more suitable which these organizations have followed. However, such style has also been inherited by successors without any appreciable change or modification. On the other hand, there are many organizations in the private sector owned by Indians or by multinationals who have appreciable degree of participation or democratic leadership. The reason is that multinationals do not bring only their technology but also the work culture which is more permissive and conducive towards the application of modern approach of management. As such, the degree of participation is greater in such organizations. The third category of organizations is in public sector. Here, bureaucratic style is more prevalent owing to the work culture inherited by public
sector managers. Initially, civil servants who brought a lot of bureaucratic culture with them manned public sector organizations. The net result is that the entire organizational processes are governed by bureaucratic model. Its implication is status differentials, class distinctions, and impersonal relationships which work against participative style.

The Right Style

What is a right leadership style for Indian managers is a difficult question to answer. One often comes across a futile search for a style appropriate for Indian managers. There are numerous variables which affect the leadership style. Thus, what may appear to be an effective leadership style for a manager may not be equally appropriate to others. The important variables in this context are superiors, subordinates, and the situation under which a particular style is followed. The analysis of these variables may throw some light upon the adoption of appropriate style.

Leadership Styles of Some Industrialists and Chief Executives

Dhirubhai Ambani, Chairman of Reliance-- He is a first generation entrepreneur and has built the largest company in the private sector. He believes in entrepreneurial style with propensity to high-risk taking, creative, innovative, keeps watch on the environment continuously and a great collector of managerial talents.

Ratan Tata, Chief of Tata group-- He inherited large industrial empire. He believes in consolidation though is not very creative, delegates’ authority to the lowest possible levels and has a democratic temperament.

Keki Dadiseth, former Chairman of Hindustan Lever-- He is highly professional and believes in consolidation, averse to taking big risks. He is a number cruner by temperament. How to attract and maintain talents is always on top of his mind.

Rahul Bajaj, Chairman of Bajaj Auto-- He inherited the industrial group, further developed and consolidated it. He has a friendly and philosophical approach. He is always making sure for level-playing field, can’t take things lying down and is slightly resistant to change.

N.R. Narayana Murthy, Chairman of Infosys Technologies-- He is a great computer technocrat turned as industrialist. He believes in simple living and high thinking, supporter of middle class culture, is not ever satisfied, constantly aspires for more, believes in doing great things but takes care of others, is highly creative and innovative.

Questions

1. What are the various situational factors in Fiedler’s contingency model of leadership? How do they affect leadership styles?
2. Hersey-Blanchard’s situational model is based on a limited number of variable but these variables are quite significant. Comment on this statement. How will you compare Hersey-Blanchard’s model with that of Fiedler?

3. What is path-goal theory of leadership and how can an employee progress towards a goal? What factors does the leader, in exercising his/her leadership styles, take into account?

4. “A successful leader is not necessarily effective.” Discuss this statement.

5. Discuss the leadership styles, with examples, which Indian managers follow. Can you suggest the best style for them? Give reasons for that.