



International Journal of Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-9380

available at <http://www.serialsjournals.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 14 • Number 15 (Part 3) • 2017

The Impact of Leadership on Employee Motivation at Food Processing Industry in Odisha

Chandra Madhab Mohapatra¹ and Bandana Nayak²

¹Research Scholar, Faculty of Management sciences, (IBCS) SOA University

²Assistant Professor and Head (HR Department) Faculty of Management sciences, (IBCS) SOA University Bhubaneswar

ABSTRACT

This study went through the different effects of leadership styles on employee motivation in medium scale food processing units based at Odisha in India. The study has emphasised on three leadership styles, that is, Transformational, Task oriented and Authoritative of managers and supervisors. Task oriented and Authoritative dimensions were based on Managerial Behaviour questionnaire (MBQ). 250 employees were selected randomly to collect information. The research revealed that the impact of transformational leadership is more on employee motivation in comparison to task oriented and authoritative styles of managers and supervisors at food processing units in Odisha.

JEL Classification Code : 3.13

Keywords: Leadership style, Employee motivation, Food processing industries, Odisha.

1. INTRODUCTION

Each and every organization wants to become successful and crave to get constant progress. The main asset of any organization is its human resource. Thus for the proper utilization of human resources, every organization requires proper leadership styles of its managers and supervisors who come in contact with the employees day in and day out. Leadership is one of the essential factors which help in building and maintaining a proper employee motivation which helps the organization to succeed. Leader is a person who influences to direct and coordinate the activities of the members towards the achievement of the group objectives. Leadership and motivation are always inter-dependable. For an employee, achieving the organizational goal is not enough to keep him motivated. But by helping other employees to achieve their personal and carrier goals is an important source to obtain motivation. It is always seen that when subordinates are motivated, the leadership of the leaders become more effective.

Leadership style in an organization is always a vital factor which has an important role in enhancing or retaining the interest and motivation of the employees in an organization.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of Leadership is always an interesting topic of debate. It is not so easy to define the Leadership and identify the final fence of analysis. As stated by Bass (1999) definition of leadership is related to the proposed associated with the attempt to define it, which has a huge number of possibilities. The literature of leadership is the main thread which develops individual and organizational interaction, Lee & Chuang (2009) described that effective leader not only inspires subordinate's potential to enhance efficiency but also maintains their requirement in the process of obtains organizational goals. Stogdill (1957) defined leadership is an individual behaviour which guides a group of employees to achieve their common target. Fry (2003) defined Leadership as a heading strategy which offers inspiring motive and increases the potentiality of growth and development. Cashman (1989) challenges the definition of leadership that focuses on external manifestations and instead defines leadership as an authentic self expression that creates value. Sabat (1998) viewed differently to future leadership as a leader has to be flexible, adaptable and aware about the dynamism of business and customer's choice and preferences. Glantz (2002) described the importance of a manager to find his proper leadership style. Leaders can influence their followers' behaviour through communication, group dynamics, training, rewards and discipline Naile (2014). Murthy (1998) opines that a leader has to create customer champions within the organization to bring voice of the customers in all major decisions. House et al (2002) reached at a consensus that leadership is the ability to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute to the effectiveness and success of the organizations of which they are members.

In a study, "Leadership styles in army at junior level during peace and war", the researchers found that an alarming lack of professionalism in the system which does not allow natural leadership qualities to blossom both during peace and war. (Pathak and Lal, 1999). Mc Call (1998) opined that leaders develop within every organization, with or without a formal development programme. Leadership development in most organizations occur by happen stance rather than by design. When future leaders are not trained on provided healthy learning opportunities, they often choose poor role models and follow behaviour that is undesirable or organizationally only functional. Sarkar (1996) viewed that old leaders have been replaced by the young. The workers are somehow happy with these leaders and they think that young leaders have successfully replaced the old relationship. Further, they could run the routine union activities dependently but for any vital discussion they have to consult the central and senior leaders. The capability of the leader's role in motivating members implies that they may coordinate, control, direct, guide, council, support, help, persuade or mobilize the efforts of others. A study by Shing (1987) found out that the nurturing task leadership is the best leader behaviour for supervising the workmen and participative task leadership is the best leader behaviour for supervising the executives. It is also resulted that the culture and values of the organization and its objectives have a great role to decide the type of leader's behaviour that has to be learnt and practiced by the executives. A study on "Leadership styles and effectiveness" reveals that there is not much difference in leadership effectiveness and style across different types of organizations. Indian executives do not think on the lines of "concern for the people" but many of them still like to be benevolent autocrats rather than participating managers. The efforts to increase participation and decrease direction or telling must be made according to the maturity level of workers (Pratap & Srivastav, 1985).

2.1. Transformational Leadership

This leadership style emphasizes an organization's mission and lays the foundation for organization's strategy, policies and procedures. These leaders use the different strategies and techniques to empower followers, enhance their self efficiency and develop the values, norms and attitude which are consistence in Leader's vision. Mengesha (2015) transformational leadership is the sum of five factors. (a) Idealized Influences (attributed), (b) Idealized Influences (Behaviour), (c) Inspirational Motivation, (d) Intellectual stimulation and (e) Individualized consideration . Bass and Avolio (1992) developed multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) which measures leadership on seven factors related to transformational leadership including Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individualized Consideration, Contingent Reward, Management-by-exception and Laissez-faire Leadership.

2.2. Task oriented Leadership

Stogdill (1950) viewed that task- oriented leadership is the style in which the leader decides the role of the followers, set the level for goal achievement and constructs a well defined pattern of communication. This leadership style makes the followers engaged in top- down communication. The leaders make the followers to know what, when and how to perform each task. In this style of leadership, employees perform the rules and process, which is established by the leaders. (Yuke, 2002) studied the effectiveness of the task oriented behaviour which reveals "placing emphasis on planning, coordinating and providing the resources needed by the followers including establishment of the goal setting for the followers.

2.3. Authoritative Leadership

It is a leadership style where the leaders formulate the policies and procedures, decides the goal for achievement and directs and controls all the activities without any meaningful participation of the subordinates. The leader carries a complete grip over the subordinates with low autonomy within the group. The group completes the task with a very close supervision by the leader. The subordinates are rewarded or punished according to their performance and order given.

2.4. Concept of Motivation

Now a day's every organization has understood the importance of motivated employees which carries the power to bring goal achievement and success for it. It is the prime concern of all organization to make their employee motivated and to bring the prime factor out which makes the employee motivated. According to (Samuel and Chipunza, 2009) employee motivation is the deciding factor in work performance, success or failure of an organization. Wiley (1997) suggested that the success of an organization depends on employer's understanding of the importance of employee motivation. So we can say motivating employees is a prime managerial function. Hellriegel.et al. (2001) defines employee motivation as "the force acting on or within a person which cause him to behave in a specific goal directed manner ". The success depends on the utilization of the motivation power of the employee.

2.5. Leadership and Motivation

Leadership style is one of the major determinants of motivation. Mehta et al (2003) found that different leadership style have different levels of influencing power towards motivation. Participative, supportive and directive leadership styles were more effective in eliciting employees' to gain higher level of motivation.

Densten (2002) stated that extra effort has a significant role for creating inspirational motivation because the outcome has been used to validate the “augmentation effect “of inspirational motivation. Alghazo and Al-Anazi (2016) found a strong relationship between leadership style and employee motivation where the correlation was positive with transformational style of leadership and negative with transactional style. Rawung (2013) did a study in higher education in Indonesia and found a significant relationship between leadership and work motivation. The study of Khuong and Hoang (2015) found result which implied a strong influence of leadership styles in retaining and developing employee motivation. In addition, this research also demonstrated that the charismatic leadership, relation-oriented leadership, and ethic-based contingent reward leadership were positively associated with employee motivation.

3. NEED OF THE STUDY

The study aims to find the relationship between leadership style and employees motivation, focusing the theoretical literature and empirical studies about them. The researchers will study how the nine leadership styles as considered in this study influences the employee motivation.

3.1. Objectives

The following objectives have been framed for the study:

To study the relationship between leadership styles and employees motivation in food processing units in Odisha.

To find out which type of leadership style is motivating more to employees.

3.2. Hypothesis

There are five hypotheses developed to identify the impact of Leadership style factor on employee motivation.

H1: There is significant relationship between idealized Influence behaviour of leadership style with employees’ motivation in food processing units in Odisha.

H2: There is a significant relationship between Inspirational Motivation behaviour of leadership style and employees motivation.

H3: There is a significant relationship between Laissez -faire Leadership style and employees motivation

H4: There is a significant relationship between Task oriented behaviour of leadership style and employees motivation.

H5: There is a significant relationship between Authoritative leadership style and employees motivation.

3.3. Research Design

A quantitative research approach and a co relational research design were formulated for this study. Data were collected using the survey method. The independent variables are dimensions of different leadership styles (that is., idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management by exception, laissez faire, task oriented and authoritative style) as perceived by the employees. The dependent variable is employee motivation.

3.4. Population and Sampling

The questionnaires were administered to two selected food processing units situated at Odisha, India, producing fast moving consumer goods like, food colour, consumable food etc. The study population was 750 employees. A total of 225 employees constituted the sample, based on convenience sampling technique. The study has included only those, who have given their consent to participate. Reluctant behaviours were observed by many employees to participate in this study because of the sensitive nature of the topic.

3.5. Research Instrument

Multifactor Leadership (MLQ7X) questionnaire, developed by Bass and Avolio(1995), was used to measure leadership styles of managers and supervisors, with little modifications, based on the subject experts, content validity and personnel of HR department. Reliability was measured by Cronbach's Alpha which resulted as .935 for Leadership Measurement Scale and .890 for Employee Motivation Scale. The modified scale of leadership incorporated two dimensions more as task oriented leadership and authoritative leadership style, based on Daftuar, (1985) and Nayak and Mishra (2005). Employee motivation was measured using 11 dimensions (as Pay, Company policies and administrative policies, Employee welfare, Work environment, Interpersonal relationship, Job security, Recognition, Sense of achievement, Growth and promotional opportunities, Responsibility and Meaning fullness of the work). The instrument was based on Herzberg's two-factor theory of motivation. Further, it was modified by discussing with HR experts and observing the industry employees of food processing units. Further validity was measured by exploratory factor analysis, 0.5 and above variables was taken for the study. A five point likert scale was used to obtain the participants responses for the questionnaire.

4. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Descriptive statistics shows in below table which is derived using SPSS 23.0.

Table 1
Mean and Standard Deviation of Leadership Measurement Scale (LMS) at Food Processing Units

	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
Idealized Influence	225	2.8859	1.07059
inspirational Motivation	225	2.5852	.92033
intellectual stimulation	225	2.9526	.97576
Individualized consideration	225	2.6844	.88846
Contingent Reward	225	2.7911	.94087
Management by Exception	225	2.9370	.92185
Laissez faire	225	2.3000	.97514
Task oriented	225	3.0015	.95561
Authoritative	225	2.9333	.93965
Valid N (list wise)	225		

The mean and standard deviations of Leadership style (MLS) variables are presented in Table 1. It represents a higher mean score in task-oriented variable in comparison to other leadership styles. It is clear that the managers and supervisors are more task-oriented ($\bar{X} = 3.0015$). The mean score of Laissez-faire ($\bar{X} = 2.3000$) is comparatively low. This implies the food processing industry leaders are emphasizing the task more and gives less importance to the human aspects. As the industries are private sector and job security is comparatively less so the leaders appears to be tough persons and less generous to the inefficient workers. Further, very less variation ($SD = 0.92033$) is found in inspirational motivation variable and more ($SD = 1.07059$) is found in Idealized Influence.

Table 2
Mean and Standard Deviation of Employee Motivation Scale (EMS) at Food Processing Units

<i>Dimensions</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Deviation</i>
Pay	225	2.6919	.93640
Company policies and administrative policies	225	2.6874	.85598
Employee welfare	225	2.6133	.91294
Work environment	225	2.9052	.88355
Interpersonal relationship	225	2.7393	.86669
Job security	225	2.5319	1.00104
Recognition	225	2.7990	.85137
Sense of achievement	225	2.9704	.81596
Growth and promotional opportunities	225	2.7437	.83808
Responsibility	225	2.8326	.80310
Meaning fullness of the work	225	3.0696	.77702
Valid N (listwise)	225		

The above table-2 depicts the mean and standard deviations of employee motivation variables. It represents a higher mean score in meaning fullness of the work variable ($\bar{X} = 3.0696$) and less in job security ($\bar{X} = 2.5319$) variability. It shows that the job itself inspires and motivates the employees. They are enthusiastic about their job and try to finish it on time and satisfied with the job. Here the higher level leadership is good in designing the job; describe it and right person to be inducted in right post. But employees lack job security. Although the managers and supervisors have given the employees complete freedom in their work but tenure is still in stake. Further, very less variation ($SD = .80310$) is found in responsibility variable and more ($SD = 1.00104$) is found in Job security.

Table-3 shows the co-relation matrix for the leadership styles and employee motivation in food processing units in Odisha. It represents the significant correlations between Idealized Influence leadership behaviour with company policies and administrative policies, employee welfare, interpersonal relationship, job security, recognition, sense of achievement, growth and promotional opportunities, responsibility and meaning fullness of the work (affinity towards job), ($r = .161^*$, $.212^{**}$, $.276^{**}$, $.162^*$, $.234^{**}$, $.265^{**}$, $.198^{**}$, $.167^*$, $.144^*$ respectively). But it did not get significant relationship with pay and employee welfare. But very strong positive correlations are found between authoritative leadership style with pay, company policies and administrative policies, employee welfare and meaningfulness of job of employee motivation

($r = .135^*$, $.166^*$, $.131^*$, $.162^*$), ($p = <.01$) along with work environment, inspirational relationship, recognition, growth and responsibility variables ($r = .273^{**}$, $.307^{**}$, $.271$, ** , $.248^{**}$, $.250^{**}$, $.240^{**}$ respectively), ($p = <.05$). Hence, hypothesis-1, the idealized Influence behaviour of leadership style is significantly related to employees' motivation has been accepted. Similarly, in inspirational motivation behaviour leadership style of managers and supervisors are significantly related with all motivation dimensions ($r = .191^{**}$, $.278^{**}$, $.193^{**}$, $.217^{**}$, $.289^{**}$, $.249^{**}$, $.208^{**}$, $.242^{**}$, $.226^{**}$ and $.147^*$ respectively, $P = <.01$ and $.05$) excluding the meaningfulness of job. Hence it rejects the null hypothesis and accepts the alternative hypothesis-2.

Table 3
Co-relation matrix for the Leadership Styles (LMS) and Employee Motivation (EMS)

Correlations N=225	Pay	Company policies and administrative policies	Employee welfare	Work environment	Interpersonal relationship	Job security	Recognition	Sense of achievement	Growth	Responsibility	Meaningfulness
Idealized Influence	.083	.161 [*]	.111	.212 ^{**}	.276 ^{**}	.162 [*]	.234 ^{**}	.265 ^{**}	.198 ^{**}	.167 [*]	.144 [*]
Inspirational Motivation	.191 ^{**}	.278 ^{**}	.193 ^{**}	.217 ^{**}	.289 ^{**}	.249 ^{**}	.208 ^{**}	.242 ^{**}	.226 ^{**}	.147 [*]	.031
Intellectual Stimulation	.091	.108	.076	.196 ^{**}	.250 ^{**}	.119	.222 ^{**}	.216 ^{**}	.168 [*]	.111	.041
Individualized consideration	.168 [*]	.158 [*]	.185 ^{**}	.199 ^{**}	.219 ^{**}	.196 ^{**}	.226 ^{**}	.236 ^{**}	.203 ^{**}	.136 [*]	.090
Contingent reward	.155 [*]	.220 ^{**}	.191 ^{**}	.249 ^{**}	.170 [*]	.206 ^{**}	.259 ^{**}	.241 ^{**}	.231 ^{**}	.178 ^{**}	.114
Management by exception	.145 [*]	.170 [*]	.099	.237 ^{**}	.224 ^{**}	.170 [*]	.187 ^{**}	.246 ^{**}	.204 ^{**}	.137 [*]	.110
Laissez faire	.242 ^{**}	.317 ^{**}	.243 ^{**}	.263 ^{**}	.296 ^{**}	.316 ^{**}	.174 ^{**}	.173 ^{**}	.265 ^{**}	.155 [*]	.015
Task Oriented	.117	.174 ^{**}	.065	.229 ^{**}	.258 ^{**}	.130	.215 ^{**}	.266 ^{**}	.199 ^{**}	.154 [*]	.161 [*]
Authoritative	.135 [*]	.166 [*]	.131 [*]	.273 ^{**}	.307 ^{**}	.129	.271 ^{**}	.248 ^{**}	.250 ^{**}	.240 ^{**}	.166 [*]

$N = 309$, $*p = <.01$ level

$**p = <.05$ level

Inspirational motivation is also carries positive and significant relationship with employee motivation because here $r = .310$ and P value is less than 0.01. Intellectual motivation have positive and significant relationship with employee motivation, because here $r = .216$ and P value is less than 0.01. Individualized consideration have positive and significant relationship with employee motivation, because here $r = 0.274$ and P value is less than 0.01. Contingent reward have positive and significant relationship with employee motivation, because here $r = 0.299$ and P value is less than 0.01. Management by exception have positive and significant relationship with employee motivation, because here $r = 0.260$ and P value is less than 0.01.

Laissez faire have positive and significant relationship with employee motivation, because here $r = 0.338$ and P value is less than 0.01, which rejects the null hypothesis and accepts alternative hypothesis-3. Task oriented have positive and significant relationship with employee motivation, because here $r = 0.263$ and P value is less than 0.01, which rejects the null hypothesis and accepts alternative hypothesis-4. Authoritative leadership have positive and significant relationship with employee motivation, because here $r = 0.310$ and P value is less than 0.01, which rejects the null hypothesis and accepts alternative hypothesis-5.

4.1. Relationship between Dimensions of different leadership style and Employee Motivation

**Table 4
ANOVAa**

	<i>Model</i>	<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
	Regression	13.338	9	1.482	5.062	.000b
1	Residual	62.948	215	.293		
	Total	76.286	224			

a. *Dependent Variable: Mean of Motivation*

b. *Predictors: (Constant), Authoritative leadership, Laissez faire, Individualized consideration, inspirational Motivation, intellectual stimulation, Task oriented, contingent reward, Management by Exception, Idealized Influence*

The ANOVA table-4 shows the significant model {F (9,215) = 5.062, p < 0.05}. This means that at least one of the 9 predictor variables can be utilized to model employee motivation.

4.2. Regression result

Results of the regression analysis between different leadership style dimensions (idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation. individualized consideration, contingent reward, management by exception, laissez - faire , task oriented and authoritative style of leadership) and dependent variable (employee motivation) are presented in the following table.

**Table 5
Regression Model Summary**

<i>Model</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	<i>Std. Error of the Estimate</i>	<i>Durbin-Watson</i>
1	.418a	.175	.140	.54109	1.927

a. *Predictors: (Constant), Authoritative leadership, Laissez faire, Individualized consideration, inspirational Motivation, intellectual stimulation, Task oriented, contingent reward, Management by Exception, Idealized Influence*

b. *Dependent Variable: Mean of Motivation*

Based on the results in above table-5, R-square value = 0.175. This means that 17.5% of the variation of employee motivation can be explained by variation in any or all of the predictor variables. Durbin Watson value = 1.927 which is between acceptable range of 1.5 and 2.5. The above value implies that independence residual is accepted in the model and there is no autocorrelation error in the data.

Table 6
Coefficient values of Leadership Style (LMS) and Employee Motivation (EMS)

Model	Coefficients ^a					Collinearity Statistics	
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta				
(Constant)	1.978	.144		13.758	.000		
Idealized Influence	.012	.063	.022	.191	.849	.290	3.450
Inspirational Motivation	.059	.060	.093	.989	.324	.430	2.323
Intellectual stimulation	-.096	.065	-.160	-1.475	.142	.327	3.055
1 Individualized consideration	.013	.063	.020	.211	.833	.423	2.362
Contingent reward	.037	.061	.059	.596	.552	.394	2.541
Management by Exception	-.009	.069	-.014	-.125	.901	.323	3.094
Laissez faire	.139	.048	.232	2.879	.004	.589	1.698
Task oriented	.035	.062	.058	.571	.568	.377	2.655
Authoritative leadership	.122	.058	.197	2.117	.035	.443	2.257

a. Dependent Variable: Mean of Motivation

The above table-6 shows there is significant relationship between Laissez faire leadership style and motivation ($b = 0.232, p < 0.05$) and Authoritative leadership style and motivation ($b = 0.197, P < 0.05$). However the relationship between idealized influence and motivation ($b = 0.022, p > 0.05$), inspirational motivation and employee motivation ($b = 0.093, p > 0.05$), Intellectual stimulation and employee motivation ($b = -0.160, p > 0.05$), individualized consideration and employee motivation ($b = 0.020, p > 0.05$), contingent reward and employee motivation ($b = 0.059, p > 0.05$), management by exception and employee motivation ($b = 0.069, p > 0.05$) and task oriented leadership and employee motivation ($b = 0.058, p > 0.05$), was found to be not significant. The above tabled results indicate that all the significant variables have low variation inflation factor (VIF) values (< 10), indicating that there is no problem with multicollinearity.

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The main aim of this study was to determine the relationship between different leadership style dimensions like idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation. Individualized consideration, contingent reward, and management by exception, laissez faire, task oriented and authoritative style and employee motivation in medium scale food processing industries. Nine different hypotheses were proposed to be tested in this study. The result showed the level of all the dimensions of leadership style in the food processing industries were low, hovering around the average value for the scale which is 2.5. This is consistent with the findings by Wright and Pandey, (2010) and Bass and Abu Bakker and Indra Subramaniam (2013).

They have stated that transformational leaders are expected to be both less common and less effective in public sector organizations than private sector organizations because the former are thought to rely more on bureaucratic control. Similarly the motivation level of employees in the food processing organizations was low. Wright (2001) stated that the greater the levels of hierarchy in a public sector company or government agencies due to the multitude of departments, the lower the efficiency in communication is less effective, lower level staff will be so far removed from management that monitoring is difficult and the scope for delegation is not very wide. The result also showed that there is significant relationship between Laissez faire leadership style, Authoritative leadership style and employee motivation. Intellectual stimulation and Authoritative leadership style was found to contribute most to employee motivation. This result is not consistent with the previous researchers who have tried to found relationship between the two variables. By creating intellectual stimuli, managers can motivate their employees' ability to experiment with new practices and generate ideas that can greatly impact performance (Dansereau *et al.*, 1995). Idealized influence dimension of Leadership was found to be not significantly related to employee motivation. The idealized influence is often referred to as charisma and encompasses the leader behaviours of vision communication with their subordinates.

The reason for lack of significant relationship could be food processing units being bureaucratic organizations, where the managers are not perceived as being able to exude great charisma and personal vision as they are answerable to their superiors in the industry.

6. LIMITATIONS

We cannot consider a study as full and final and having no limitation. Likewise this study also bears limitations. These limitations can become scope for future researcher about the betterment and more quality of study. So the followings are the limitations of this current research

1. Data was collected only from food processing unit only.
2. There may be more variables added to employee motivation and leadership styles of managers and supervisors.
3. Due to low sample size, the results of research work may not generalize to whole population.
4. Study is specified to supervisors and managerial staffs only.

References

- Abu Baker Almintisir Abu Baker Akeel and Indra Devi Subramaniam 2013 . The Role of Transformation Leadership Style in Motivating Public Sector Employees in Libya. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 7(2): 99-108, 2013 ISSN 1991-8178
- Alghazo, M. Ali and Al-Anazi, Meshal 2016. "The Impact of Leadership Style on Employee's Motivation", International Journal of Economics and Business Administration, Vol.2, No.5, pp.3744, ISSN:2381-7356 (print); ISSN:2381-7364 (Online).
- Avolio, B.J., Waldman, D.A. & Yammarino, F.J. 1991. Leading in the 1990's: the four I's of transformational leadership. Journal of European industrial training, 15(4):pp.1-8.
- Cashman, J.F. 1989. "Situational Leadership Theory, A test of leadership Prescriptions", Group-7, Organization studies.

- Chipunza C 2009. Factors influencing survivor qualities after downsizing. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Port Elizabeth: Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.
- Daftuar,C.N. 1985. “Managerial Behaviour Scale” (MBQ) used in Ph.D thesis (awarded) of Nayak B. 2003. on “A Study on Effective Leadership on Managers and Supervisors of Rourkela Steel Plant”, Utkal University.
- Dansereau, F., F.J. Yammarino, S.E. Markham, J.A. Alutto, J. Newman, M.D. Dumas, S.A. Al-Kelabi, 1995. Individualized leadership: A new multiple-level approach, *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3): 413-450.
- Fry, L. W. 2003. Towards a Theory of Spiritual Leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14, 693-727.
- Glantz, J. 2002. Finding Your Leadership Style. A Guide for Educators; Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hellriegel D, Slocum JW, Woodman RW 2001. Organizational behavior (9th ed.). Cincinnati: South Western College Publishing.
- House, R. Javidan, M., Hanges, P. and Dorfman P. 2002, Understanding Cultures and Implicit Leadership Theories across the Globe: An Introduction to Project GLOBE”, *Journal of world Business*, Pp.3-10.
- Jagot, 1982. “Influences to direct and co-ordinatr the activities of the members of an organized group towards the accomplishment of group objectives”
- Lee and Chuang 2009. The Impact of Leadership Styles on Job Stress and Turnover Intention: Taiwan Insurance Industry as an Example. www.hclee@ttu.edu.tw
- Mai Ngoc Khuong and Dang Thuy Hoang 2015 .”The Effects of Leadership Styles on Employee Motivation in Auditing Companies in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam”, *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, Vol. 6, No. 4.
- Mc Call W. Morgan 1998. “*High Flyers: Developing the next Generation of Leaders*”, Jr. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Mehta R, Dubinsky AJ, Anderson RE 2003 . Leadership style, motivation and performance in international marketing channels: An empirical investigation of the USA, Finland and Poland. *Euro. J. Mark.*, 37(1/2): 50-85.
- Mengesha A.H. 2015 . Impact of leadership approaches on employees motivation: an empirical investigation in Haramaya University. *AshEse journal of Business Management* Vol.1(3), pp, 028-038
- Murthy, P.N. 1998. “*Leadership: A Comparative Study of Indian Ethos and Western Concepts*”, *Human Values*, vol-4, No-2, (July-Dec).
- Naile. I. 2014. The role of leadership in employee motivation: strong relationship between leadership behaviour and employees motivation. *mediterranean journal of social science*. ISSN 2039-9340
- Pathak, R.D. and Col. Lal, Shyam 1999. “*Leadership Styles in Army at Junior Level During Peace and War*”, *Indian Management*, Vol-38, No-12, Dec.
- Pratap, S and Srivastava, SK, 1985. “*Leadership Styles and Effectiveness: A comparative study*”, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 21(1).
- R.M. Stogdill, “ Leadership , membership and organization “ , *Journal of psychological bulletin*, vol.1, No.14, pp.47,1950
- Rawung, Ficke, H. 2013. “The Effect of Leadership on the Work Motivation of Higher Education Administration Employees (Study at Manado State University)”, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management*
- Sabat, H.K. 1998. “*New era of Leadership*”, *Indian Management*, Vol-37, July.
- Sarkar, Kanchan 1996. “*Trade Union Leadership in a Plantation System*”, *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, Vol-31, No-4, April.

- Singh, Prabhakar 1987. "Nurturant-task and Participate-task Leadership: The Effective Leader Behaviours for Indian Industries", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol-23, No-2, Oct.
- Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.E. 1957. Leader Behavior it's Description and Measurement. Ohio: Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, 88, 1-27.
- Wiley C 1997. What Motivates Employees According to Over 40 Years of Motivation Surveys? Int. J. Manage., 18 (3): 263-281.
- Wright, B.E. & S.K. Pandey 2010. Transformational leadership in the public sector: Does structure matter? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 20(1): 75-89
- Yukl GA 1999. An evaluative essay on current conceptions of effective leadership. Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol., 8(1): 33-48.