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Abstract
Several studies have observed the leadership styles and behavior in institutional framework to comprehend whether the styles and behaviors of managers are same or not. The present study composed data from more than 24 published researches over different research channels in various countries. It is establish that leadership style is most steady with the essential purposes and emotional desires underlying varied groups of employees, based on unforeseen event approaches to leadership. It is on the contrary found that in organizations with undersized chains of command the diversity in the leadership style adept by managers might be vague impression, whereas in organizations with extended chains of command, it will be likely to articulated, Citrus Paribas. This study concludes a number of implications for theory and practice.
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1.0 Introduction
A great range of research on leadership has highlighted on leaders at the higher hierarchical positions only. This was for the reason that, feasibly, so far, it was mistakenly assumed that middle and first-level leaders have vibrantly smaller roles to contribute to organizational achievement. However, with latest organizational models together with reform of policymaking power to lower hierarchical levels, the development of leaders across all hierarchical levels has come to be a desideratum intended at increasing corporate success. The distribution of information and the general use of team work within organizations similarly contribute to the improvement of leaders across various hierarchical levels (Lowe, Kroeck et al. 1996).

Organizational leaders express wide deviations in the behaviors and styles which they express at work. A number of managers used a variety of leadership styles and behaviors in their regular events; others utilize one or two of the leadership styles or behavior levels. It could be worthwhile to ask, and so, the scope to which seeing these variations managers can be emotionally grouped on the foundation of the leadership styles and behavior practices which they express on their jobs. A related query is the scope to which use of a precise leadership style and or behavior supported to a person’s improved work performance and to the broad satisfaction of the user, associates, managers and junior workers.

Corporations and researchers have been infatuated over the previous four decades with leadership, and try to examine the sensation into a global set of actions (De Vries 2003). In the modern times, a leading tactic to reviewing leadership has seemed. This is based on the model of Transformational and Transactional leadership established by Bass (1985) and operationalized by Bass and Avolio (1995). Strength of the model has been the difference among sets of leadership behaviors essential in two different contexts.
The diverse priorities of the dual styles of leadership arise as: strategic leadership emphasis on the existence and achievement of the organization, its critical spectators includes the community of personnel, its time skyline is long-lasting practice and it contains an excess of immediate situations. While supervisory leadership emphasises on the achievement of tasks, its critical viewers consist of individuals and/or teams, its time horizon is normal- to short-term practice and it comprises one or very few conditions (Kur 1995).

1.1 Different Leadership styles

Just as researchers are aware of that various employees show a variety of seeming responsibility and prospects in their connections with their firm (Rousseau 1989; Robinson 1996), a related disparity exists within the leadership fiction. Namely, the leadership literature has a striking tradition of abstracting leadership typologies. In a typical typology, leader behaviors are preferably clustered into evident types of leadership styles. As one primary instance, path – goal theory documented four different styles of leader behaviors— directive leadership, supportive leadership, achievement-oriented leadership, and participative leadership. (Tsui, Pearce et al. 1997) have offered experiential evidence to back the idea that these four styles of leadership are evidently changed from each other and indicate unique characteristics. Therefore, we used this typology of leadership styles as the source of our integration. Because of their different characteristics, these leadership styles are also expected to have variable consequences for leader efficiency.

2.0 Literature Review

The Nature of a corporate’s human capital and the mode in which it is control can influence employee and organization performance (Wright, McMahan et al. 1994; Wright and Snell 1998). In addition, leader–member exchange (LMX) theory (Dansereau, Graen et al. 1975; Duchon, Green et al. 1986; Graen and Wakabayashi 1994; Bauer and Green 1996) tells that leaders do not traditionally involved and contact with all employees in the same way (Sparrowe and Liden 1997; Richard, Robert et al. 1999). Likewise, situational leadership theory (Hersey and Blanchard 1969) demands that, for the reason that the achievement of leadership be liable on the positional variables.

A resemble effect of transformational leadership combined in this research. Effective leadership suggests influencing the abilities, attitudes, and behaviors of admirers (Bass 1960). Leadership ways of combined-superior dyads somehow inclined to match each other. Agreeing to (Burns 1978), the leadership process can take place in one of two manners. It is either one transformational or transactional. The lower level supervisors are self-nominated, nominated by their second-level manager, or administratively chosen into positions so that they will be working very well manner as compared with their superior. Some research proof supports the notion that supporters’ behavior or attitudes are effectively associated with those of their leaders over time (Bowers and Seashore 1966; Ouchi and Maguire 1975).

The resemble effect consciously in the current situation due to the sub-culture of demographically racially within which the leaders operate. Lower-level leaders, who were professed as being more forceful by their assistants in turn, required less magnetism in their Superiors. (Tichy and Ulrich 1984), but, took omission with Burns’s view. They projected that charismatic/transformational leadership largely involves the development of new visions and structural changes by top management supervisors. A better way to convey transformational leadership training is originally to top level-managers.

Organizations and scholars have been obsessive over the previous four decades with Leadership, and efforts to assess the phenomenon into a universal set of measures (Kets de Vries 1993; Higgs and Aitken 2003; Jones and Goffee 2006). To discover the new
Leadership Dimension questionnaire and a mutual framework for assessing an individual’s leadership style regarding the perspective the leader use them in their work spot. Data composed for completion this study directly associated to the respondent’s individual biographical, race, job-function, demographic and ethnic group. The study also exhibit that the five-FFM personality element do not use for extra dissimilarity on any of the styles at an indicative level. Research is entirely based on the personal self assessed The LDQ can be used devoid of losing suggestive personality-associated differences. Leader performance and fan dedication sub-scales must facilitate added research by researchers into leadership performance.

(Stordeur, Vandenbergh et al. 2000) studied the flowing effect of leadership styles through hierarchical levels in a model of nursing departments in Belgium, with eight hospitals with 41 wards. Here we found that there are suggestive variances in the leadership styles among the senior and first level mangers. (McDaniel and Wolf 1992) conducted an experiential study that observed transformational leadership through hierarchical levels in nursing departments and found proof for a cascading outcome of leadership style. Three out of seven ways of leadership styles were suggestively different when we matched with one or two levels of management there was a strong suggestively variance in the leadership behavior of senior and first line mangers. (Tichy and Ulrich 1984) and (Avolio and Bass 1988) establish transformational leadership to be mainly evident and durable at the top level.

The managerial level of an organization must be important for assessing the suggestive leadership behavior measurements of UK managers the overall leadership behavior among senior and first-level supervisors was substantial at a sturdier 95 per cent confidence level. (Dunham and Klafehn 1990) suggest that transformational leaders transmit a sense of mission and are concerned with longstanding objectives. (Coad 2000) presents a counterpoint to a “falling dominoes effect”, whereby transformational leadership at great levels in a executive hierarchy seems to Cascade to lower levels.

In various organizations, self-managing teams (SMTs) have been presented as a way of enlightening the performance and comfort of employees (Cascio 1995; Manz and Sims 1995; Spreitzer, Cohen et al. 1999; Kauffeld 2006). The aim of the study is to ascertain the relationship among Leader behavior and the efficiency of the members of a self-managing team in the way to see how much an individual performance and exhaustion. Indeed, publications on SMTs mainly focus on team effectiveness(Cohen and Ledford 1994). Team member within a short period of time the performance of the individual they measured with the use of behavior tell him their leader and also reported him. Several leadership theories (Hersey and Blanchard 1969; Hersey and Blanchard 1993) have recognized team member experience as a significant moderator.

In other way when members spent a longer time in a team than he doing a good job and perform well and do not feel hesitation to do any work related to the task or share any idea. Leader of self-managing team get benefit to showing how an individual perform better in a short time period or greater time period. Leader can also enhance the intellectual skill of an individual. This decision adds to the debate on the demand for “specific “leadership performance in SMTs (Manz and Sims Jr 1987; Manz and Sims 1995; Stewart and Manz 1995).

Since it’s initially over 25 years ago, the convincing of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory (Dansereau, Graen et al. 1975; Graen and Cashman 1975; Graen 1976; Graen, Liden et al. 1982) has undergone many studies. This principle develop relationship between levels of issues and explain leadership theories according to the extension addressed by the three sides leadership(leader, follower, relationship).This study tells that defines how operational leadership relationships develop among dyadic “partners” in and among organizations leaders and admirers. Assumption from this testing specifies to us that,
although items were added to knock into likely multiple dimensions, the expanded measure was highly connected with the more brief 7-item LMX and produced the same effects.

We agree that certain aspects of LMX are transactional because of its location as an exchange-based attitude to leadership; LMX is visibly not limited to Transactional Leadership. Rather, LMX is both transformational and transactional. By accepting this perspective, we have come to a purer understanding of leadership and LMX, and approve with (Klein, Dansereau et al. 1994).

In today’s we primarily focused on transformational leadership but some comments tells that there is a change among management and leadership. Traditionally the UK had a large amount of hierarchical organizations that still have a custom of Theory X management styles, which have factually been arranged as the leadership role models. If the people at the top do not fixed the right context then the organization will unavoidably suffer failure from increasing rigor mortis. If you take (Handy 1978) view of organizations many organizations tracked the “Apollo” model, which has brilliant stable state characteristics That carries us on to a discussion about the relative qualities of the Reagan style of leadership related with the Thatcher style. Thatcher got much more involved in the detail of issues; however Reagan was only concerned with the very comprehensive PR type presentational approach.

Higher and lower level leaders face fundamentally different problems. Middle managers, by contrast, are more often “subject to rules, constraints, and limited participation”(Rainey and Watson 1996). These differences might affect the existence of TFL behaviors amongst upper and middle managers (Shamir and Howell 1999). Perfect pressure and inspirational motivation put regularly upon upper instead of middle managers. While there were no difference in the intellectual and physiological skills of both. Also provide all the essential facilities provided or fulfill basic needs of the upper managers instead of the middle. While customized consideration was likewise effective together in groups TFL on lower managerial levels. Organizations may possibly achieve this by cutting managerial restraints and authorizing lower level leaders.

In this study the healthcare organizations, voices in favor of the New Public Management model are evidently clear. The improvements have been connected for their part with a wider administrative development of the public sector, which supports efforts to? Improve competence in the sector, lock up growing expenditure and decrease bureaucracy and expert power (Farrell and Morris 2003). In terms of its organized structure, financing and goals, the Finnish healthcare system fit in to the same family as the other Scandinavian countries and the UK. The main focus in this study upon the leadership styles between middle-level managers in social and health care using the leadership role descriptions developed by Robert Quinn et al. Leadership roles of middle-level managers were calmly distributed on a fairly high level. Statistically suggestive variances found in leadership styles were associated to professional background, gender, and activity sector and unit size. Leadership styles hassled intra-organizational actions, whereas extra-organizational roles established less attention.

Leaders are mostly effective if they involve in transformational leadership (TFL) behaviors, like articulating an appealing vision for the future, acting as fascinating role models, developing the approval of common goals, , providing individualized support and setting high performance expectations and intelligent stimulation for followers (Bass 1985; Podsakoff, MacKenzie et al. 1990) Lots of studies show that these TFL behaviors stimulate high levels of performance in admirers (Podsakoff, MacKenzie et al. 1990; Lowe, Kroeck et al. 1996; Judge and Piccolo 2004; Wang, Law et al. 2005). TFL climate is connected to workers performance through the organization's progressive affective climate. Means, standard deviations, and bi-variant correlations for all study variables were used. TFL climate within the contributing organizations was clearly related with positive affective climate and
positive Affective climate was positively associated with overall employee aggregate organizational output. The degree to which various leaders in an organization direct related behaviors on the way to their subordinates is taken in the concept of leadership climate (Bliese and Halverson 1998; Chen and Bliese 2002; Chen, Kirkman et al. 2007; Walter and Bruch 2010).

Research has establish sufficient evidence representing the beneficial significances of transformational leadership (TFL; e.g.,(Judge and Piccolo 2004)). The behaviors usually associated with TFL consist of articulating a charismatic vision, acting as a captivating role model, developing the approval of common goals, providing individual support and setting high performance expectations, and logical stimulation for admirers (Bass 1985; Podsakoff, MacKenzie et al. 1990). Such leadership has been revealed to improve both supporter performance (McColl-Kennedy and Anderson 2002) and organizational achievement (Waldman, Javidan et al. 2004). Yet, researchers are progressively recognizing that leadership does not take place inside a virtual space, but is subject to significant contextual impacts (Osborn, Hunt et al. 2002; Porter and McLaughlin 2006). Let's say, theorists have claimed that an organization's structural structure may shape TFL processes, advising that such leadership arises more often and is more operative in organizations with organic rather than mechanical structures (Pawar and Eastman 1997; Kark and van Dijk 2007).

The recent study explores the association of empowerment, leadership style and customer service as an extent of effective project managing in projects with variable degree of vitality. Improved productivity, greater quality products and services, better teamwork and customer service, improved speed and receptiveness has led to the fame of empowerment (Shelton 1991; Von Dran, Kappelman et al. 1996; Appelbaum and Honegger 1998). Preceding research has established a positive relationship among team empowerment and collocated team performance (Burpitt and Bigoness 1997; Kirkman and Rosen 1999). Virtual teams can quickly react to business globalization dares (Maznevski and Chudoba 2000; Montoya-Weiss, Massey et al. 2001; Kayworth and Leidner 2002) and their use is growing exponentially (Kirkman, Rosen et al. 2002). Therefore there is a need to recognize further the role of empowerment in virtual projects.

The main purpose of the study is to test the application of two leadership models to a volunteer service club. Servant leadership was foreseen to better describe the attitudes and obligation of service organization followers than transformational leadership. Vision and motivation activate a transformation procedure within the follower (Scandura and Williams 2004). More usually, leaders who offer volunteers with progressive, meaningful experiences might be able to keep their concern in their volunteer situations. Transformational leader practices stimulates followers to attain goals, and increase commitment, confidence, and job performance (Bono and Judge 2003). A huge body of research on transformational leadership has accepted its positive association with satisfaction, commitment and aims to stay (Fleishman and HARRIS 1998; Bliss and Fallon 2003; Brown and Yoshioka 2003; Walumbwa and Lawler 2003; Avolio, Zhu et al. 2004; Jaskyte 2004; Epitropaki and Martin 2005) contend that leadership and job satisfaction are the most active predictors of purposes to leave non-profit organizations.

The varied priorities of the two types of leadership arise as: strategic leadership emphasizes on the existence and achievement of the organization, its critical viewers includes the community of employees, while supervisory leadership emphasizes on the success of tasks, its critical viewers involves individuals and/or teams, its time prospect is medium- to short-range practice and it involves one or very few conditions. A bright decision can prove valueless without its effective implementation. The implementation of results is a critical aspect of leadership efficiency across European countries and the USA (Robie, Johnson et al. 2001). Even the best results fail to be executed due to the insufficient supervision of
assistants, among other reasons (Hill, Bedau et al. 1979). (Kenny 1999) emphasizes that people who implement results to the best of their skill are usually those who have created them. Even though the significance of supervisory leadership throughout the implementation stage of decisions is usually accepted (Harrison 1981), little research has been made on this subject. (Hofstede 1976) descriptions of leadership styles joining a summarized version of (Tannenbaum and Schmidt 1982)leadership range, indifferently view both choice and implementation.

This Multicultural study developed the full range leadership context developed by (Avolio, Bass et al. 1995) model of culture, and relate leadership styles and cultural standards of over 4,000 managerial and non-managerial personnel in ten business organizations in Russia, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Germany, Kyrgyzstan, and the US. About socio-cultural dimensions, the study establish that, related to Germany and the US, the four former USSR countries varied primarily by much minor levels of Power Space, higher levels of Masculinity and much extended planning horizons. Lastly, the study proposes that multicultural human resource development issues cannot be defined in terms of simplified dichotomies between the East and West. For constructs measured in this study, significant differences were found not only between the two groups of countries but also between individual countries within these groups. Socio-cultural dimensions. The notion of culture is widely used in global management, organization behavior, and human resource development literature to measure effects that can distinguish among countries and ethnic or occupational groups (Kuchinke 1999).

Close leadership among a focal leader and his/her instant followers has been the focus of extensive study in many settings. But our understanding of distant leadership among a focal leader and his/her admirers not reporting straight to him/her is much more narrow (Waldman and Yammarino 1999; Antonakis and Atwater 2002; Avolio, Zhu et al. 2004). Examination shows variances in leadership power perceptions, processes, and many levels of-analysis effects among close and distant captivating and dependent reward leadership through three hierarchical levels in Korean companies. Multi-source data open that followers' potential to the leader mediated relations between leadership and fans' behavioral, attitudinal, and performance outcomes in close conditions. Last of all, leadership is by nature a multi-level phenomenon happening among an individual leader and individual admirers, groups of followers, and/or collectives of the groups of followers (Dansereau and Yammarino 1998).

Transformational leader inspires subordinates to put in more effort and to go afar what they (subordinates) expected prior to (Burns 1978). The aim to inspect how project managers’ leadership styles and assistants’ organizational responsibility correlates with leadership effects and work performance of assistants on construction projects. It delivers remarkable value for both practitioners and researchers. On the practical side, it seek out to notify project managers that they can get a feel for their leadership behaviors in order to augment subordinates’ improve work performance, organizational commitment, and consequently increase a positive functioning impression.

Effective leaders are distinguished from other leaders over the exercise of a fairly small range of skill or competence areas (Kouzes and Posner 1998; Goffee and Jones 2001; Higgs and Rowland 2001; Hogan and Hogan 2001). To inspect the new leadership dimensions questionnaire (LDQ) and a linked context for assess an individual’s leadership style regarding the context in which the leader works; the three new LDQ sub-scales aimed to measure organizational context, follower duty and leader performance; and the linking among personality and leadership. (Goffee and Jones 2001) in their statement that effective leadership requires “being you, with skill”.

The contingency perception of leadership suggests that leadership is a social construct that cannot be fully understood when examined in isolation from the context in which it
occurs (Podsakoff et al., 1993; Yammarino et al., 1998). A variety of organizational leaders, workers, managers and academics had previously been classified on the basis of characteristics of their jobs including how they spent their time. This study investigated the extent to which managers from various foreign industries could be meaningfully grouped on the basis of the leadership styles and behavior patterns which they exhibited in the performance of their jobs. Bass et al. (2003) found that team efficacy fully mediated the relationship between sergeants’ transactional leadership and platoon performance.

The process of joint stimulation which panels human energy is the hunt of mutual cause. Weber (1961) recognizes leadership to be "A moral function best identified by the person it improves a not essentially by the smoothness of process or the number of persons it fascinates." There is no assurance that any one leadership behavior will all the time be effective. But it must be agreed that any leadership behavior used by the leader while managing the affairs of his office is possible to have an influence on organization performance, be it positive or negative. The process of joint stimulation which pedals human energy in the search of common cause (Pigors 1935).

To investigate relationships and variances in the leadership styles and behavior of managers through hierarchical levels in Pakistan organizations, the following research method was engaged in the study. A survey questionnaire was conducted where the population for the study included managers and leaders working in the Pakistan. A total of about 1,440 questionnaires were directed to prospective respondents from several organizations and at different administrative levels. The questionnaire enclosed managers from all the provinces of the country. A total of 405 completed and operating questionnaires were returned, giving a reaction rate of somewhat over 28 per cent. The sample included 242 male managers representing 59.8 per cent and 163 female managers representing 40.2 per cent. The names of the prospective respondents were found largely from the key Pakistani enterprises. To collect data on changes in the leadership behavior and styles of Pakistan managers, across hierarchical levels, the questionnaire demanded respondents to specify where they belong, in the following classification: top management, senior management, middle management, first-level management and non-management. A total of 40 respondents who were non-management staff were omitted from the study. The top and senior-level managers were divided into one category and named senior management. Therefore, for the study, we have senior, middle and first-level managers. The amounts of managers included in each category are 214, 115 and 36, respectively. We gathered data on how frequently they agreed each of the four leadership styles – directive, consultative, participative or delegative in their everyday activities. The questionnaire also demanded respondents to point out the extent to which they have confidence in themselves that they use each of the following leadership behavior – laissez-faire, management- by-exception, individual consideration, intellectual stimulation, contingent reward, inspirational motivation or idealized influence in their actions. The sense attached to each of the leadership styles and behaviors was clarified in the survey. The questionnaire therefore incorporated a self-report styles of a leadership styles questionnaire assessing the four leadership styles derived from Profile, an organizational systems survey research program (Bass, 1974; Bass et al., 1975), and Bass’s Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form MLQ-5S Re vise d, 198 9), which measures laissez-faire, transactional and transformational leadership.

Test of important differences among two of the three levels being observed were computed in turn, i.e. among senior and middle level managers, concerning senior and first-level managers and among middle and first-level managers. Two tables summarizing the results of the studies are produced.
3.0 Results and Discussions

Table I records the leadership styles of managers at various organizational levels. It covers a summary of the questions for senior, middle and first-level managers regarding their directive, participative, consultative, delegative and overall leadership style. The result of the t-test is significant among senior and first-level managers with respect to the directive leadership style. It shows that the level of management is significant in the position and weight attached to the directions of managers – the upper the level of management, the better the significance attached to such an order by the recipient. Therefore, a direction from a senior manager considered as not significant by the middle-level manager, might be understood as significant by the first-level manager. It shows that hierarchy is still important in Pakistani organizations although where there are long chains of command; dissimilarities in directions among the next levels of command might not be easily obvious. While the management attitude of the scalar chain of command is still proficient in most Pakistani organizations, therefore, a change to the Japanese flatter organizations seems to be evident. Table I shows that there are no major variances among any of the levels of management in counseling leadership style. It seems that discussion is widely practiced in Pakistani organizations at all levels. Participative leadership style is, on the other hand, significantly practiced among senior and first-level managers but not in the middle of senior and middle-level managers or amongst middle-level and first-level managers. The figures in the table propose that the level of participative management is higher; the higher one is on the organizational hierarchy. This means that participation, for example, in policy formulation and decision-making, is highest at the senior management level and lowest at the first-level of management, as one would expect.

Table 3.1 The leadership styles of managers at different organizational levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership styles</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Levels of management</th>
<th>First-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.755)</td>
<td>(0.671)</td>
<td>(0.786)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 0.126$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 1.472$</td>
<td>$t_3 = 1.516$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participative</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.782)</td>
<td>(0.747)</td>
<td>(0.845)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 1.355$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 0.957$</td>
<td>$t_3 = 1.834^*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegative</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.824)</td>
<td>(0.822)</td>
<td>(0.871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 1.873^*$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 2.497^*$</td>
<td>$t_3 = 3.848^{**}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall leadership style(c)</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>11.965</td>
<td>11.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>($n_1 = 214$)</td>
<td>($n_2 = 115$)</td>
<td>($n_3 = 36$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 1.199$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 1.000$</td>
<td>$t_3 = 1.854^*$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The $t$ values $t_1$ refers to the difference between senior and middle level means, $t_2$ to that between middle and first level means, and $t_3$ to that between senior and first level means. \(^a\)The figures in the table are mean responses from the questionnaire; \(^b\)Figures in parentheses are standard deviations; \(^c\)The overall leadership style is a summation of the directive, consultative, participative and delegative leadership style.

* $p < 0.10$; **$p < 0.05$; ***$p \leq 0.01$
Table 3.1 shows that there are no major variances among any of the levels of management in counseling leadership style. It seems that discussion is widely practiced in Pakistani organizations at all levels. Participative leadership style is, on the other hand, significantly practiced among senior and first-level managers but not in the middle of senior and middle-level managers or amongst middle-level and first-level managers. The figures in the table propose that the level of participative management is higher; the higher one is on the organizational hierarchy. This means that participation, for example, in policy formulation and decision-making, is highest at the senior management level and lowest at the first-level of management, as one would expect.

The result of the delegative leadership style is different from that of the other leadership styles. The result shows that there are major delegative practices at each of the three management levels. The mean score is highest at the senior management level and lowest at the first-level. The statistical test for the variances among the senior and first-level management is, thus, significant at the 99 per cent confidence level. Differences at the two other stages of management are statistically significant at the 90 per cent level.

Delegation is the means by which senior manager’s pass on the jobs of an organization to their lower-level managers and workforces in a hierarchical fashion. Managers and those to whom they envoy should both appreciate the fact that delegation is not just desirable but likewise necessary, i.e. no organization can really function lacking it as delegation is the means by which managers get their work done (Oshagbemi, 1999). It allows work to be distributed for organizational effectiveness. It gains the advantages of the division of labor and enables every member of an organization to play a part.

From Table 3.1, the result of the t-test is significant among senior and first-level managers regarding the overall leadership style while other tests of variances are not statistically significant. The general result proposes, thus, that there are some variances among the leadership styles of managers at diverse levels in an organizational hierarchy. However, these differences be likely to be weak, but might come to be pronounced among the top management level and say, the supervisory level. It therefore seems that while leadership patterns be to to replicate from upper to lower organizational levels, the leadership style at the lowest organizational level might be significantly changed from that at the highest organizational level.

Table 3.2 contains a summary of the leadership behavior of our sampled managers at different organizational levels. Figures in the table reveal that there are no significant differences between senior, middle and first-level managers, in respect of their leadership behavior dimensions of laissez-faire and management-by-exception. Our results are therefore inconsistent with that of Bass et al. (1987), which found that management-by-exception was more evident at lower levels of the organization in comparison with the higher levels. Management-by-exception was about equally practiced at all levels in our sample (Table 3.2).
Table 3.2 The leadership behavior of managers at different organizational levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership styles</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Levels of management</th>
<th>First-level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire</td>
<td>1.59 (0.547)</td>
<td>1.57 (0.531)</td>
<td>1.75 (0.770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 0.281$</td>
<td>$t_2 = -1.548$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management-by-exception</td>
<td>2.75 (0.924)</td>
<td>2.71 (0.873)</td>
<td>2.78 ((0.866)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 0.421$</td>
<td>$t_2 = -0.419$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>3.01 (0.885)</td>
<td>2.98 (0.916)</td>
<td>2.51 (0.951)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 0.260$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 2.618**$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual consideration</td>
<td>3.42 (0.842)</td>
<td>3.42 (0.838)</td>
<td>3.28 (0.974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = -0.024$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 0.839$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual stimulation</td>
<td>3.42 (0.944)</td>
<td>3.10 (0.959)</td>
<td>2.92 (0.937)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 2.842**$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 1.031$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational Motivation</td>
<td>3.18 (0.939)</td>
<td>2.83 (0.888)</td>
<td>2.66 (1.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 3.261***$</td>
<td>$t_2 = -0.998$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idealized influence</td>
<td>2.93 (0.969)</td>
<td>2.99 (0.945)</td>
<td>2.74 (1.245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = -0.511$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 1.257$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership behavior</td>
<td>7.3396 (1.413)</td>
<td>7.2703 (1.519)</td>
<td>7.0857 (1.900)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 0.408$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 0.589$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership behavior</td>
<td>12.9663 (2.7913)</td>
<td>12.3684 (2.6649)</td>
<td>11.6000 (3.3449)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 1.868*$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 1.402$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall leadership behaviour</td>
<td>20.2816 (3.3449)</td>
<td>19.6818 (3.1446)</td>
<td>18.6857 (4.5165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t_1 = 1.550$</td>
<td>$t_2 = 1.458$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < 0.10$; **$p < 0.05$; *** $p \leq 0.01$
Dependent reward, one of the transactional leadership behaviors, was statistically significant among middle and first-level management and also between senior and first-level management. It would appear that the incidence of contingent reward is high in today’s organizations. When employees meet the specifications of quantity and quality of their production schedules, suitable rewards tend to trail in most organizations in respect of such performance. Where there are no tangible rewards for executing one’s job well, some consent would tend to follow lack of acceptable performance of the job. This would have the same result as rewarding good performance.

It is of interest to notice, however, that there are no significant variances among any of the levels of management for the transactional behavior as a whole. This result is not unexpected considering the fact that no level of management is statistically significant from the other in the leadership behavior dimensions of laissez-faire and management-by-exception. Overall, therefore, transactional leadership behavior would appear to be fairly similar among all levels of management within the sampled organizations. This result is not surprising as the basis of transactional leadership is a transaction or exchange process between leaders and followers. Leadership is a series of economic and social transactions to achieve specific goals. Activities involving transactional leadership are common in Pakistani organizations. While the details of these activities may not be identical from one organization to the other, as organizations pursue different goals, the activities tend to be very similar.

According to Burns (1978), the leadership process can occur in one of two ways. It is either transactional or transformational. Among the four dimensions of transformational leadership behavior, intellectual stimulation and inspirational motivation show significant differences in the various levels of management while the other two dimensions, i.e. individual consideration and idealized influence, do not show any significant differences among the levels of management examined. Transformational leadership is based on personal values, beliefs and qualities of the leader. It focuses on intangible qualities, e.g. vision and shared values useful in building relationships and enlisting followers in the change process. The transformational leader brings about significant changes in the organization’s vision, strategy and culture and promotes innovation in culture and technology. Effective transformational leadership can influence major change in the attitudes and assumptions of subordinates and build commitment to the organizations goals and stimulate dedication to greatness (Steers, 1991).

Intellectual stimulation as a subset of transformational leadership concentrates on the stimulation of followers to be creative and innovative and to change their own beliefs and values as well as those of the leader and the organization along an agreed desired path. Table II expresses that there are significant differences among senior and middle-level managers and among senior and first-level managers on their level of rational stimulation. Our finding supports that of Tichy and Devanna (1986) that the intellectual stimulation of subordinates is more important at higher levels of the organization. Our finding shows that the importance attached to this variable decreases the further down one goes from the top to the lower levels of the organization. Our result, thus, contradicts the findings of Lowe et al. (1996) that the variable is equally important, irrespective of the level of management. Between middle and first-level management, however, there are no significant differences in the expressed levels of intellectual stimulation.

Inspirational motivation attempts to develop followers into leaders by elevating their concerns and inspiring them to go beyond their self-interests for the good of the group. The inspirational leader paints a vision of a desired future state and communicates it in a way that makes the pain of change worth the effort. The leader acts as a strong role model for followers who identify much with their leaders and want very much to emulate them. Table II reveals that there are significant differences between senior and middle-level managers and
between senior and first-level managers on their level of inspirational motivation. This means that inspirational motivation is used most at senior management level, followed by the middle-level managers and least by the first-level managers.

Displaying individual consideration by a senior manager leads to a desire among lower level managers to improve them while showing idealized influence entails gaining the respect of followers by demonstrating extra ordinary knowledge and competence. It is believed that these features are not kept to senior management levels only as some middle level and first level managers also hold them.

4.0 Conclusion

This study has examined the leadership styles and behaviors of managers at different levels in Pakistani organizations. It found that, generally, there are significant differences neither in the leadership styles between senior and first-level managers, but not between senior and middle-level managers nor between middle and first-level managers. This finding suggests that the level(s) of management from and to which a particular leadership style is adopted is important in the significance or non-significance of the leadership style. It also suggests that differences in the leadership style practiced by managers may be blurred in organizations with short chains of command, while it will tend to be pronounced in organizations with long chains of command, other things being equal. Compared with directive, consultative and participative leadership styles, delegative leadership style was found to be distinctive in that significant differences were found in all the three levels of management examined.

The study likewise found that three out of the seven sides of the leadership behavior were significantly not the same when compared with one or two other levels of management. These are contingent reward, rational stimulation and inspirational motivation. Variances in transactional leadership behavior were not major in any of the three combinations of the levels of managers examined while differences in transformational leadership were statistically significant between senior and middle-level managers and between senior and first-level managers. It was found that in overall leadership behavior, there was a strong statistically significant difference between the leadership behavior of senior and first-level managers.

Similar to the findings in the leadership styles research, the organizational level of a manager appears to be important in predicting the significance or otherwise of the leadership behavior dimension of Pakistani managers. In particular, the level of management appears to be strongly related to the transformational leadership behavior of managers, as managers at higher levels display significantly more of this feature in comparison with lower-level managers. Unlike the findings of the leadership styles, however, the overall leadership behavior between senior and first-level managers was significant at a stronger 95 per cent confidence level. One can therefore infer that behavior emanating from senior managers tend to influence the perception of lower-level managers towards acting in a similar fashion to create a culture of similar organizational practices.
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