

## Whistle Blowing and Leadership Style- Indian Context

**Dr.Sowmya S**

Assistant Professor in Commerce

Department of Commerce Bangalore University

### Abstract:

India is a democratic country, where people like to be ruled out by democracy as a rule. This culture is identified as leader's quality too. Leaders are not only born, but can also be created. This is the new theory of leadership. Whistle blowing in simple means reporting by employees about wrongdoing by their employers in the organizations seeking for corrective action to curb the unethical practices which majorly affects the public interest. The present study aims in understanding the nature of whistle blowers which reflects the employee action towards whistle blowing and this forming the base to examine the relationship between whistle blowing and leadership style. The study considers respondents group being classified as reporters, non-reporters and others based on their perception towards reporting behavior when the respondents observe serious wrongdoing in their organization. The autocratic, democratic, paternistic, charismatic and free reign styles of leadership is being considered in testing the hypotheses. The study is empirical in nature, testing the perception of employees working in different sectors of state level public enterprises in Karnataka (India). Out of 524 respondent's data, the study revealed there is significant relationship between leadership style and employee action towards whistle blowing. The leadership style (autocratic/democratic and charismatic) is significantly associated with employee whistle blowing. The demographic style of leadership is associated with reporting groups (Whistle blowers), while the autocratic style of leadership is mostly associated with non-reporting groups (Non-whistle blowers) and the charismatic leadership is mostly associated with other group (not whistle blowers who are other than whistleblowers and non whistle blowers).

### Keywords:

Whistle blowing, leadership style, autocratic, democratic, and charismatic

### Introduction

The success of any project depends on the performance of the project team. Leader leads, but follower follows is the traditional or conventional style of group management. But the old theory of leadership does not suit the present scenario. There is a need for new theory which explains the role of team members in a group. The new theory must consider each member of the group as a performer rather than just follower.

A leadership style is a leader's style of providing direction, implementing plans and motivating people. Leadership is influencing people by providing purpose, direction, and motivation while operating to accomplish the mission and improving the organization **U.S Army (1983)<sup>1</sup>**. There is lack of studies pertaining to examining the relationship between whistle blowing and Leadership style. However, one of the study found examined the relationship between whistle blowing and transformational leadership style. Employees were more comfortable blowing the whistle when they perceived organizational leaders and managers were practicing transformational leadership than when they perceived they were not **Caillier J G-(2013)<sup>2</sup>**. The transformational leaders inspire individuals within the organization to transcend their own self-interest for the greater good of the organization **Robbins (2008:432)<sup>3</sup>**. Leaders who are more transformative are likely to have followers who are more likely to voice. Positive team content was associated with more individuals willing to voice. This suggests the role of the team leader can also include building a favorable climate for voice. With increase number of women in the managerial cadre, the gender role leadership is of significant to study. When they are in positions of authority, women leadership styles impact workplace voice behavior. Not only women in higher organizational positions are more likely to engage in voice behavior themselves, they may also create

<sup>1</sup> U.S Army (1983). Military leadership. Field Manual 22-100. Washington, DC:US Government Printing Office.2.

<sup>2</sup> Caillier, J. G. (2013). Do Employees Feel Comfortable Blowing the Whistle When Their Supervisors Practice Transformational Leadership?. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(14), 1020-1028.

<sup>3</sup> Organizational commitment (n.d)(pdf), Retrieved on 16 february 2015 from [www.press.anu.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/a.pdf](http://www.press.anu.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/a.pdf)

a more favorable climate for others to voice, as well **Ronald J Burke, Cary L Cooper**<sup>4</sup>. The motives behind the voice behavior in men and women as been proposed by Ronald J Burke, which says the equity theory is more likely to explain why women engage in voice behavior while expectancy theory is more likely to explain why men engage in voice behavior. And women will be more likely to engage in voice behavior on behalf of others.

For virtually all aspects of organizational activity, effective leadership leads to improvement of performance. This extends to encouraging employees to come forward with reports of wrongdoing and ensuring that the organization protects them. Leadership in the context of reporting wrongdoing comprehends **Peter Roberts, et al (2011)**<sup>5</sup>.

1. Actively engendering a culture supportive of whistle blowing and a culture of consistency, openness and transparency.
2. An emphasis on sorting out bullying and harassment.
3. Drawing the connection between whistle blowing, ethics and integrity.
4. Resisting the temptation for leaders to simply look after their own position when under political pressure.

**Kanika T. Bhal , Anubha Dadhich (2011)**<sup>6</sup>, the authors studied the impact of ethical leadership and leader–member exchange on whistle blowing. The authors explored the moderating role of the moral intensity of the issue on this relationship. The study was experimental studies, conducted on the postgraduate students of a premier technology institute in India. Ethical leadership, leader–member exchange, and moral intensity were manipulated through scenarios. Results showed that not only ethical leadership and leader–member exchange predict whistle blowing, but these relationships get moderated by the moral intensity of the issue.

### Definition of Whistle Blowing

Whistle blowing in simple means reporting by employees about wrongdoing by their employers in the organizations seeking for corrective action to curb the unethical practices which majorly affects the public interest. According to **Hellriegel, Jackson, Staude and Associates (2001)**<sup>7</sup>, “whistle blower’s as employers to other people or organizations that are capable of their employers to other people or organizations that are capable of taking corrective action”.

**Camerer (2001)**<sup>8</sup> defines whistle –blowing in its most general form as involving calling public attention to wrongful acts, typically in order to avert harm. **Eaton and Akers (2007)**<sup>9</sup> say whistle blowing in its simplest form involves the act of reporting wrongdoing within an organization to internal and/ or external parties.

According to **Daft (2006)**<sup>10</sup> “Whistle blowing is the employee’s disclosure of illegal, immoral, or illegitimate practices on the employer’s part”.

Similarly, **Judy Nadler and Miriam Schulman**<sup>11</sup> defines, “whistle blowing means calling attention to wrongdoing that is occurring within an organization”.

### Objective of the study

1. To know the reporting nature (employee action towards whistle blowing) of the respondents.
2. To examine the leadership style affecting the employees on whistle blowing in Karnataka State Public Enterprises.

<sup>4</sup> Ronald J Burke, Cary L Cooper. Edited book. Voice and whistle blowing in organizations. Pg:284,290.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Roberts, Alexander Jonathan, Brown, Jane Olsen (2011). Whistling while they work. pg:21. Business and Economics Book.

<sup>6</sup> Kanika T Bhal, Anubha Dadhich (2011) “Impact of ethical leadership and leader- member exchange on whistle blowing: the moderating impact of the moral intensity of the issue”. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.103.

<sup>7</sup> Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S.E., Slocum, J., Staude, G. & Associates (2004). *Management*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

<sup>8</sup> Camerer, C. (2001). Protecting whistle blowers: the protected disclosures Act. *Organization day*, 7 February, p. 21.

<sup>9</sup> Eaton, T., & Akers, M.D.( 2007). Whistle blowing and good governance, *CPA Journal*, 77(6), 66-71

<sup>10</sup> Daft, R.L. (2006). *The new era of management*. International edition. Australia: South Western Thompson.

<sup>11</sup> Judy Nadler and Miriam Schulman, “Whistle Blowing in the Public Sector”. Retrieved on on 16 February 2015 from <http://www.scu.edu>

### Hypothesis of the study

1. **Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** "There is no significant relationship between leadership style (autocratic) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

**Research Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** "There is significant relationship between leadership style (autocratic) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

2. **Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** "There is no significant relationship between leadership style (democratic) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

**Research Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** "There is significant relationship between leadership style (democratic) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

3. **Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** "There is no significant relationship between leadership style (paternistic) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

**Research Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** "There is significant relationship between leadership style (paternistic) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

4. **Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** "There is no significant relationship between leadership style (Charismatic) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

**Research Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** "There is significant relationship between leadership style (Charismatic) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

5. **Null Hypothesis ( $H_0$ ):** "There is no significant relationship between leadership style (free reign) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

**Research Hypothesis ( $H_1$ ):** "There is significant relationship between leadership style (free reign) and employee action towards whistle blowing".

### Research Methodology

The research methodology includes the details about data collection method, sampling technique and size, sample design, and pilot study report.

### DATA COLLECTION:

The primary data has been collected using the questionnaire method and direct interview method. The structured questionnaire has been prepared using a 5 point Likert scale. The questionnaire was addressed to employees working in Karnataka State Public Enterprises in Karnataka. The Questionnaire consists of two parts, wherein PART A consists of general information and profile of employees and PART B consists of multiple choice questions. The questionnaire was pre-tested with the sample size of fifty in the pilot study.

### SAMPLING TECHNIQUE AND SIZE:

The random stratified sampling method has been selected. The sample tested includes the employees working in selected public enterprises in Karnataka State. The sample size consists of **524** employees working in selected public enterprises in Karnataka State across different sectors namely agriculture, finance, infrastructure, manufacturing, service, power. The actual data was collected from 18 enterprises visited.

### Pilot study and reliability testing

The pilot study was done with an objective of pre-testing the reliability and consistency of the schedules prepared. Nearly 6 months was spend for pilot study. The questionnaire was filtered in three stages.

The following observations were made in the process.

1. The data collected was entered in SPSS software to analyze the data. Each question was sequentially coded.
2. Part-A of the questionnaire which included the demographic profile of the respondents, satisfied in application and analyzing the data collected. A minute changes was done in Part-A, where the relevancy of open ended and close ended questions being checked.
3. Part-B, section -1 of the questionnaire which included the questions to know the statements deciding leadership style. The 5 point Likert Scale is being used in the questionnaire with 1 as strongly disagree, 2 as disagree, 3 as neutral, 4 as agree and 5 as strongly agree. The cronbach's alpha was calculated with the sample of 30 responses.

The following Table 1 shows the value of Cronbach's alpha.

**TABLE 1**

**Pilot Study Reliability Analysis Results**

| Sl. No | Organization Factors(codes) | Alpha value-factors | Remarks.   |
|--------|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------|
| 1.     | Leadership style(oa1-oa18)  | 0.896-18            | Excellent* |

\*Nunally

**Research Data Analysis**

**Descriptive Statistics**

**Table 2**

**Table Showing Frequency Analysis for**

**Reporting Wrongdoing Nature of the Sample Respondents**

| Sl. No | Reporting Nature              | No of Respondents | Valid Percent |
|--------|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| 1      | Report it                     | 205               | 39.1          |
| 2      | Don't want to report          | 8                 | 1.5           |
| 3      | Keep silent                   | 172               | 32.8          |
| 4      | Try to inform it Is not right | 13                | 2.5           |
| 5      | Both 1&4                      | 116               | 22.1          |
| 6      | Both 3 & 4                    | 3                 | 0.6           |
| 7      | Discuss with colleagues       | 5                 | 1             |
| 8      | Others                        | 2                 | 0.4           |
|        | <b>Total</b>                  | <b>524</b>        | <b>100</b>    |

**Source: SPSS Data Analysis**

TABLE 2 depicts the reporting wrongdoing nature of the sample respondents. Out of 524 sample respondents, 39.1 percent of them said they will report it, 32.8 percent of them said they keep silent when they observe wrongdoing from their superiors, 22.1 percent of them said they try to inform him it is not right at first followed by reporting as subsequent action, 2.5 percent of them said they try to inform the wrongdoer what he/she doing is not correct/right, 1.5 percent of them said they don't want to report, 1 percent of them said they discuss with their colleagues, 0.6 percent of them said they try to inform wrongdoer as not right and keeping quiet as subsequent action, 0.4 percent of them said they did other options, which was not revealed by the respondents.

The leadership style is the independent variable. The dependent variable is nature of whistle blowing identified with the different action groups namely reporters, non-reporters and others. **Table 3**

**Table Showing Frequency Analysis for Classification of Respondents**

| Classification of Respondents | No of Respondents | Valid Percent |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Reporters                     | 321               | 61.3          |
| Non-Reporters                 | 183               | 34.9          |
| Others                        | 20                | 3.8           |
| <b>Total</b>                  | <b>524</b>        | <b>100</b>    |

**Source: SPSS Data Analysis**

TABLE 3 classified the respondents based on their reporting wrongdoing nature into three main groups as reporters, non-reporters and others. Accordingly out of 524 sample respondents, 61.3 percent are willing to report or actually

reported the observed wrongdoing in their organization, 34.9 percent are not willing to report or keep silent and do not want to report, and 3.8 percent included other category such as trying to inform wrongdoer as not correct, discussing with colleagues and other unrevealed options.

The following table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for each variable.

Table 4

Table Showing Frequency Analysis for Leadership Style Factors

| Sl.no | Items                                                          | Strongly Agree                  | Agree      | Neutral    | Disagree   | Strongly Disagree | Total     |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------|-----------|
|       |                                                                | 5                               | 4          | 3          | 2          | 1                 |           |
| A     | LEADERSHIP STYLE:                                              | No of Respondents/( Percentage) |            |            |            |                   |           |
| 1     | I have been dictated by my superior to do what he says.        | 62(11.9%)                       | 124(23.7%) | 92(17.7%)  | 175(33.6%) | 68(13.1%)         | 521(100%) |
| 2     | I have not considered in the process of decision making.       | 49(9.4%)                        | 130(25.0%) | 120(23.1%) | 132(25.4%) | 89(17.1%)         | 520(100%) |
| 3     | My feedback is not valued.                                     | 73(14.0%)                       | 197(37.8%) | 132(25.3%) | 78(15.0%)  | 41(7.9%)          | 521(100%) |
| 4     | My superior expects me to obey him without questioning.        | 71(13.6%)                       | 154(29.6%) | 80(15.4%)  | 121(23.2%) | 95(18.2%)         | 521(100%) |
| 5     | I am not given the chance to take any initiative.              | 58(11.1%)                       | 171(32.8%) | 93(17.9%)  | 102(19.6%) | 97(18.6%)         | 521(100%) |
| 6     | I have not been asked for any opinion or suggestion            | 56(10.8%)                       | 191(36.7%) | 83(16.0%)  | 111(21.3%) | 79(15.2%)         | 520(100%) |
| 7     | My superior shows high concern upon my sentiments and emotions | 58(11.1%)                       | 143(27.4%) | 155(29.8%) | 109(20.9%) | 56(10.7%)         | 521(100%) |
| 8     | My superior helps and counsels me at the time of difficulties. | 93(17.9%)                       | 201(38.6%) | 93(17.9%)  | 87(16.7%)  | 47(9.0%)          | 521(100%) |
| 9     | I'm completely dependent upon my superior's guidelines.        | 153(29.4%)                      | 122(23.4%) | 110(21.1%) | 118(22.6%) | 18(3.5%)          | 521(100%) |

|    |                                                                                          |            |            |            |            |            |           |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| 10 | My superior encourages at my weak job performance.                                       | 55(10.6%)  | 136(26.1%) | 106(20.3%) | 129(24.8%) | 95(18.2%)  | 521(100%) |
| 11 | My superior is vision/goal oriented person.                                              | 91(17.5%)  | 198(38.0%) | 143(27.4%) | 51(9.8%)   | 38(7.3%)   | 521(100%) |
| 12 | I have been inspired and empowered by my superior's taught.                              | 89(17.1%)  | 211(40.6%) | 109(21.0%) | 64(12.3%)  | 47(9.0%)   | 520(100%) |
| 13 | My superior considers ethics and values in his dealings.                                 | 115(22.1%) | 221(42.5%) | 118(22.7%) | 48(9.2%)   | 18(3.5%)   | 520(100%) |
| 14 | My superior feels accountable and responsible.                                           | 125(24.0%) | 270(51.9%) | 85(16.3%)  | 27(5.2%)   | 13(2.5%)   | 520(100%) |
| 15 | My superior gives more importance to human values and concern than organizational goals. | 62(11.9%)  | 149(28.6%) | 133(25.5%) | 78(15.0%)  | 99(19.0%)  | 521(100%) |
| 16 | My superior has given complete freedom at work place.                                    | 74(14.2%)  | 180(34.6%) | 111(21.3%) | 73(14.0%)  | 82(15.8%)  | 520(100%) |
| 17 | My superior does not wish to interfere at my task/job/work.                              | 57(11.0%)  | 103(19.8%) | 123(23.7%) | 116(22.3%) | 121(23.3%) | 520(100%) |
| 18 | I can take independent decisions.                                                        | 37(7.1%)   | 99(19.0%)  | 95(18.2%)  | 122(23.4%) | 168(32.2%) | 521(100%) |

Table 5

Table Showing Descriptive Statistics (N, Mean and Standard Deviation) for Leadership Style Factors

| Sl. No | Variables                                                       | N   | Mean        | Std. Deviation |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------------|----------------|
| 1      | I have not been dictated by my superior to do what he says.     | 521 | 2.88        | 1.249          |
| 2      | I have been considered in the process of decision making.       | 520 | 2.84        | 1.242          |
| 3      | My feedback is valued.                                          | 521 | <b>3.35</b> | 1.132          |
| 4      | My superior does not expect me to obey him without questioning. | 521 | 2.97        | 1.343          |

|    |                                                                                          |     |             |       |
|----|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|-------------|-------|
| 5  | I am given the chance to take any initiative.                                            | 521 | 2.98        | 1.31  |
| 6  | I have been asked for any opinion or suggestion                                          | 520 | 3.07        | 1.272 |
| 7  | My superior shows high concern upon my sentiments and emotions                           | 521 | 3.07        | 1.165 |
| 8  | My superior helps and counsels me at the time of difficulties.                           | 521 | <b>3.4</b>  | 1.214 |
| 9  | I'm completely dependent upon my superior's guidelines.                                  | 521 | <b>3.53</b> | 1.225 |
| 10 | My superior encourages at my weak job performance.                                       | 521 | 2.86        | 1.282 |
| 11 | My superior is vision/goal oriented person.                                              | 521 | <b>3.49</b> | 1.111 |
| 12 | I have been inspired and empowered by my superior's taught.                              | 520 | <b>3.44</b> | 1.175 |
| 13 | My superior considers ethics and values in his dealings.                                 | 520 | <b>3.71</b> | 1.022 |
| 14 | My superior feels accountable and responsible.                                           | 520 | <b>3.9</b>  | 0.91  |
| 15 | My superior gives more importance to human values and concern than organizational goals. | 521 | 2.99        | 1.294 |
| 16 | My superior has given complete freedom at work place.                                    | 520 | <b>3.18</b> | 1.288 |
| 17 | My superior does not wish to interfere at my task/job/work.                              | 520 | 2.73        | 1.312 |
| 18 | I can take independent decisions                                                         | 521 | 2.45        | 1.305 |

### FACTOR ANALYSIS- CONSTRUCTIVE APPROACH (1-18)

In constructive approach the factors are determined without running the factors in software, as elements are predetermined which are associated with each factor. Thus, number of factors is easily estimated. The four types of leadership are considered to be 4 factors. The study considers the constructive approach as a part of factor analysis. To understand the different styles of leadership style, totally 18 elements were considered which are explained as follows.

#### A. DEMOCRATIC STYLE/AUTOCRATIC STYLE (1-6)

The factors from 1 to 6 are considered, where in the statements reflect autocratic or democratic style of leadership. The statements at the time of interview were negative, later it is been converted into positive to get the unbiased results. The values by rating also been considered in shifting at the same time. The mean value is considered to estimate the kind of leadership style. Since the statements are positive at the time of analysis, reflecting lower the mean as autocratic style and higher the mean value as democratic style of leadership.

#### B. PATERNISTIC STYLE (7-10)

The factors from 7 to 10 are considered, where in the statements reflect the paternistic style of leadership. All the statements were kept as it is, being unchanged.

#### C. CHARISMATIC STYLE (11-15)

The factors from 11 to 15 are considered, where in the statements reflect the Charismatic style of leadership. All the statements were kept as it is, being unchanged

#### D. FREE REIGN STYLE(16-18)

The factors from 16 to 18 are considered, where in the statements reflect the free reign style of leadership. All the statements were kept as it is, being unchanged

Table 6

Table Showing Descriptive Statistics for Leadership Style Factors among different action groups (reporters, non-reporters and others)

| SL. NO | FACTORS                                    | REPORTERS |       |       | NON-REPORTERS |      |       | OTHERS |      |       | TOTAL |      |       |
|--------|--------------------------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|---------------|------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
|        |                                            | N         | M     | S.D   | N             | M    | S.D   | N      | M    | S.D   | N     | M    | S.D   |
| 1      | Democratic/Autocratic style of leadership  | 320       | 3.131 | 0.927 | 181           | 2.81 | 0.920 | 20     | 3    | 1.171 | 521   | 3.02 | 0.945 |
| 2      | Paternistic style of leadership            | 320       | 3.238 | 0.797 | 181           | 3.19 | 0.836 | 20     | 3.06 | 0.854 | 521   | 3.21 | 0.812 |
| 3      | Charismatic leadership style               | 320       | 3.713 | 0.833 | 181           | 3.46 | 0.900 | 20     | 3.94 | 0.902 | 521   | 3.63 | 0.868 |
| 4      | Free reign/lazier fair style of leadership | 320       | 2.885 | 0.954 | 181           | 2.75 | 1.009 | 20     | 2.91 | 1.030 | 521   | 2.84 | 0.977 |

TABLE 6 shows the descriptive statistics of leadership style factors based on action groups. The action groups include reporters, non-reporters and other groups.

The demographic style of leadership is mostly associated with reporting group, where the mean value (3.131) is greater than average 3, whereas the autocratic style of leadership is mostly associated with non-reporting group, where the mean value is 2.81 which is less than average 3. The others group is neither associated with autocratic style or democratic style, where the mean value is equal to average 3, which indicates neutral.

The charismatic leadership style is associated with all the three groups. However, it is mostly associated with other groups, where the mean value (3.94) is highest compared to reporters and non-reporters group.

### Hypotheses Testing Results

TABLE 7

Table Showing One-way- ANOVAs Statistics for Leadership Style Factors affecting Whistle Blowing

| Leadership Style Factors                   |                | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig.  |
|--------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|-------|
| Democratic/Autocratic Style Of Leadership  | Between Groups | 11.677         | 2   | 5.838       | 6.677 | 0.001 |
|                                            | Within Groups  | 452.943        | 518 | 0.874       |       |       |
|                                            | Total          | 464.621        | 520 |             |       |       |
| Paternistic Style Of Leadership            | Between Groups | 0.759          | 2   | 0.379       | 0.574 | 0.563 |
|                                            | Within Groups  | 342.547        | 518 | 0.661       |       |       |
|                                            | Total          | 343.307        | 520 |             |       |       |
| Charismatic Leadership Style               | Between Groups | 9.310          | 2   | 4.655       | 6.293 | 0.002 |
|                                            | Within Groups  | 383.153        | 518 | 0.739       |       |       |
|                                            | Total          | 392.463        | 520 |             |       |       |
| Free Reign/Lazier Fair Style of Leadership | Between Groups | 2.268          | 2   | 1.134       | 1.188 | 0.306 |
|                                            | Within Groups  | 494.313        | 518 | 0.954       |       |       |
|                                            | Total          | 496.581        | 520 |             |       |       |

The TABLE 7 shows the ANOVA test results for leadership style affecting whistle blowing. There is a significant relationship between leadership style and employees' action towards whistle blowing. The  $p < 0.05$ , which is significant in case of leadership style (autocratic/democratic and charismatic)

**Result:** Null hypothesis 1 & 3 are rejected and research hypothesis is accepted. There is significant relationship between leadership style factors (being autocratic/democratic and charismatic) and employee reporting actions.

### Research Findings

1. There is significant relationship between leadership style and employee action towards whistle blowing.
2. The leadership style (autocratic/democratic and charismatic) was significantly associated with employee whistle blowing.
3. The demographic style of leadership is associated with reporting groups.(whistle blowers)
4. The autocratic style of leadership is mostly associated with non-reporting groups. (non whistle blowers)
5. The charismatic leadership is mostly associated with other group (not whistle blowers who are other than whistleblowers and non whistle blowers).

### Conclusion

There is a need for democratic style of leadership at the top level. The management support and interaction to employees results in healthy reporting behavior among employees. But unfortunately the presence of leadership style in a leader depends on individual personality traits. This can be dealt by choosing right leader for right issue by the whistle blower. The results reveals that democratic style of leadership encourages whistle blowing and autocratic style of leadership discourage the employees in blowing the whistle and so they are made to keep quite by not reporting the observed wrongdoing. If organization wants to encourage whistle blowing practice among employees, then the leader must be trained in adopting democratic style of leadership to avoid the extremity of the negative situations, which may cause serious injury to the public interests and organization interests at the earliest creating win-win situation.

### Bibliography

1. AC Fernando (2006), *Corporate Governance Principles, Policies and Practices* Pearson Education
2. Brown,A., Lewis,D., Moberly,R., Vandekerckhove,W. (2014).International Handbook on Whistleblowing, Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
3. C.V Baxi(2008), *Corporate Governance- Critical issues* Excel Books
4. Caillier, J. G. (2013). Do Employees Feel Comfortable Blowing the Whistle When Their Supervisors Practice Transformational Leadership? *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(14), 1020-1028.
5. Camerer, C. (2001). Protecting whistle blowers: the protected disclosures Act. *Organization day*, 7 February, p. 21.
6. Daft, R.L. (2006). *The new era of management*. International edition. Australia: South Western Thompson.
7. Daft, R.L. (2006). *The new era of management*. International edition. Australia: South Western Thompson.
8. David Murray(2001), *Ethics in Organizations* 1<sup>st</sup> Edition Crest Publishing House
9. Dennis Tourish. The dark side of transformational leadership- A critical perspective, pg:88,89
10. Eaton, T., & Akers, M.D.( 2007). Whistle blowing and good governance, *CPA Journal*, 77(6), 66-71
11. Glazer Myron. P and Penina Glazer. 1989. The whistleblowers. Newyork, N.Y: Basic Books
12. Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S.E., Slocum, J., Staude, G. & Associates (2004). *Management*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
13. In Burke, R. J., & In Cooper, C. L. (2013). *Voice and whistle blowing in organizations: Overcoming fear, fostering courage and unleashing candour*.
14. Janet P Near, Terry Morehead Dworkin, Marcia P Miceli. "*Whistle blowing in Organizations*", Lea's Organization and Management Series
15. Judy Nadler and Miriam Schulman, "Whistle Blowing in the Public Sector". Retrieved on on 16 February 2015 from <http://www.scu.edu>
16. Kanika T Bhal, Anubha Dadhich (2011) "Impact of ethical leadership and leader- member exchange on whistle blowing: the moderating impact of the moral intensity of the issue". *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol.103.
17. Leadership styles(n.d). retrieved on 28/11/2014 from <http://www.nwlink.com>
18. M.B Shukla, *Corporate Management text and cases*. Himalaya Publishing House
19. Mannel G Velasquez , *Business Ethics Concepts and cases* 5<sup>th</sup> edition- Prentice Hall India

20. Manuel G Velasquez(2005) , *Business Ethics Concepts and cases* 6<sup>th</sup> Edition Prentice Hall India
21. Nunnally J.C (1978), *Psychometric Theory* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.), Newyork: McGraw-Hill
22. Organizational commitment (n.d)(pdf), Retrieved on 16 February 2015 from [www.press.anu.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/a.pdf](http://www.press.anu.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/a.pdf)
23. Peter Roberte, Alexander Jonathan, Brown, Jane Olsen (2011). *Whistling while they work*. pg: 21. Business and Economics Book
24. Peter Roberts, Alexander Jonathan, Brown, Jane Olsen (2011). “Whistling while they work”. pg: 21. Business and Economics Book.
25. R K Sharma, Puneeta Goel, Pooja Bhagwan, *Corporate Governance, Values and Ethics*, Kalyani Publishers
26. Ronald J Burke, Cary L Cooper. Edited book. “Voice and whistle blowing in organizations”. Pg: 284,290.
27. S.A Sherlekas , *Ethics in Management*- Himalaya Publishing House
28. Shashi K Gupta, Rosy Joshi, *Organization Behavior*, Kalyani Publishers
29. Swami(Dr) Parthasarathy, *Corporate Governance Principles, Mechanisms and Practice*
30. U.S Army (1983). *Military leadership. Field Manual 22-100*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.2.
31. William H Shaw(2000) , *Business Ethics* 4<sup>th</sup> Edition Wadsworth Publishing