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ABSTRACT

This study is aimed to examine the relationship between leadership style and perceived leadership effectiveness of corporate leaders in Kolkata. A random sample of 481 corporate leaders is studied. A chi-square test is conducted to understand the relationship between leadership style and leadership effectiveness of corporate leaders from their subordinates’ viewpoint. The result shows that there is a relationship between leadership style and perceived leadership effectiveness of corporate leaders in Kolkata and transformational leadership style is considered as the most effective corporate leadership style as compared to transactional and laissez-faire leadership style so far as their leadership effectiveness is concerned.
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INTRODUCTION:

In today's complex, multi-faceted business world, every organization faces specific challenges that threaten their growth and success and thus the most important factor in this ever increasingly changing environment is the important role of the leader. At the heart of every successful organization, there are dynamic leaders who inspire, direct, enable, and empower individuals to achieve organizational goals. A leader generally builds efficient work environment which helps in continual growth through proper and effective co-ordination. Evil leadership can bring massive destruction.

Leadership:
Leadership is the ability to motivate groups of people which helps to maximize efficiency and to achieve organizational goals.

Corporate Leadership:
A company's corporate leadership is composed of the top executives who oversee its operations and plot its strategies for the future. Corporate leaders must be confident risk-takers who manage business operations as well as the people who work for their organizations. They are motivated to work diligently to achieve success and show empathy in relationship-building and influencing change among the company's workforce.

Leadership Style:
The Leadership Styles are the behavioral patterns that a leader adopts to influence the behaviour of his/ her followers by providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people. There are different types of leadership style such as transformational leadership style, transactional leadership style and laissez-faire leadership style.
Transformational Leadership Style:
The concept of transformational leadership, initially introduced by presidential biographer James MacGregor Burns can be seen when leaders and followers make each other to advance to a higher level of moral and motivation. Leaders with transformational leadership style concentrate on the growth and development of value system of the employees, their inspirational level and moralities with the preamble of their abilities.

Transactional Leadership Style:
Transactional leadership style is understood to be the exchange of rewards and targets between employees and management. The transactional leader will first validate the relationship between performance and reward and then exchange it for an appropriate response that encourages subordinates to improve performance.

Laissez-Faire Leadership Style:
Laissez-faire leadership style implies a completely hands-off approach where many leaders still remain open and available to group members for consultation and feedback and might provide direction at the beginning of a job, but then allow group members to do their jobs with little oversight.

Leadership Effectiveness:
In past days Leadership effectiveness was measured in terms of a leader’s influence in controlling others, to set and achieve goals and to coordinate the reporting team’s efforts on a “top-down” basis. Although these factors may still play a part, leadership effectiveness is now likely to involve the factors in determining overall success, and to apply in part to individuals in a non-formal leadership role. Leadership Effectiveness must result in enabling and empowering the team of people to do what they ought to do. Effective leadership accomplishes common goals and helps the people to connect with their immense potentials which enable them to accomplish purposeful things collectively. It may provide the individual contributors a sense of personal accomplishment and fulfillment. An effective leadership is the ability to influence and align the follower’s outlook, motivation, and beliefs with accomplishing organizational goals (Spatig, 2009). Effective leaders successfully guide the organization through development and change.

LITERATURE REVIEW:

Bell et al., (2015) explore the relationship between some demographical variables and leadership effectiveness among local government managers in Eastern Cave Province which indicates that gender, age, education have a positive and significant relationship with leadership effectiveness. Thus local government department should consider these demographic variables when assigning leadership responsibility to managers.

Hailey (2006) examines the role of leadership in NGOs and the challenges of designing leadership development programmes to the needs of NGOs and assesses that NGO leaders need a set of attributes such as need integrity, personal strength, political acumen and managerial ability to balance the competing pressures they face and the judgment to know what leadership style or strategies best suites the circumstances.

Inderyas et al., (2015) examine the effect of transactional, transformational, charismatic, autocratic, democratic, laissez faire leadership styles on employee job performance where power distance moderates the relationship among transactional leadership and employee job performance on public health care sector of Pakistan.

Dr. Al-Ababneh (2013) investigates the impact of leadership style on employee job satisfaction in five-star Jordanian hotels which indicates that democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles will have direct positive significant relationships with employees’ job satisfaction and democratic leadership has a stronger influence on job satisfaction than laissez-faire leadership does. Thus, by adopting the appropriate leadership styles, leaders can affect employee job satisfaction.

Belonio (2012) determines the effect of leadership styles on employee job satisfaction and the effect of employee job satisfaction on employee job performance in the banking sector in Bangkok. The results show that transactional, transformational, laissez-faire leadership styles are seen to have a positive effect on various facets of employee job satisfaction which is seen to have a positive effect on the various aspects of employee job performance analyzed. It is found that leaders and managers combine the various leadership styles in proportions that produce a positive result when administering their leadership duties.

Alam (2014) reveals significant positive correlations, both simple and multiple, between spiritual intelligence and transformational leadership style in the sports managers in Alborz province, Iran. From among the core abilities of spiritual intelligence, transcendental awareness is a stronger predictor of transformational leadership in the sports managers and spirituality is strengthened in sports managers in order to improve their spiritual
intelligence and transformational leadership style.

Dr. Almansour (2012) indicates that Transformational leadership is implemented when leaders generate awareness and acceptance of the group’s tasks and mission. This also happen when a leader creates the need within subordinates to look beyond their own self-interests for the good of others. Transactional leadership involves leader-follower exchanges necessary for achieving routine performance agreed upon between leaders and followers. Situational leadership involves the flexible leaders to have the social perceptiveness and information to match their behavior with situational demands which indicates that more flexible leader is one who is capable of showing a wider range of situation appropriate behavioral responses.

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY:

In the context of studies related to leaders’ leadership style and leadership effectiveness, there are controversies regarding the relationship between leadership style and leadership effectiveness in various countries of the world. Hence, in light of the theoretical literature and empirical studies, the leadership styles are effective in leading change and are essential for the leaders to nurture an organizational culture and to handle the stress effectively in the times of change. To understand the various types of leadership styles, no one can tell that a specific leadership style is successful and effective in all the situations. Therefore, a leader need not be perfect in all situations and he/she should be familiar with some of the common issues which immerge in day to day management. It is clear that a proper and particular leadership style of a person can help the leader to become more effective. In India, there is hardly any research done to identify the relationship between the leadership style and leadership effectiveness of corporate leaders in Kolkata. These limitations create the need to develop an empirical study to get a more conclusive finding to clarify several contradictions.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

The objective is to determine the relationship between leadership style and perceived leadership effectiveness of corporate leaders from different organizations in Kolkata.

Hypothesis:

Keeping these questions in mind, based on the review of literature, the following hypothesis is formulated.

H1: There will be associationship between of leadership style (transformational/ transactional/ laissez-faire) and perceived leadership effectiveness of corporate leaders in Kolkata.

METHODOLOGY:

This study will examine the relationship between leadership style of corporate leaders in various organizations in Kolkata with their perceived leadership effectiveness from subordinates’ point of view.

RESEARCH POPULATION:

In this study, corporate leaders who are decision makers in organizations in Kolkata are a well-defined group of individuals which can be considered as a population.

Sample:

The study uses a sample which consists of 481 corporate leaders in Kolkata from various organizations such as Normura Research Institute, Financial Technologies India Pvt Ltd, Infinity Infotech Parks Ltd, Jyoti Motors Bengal Pvt Ltd, SMS India, IRS-ISSPL, Artintel Systems Laboratories Pvt. Ltd, Alumnus Software Limited, ARB Software India (P) Ltd, Atlas Software Technologies (India) Pvt. Ltd, Acclaris Business Solutions Pvt. Ltd, AMB Computer Integrated Engineering P. Ltd, AIG Systems Solutions Pvt. Ltd, BRI Technologies Pvt. Ltd Kolkata, etc. (North, West, South, and East) by applying probability sampling method (simple random sampling technique) where each unit in the universe will have equal chance of being chosen for the study.

Measures:

In this study, three questionnaires are used to collect the data from 481 corporate leaders from corporate organizations in Kolkata, West Bengal.
Questionnaire 1: The Demographical Sheet
The first questionnaire is the demographical sheet which includes information regarding the respondents’ gender, age, income group & years of experience.

Questionnaire 2: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ)
MLQ Form 6S (the Leader/ Self form) is a survey instrument to provide feedback based on the self-perception of the leaders which is developed by Bass & Avolio, 1992. It consists of 21 items measuring leadership behavior to be rated on 5 point rating scale, scored on seven factors and grouped on three styles i.e. Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership and Passive /Avoidant Behavior. These items can be divided into seven factors: Idealized Influence, Inspirational Motivation, Intellectual Stimulation, Individual Consideration, Contingent Reward, Management-by-Exception, and Laissez-faire. The first four factors are included in the Transformational Leadership set of behaviors. Contingent Reward and Management-by-Exception factors will represent the Transactional Leadership set of behavior. Laissez-faire leadership consists of passive management-by-exception and an avoidant approach to leadership. The leaders have to judge how frequently the behavior described in the statement will be exhibited by him/her.

Reliability and Validity of the Questionnaire 2:
Cronbach’s alphas, measuring reliability of the MLQ–Form 6S scales are (a) Idealized/Charismatic Influence (α = 0.78), (b) Inspirational Motivation (α = 0.81), (c) Intellectual Stimulation (α = 0.75), (d) Individual Consideration (α = 0.74), (e) Contingent Reward (α = 0.73), and (f) Management-by-Exception (α = 0.72).

Questionnaire 3: Leadership Effectiveness Inventory (LEI):
The LEI (©2007 Organization Dimensions) measures the perceived effectiveness of the leader as measured by the standards of their peers and/or subordinates. As anyone who works in situations with leader-peer-subordinate relationships knows, many factors can influence a peer or subordinate's perception of a leader. High scores may be as indicative of the state of the subordinate's mind as they are of the ability of the leader. Leaders having score (13-18) are considered to be an outstanding effective leader who understands both task-related and interpersonal needs. Leaders having score (19-26) indicates a very capable effective leader. Leaders having score (27-33) means a leader who is generally capable, although with some lapses in effectiveness and training could increase their effectiveness. Leaders having the score of (34-44) means that a leader of average ability and subordinates sense their superior lack competence and the leader must need training. Leaders having the score of (45-54) might indicate serious lapses in leadership ability and the leaders having the score (55-78) means that the employer should consider immediate intervention and investigation.

Test Administration: The data collection is undertaken in Kolkata from January to May 2018 by administering 3 questionnaires on 481 respondents representing the corporate leaders of Kolkata.

Demographic Characteristics of Sample:
a) Gender-Wise Distribution: Among the sample (N=481), there are 436 (90.6%) males and 45(9.4%) females.
b) Age-Wise Distribution: The range of age is 18 years to above 55 years which is categorized into 4 parts: Age Category 1 [(18-30) years]: n= 0; Age Category 2 [(30-40) years]: n= 43; Age Category 3 [(40-55) years]: n=300; Age Category 4 (Above 55 years): n= 138. It means that among the sample, 0 %, 8.9 %, 62.4 % and 28.7% are included in age category 1, 2, 3 and 4 respectively.
c) Income-Group Wise Distribution: Income group of corporate leaders are classified into 6 categories: Income group Category 1 [ monthly income having Rs. (50,000-60,000)]: n=0; Income Group Category 2 [monthly income having Rs. (60,000-70,000)]: n=60; Income Group Category 3 [monthly income having Rs. (70000-80000)]: n=0; Income Group Category 4 [monthly income having Rs. (80000-90000)]: n=140, Income Group Category 5 [monthly income having Rs. (90000-100000)]: n=47, Income Group Category 6[monthly income having Rs. (Above 100000)]: n=234. Hence, among the sample 0%, 12.5%, 0%, 29.1%, 9.8% and 48.6% respectively are included in income group 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 respectively.
d) Work-Experience Wise Distribution: Work experience of corporate leaders are classified into 4 categories: Work Experience Category 1 [(0-10) years of work experience]: n= 49; Work Experience Category2 [(10-20) years of experience]: n=157; Work Experience Category 3 [(20-30) years of work experience]: n=188 and
work Experience Category 4[30-40) years of work experience]: n=87. Hence, among the sample 10.2%, 32.6%, 39.1% and 18.1% are included in income group 1, 2, 3, 4 respectively.

DATA ANALYSIS:

Data analysis will be done by applying parametric statistics (like mean, SD) and non-parametric statistics (chi-square analysis) for categorical scores with the help of SPSS package (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) 23.

Descriptive Statistics:

Referring to table 2, the mean of leadership effectiveness score is 3.096 & standard deviation is 1.586. Again, the mean of leadership style is 1.692 & standard deviation is 0.6929. Frequency table for leadership style (Figure 2) and leadership effectiveness (Figure 3) are shown.

Testing of Hypothesis:

Referring to the table 5, among all 481 corporate leaders, 212 leaders are transformational leaders, 205 leaders are transactional leaders and 64 leaders are laissez-faire leaders. Among all the transformational leaders, 15.2% are outstanding effective leaders who understand both task-related and interpersonal needs, 16.2% are very capable effective leaders where observation and training could improve their performance. 4.2% are perceived as generally capable leaders, although with some lapses in effectiveness and training could increase their effectiveness. 7.1% are considered as average leaders so far as leadership effectiveness is concerned and for them, subordinates sense their superior lack competence where training must be required. 0.2% is considered as ineffective leaders where serious lapses are found in their leadership ability and thus, investigation and observation should be advised where training is required. Among them, 1.2% is evil leaders which mean that the employer should consider immediate intervention and investigation.

Similarly, (see table 5) among all the transactional leaders 3.5% are outstanding effective leaders, 6.4% are very capable effective leaders .3.3% are perceived as generally capable leaders, 21% are average leaders in terms of leadership effectiveness, 0.6% are ineffective leaders and 7.7% is evil leaders.

Among all the laissez-faire leaders, 1% is outstanding effective leaders, 2% are very capable effective, 1.7% is generally capable leaders, 5.6% are average Leaders in terms of leadership effectiveness and 0.4% are ineffective leaders. Among them, 3.3% is evil leaders.

Referring to the table 5, it is clear that among transformational corporate leaders 35.6% are effective leaders, among transactional corporate leaders 13.2% are effective leaders and among laissez-faire corporate leaders 4.7% are effective leaders.

Referring to the table 6, the Pearson Chi-Square value of the test statistic is 137.693 and the corresponding p-value of the test statistic is less than 0.001. There was a significant association between leadership style and leadership effectiveness. Therefore, the hypothesis H1 is accepted and it can be concluded that there is association between leadership style and perceived leadership effectiveness of corporate leaders in Kolkata from subordinates’ point of view. Referring to the figure 7, the clustered bar chart confirms what the p-value indicates and highlights the group categories and the frequency of counts in these groups and indicates that the observed values for each category are very similar to the expected values for each category.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION:

The present study concludes that leadership style (transformational, transactional, and laissez faire) of corporate leaders is related to their perceived leadership effectiveness from subordinates’ view point in Kolkata. The study also shows that among transformational corporate leaders 35.6% are effective leaders, among transactional corporate leaders 13.2% are effective leaders and among laissez-faire corporate leaders 4.7% are effective leaders. From the research, it can be concluded that transformational leadership style is considered as the most effective leadership style as compared to transactional and laissez-faire leadership style so far as leadership effectiveness is concerned.

CONCLUSION:

This study found that transformational leadership style is the most effective leadership style so far as leadership effectiveness is concerned in case of corporate leaders in Kolkata as compared to transactional & laissez-faire
leadership styles. Corporate leaders need to understand that for leadership to be effective, it must be built on a solid foundation of a clear mission, a vision for the future, a specific strategy, and a culture conducive to success. The best leaders positively impact long-term organizational culture and values through self-modelling of behaviours, creating cultural expectations, and formally communicating cultural expectations. Since transformational leaders are generally energetic, enthusiastic, and passionate, they are able to inspire followers to change expectations, perceptions, and motivations to work towards common goals. Thus, groups led by transformational corporate leaders have higher levels of performance and satisfaction than the groups led by other types of leaders, because transformational leaders believe that their followers can do their best, leading members of the group to feel inspired and empowered. The results of this study suggest that a transformational leadership style, which both conveys a sense of trust and individual challenges and develops employees, also has a positive effect on employee well-being and thus leadership becomes most effective.

Transactional leadership focuses on results, conforms to the existing structure of an organization and measures success according to that organization’s system of rewards and penalties. Transactional leaders have formal authority and positions of responsibility in an organization and are responsible for maintaining routine by managing individual performance and facilitating group performance. This type of leader sets the criteria for their workers according to previously defined requirements.

Lack of role awareness among corporate laissez-faire leaders may lead to poorly defined roles within the group. Since laissez-faire leaders are often seen as unconcerned with what is happening, which can lead to a lack of cohesiveness within the group and followers sometimes express less care and concern for the work. Some leaders might avoid personal responsibility for the group's failures. Laissez-faire leadership represents passivity or even an outright avoidance of true leadership. In such cases, these leaders do nothing to try to motivate followers, do not recognize the efforts of team members, and make no attempts at involvement with the group and thus this type of leadership style can result in low leadership effectiveness in corporate sector. The results of this study are important for academic field and for decision makers and also for future executives in the corporate sector.

LIMITATION: This study considers only 481 corporate leaders in Kolkata and there is very short time span for conducting the research only in Kolkata but the number is not satisfactory to conclude the relationship between leadership style and leadership effectiveness in the corporate organizations. Thus, future studies should be recommended to consider more leaders to reflect the relationship between leadership style and leadership effectiveness of corporate leaders in Kolkata. Sometimes subordinates may, for personal reasons, dislike their leader, or may have a general problem with anyone with authority and answer the Leadership Effectiveness Inventory with undue or unjustified harshness or, if they personally like the leader, may answer with unwarranted generosity. Finally, the present research is cross-sectional in nature that means the data is collected for one-time period. This study takes a one-shot of corporate leaders’ leadership style. Instead, a longitudinal approach that permits following up of these leaders for a number of years would yield more meaningful information in order to assess the predictive validity for future.
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**Figure 1: Bar diagram showing Gender- Wise Distribution of the Sample**
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**Figure 2: Bar diagram showing Age- Wise Distribution of the Sample**
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Figure 3: Bar diagram showing Income Group Wise-Distribution of the Sample
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Figure 4: Bar diagram showing Work Experience Wise-Distribution of the Sample
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Figure 5: Histogram showing Leadership Style of Corporate Leaders in Kolkata
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Figure 6: Histogram showing Leadership Effectiveness of Corporate Leaders in Kolkata
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Figure 7: Clustered Bar Chart showing the Group Categories and the Frequency of Counts in these groups

![Clustered Bar Chart showing the Group Categories and the Frequency of Counts in these groups](image)

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

| Statistic | N | Minimum Statistic | Maximum Statistic | Mean Statistic | Std. Deviation Statistic | Skewness Statistic | Kurtosis Statistic |
|-----------|---|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Gender(Male=0, Female=1) | 481 | .0 | 1.0 | .094 | .2915 | 2.800 | .111 | 5.865 | .222 |
| Age | 481 | 2.0 | 4.0 | 3.198 | .5814 | -.051 | .111 | -.321 | .222 |
|                  | N  | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|------------------|----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|----------|----------|
| **Income Group** | 481| 2.0     | 6.0     | 4.821 | 1.3683         | -.850    | -.421    |
| **Work Experience as a manager** | 481| 8.0     | 32.0    | 19.135| 6.1611         | .277     | -.099    |
| **Valid N (listwise)** | 481|         |         |       |                |          |          |

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics-Frequencies

|                  | Leadership Style(Transformational=1, Transactional=2, laissez-faire=3) | Leadership Effectiveness(Outstanding Effective Leader, 2=Very Capable Effective Leader, Capable Effective Leader, Average Leader, Ineffective Leader, Evil Leader) |
|------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| N                | Valid 481 Missing 1                                                  | Valid 481 Missing 1                                                                                                               |
| Mean             | 1.7692                                                               | 3.096                                                                                                                             |
| Median           | 2.000                                                                | 3.000                                                                                                                             |
| Mode             | 1.0                                                                   | 4.0                                                                                                                               |
| Std. Deviation   | .6929                                                                 | 1.5861                                                                                                                            |
| Variance         | .480                                                                  | 2.516                                                                                                                             |
| Skewness         | .495                                                                  | .305                                                                                                                              |
| Std. Error of Skewness | .111                                                               | .111                                                                                                                             |
| Kurtosis         | -.844                                                                 | -.891                                                                                                                             |
| Std. Error of Kurtosis | .222                                                               | .222                                                                                                                             |
| Range            | 2.0                                                                   | 5.0                                                                                                                               |
| Sum              | 814.0                                                                 | 1489.0                                                                                                                            |

Table 3: Frequency Table (Leadership Style)

| Leadership Style(Transformational=1, Transactional=2, Laissez-faire=3) | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| Valid                                                                  | 481       | 99.8    | 100.0         |                    |
| 1.0                                                                    | 212       | 44.0    | 44.1          | 44.1               |
| 2.0                                                                    | 205       | 42.5    | 42.6          | 86.7               |
| 3.0                                                                    | 64        | 13.3    | 13.3          | 100.0              |
| Missing System                                                        | 1         | .2      |               | 100.0              |
| Valid                                                                  | 482       | 100.0   |               |                    |
Table 4: Frequency Table (Leadership Effectiveness)

Leadership Effectiveness (Outstanding Effective Leader, 2=Very Capable Effective Leader, Capable Effective Leader, Average Leader, Ineffective Leader, Evil Leader)

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 1.0       | 95      | 19.7          | 19.8               |
| 2.0       | 115     | 23.9          | 43.7               |
| 3.0       | 44      | 9.1           | 52.8               |
| 4.0       | 162     | 33.6          | 86.5               |
| 5.0       | 6       | 1.2           | 87.7               |
| 6.0       | 59      | 12.2          | 100.0              |
| **Total** | **481** | **99.8**     | **100.0**          |

Missing

| System | %     |
|--------|-------|
|        | .2    |
| **Total** | **482** | **100.0** |

Table 5: The Cross Tabulation Table

Leadership Style (Transformational=1, Transactional=2, Laissez-faire=3) * Leadership Effectiveness (Outstanding Effective Leader, 2=Very Capable Effective Leader, Capable Effective Leader, Average Leader, Ineffective Leader, Evil Leader) Cross tabulation

| Leadership Style (Transformational =1, Transactional =2, Laissez-faire=3) | Leadership Effectiveness (Outstanding Effective Leader, 2=Very Capable Effective Leader, Capable Effective Leader, Average Leader, Ineffective Leader, Evil Leader) Count % of Total | Total % |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
|                             | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | Total |
| Count                      | 73  | 78  | 20  | 34  | 1   | 6   | 212   |
| % within Leadership Style(Transformational=1, Transactional=2, Laissez-faire=3) | 34.4% | 36.8% | 9.4% | 16.0% | 0.5% | 2.8% | 100.0% |
| % within LE(Outstanding Effective Leader, 2=Very Capable Effective Leader, Capable Effective Leader, Average Leader, Ineffective Leader, Evil Leader) | 76.8% | 67.8% | 45.5% | 21.0% | 16.7% | 10.2% | 44.1% |
| % of Total Count           | 15.2% | 16.2% | 4.2% | 7.1% | 0.2% | 1.2% | 44.1% |
| 2.0 | 17  | 31  | 16  | 101 | 3   | 37  | 205   |
| % within Leadership Style(Transformational=1, Transactional=2, Laissez-faire=3) | 8.3% | 15.1% | 7.8% | 49.3% | 1.5% | 18.0% | 100.0% |
| % within LE(Outstanding Effective Leader, 2=Very Capable Effective Leader, Capable Effective Leader, Average Leader, Ineffective Leader, Evil Leader) | 17.9% | 27.0% | 36.4% | 62.3% | 50.0% | 62.7% | 42.6% |
| % of Total Count           | 3.5% | 6.4% | 3.3% | 21.0% | 0.6% | 7.7% | 42.6% |
| 3.0 | 5   | 6   | 8   | 27  | 2   | 16  | 64    |
| % within Leadership Style(Transformational=1, Transactional=2, Laissez-faire=3) | 7.8% | 9.4% | 12.5% | 42.2% | 3.1% | 25.0% | 100.0% |

Vol.--V, Special Issue_1, August 2018 [53]
| Leadership Effectiveness (Outstanding Effective Leader, 2=Very Capable Effective Leader, Capable Effective Leader, Average Leader, Ineffective Leader, Evil Leader) | Total |
|---|---|
| 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | **13.3%** |
| 5.3% | 5.2% | 18.2% | 16.7% | 33.3% | 27.1% |

| % of Total Count | % within Leadership Style(Transformational=1, Transactional=2, laissez-faire=3) | N of Valid Cases |
|---|---|---|
| 95 | 115 | 44 | 162 | 6 | 59 | 481 | 100.0% |
| 1.0% | 1.2% | 1.7% | 5.6% | 0.4% | 3.3% | 13.3% |
| 19.8% | 23.9% | 9.1% | 33.7% | 1.2% | 12.3% |

| % of Total | % within LE(Outstanding Effective Leader, 2=Very Capable Effective Leader, Capable Effective Leader, Average Leader, Ineffective Leader, Evil Leader) | **100.0%** |
|---|---|
| 19.8% | 23.9% | 9.1% | 33.7% | 1.2% | 12.3% |

Table 6: Chi-Square Tests

| Chi-Square Tests | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance (2-sided) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 137.693* | 10 | .000 |
| Likelihood Ratio | 146.136 | 10 | .000 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 105.355 | 1 | .000 |
| N of Valid Cases | 481 | |

a. 3 cells (16.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .80.