Need for Nurturant-Task Leaders in India: Some Empirical Evidence

MAHFOOZ A. ANSARI*

This study aims at providing empirical evidence in support of the nurturant-task (NT) style of leadership which is hypothesized to be conducive to Indian organizations. One hundred eighty-nine male executives in middle positions representing about 15 organizations in northern India participated in the study. The results disclosed that the NT style was perceived as distinctly different from other styles, and it had a positive impact on several indicators of effectiveness--commitment, facets of job satisfaction, and perceived effectiveness. The implications of the findings are discussed, and the directions for future research are suggested.

The fundamental aim of this study is to provide empirical evidence in support of the Nurturant-Task Leader as a model for an effective executive.

THE BACKGROUND

What makes an organization successful? Some management analysts believe that the basic difference between a successful and an unsuccessful organization is its leadership. Evidence[28] exists that half of all new businesses fail within the first two years and only one-third survive five years. In most cases, the failures are caused by poor leadership.

Definitions of leadership vary in their focus on one or another aspect of leadership:

1. The leader as a position in the group or organization structure;

2. The leader as a role or a type of expected behavior;

3. The leader as one or more functions in the activities of the organization; and

4. The leader as a person.

All these aspects of leadership are important and, hence, a leader may be viewed as "someone who occupies a position in a group, influences others in accordance with the role expectation for that position and coordinates and directs the group (or organization) in maintaining itself and reaching its goals"[26]. Consequently, a leadership style may be re-ferred to as the characteristic manner in which a leader exercises power and influence over his followers.

What makes a leader effective? A variety of ways have been adopted to answer this basic question, and they differ in many ways. Some investigators[37] emphasize the modes of decision-making; others focus on the motivational orientations of a leader; yet others[10],[18] stress the leader's interactions with his/her subordinates. Though these appear to be divergent approaches, there can be seen strikingly clear evidence of either concern for the task or concern for people. Briefly speaking, literature on this topic suggests a growing preference for a democratic style of leadership. The first to indicate this preference were Lewin, Lippitt, and White[16]. Since then, a number of labels-such as high on consideration[10], high LPC[9], GII[37], participative[18], model II[4], 1,9 style[5], Y style[19], and, so on, have been used not only because a people-oriented style is conducive to greater satisfaction among the members of organizations, but also because it is found suitable in the long run for organizational productivity.

Does this suggest that in India also a participative style would be more conducive to productivity and to individual well-being? To answer this question, empirical data were made available to demonstrate that Indian students score higher than students in other countries on authoritarianism (F) scale. Now Sanford[27] reports that adults who score high on scales designed to measure authoritarianism, prefer "status ladened leadership, accept strongly-directive leadership and talk in terms of 'power' words when categorizing 'good' leaders" (p. 170). Listed

*Dr. Mahfooz A. Ansari is a faculty member in the department of Humanities of Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur.

in order of decreasing authoritarianism, the cultural groups were India, Rhodesia, Hong Kong, Arabia, Brazil, and the United States[21]. In a subsequent study, Canadian students were also found to exhibit less authoritarianism than Indian students. These findings led Meade[20] to hypothesize that authoritarian leadership would be a good bet to promote organizational productivity in the Indian set-up. He replicated the Lewin, Lippitt, and White[16] study for a sample of school children between the ages of 10 and 11 living in a city in northern India. His major conclusions are "Work done under authoritarian leadership was of a higher quality than that done under democratic leadership. That the morale of *S*s working under authoritarian leaders was higher than that in democratic leadership was indicated by the lower rate of absenteeism, the greater number wishing to continue in the authoritarian conditions, and the number of *S*s expressing a preference for the authoritarian leader" (p. 40). These results obtained with *S*s in India were the opposite of Lewin, Lippitt, and White's, who used American *S*s. Thus, Meade[20] and others[22,38] asserted that Indian culture, by and large, is authoritarian, and Indians foster excessive dependency in their children.

Hence, authoritarian leadership would produce better morale and productivity than democratic leadership. Though excessive dependency among Indians has been noticed by Indian authors also [7,23,25,31], it is not a prerequisite of the authoritarian style of management. About twenty years ago, it was realized that democratic procedures were being taught and emphasized in schools and there was also considerable enthusiasm for participation in national and local government elections[39]. It was also observed that the joint family system with its tendency to strong authoritarian leadership was also beginning to breakdown[17]. If these tendencies are still continuing, follow-up studies should now reveal results more congruent with those of Lewin, Lippitt, and Whitet[16]

THE MODEL

Sinha and Sinha[36], for the first time, expressed doubts about the appropriateness of the authoritarian (F)

style in Indian culture. They identified some socio-cultural values, such as preference for *Aram* (rest and relaxation, without being tired), dependence proneness, lack of commitment, showing-off, personalized relationships, and lack of team-orientation—some of which, of course, seem to share the rubric of authoritarianism. Given the presence of such values, Sinha[34] wondered whether a task-oriented (with a blend of nurturance), discipline-minded, tough leadership with a personalized approach would be more successful in the Indian setting. Such a leadership style was named `nurturant task' (NT).

Not that participative (P) management is not conducive; rather, it is considered to be trans-cultural and, hence, applicable to Indian organizations, too. However, when this system was introduced into public sector enterprises, the net result was found to be far from satisfactory[33]. It was postulated that unless an organization passes through a phase of preparation in which employees understand and accept the normative structure and the goals of the organization and thereby develop a fair amount of commitment to the organization, any attempt to introduce participative management is likely to be misunderstood[32]. The employees tend to take undue advantage causing indiscipline and loss of productivity and, eventually, dissatisfaction. Therefore, Sinha[54] recommends the NT style as an alternative model suited to the Indian culture. Four typical expectations that Indian subordinates bring to their organizations led to the formulation of NT. Indian subordinates tend to depend excessively on their superior with whom they want to cultivate a personalized rather than contractual work relationship. They readily accept the authority of their superior and yield to his demands. Work is not valued in itself. Yet, the subordinates are willing to work even extra hard as a part of their efforts to maintain a personalized relationship with the superior. Under such conditions, according to Sinha[34], a nurturant task (NT) leader will be effective. The NT leader "cares for his (or her) subordinates, shows affection, takes personal interest in their well-being, and above all, is committed to their growth" (p. 55). He, however, makes

His/her nurturance contingent on the subordinate's task accomplishment. Thus, the NT leader is effective for those subordinates who want to maintain dependency, a personalized relationship, and a status differential. He/she helps his/her subordinates grow up, mature, and assume greater responsibility. Once the subordinates reach a reasonable level of maturity, they generate pressure on the leader to shift to the participative (P) style. From this perspective, then, the NT style is considered to be a forerunner of P style in the reciprocal influence process between a leader and his/her subordinates. The only uniqueness of this model is the priority attached to productivity over job satisfaction. It assumes that meaningful and lasting job satisfaction has a pre-condition, i.e., the productivity of an organization.

The NT style receives meaningful support from later findings, too. For example, a survey[3] was conducted to examine the leadership styles and organizational climate for successful and unsuccessful executives in three contrasting business organizations. The success of an executive was determined through a salary progression-length of service ratio and validated by peers', superiors', and subordinates' ratings. Results disclosed that while the organizational differences had significant effect on NT ($p < .01$) and P styles ($p < .0l$) of the executives, neither success nor its interaction with organizations had any significant effect on any of the three styles. In two of the organizations, a majority of the executives reported employing NT, and, in one, P style of leadership. An interesting finding was the significant interaction effect of success and the NT climate of the organization ($p < .01$). The multiple comparison of means indicated that the successful executives in an electricity company and in a steel company perceived the climate as more nurturant task-oriented than the unsuccessful ones. On the contrary; the unsuccessful executives in a fertilizer company perceived the climate as more nurturant-task-oriented and the successful ones as less nurturant-task-oriented. Probably, a process technology, which is considered to be more advanced, led the successful executives to perceive the climate as less NT-oriented. They also perceived the climate as less authoritarian, but more participative.

In sum, Sinha[34] and his associates in about 15 studies unfolded the salient features of the NT model and tested some of the postulates. Furthermore, Sinha[35] in a review of 12 studies presented additional evidence in support of the model. These studies accumulated data from several laboratory and survey investigations employing the variables of ownership, organizations, size, functions of the organizations, geographical location, etc.; and samples ranged from students and department heads to company executives and bureaucrats.

In the present study, the NT model has been put to a rigorous statistical test with a view to establishing its relationship to some indicators of organizational effectiveness, such as commitment, facets of job satisfaction, and perceived efficiency.

METHOD

Sample and Procedure

The study concerns about 15 non-similar organizations in northern India. The selection of heterogeneous organizations was deliberately done in order to make this study more generalizable. The points of difference between the organizations lie mainly in:

1. The production process;
2. The source of capital investment;
3. The size; and
4. The geographical location.

Altogether 189 male executives in middle positions participated in the study. The average age of the respondents was approximately 40 years. They had about 4 years of experience in their present position, and the average company tenure was 11 years. Questionnaires were administered to the executives during working hours. They were assured anonymity of their individual responses, and the importance of frank and sincere replies was emphasized.

Measures

Descriptive statistics, scale characteristics, coefficient of alpha reliabilities, and inter-relationships of study variables are displayed in Table 1. Descriptions of the measures

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics, Scale Characteristics, Alphas, and Intercorrelations of Study Variables

Variables	Climate			Style				Outcome Variables									No. items	Range	M	SD
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)				
NT-1	(91)																18	18-90	55.65	11.35
F-2	-34[a]	(67)															8	8-40	25.70	4.74
B-3	-15[b]	53[a]	(72)														2	2-10	8.04	1.87
FT-4	25[a]	36[a]	32[a]	(60)													5	5-25	14.90	3.17
FB-5	05	51[a]	43[a]	39[a]	(81)												10	10-50	32.97	6.32
CF-6	15[b]	11	16[b]	20[a]	15[b]	(76)											9	7-35	27.08	3.56
NT-7	27[a]	-07	03	14[b]	03	42[a]	(67)										6	6-30	23.82	2.65
CS-8	39[a]	-18[a]	-11	07	06	22[a]	16[b]	(*)									1	1-5	2.95	1.15
VC-9	49[a]	-14[b]	-14[b]	07	15[b]	12	38[a]	47[a]	(86)								9	9-45	30.64	5.72
SP-10	28[a]	-29[a]	-21[a]	-12	-24[a]	07	16[b]	19[a]	31[a]	(*)							1	1-5	3.04	1.11
SPr-11	31[a]	-25[a]	-22[a]	-07	-17[b]	05	21[a]	32[a]	41[a]	42[a]	(*')						1	1-5	2.79	1.09
SJs-12	16[b]	-07	04	-09	-19[a]	-06	03	-05	02	17[b]	02	(*)					1	1-5	4.03	0.88
SJ-13	40[a]	-23[a]	-21[a]	-05	-12	10	28[a]	22[a]	40[a]	23[a]	29[a]	31[a]	(*)				1	1-5	3.56	0.99
SS-14	49[a]	-32[a]	-23[a]	-01	-10	-07	12	26[a]	42[a]	33[a]	36[a]	14[b]	30[a]	(*)			1	1-5	2.58	1.06
OS-15	52[a]	-37[a]	-27[a]	-10	-26[a]	03	26[a]	31[a]	50[a]	70[a]	68[a]	47[a]	65[a]	67[a]	(64)		5	5-25	16.00	3.29
PE-16	48[a]	-11	-12	21[a]	-04	21[a]	20[a]	26[a]	22[a]	08	19[a]	07	37[a]	25[a]	30[a]	(72)	6	6-30	20.81	4.62

Note. Decimal points in correlation matrix and alphas have been omitted; figures in parentheses include coefficient of alpha; $N = 189$; [b]$p < .05$; [a]$p < .01$; [*]single item variable; F = Authoritarianism; CF = Caring and Friendly; NT= Nurturant-Task; FB = Authoritarian Bureaucrat; B = Bureaucracy; FT = Authoritarian task; CS = Commitment to stay; VC = Value commitment; SP = Satisfaction with pay; SPr = Satisfaction with promotion; SJs = Satisfaction with job security; SJ = Satisfaction with job itself; SS =Satisfaction with supervision; OS = Overall satisfaction, PE = Perceived effectiveness.

are presented below. It is important to note that the measures employed in the study have substantial reliability documentation: coefficients of alpha ranging from .60 to .91.

Independent variables

In a recent investigation, Habibullah and Sinha[12] examined the factorial structure of the leadership style measure. Their factor analysis of the style scores generated 10 inter-related factors. A significant finding was the emergence of "task-orientation" as a distinct factor, and the executives differentiated nurturance and task orientation as two separate entities, which were combined into a normative model of leadership style[34].

In view of the above development, the present study employed two measures of independent variables—leadership styles and organizational climate. Each measure consisted of 50 items and each employed five dimensions: Authoritarianism (F), Nurturance (N), Task (T), Participative (P), and Bureaucracy (B). Every possible attempt was made to include items of similar content in each pair. Respondents rated each statement of leadership on a 5-point scale, whether it was true or false to them. Similarly, they rated each item on a similar 5-point scale by indicating whether it was true or false for their respective organizations.

The inclusion of leadership dimensions in organizational climate was made to investigate to what extent the climate of an organization was perceived as F, N, T, P, or B type. Climate was viewed as the attributes of an organization as perceived by individual members. While some authors[2,11,15] seem to doubt the validity of perceptual measures of organizational climate, Hellriegel and Slocum are of the opinion that "to the extent that a climate researcher has a strong interest in understanding and anticipating the human components within organizations, it is probably desirable to employ perceptual measures"[13, p.260].

Both measures—leadership styles and organizational climate—were subjected to a principal components' varimax (orthogonal) rotation, using R^2s as communality estimates[24].

The solution was constrained using the criterion of eigenvalue greater than 1.00, and meeting the criteria of factor loadings not less than .35 (r required at $p < .01 \cong .18$) on the defining component and no cross-loading greater than .25. The factor analysis results are in order.

Leadership style measures constrained to three interpretable factors, accounted for 60.5% of the variance. The 10-item content comprising the first component (33.8% of variance) was closely associated with formal relationship, suspicion, strict division of labor, loyalty, status consciousness, power, prestige and control. This style dimension was named authoritarian bureaucrat. The second component (19.5% of variance) was dominated by 7 items having to do with helping attitudes, friendliness, and affection. This dimension was referred to as caring and friendly. Finally, the third component (7.2% of variance), consisting of 6 items, was identified as nurturant-task, which had mixed items from nurturance and task dimensions of leadership. The average correlation between the factors used as scales was .20, indicating considerable non-overlapping variance in the dimensions.

Using the criterion of factor loadings as specified above, the climate measures constrained to four usable factors, accounting for 70.2% of the variance. The first component (45% of the variance), employing 18 items, was referred to as nurturant-task climate. This component was closely associated with structuring, hard work, high standard of performance, feedback, sense of responsibility, affection, solving personal problems, and career planning. The second factor identified as authoritarian climate consisted of 8 items, explaining a total of 17.7% of the variance. This component was characterized by status-differentiation, strict discipline, blind obedience and personal loyalty. The third component, explaining 4.7% of the variance, constituted two items, and was named bureaucracy. The fourth component, authoritarian-task climate, employed 5 items, explaining only 2.8% of the variance. Mixed items from authoritarianism and task dimensions were clustered into this factor. While the climate factors were found to be inter-related on theoretical grounds, they

may be construed as orthogonal (average *r* =.16).

Dependent variables

Four perceptual measures were employed to assess organizational effectiveness. First, the value commitment scale included 9 items rated on a 5-point scale ranging from `strongly disagree' to `strongly agree'. This scale connoted pride in association with the organizations (i.e., identification), willingness to perform for the organization, concern for the fate of the organization, and congruence of personal values with those of the organization[1]. Secondly, commitment to stay was measured through a single item rated on a 5-point scale ranging from `strongly disagree' to `strongly agree'. This item employed a general impression of Etzioni's[8] "calculative involvement". Thirdly, a five-item instrument employing a 5-point scale (ranging from `quite dissatisfied' to `quite satisfied') was used to measure job satisfaction. The facets of satisfaction included were pay, promotion, job security, job itself, and supervision. An index of overall job satisfaction was secured by summing up the scores of the five facets of satisfaction. Finally, a six-item scale was employed to assess perceived organizational effectiveness. The respondents were asked to rate on a five-point efficiency scale (ranging from very inefficient to very efficient) (i) themselves, (ii) their superiors, (iii) their subordinates, (iv) employees in general, (v) their units, and (vi) their organizations as a whole.

Descriptive information such as the respondents' age, tenure, job title, etc., were gathered with the help of a personal data bank.

RESULTS

Nature of Overlap Between Style Dimensions

Previous studies show that the nurturant task (NT) style has positive overlap with the participative style (P) of leadership, and the two are inversely correlated with the authoritarian (F) style[34]. Though there exists a significant degree of overlap between the two, the NT and P styles are not the same. The people-orientation of the P style is of the fraternal type based on the ethos of equal potentials of the leader and the subordinates. On the other hand, the NT style is predominantly task-and-efficiency-oriented and contains the ingredients of affection, care, and warmth of a benevolent paternal figure[95]. In the present study, the factor analysis results are constrained to only three meaningful and interpretable factors (see Table 1). The authoritarian bureaucrat (FB) style was positively but mildly related with the caring and friendly (CF) style, while it had near zero correlation with the NT style. However, a significant degree of overlap, as expected, was observed between the NT and CF styles.

As for the climate items, it is important to note that no participative climate emerged at all through factor analysis. Rather, it is apparent from Table 1 that the NT climate appeared as the most distinct and the strongest factor. The F climate was split into two factors, one had a clear-cut configuration of F climate, while the other included a few items from the task climate and, hence, this factor was named authoritarian task (FT) climate. However, bureaucracy (B) emerged a unique, yet a weak factor. The interrelationships among climate factors were all as expected on theoretical grounds. For example, the NT climate was inversely correlated with both the F and the B climates, but it had a positive overlap with the FT climate. As expected, there appeared a significant overlap between the F, B, and FT climates.

Leadership Styles and Outcome Variables

To predict leadership effectiveness, a step-wise multiple regression analysis using SPSS[24] was run. The relevant statistics have been summarized in Table 2. It is evident from this table that the authoritarian bureaucrat (FB) style positively and significantly (but mildly) affected only one outcome variable--value commitment--accounting for 2 % of the variance. While this style was found to be completely independent of perceived effectiveness, it negatively affected three facets of job satisfaction--

Table 2 **Multiple Regression Results—Leadership Styles and Organizational Effectiveness Independent Variables**

| | | Independent Variables | | | | | |
| | | Climate | | | | Style | |
Outcome variables	Nur-turant task	Autho-ritarian	Bureau-cracy	Autho-ritarian task	Authoritarian bureau-crat	Caring and friendly	Nur-turant task
Commitment to Stay							
r	.39	-.18	-.11	.07	.06	.22	.16
Beta	.37	-.02	-.03	+	.04	.17	.09
R^2 change	.15a	.00	.00	+	.00	.04b	.01
Value Commitment							
r	.49	-.14	-.14	.07	.15	.12	.38
Beta	.37	.12	-.11	-.07	.15	-.08	.41
R^2 change	.24a	.0l	.01	.00	.02b	.00	.15a
Satisfaction with pay							
r	.28	-.28	-.21	-.12	-.24	.07	.16
Beta	.27	-.12	-.08	-.13	-.25	.04	.15
R^2 change	.04a	.08	.00	.01	.06a	.00	.03a
Satisfaction with promotion							
r	.31	-.25	-.22	-.07	-.17	.05	.21
Beta	.29	-.07	-.12	-.08	-.17	-.02	.23
R^2 change	.09a	.00	.03	.01	.03a	.00	.05b
Satisfaction with job security							
r	.16	-.07	.04	-.09	-.19	-.06	.03
Beta	.21	.02	.15	-.19	-.18	-.06	.06
R^2 change	.02 a	.00	.02	.02 a	.04a	.00	.00
Satisfaction with job							
r	.40	-.23	-.21	-.05	-.12	.10	.28
Beta	.43	+	-.12	-.13	-.13	+	.28
R^2 change	.16a	+	.01	.02	.02	+	.08a
Satisfaction with Supervision							
r	.49	-.32	-.23	.01	-.10	-.07	.12
Beta	.44	-.08	-.09	-.03	-.09	-.13	.17
R^2 change	.24a	.01	.03	.00	.01	.02	.01b
Overall Satisfaction							
r	.52	-.37	-.27	-.10	-.26	.03	.26
Beta	.52	-.08	-.09	-.17	-.26	-.05	.28
R^2 change	.27a	.00	.01	.06a	.07a	.00	.07a
Perceived Efficiency							
r	.48	-.11	-.12	.21	-.04	.21	.20
Beta	.45	.10	-.11	-.03	-.06	.07	.31
R^2 change	.19a	.00	.01	.00	.00	.00	.11a

Note. $N = 189$; b$p < .05$; a$p < .01$; +Tolerance level insufficient for further computation.

pay (6%), promotion (3%), and job security (4%)—and overall job satisfaction (7%). The caring and friendly (CF) style was found to be independent of almost all the criterion variables except that it influenced mildly but positively the `commitment to stay' variable (4%). Interestingly enough, as anticipated, the NT style positively influenced most of the outcome variables, that is, it explained 15% of the variance in value commitment, up to 8% of the variance in job satisfaction, and 11% of the variance in perceived effectiveness.

Organizational Climate and Outcome Variables

The findings with regard to organizational climate are similarly relevant to leadership styles—the NT climate being more effective (see Table 2). For example, the NT climate was found to have a significant and positive impact ($p < .01$) on all the outcome variables—that is, it explained 15% to 24% of the variance in commitment, up to 27% in job satisfaction, and 19% of the variance in perceived effectiveness. The other two climates—F and B—did not significantly affect any of the indicators of effectiveness; however, the trends (i.e., beta weights) appeared to be in the negative direction. Finally, the fourth climate factor (i.e., authoritarian task) did significantly influence the two criterion variables-- satisfaction with job security (2%} and overall satisfaction (6%)--but the beta weights (impact) were negative**.**

DISCUSSION

A summary of the findings indicates that the NT style obtains significant support from this study. Its overlap with the other styles in factorial structure has also been found to be in accordance with the conceptualization of the NT style. Some comments are in order.

Factor analysis results show that the authoritarian bureaucrat (FB) style was mildly but positively related to the caring and friendly (CF) style, and it was independent of the NT style. Yet, a significant degree of overlap, as expected, was observed between the NT and CF styles. This overlap accounted for only about 17% of the covariation

between the two styles, suggesting that the two are conceptually not the same. This conclusion neatly fits into the normative model of the NT style, namely, that the people-orientation of the P style is of a fraternal type, while the NT style is of benevolent paternal type. It should be noted that no clear-cut style as participative was identified through the factor analysis results. In the factor analysis results of climate items, a similar pattern of relationships was noticed. The NT climate appeared as the most distinct and the strongest factor; it was inversely correlated with both the F and B climates; and it had a meaningful overlap with the authoritarian task (FT) climate. It might be because both the NT and FT climates contained a few items from the task dimension. As anticipated, F, B, and FT climates were significantly tied with each other. These findings are all consistent with most of the previous studies on leadership styles with the exception of Habibullah and Sinha's[12] study in which the task and nurturant styles emerged as two distinct dimensions. The emergence of task orientation as a separate configuration raised a problem: can task orientation be conceptually distinguished from nurturance orientation? If so, then it would follow from the findings of Habibullah and Sinha[12] that any leadership style scale should make provision to measure the two dimensions separately. It should be made clear at this point that only two factor analytic studies employing the NT model (including the present study) have been reported so far. The conflicting results from the two studies might be because the previous study[12] was conducted only in one large-sized manufacturing company, while the present study took in several heterogeneous organizations. However, the present analysis clearly demonstrates that the nurturant and the task styles are not two separate dimensions; rather, they jointly appear as one clear and distinct factor as postulated by Sinha[34].

The findings relating to the relationship between leadership styles and outcome variables are all expected and in the hypothesized direction. For example, the NT style and the NT climate positively in-fluenced almost all the indicators of effec-tiveness--commitment, job satisfaction and

perceived effectiveness. The caring and friendly style mildly, but positively, affected only the `commitment to stay' factor. The FB style had its positive impact only on the commitment factor, but it appeared to affect the facets of job satisfaction negatively. While the F and B climates were not linked with any of the outcome variables, the authoritarian task climate negatively affected the sense of job security and overall job satisfaction.

The present findings can be compared with at least three studies conducted in the past. Singh[29] administered a leadership style scale to the executives of fertilizer and coal industries. He had in his scale five style dimensions including nurturant (N) and task (T) styles separately. Although Singh did not check the factorial structure of the scale, his correlational analysis revealed several interesting results. The N style was strongly associated with the effectiveness of self, subordinates, immediate superior, department, and organization. The T and P styles were positively and significantly related only to the subordinates' effectiveness. The N style was also related to satisfaction with the job, with superiors, and with life. While the P style was unrelated to any factor of job satisfaction, the T style was positively associated with satisfaction with the job and with the superiors' behavior. However, in line with the present findings, the F style was negatively correlated with executives' overall satisfaction. Singh's[29] significant correlation between nurturance and effectiveness clearly contradicted the postulates presented by Sinha[34] that nurturance, only when made contingent on subordinates' task accomplishment, can lead to leadership effectiveness. But, Sinha's[34] proposition was well-established in a study by Hinger[14]. Hinger reported that the N style was not related to any indicators of effectiveness. However, when she combined the N and T orientations, it was found to be correlated with the effectiveness of the superior, and the efficiency of the division and the organization--a conclusion which is quite consistent with the present findings. The present study obtains rather direct support from Singhal's study[30] conducted in a university organization. Her findings revealed that the NT style was the only one, which was correlated significantly with the intellectual commitment of students. She also noted that NT was the preferred teaching style, rather than the P one, while the F style was the least typical of effective teachers.

CONCLUSIONS

On the positive side, we can conclude that the study provides significant evidence in support of the NT style of leadership in Indian organizations. The factor analysis results demonstrate that the NT style is perceived as distinctly different from other styles, although it has a positive overlap with the caring and friendly style and inverse correlation with F and B styles or climates. We also note that the NT style positively affects several indicators of organizational effectiveness, while the F style or F climate negatively affects the factors of efficiency and satisfaction. A note of caution is in order: the NT style is associated with efficiency, if the subordinates are not prepared for participation, but it may lead to dissatisfaction, if the subordinates are ready for participation. Evidence exists that the NT leader causes loss of efficiency and greater dissatisfaction if this style is unduly prolonged[35]. Hence, the two-stage model of NT and P leadership effectiveness is more normative than descriptive.

In sum, we have provided sufficient data in favor of the usefulness of the NT model. Even now, there remain many questions to be answered, many quests to be undertaken, and many webs to be unraveled. For example, we do not have any solid evidence regarding shift in the leadership style from NT to P. Nor do we have any data to show how a leader varies his/her style from subordinate to subordinate. And, we are yet to examine the leader's power relationship with his/her subordinates, peers, and superiors, which may have an important bearing on organizational effectiveness. It is hoped that these questions will be investigated in future studies.

REFERENCES

1. Angle, H. L. and Perry, J. L.: "An Empirical Assessment of Organizational

Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 26 (1981); pp. 1-13.

2. Ansari, M. A. : "Organizational Climate: Homogeneity within and Heterogeneity between Organizations", *Journal of Social and Economic Studies,* 8 (1980); PP. 89-96.

3. Ansari, M. A.   :"Some of the Determinants of Success on Executive Positions" Ph. D. Thesis, Patna University, Patna, 1981.

4. Argyris, C. : "Single-loop and Double-loop Models in Research on Decision making", *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 21 (1976) ; pp. 363-375.

5. Blake, R. R. and Mouton, J. S. : *The Managerial Grid* (Texas: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964).

6. Carmett, D. W. and Alcock, J. E. : "Some Psychometric Correlates of Behavior in India and Canada", *International Journal of Psychology, 11* (1976) ; pp. 57-64.

7. Chattopadhyay, G. P. : "Dependence Of in Indian Culture: From Mud Huts To Company Board Rooms", *Economic and Political Weekly, 10* (1975); pp. 30-38.

8. Etzioni, A. : A *Comparative Evaluation of Complex Organizations : On Power, Involvement and their Correlates* (New York : Free Press, 1975).

9. Fiedler, F. E. : *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967

10. Fleishman, E. A. and Harris, E. F. : "Patterns of Leadership Behavior Related to Employee grievances and turnover", *Personal Psychology,* 15 (1962); pp.43-56

11. Guion, R. M. : "A Note on Organiza tional Climate", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance,* 9 (1973); pp. 120-125.

12. Habibullah, A. H. M. and Sinha, J. B. P. : "Motivational Climate and Leadership Styles", *Vikalpa,* 5 (1980) ; PP. 85-93.

13. Hellriegel, D. and Slocum, J. W. : "Organizational Climate: Measures, Research and Contingencies", *Academy of Management journal, 17* (1974) ; pp. 255-280.

14. Hinger, Asha, : "A Study of the Relationship between Leadership Styles Effectiveness and Job Satisfaction", Ph. D. Thesis, Rajasthan University, Jaipur, 1982.

15. James, L. R. and Jones, A. P. : "Organizational Climate: A Review of Theory and Research", *Psychological Bulletin,* 81 (1974) ; pp. 1096-1112.

16. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. and White, R. K. : "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates", *The Journal of Social Psychology, 10* (1939); pp. 271-299.

17. Lewis, O. : *Village Life in Northern India,* New York: Vintage, 1962.

18. Likert, R. : *Human Organizations,* New York: Wiley, 1967.

19. McGregor, D. : *The Human Side of Enterprise,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

20. Meade, R. D. : "An Experimental Study of Leadership in India", *Journal of Social Psychology,* 72 (1967) : pp. 35-43.

21. Meade, R. D. and Whittaker, J. O. : "A Cross-cultural Study of Authoritarianism", *The Journal. of Social Psychology,*72 (1967) ; pp. 3-7.

22. Murphy, Lois B. : "Roots of Tolerance and Tension in Indian Child Development", G. Murphy (Ed.), *In the Minds of men,* New York: Basic Books, 1953; pp.46-59.

23. Narayan, D. : "Indian National Charac ter in the Twentieth Century", *Annals of American Academy of* (Ed.), *In the Minds of Men,* New York: Basic Books, 1953; pp. 46-59.

24. Nie, H. H., Hull, D. H., Jenkins, J.G.,

Steinbranner, K. and Bent, D. H. : *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences,* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

25.   Pareek, U. : "A Motivational Paradigm of Development", *journal of Social i*ssues, 2 (1968) ; pp. 115-124.

26.   Raven, B. H. and Rubin, J. Z. : *Social Psychology : People in Groups,* New York: Wiley, 1976; p. 371.

27.   Sanford, F. : *Authoritarianism and Leader*ship, Philadelphia : Institute of Research in Human Relations, 1950. *Sector Organizations,* New Delhi: National , 1973.

28.   Schultz, D. P. : *Psychology and Industry Today,* New York: Macmillan, 1982.

29.   Singh, J. B. P. : "A Study of Leadership Styles and their Effectiveness", Ph. D. Thesis, Bihar University, Muzaffarpur,1982.

30.   Singhal, Sushila, : "Effective Leaders and Leadership Styles in College Context: Some Research Evidence". Paper presented at the Workshop on Organizational Research in India, Allahabad University, Allahabad, Oct. 1-3, 1981.

31.   Sinha, J. *B. P. : Development through Behavior Modification,* Bombay: Allied, 1970. *Review of Applied Psychology,* 22 (1973) : pp. 55-64.

32.   Sinha, J. B. P.: "Organizational Climate and Problems of Management in India", *International*

33.   Sinha, J. B. P. : *Some Problems of Public Sector Organizations,* New Delhi: National, 1973.

34.   Sinha, J. B. P. : *The Nurturant-Task Leader : A Model of Effective Executive,* New Delhi: Concept, 1980.

35.   Sinha, J. B. P. : "Further Testing of a Model of Leadership Effectiveness", *Indian journal of Industrial Relations*(1983): pp. 143-160.

36.   Sinha, J. B. P. and Sinha, Mira : "Middle Class Values in Organizational Perspective", *journal of Social and Economic Studies, 1* (1974): pp. 95-114.

37.   Vroom, V. H. and Yetton, P. : *Leader ship and Decision-making,* Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.

38.   Winter, Sara : "Case Studies" in D. C. McClelland and D. G. Winter (Eds.), *Motivating Economic Achievement,* New York: Basic Books, 1969, pp. 275-308.

39.   Wiser, W. and Wiser, C. : *Behind Mud Walls,* California: University of California Press, 1963.

Footnotes

1.   Gratitude is expressed to Dr. B. N. Patnaik for going through the earlier version of this paper.

2.   The presentations summarize highlights of the data: statistical information (e.g., factor loadings) not reported explicitly is available from the author. A copy of the questionnaires is also available on request.