



ISSN: 2249-894X
IMPACT FACTOR : 5.7631 (UIF)
UGC APPROVED JOURNAL NO. 48514
VOLUME - 8 | ISSUE - 8 | MAY - 2019



A LITERATURE REVIEW ON FACTORS AFFECTING MANAGEMENT STYLES

Dr. Dipanker Sharma

Associate Professor , FMSLA, Shoolini University ,
Solon (HP).

ABSTRACT:

Management style can be stated as a way to manage an organization and its people. Various models have been proposed by research scholars to identify the management styles adopted by the supervisors and managers in a company. The concept of Management styles dates back to ancient era and is evident in Sanskrit Literature. However, the articulation of Management styles happened in the nineteenth century when this topic started gaining attention of the researchers. With growing industries, both in number and their sizes, twentieth century experienced a very comprehensive research on this topic so as to enable sustainable growth of these

companies. The study accounts for the work on Management styles in India and abroad. This paper is an attempt to review the studies on Management styles and bridge the gap for budding researchers to pursue this topic with new and innovative concepts. So also, it will enable them to conduct studies in the upcoming sectors like Insurance, telecom etc.

KEYWORDS: Management Styles, Leadership .

1. INTRODUCTION

The term management style is comprehended as a way to manage an organization and its people. It is the philosophy or set of principles by which managers can harness the capabilities of their people. Be that as it may, Khandwalla (1995) has characterized the board style as the one of a kind and judicious manner by which an association makes ends and releases different capacities, including target setting, developing and usage of procedure, all essential administration exercises, corporate picture building, and managing key partners.

Contingent upon an association's working conditions, styles can change and can be unique. Various research scholars and social scientists have defined management style in their own ways.

1.1 Historical Views on Management Styles

The historical overview of literature on management style reveals that the concept is not new however there has been a change in the styles of managing people. Sanskrit literature identifies ten leadership styles defining characteristics different types of leaders. The leadership style as per the opinion of Aristocratic thinkers depends on one's genes. The same concept is viewed by Monarchy in

extreme. In this system of management all political powers were passed down to an individual (usually hereditary) known as a monarch or single ruler. Despite what might be expected, all the more equitably slanted scholars have underlined on instances of meritocratic pioneers, for example, the Napoleonic marshals where the initiative specialists were given to the most ability people. Hierarchical form of a family based on patriarchy was followed as per the paternalistic strain of thought. However, such models may be pointed and objected to as patriarchal and supported matriarchies by Feminist thinking. A matriarchy is a society in which females have the central roles of leadership

and moral authority. It is also sometimes called a gynocratic or a gyno-centric society.

Confucianism is a Chinese ethical and philosophical system and brings insights on "Right Living" related to scholar leader and his benevolent rule, buttressed by a tradition of filial piety. He developed from the teachings of the Chinese philosopher Confucius. It is a system of moral, social, political, philosophical, and quasi-religious thought that support the idea that human beings are teachable, improvable and perfectible through personal and communal endeavor. A main idea of Confucianism is the cultivation of virtue and the development of moral perfection. Confucianism holds that one should give up one's life, for the sake of upholding the cardinal moral values of people. In spite of what may be normal, even more evenhandedly inclined researchers have underlined on occasions of meritocratic pioneers, for instance, the Napoleonic marshals where the activity experts were given to the most capacity individuals. An excessive amount of order and sternness in direction bring about cruelty. Working on trust alone outcomes in habit. Reliance on bravery just outcomes in brutality. Suitable blend of every one of the five temperances together to its capacity, makes a pioneer. — Sun Tzu

In the 19th century, anarchist school of thought changed the entire concept of leadership into question. Anarchism is a political philosophy which promotes a stateless society, or anarchy. It stressed upon diminishing the authority in human relations. Leninism then again, requested a gathering of taught units to represent a communist insurgency, getting place the fascism style of administration. Differentiations among common and religious initiative have additionally been talked about by other recorded leadership thoughts. The look for the qualities or styles of pioneers has been continuous for a considerable length of time and decades. History's most noteworthy philosophical work from Plato's Republic to Plutarch's Lives attempted to recognize person's and a pioneer's characteristics. This search for the answer for the question laid foundation of trait theory, which is based on the notion that leadership is rooted in characteristics of the leader. For decades, this trait-based perspective dominated empirical and theoretical work in leadership. In twentieth century, during the late of fourth and early of fifth decade a series of reviews of these studies, though qualitative in nature, encouraged researchers to take a very different view of the driving factors behind leadership and suggested that a persons who may be a leader in one situation may not necessarily be a leader in other situations. Consequently, authority relies upon circumstance and can never again be described as a suffering individual quality. Amid the 1980s with the forthcoming factual advancements, the analysts could direct meta-investigations, which furnished them with different strategies to dissect and condense the discoveries from a wide exhibit of studies. Through this analysis it was concluded that individuals can emerge as leaders in a variety of situations. It was also identified that there is a significant relationship between leadership and individual traits such as intelligence, adjustment, extraversion, conscientiousness, openness to experience and self-efficacy. In this way Trait Theory picked up a great deal of prominence however later it was distinguished that hypothesis concentrated on a little arrangement of individual characteristics like Big Five identity attributes and ignored the social abilities, social aptitudes, intentions, qualities, mastery, and critical thinking aptitudes of people.

Considering the criticisms of the trait theory researchers adopted a different perspective of leadership style. It was observed that, the individual differences may lead to both leader emergence and leader effectiveness. The behavior of leaders with subordinates also predicted their effectiveness. The appearance of Situational theory was a reaction to the trait theory of leadership. This hypothesis expected that various circumstances call for various attributes. The hypothesis further laid accentuation that what people do as a pioneer relies on attributes of the circumstance in which they work and no single ideal psychographic profile of a pioneer exists. Certain theorists also tried to synthesize the trait and situational approaches of leadership. with the examination of Lewin et al. (1939), three sorts of the board styles were recognized, to be specific, the dictator style, which is proper in emergency yet can't win the "hearts and psyches" of their supporters in the everyday administration; the democratic style is appropriate in situations that require consent building and the laissez faire style which provide the freedom to followers to take their own decisions and leaders do not "take charge". Four theories of contingency leadership; Vroom-Yetton choice model, the way objective hypothesis, Fiedler possibility model and the Hersey-Blanchard situational hypothesis further upheld situational speculations.

1.2 Management Styles in its Modernized form

An assortment of formal styles of the executives have been depicted since the 1950s. Likert (1967) characterized four styles fluctuating on a continuum from tyrant to participative. Consumes and Stalker (1961) underscored that there can be natural and robotic styles of the board. According to the assessment of Mintzberg (1973) the board style can be the pioneering, the arranging and the versatile sort. After Japan's financial achievement examine researchers endeavored to contemplate the Japanese style of the executives which stresses long lasting learning, aggregate basic leadership, paternalism, lifetime business, status, diligent work, collaboration morals, constant adjustment and improvement (Pascale and Athos, 1981; Williamson and Ouchi, 1981; Wilkins and Ouchi, 1983. In the mid of 1970s, in the wake of examining American, Canadian and Indian firms, Khandwalla (1995a, 1995b) proposed five components of the board style to be specific hazard taking, technocracy, adaptability, investment, and tyranny and accentuated that these styles of the board can go about as structure squares of generally styles. Dwindles and Waterman (1982) through their investigation on the executives style recognized that administration style of American organizations was unique in relation to those of the romanticized Japanese style, massively adaptable structures and concentrates more on principal esteems, specialty unit self-rule, intuitiveness and advancement. Geus (1997) upheld that learning associations and information based organizations ought to receive the board of resilience rather than the 'activity situated' the executives style.

Rensis Likert and his associates (1967) studied the patterns and styles of managers and developed certain ideas and approaches for understanding leadership behavior. As per their opinion of Likert effective managers are strongly oriented to subordinates and rely on communication to a great extent in order to keep all the departments or individuals working in unison. As per the opinion of Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1973) leadership style can be of various types and can depend upon the degree of authority used by a manager and degree of freedom enjoyed by a subordinate in relationship to his superior. Reddin (1970) proposed a three- dimensional grid which is also called as 3-D management. Three dimensional axes represent task –orientation, relationship orientation and effectiveness. Fiedler (1967) developed a contingency model of leadership which is based on the assumption that effectiveness of leaders depends upon the ability to act in a particular situation.

Lewin, Lipitt, and White (1939) tried to assess the impact of leadership styles on performance using three different styles of management namely democratic, authoritarian and laissez-faire. These examination researchers, under various sorts of work atmosphere, assessed the presentation of gatherings of eleven-year-old young men. The pioneers endeavored to practice their impact with respect to the sort of cooperative choice making, commendation and analysis (criticism), and the administration of the gathering undertakings (venture the executives). Dictator atmospheres were portrayed by pioneers who settle on choices alone, anticipate that severe consistence should his requests, and direct. Popularity based atmospheres were described by aggregate basic leadership forms. Individuals were given decisions and all things considered choose the division of work. Free enterprise atmospheres offered opportunity to the gathering for arrangement assurance with no interest from the pioneer. The pioneer stays uninvolved in work choices except if inquired. The result of their study proposed that democratic climate leads to better performance.

In their study on management style Burns and Stalker (1961) and (Khandwalla, 1977) concluded that management styles can vary significantly not only between industries, but also within each industry. This variety in the executives styles can be a direct result of firm qualities, for example, association type, business reason, estimate, outer condition and corporate culture. Hence, it is impossible to manage all organizations in the same way.

In light of his perceptions of eleven nations of various political and financial frameworks, Davidmann (1995) found that styles of the executives may rely on the idea of the board. In a littler or medium size organization, it is feasible for the proprietor or the CEO to constrain their very own style of the board on the remainder of the association yet in greater associations it may not be conceivable. As of late, propels in the field of data innovation and correspondence have made significant consequences for the administration style in an association. The new gadgets and frameworks (for example cell

phones and the Internet) can prompt the reception of a specific style. From a more market-situated perspective, Dolan et al. (2002) contended that in an inexorably worldwide, complex, and expertly requesting world, which is continually changing and situated toward quality and consumer loyalty, another model is required. In this era of globalization both managers and employees has their own cultural framework. Therefore, leaders require specific skills to manage a culturally diverse workforce. Managers of a multinational company need to understand their own culture and culture of their staff and behave accordingly. At organizational level, organizational culture is determined by the top management team. However, leadership style of managers can be influenced by the value, norms and religion of their subordinates. Managing a diverse workforce has proven to be a key success factor for the effectiveness of an organization but managers need to adopt an appropriate and effective style for managing the employees.

In light of his impression of eleven countries of different political and money related systems, Davidmann (1995) found that styles of the officials may depend on the possibility of the board. In a more diminutive or medium size association, it is practical for the owner or the CEO to oblige their own one of a kind style of the board on the rest of the affiliation yet in more prominent affiliations it may not be possible. Starting late, drives in the field of information development and correspondence have made noteworthy ramifications for the organization style in an affiliation. The new devices and structures (for instance mobile phones and the Internet) can incite the gathering of a particular style. From a more market-arranged point of view, Dolan et al. (2002) battled that in an inflexibly around the world, complex, and expertly mentioning world, which is constantly changing and arranged toward quality and shopper reliability, another model is required. The way objective hypothesis of authority proposed by Robert House (1971) depended on the anticipation hypothesis of Victor Vroom. As indicated by this hypothesis there can be four kinds of pioneer practices, in particular participative, accomplishment situated, order and steady, that are unexpected to the earth factors. Four authority styles and four dimensions of devotee improvement were recommended in a model proposed by Hersey and Blanchard. The Action oriented approach of leadership aimed at action oriented environments where effective functional leadership is required to achieve critical or reactive tasks by small teams. As indicated by this methodology chiefs should adequately work and arrange both the necessities of the individual, group and assignment inside a variable domain. Practical initiative hypothesis proposed by Hackman and Walton (1986) and McGrath (1962) is especially valuable for tending to explicit pioneer practices expected to add to hierarchical adequacy. This hypothesis recommends that the pioneer's fundamental occupation is to deal with gathering adequacy and cohesion., Klein, Zeigert, Knight, and Xiao (2006), Wageman (2005), Hackman and Morgeson (2005), Zaccaro et al. (2001), Kozlowski et al. (1996) Hackman and Walton (1986), watched five wide elements of a pioneer that can advance association's viability. These capacities include: (1) ecological observing, (2) sorting out subordinate exercises, (3) instructing and training subordinates, (4) spurring others, and (5) interceding effectively in the gathering's work. Eric Berne gave a new direction to the concept of leadership style by analyzing the relations between a group and its leadership in terms of Transactional Analysis.

According to the conclusion of Burns (1978) the value-based pioneers are the individuals who have some capacity to play out specific errands and compensate or rebuff for the group's presentation. It additionally offers the supervisor a chance to lead the gathering and has control achieve a foreordained. The pioneer likewise have capacity to assess, right and train subordinates to improve group execution. The transformational pioneers then again rouses its group to be compelling and proficient. These pioneers are very obvious and use chain of directions to take care of business. Culpan and Kucukemiroglu (1993) proposed a different model for evaluating the executives style which depended on six main measurements for looking at the executives frameworks. They were: supervisory style, basic leadership, correspondence designs, control system, interdepartmental relations, and paternalistic introduction. Khandwalla (1995) developed separate model to study management styles. The model depended on ten central measurements to gauge the executives styles, in particular, moderate, pioneering, proficient, bureaucratic, natural, tyrant, participative, instinctive, familial, and philanthropic. Each type of style had key functional feature adopted in different situations. Similarly,

various research scholars tried to explain the concept of leadership in their own ways. The efforts of various social scientists led to the advent of various approaches that can be used to measure the management style of the managers.

Table 1.1 :Variables Used In the Model of Refik Culpan and Orsay Kucukemiroglu (1993)

Variables used in the model of Refik Culpan and Orsay Kucukemiroglu (1993)	
SUPERVISORY STYLE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amount of discretion given to subordinates • Degree of delegation of authority to employees • Soliciting for worker inputs • Freedom of employees to schedule their own work • Democratic supervision • Only supervisor handling work problem • Decisions and work problems delayed in supervisor's absence • Supervisory back-up for his/her employees • Amount of direction given from top • Close supervision
DECISION MAKING	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soliciting for workers' inputs • Tackling unusual work problems • Trying innovative methods and products • Number of suggestions from the members • Wasting time and effort by incorrect estimates • Accepting unpopular projects • Initiating improvements • Decision delegation to the lowest level • Consensus decision making • Employees' participation in decision making • Amount of supervisory direction • Individual decision making • Employee freedom to select their own course of actions
COMMUNICATION PATTERN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supervisory awareness of unit performance meeting standards • Free flow of information • Supervisors' awareness of things happening within unit • Complains reaching top management • Employees' unawareness of changes in policies and directives • Communication is blocked
CONTROL MECHANISM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managers being on top of everything • Emphasizing production as a goal • Freedom of workers to schedule their own activities • Democratic supervision

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relying on the unit without checking • Following-ups and checking in the goal realisation • Close supervision
INTERDEPARTMENTAL RELATIONS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing assistance to other units for favours • Making trades and deals with other unit • Bargaining with other units • Frictions with other units • Criticised by other units for being uncooperative • Getting into conflict with other units
PATERNALISTIC ORIENTATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involving family matters of employees • Helping employees with non-work related matters

Source: "Culpan and KucuKemiroglu (1993)Model". Truong,Q.& Nguyen,T. V(2002). A study on the relationship between management styles and organizational effectiveness in Vietnam. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 10(2), 36-55.

Table 1.2 Variables used in the model Proposed by of Pradip Khandwalla(1995)

Variables used in the model Proposed by Pradip Khandwalla	
MANAGEMENT STYLE	KEY FEATURES
CONSERVATIVE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bias for preserving and extending whatever has worked. • Cautious in innovating and/or changing status quo. • Predisposes the organization to related diversification and growth in familiar directions. • Use of traditions that preserve the strengths of the past. • Conservationist in character but not necessarily.
ENTREPRENEURIAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indulges in calculated risk taking, pioneering, innovation and rapid growth. • Necessary for a developing country to diversity its industrial base and expand it's output rapidly.
PROFESSIONAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adapts scientific optimisation oriented approach to management. • Uses sophisticated management tools and techniques. • Undertakes long range planning. • Useful for managing new and complicated technology-intensive industries in complex, globalization environments
BUREACRATIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasizes orderly management, accountability, and formalization of rules, regulations, and procedures. • Used widely in large organizations and the public

Variables used in the model Proposed by Pradip Khandwalla	
MANAGEMENT STYLE	KEY FEATURES
	sector to ensure accountability, equity, orderliness and operating efficiency.
ORGANIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Show deep commitment to flexibility, innovation, responsiveness to change, teamwork and interactive, feedback based decision making useful for operating in fast changing environments.
AUTHORITARIAN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emphasizes discipline and obedience. Is archetypal style of great antiquity? Perceived to be useful in situations of weak work ethic and a hostile task environment.
PARTICIPATIVE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Committed to an ideology of collective, consensus-based decision-making. Useful in ensuring that diverse perspective is voiced and that diverse information is shared by those affected by a decision before taking the decision. Known to foster motivation and cooperation.
INTUITIVE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shows faith in experience, common sense and intuitive judgment based on good rules of thumb or heuristics learned from experience. A style as old as human collective living.
FAMILIAL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anchored in the notion that for cohesiveness and loyalty to organization, the organization must treat its employees like members of the family and look after their needs.
ALTRUISTIC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes in the philosophy that the organization is an instrumentality of some larger social good, not just for profit maximization. Of particular relevance in developing societies that have embarked on major nation building and poverty alleviation goals.

Source: "Khandwalla, P. (1995)Model". Truong,Q.& Nguyen,T. V(2002). A study on the relationship between management styles and organizational effectiveness in Vietnam. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 10(2), 36-55.

1.3 Management Styles in Indian Organizations

As per the opinion of Prasad (1989), in the first instance, Indian Management is believed to be autocratic where subordinates are closely supervised by their superiors and a limited degree of participation is allowed to the subordinates. However, various studies have been conducted by research scholars to understand real picture of management style in Indian Scenario. As per the opinion of Myers (1960) most of the Indian managers are authoritarian. Ganguli (1964) also expressed the similar opinion. However, Rangaswamy (1976) through his study on Indian managers stressed that Indian managers are more employees oriented.

Similar opinions were expressed by Elhance and Agarwal (1975) through their study on leadership style. Singh and Das (1977) stated that the management style adopted by the managers is associated with type of the organization, age- group, level of the managers in the organization and their exposure to the management programs. A study by Joseph and Kesavan (1977) of supervisors from public sector and private sector showed that in private sector emphasis is on production since total wages are tied up to the production whereas in public sector orientation of the superior is prevalent. Jaggi (1978) through his study on leadership style emphasized that management style appeared to be between benevolent, autocracy and consultative type. He further stated that the leadership style is influenced by age of the executives, their positions and size of the organization. He further stated that younger managers are less authoritarian, managers in bigger organizations are less authoritarian, and managers in production and technical areas are found to be less authoritarian. Thus, the review of previous studies does not give a clear picture of the management style prevalent in Indian organizations. There are lots of factors that determine the style of the manager.

It is not right to expect a uniform style of management from Indian managers. However, as per the opinion of Prasad (1996) the style of management can vary with the factors whether the organization is family owned, professionally managed Indian organizations, and public sector organizations. In family owned organizations most prevalent style is autocratic style. In these of organizations the sons and grandsons are automatically promoted without considering efficiency and competence of the managers. The Organizations that are owned by Indians or by multinationals have participative or democratic leadership. The participative management style is prevalent in such type of organizations. The third category of organizations that is public sector units, have bureaucratic style more prevalent in their work culture. The entire organizational processes are governed by bureaucratic model.

Thus, through the review of literature related to management styles and factors affecting management style it can be observed that lot of studies have been conducted in this field but there is dearth of studies in growing sectors like Insurance, Telecom and Banking industry. Likert model has gained attention to study the management styles, however models of Refik Culpun and Orsay Kucukemiroglu (1993) and Pradip Khandwalla(1995) have still not gained researchers attention to study management styles. Therefore, there is a need for a study that can be conducted for understanding management styles prevalent in some specific industries such as banking, insurance etc. and linking it to the effectiveness of the organizations.

SCOPE OF FUTURE STUDIES

Studies related to management styles can be conducted for Indian organizations especially industry specific like Insurance, banking, telecom etc. Moreover, there is need of conducting studies to find relationship of Management styles with Organizational effectiveness and other variables. New Management style model can be proposed especially looking at the organizations which are dynamic and ever changing and require a very specific input.

CONCLUSION

In this era of globalization both managers and employees has their own cultural framework. Therefore, leaders require specific skills to manage a culturally diverse workforce. Managers of a multinational company need to understand their own culture and culture of their staff and behave accordingly. At organizational level, organizational culture is determined by the top management team. However, leadership style of managers can be influenced by the value, norms and religion of their subordinates. Managing a diverse workforce has proven to be a key success factor for the effectiveness of an organization but managers need to adopt an appropriate and effective style for managing the employees.

REFERENCES

- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers Inc.
- Burns, T. & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*, London: Tavistock.
- De Geus, A. (1997). *The Living Company: Habits for Survival in a Turbulent Business Environment*, Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.
- Elhance, D.N. and Agarwal, R.D. (1975). *Delegation of Authority*, Bombay: Progressive.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. New York: McGraw Hill
- Ganguli, H.C. (1964). *Structure and Process of Organizations*. Bombay: Asia Publishing.
- Hackman, J. R., & Walton, R. E. (1986). Leading groups in organizations. In P. S. Goodman (Ed.), *Designing effective work groups* (pp. 72–119). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hackman, J. R., & Wageman, R. (2005). A Theory of Team Coaching. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(2), 269-287.
- Khandwalla, P. (1995a). 'Effectiveness Management Styles: An Indian Study', *Journal of Euro-Asian Management*, 1(1), 39-64.
- Khandwalla, P. (1995b). *Management Styles*, New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Klein, K. J., Ziegert, J. C., Knight, A. P., & Xiao, Y. (2006). Dynamic delegation: Shared, hierarchical, and deindividualized leadership in extreme action teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51(4), 590-621.
- Lewin, K.; Lippitt, R.; White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10, 271–301.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization*. McGraw Hill, New York.
- McGrath, J. E. (1962). *Leadership behavior: Some requirements for leadership training*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Civil Service Commission.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). 'Strategic Making in Three Modes', *California Management Review*, 16, 44-58.
- Morgeson, F. P. (2005). The External Leadership of Self-Managing Teams: Intervening in the Context of Novel and Disruptive Events. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(3), 497-508.
- Myers, C.A. (1960). *Industrial Relations in India*, Bombay: Asia Publishing.
- Pascale, T. R. & Athos, A. G. (1981). *The Arts of Japanese Management*, New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Peters, T. & Waterman, Jr, R. (1982). *In Search of Excellence*, New York: Harper & Row.
- Prasad, L.M. (1996). *Principles and practices of management*. Sultan Chand and Sons, New Delhi
- Reddin, W.J. (1970). *Managerial Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Tannenbaum, R. and Schmidt, W.H. (1973). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review*, 162-180.
- Truong, Q. & Nguyen, T. V. (2002). A study on the relationship between management styles and organizational effectiveness in Vietnam. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 10(2), 36-55.
- Vroom, V., Jago, A.G. (1988). *The New Leadership: Managing Participation in Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Vroom, V., Sternberg, R. J. (2002). Theoretical Letters: The person versus the situation in leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13, 301–323.
- Wilkins, A. & Ouchi, W. G. (1983). 'Efficient Culture: Exploring the Relationship between Culture and Organizational Performance', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 465-481.
- Williamson, O. & Ouchi, W. G., (1981). *The Markets and Hierarchies Programme of Research: Origin, Implications, Prospects*, 342-370.
- Zaccaro, S. J., Rittman, A. L., & Marks, M. A. (2001). *Team leadership*. *Leadership Quarterly*, 12(4), 451-483.