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Abstract: Leadership is not about speed, it’s about direction. Corporates, politics, sports, spirituality etc. is driven by leaders with utmost direction to their subordinates. Several leaders existed and each had their own style of administering their followers. Focusing into corporate world, leadership plays a dominant role in determining the culture and reputation of an organization. The idea of ‘authenticity’ is a primary factor in leadership which is part of the new era in leadership research. However, various conceptions of authenticity include other traits such as creativity, personal traits, hopefulness, having enduring relationships, confidence, and behaving ethically. ‘Leadership in Management’ is the most appropriate terminology because it connotes more with managerial abilities. Sincere efforts are taken here to formulate a theory based on study of management stalwarts about their practices in leadership. Many scholars have inked a leadership theory for the purpose of enhancing and improvising the organizational behavior. This manuscript is a discovery of particular leadership style which is been practiced by prominent corporate leaders knowingly or unknowingly and has made a tremendous escalation in their respective organization. Terminology LIM abbreviates Leadership in Management. Theory of LIM Law is constituted and tested herewith with solid illustrations in the section Illustrative Paradigm. Adding to spectrum of numerous management theories, this Theory of LIM Law is an extension of Contingency theory which insists that every leadership style is situation based. Few leaders drive the organization with leniency, few with audacity. Ultimate aim is to direct the team towards triumph. Theory of LIM Law depicts a style whereby the leader dominates and leads with efficiency for best results. Disclosure is admitted that this cannot be considered as universal theory for success, but this can be one strong force of behavior to drive the organization. Several other theories are discussed under Literature Review section hereby merely for the purpose of recapping the existing theories and not for comparing those with LIM Law. The term ‘Law’ is titled as those leaders who practiced this style so far has spread it as organizational law. This manuscript thus is an attempt to submit a new theory which is been practiced severely by few leaders and ironically it’s not yet titled. Hereby Theory of LIM Law is submitted after full scrutiny, analysis and experimentation.
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INTRODUCTION

A leader is a person with commanding authority or influence. Few researchers have developed working definitions of leadership. Some define leadership as an integral part of group process (Green, 2002; Krech and Crutchfield, 1948). LIM Law Theory (2017) is inspired by the rules, results and referendum of successful leaders like Jack Welsh, Rupert Murdoch, Jack Harnet and especially Limkokwing proudly called as Tan Sri Lim Kok Wing. Their leadership personas are significant, that all of them have built an empire from scratch to immense. Creativity, Personal traits, innovation were given
priority. Deriving a leadership style from such icons was noteworthy. On the same note, LIM Law Theory is merely not individual-based, however the author has taken efforts to recap various leadership styles that are practiced and may agree LIM Law as an extension of present leadership theories. Many leaders and managers evidently practice the style and action of this theory; however a solid move has been taken now to structure this style as Theory of LIM Law, which is undoubtedly inspired and extracted from eminent leader’s style of managing their subordinates.

Managing a team is complex. Leaders play vital role on it by earning critics and credits consistently. One who is clear on the objectives will carry the skills of leadership prominently. Arguments on ‘like what you do’ or ‘do what you like’ are always on. Employees are highly concerned to do what they like however they need to adapt the organizational environment to love what they do. Excellence in discipline is cultivated herewith as shown in Figure 1.1. An organization fails or triumphs for several reasons, one among it could be ‘leadership’ and ‘discipline’ in the organization. This discipline is subjective, which categorizes within financial discipline, administrative discipline, behavioral discipline, revenue-distribution discipline, policy discipline, developmental discipline and so on. Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) often involve with innovative entrepreneurship and takes-off on business. Later on the leaders play survival the most crucial part. If they misguide, organization fails and if they levy rightful decisions, organization grows. Many anecdotes about bad leadership contain elements of lack of trust, dishonesty, and unwillingness to be held accountable on the part of the leaders. Few even declared, leaders to be servants of their followers (Greenleaf, 1998). Despite the differences, the various definitions of leadership share four common elements. First, leadership is of group and social phenomenon, it’s impossible to have leaders without followers. Second, leadership involves interpersonal influence or persuasion. Leaders move others toward goals & actions. Third, leadership is an action oriented and goal directed; they use influence to guide others through a course of action or towards the achievement of certain goals. Fourth, the manifestation of leaders assumes some form of hierarchy within a group.

![Figure 1.1: Commitment & Excellence driven by Leadership](image)

With blend of all these four elements, a leader can be defined as any person who influences an individual or a big group within an organization, helps them to establish goals, and guides them toward achievement of those goals, thereby allowing them to be effective. Being a leader is about getting things done for, though, and with others. Notice that the definition does not include a formal title and does not define leadership in terms of certain traits or personal characteristics. Neither is necessary to leadership. As is the case with the definition of leadership, effectiveness can be defined in various ways. Fred Fiedler defines leadership effectiveness in terms of group performance. Interestingly, integrity, or lack of integrity, is quoted one of key factors in leadership. The corporate scandals have increased and renewed focus on the importance of transparency and honesty. The GLOBE researchers have found that integrity is one of few culturally universal leadership characteristics (House et al., 2004). In the world of business, new leaders can influence a firm’s credit rating, which can affect the confidence of the financial community.

For example, when Xerox had considerable financial and leadership problems in 2000 and 2001, the selection of Anne Mulcahy, a company veteran, as CEO helped ease stakeholders’ concerns. We know that leadership matters. Some of the traits, namely intelligence and drive, cannot be acquired through training. Others, such as knowledge of the industry and self-confidence, can be acquired with time and appropriate experience.
The trait of honesty is a simple choice. Studies of managers and leaders in other cultures found similar traits present in successful leaders. For example, successful Russian business leaders are characterized by “hard-driving ambition, boundless energy, and keen ability” (Puffer, 1994: 41).

![Figure 1.2: Leadership Elements](image)

Chinese business leaders value hard work and an impeccable reputation for integrity. Being hard-driving to the point of being a workaholic is not an uncommon trait in U.S. business executives either. Surveys indicate that 60 percent of people in high-earning jobs work more than 50 hours a week; 35 percent more than 60 hours a week (Armour, 2007). Just as some traits are necessary for leadership, they can be detrimental when carried to an extreme (Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991). A leader with too much drive might refuse to delegate primary tasks to his/her followers. Much of the early research in leadership characteristics focused on establishing leadership abilities. Although leaders clearly must have some abilities, competencies, and skills, these characteristics do not have high correlations to leadership effectiveness (for a review of the early research, see Bass, 1990). Intelligence and creativity have been the primary focus in the area of abilities; technical, interpersonal, and cognitive skills are the focus in that area. Figures 1.3 illustrates characteristics of positive leaders.

![Figure 1.3: Characteristics of Positive Leaders](image)

**THEORY OF LIM LAW**

Theory of LIM Law: Every theory is coined with particular study of situation, whereas this Theory of LIM Law is constituted and inspired after witnessing few eminent leaders who has groomed their organization to reach heights. Few like Jack Hartnett (President, D.L. Rogers Corp., USA), Limkokwing (President, Limkokwing University, Malaysia), Rupert Murdoch (Chairman, News Corp, USA), etc. are tremendously successful in managing people by their remarkable leadership style. This Theory of LIM
Law is derived from them. Nevertheless, this doesn't mean as universal theory to succeed in leadership recklessly, whereas the attempt is made to highlight this as one of a practice in leadership styles. At one stage the leaders have treated this practice as even organizational law. High concern is given to management perspective than rational notions. Leaders like Jack Welsh of GE were titled as rude leader; however the ultimate benefit of his association with GE has helped the company to grow in folds. Thus the components like ‘emotions’ and ‘sentiments’ are isolated from the viewpoint of this theory. The term ‘lenient-leader’ is like oxymoron (a). Never a leader was found lenient in vision or management and claims to be on right journey. Employees need to be given discipline. This can be either injected or instructed. Following is the absolute theory definition.

**Theoretical Definition**

“Continuous instruction passed to lower officials by the leader with insolent enforcement until the receivers perform beyond expectation to the extent of exhausting and grueling themselves, the Leader then steps in to cultivate this as habitual application to receiver with measures to retain them and progress the organization.”

**Logical Definition**

Consistent pressure of tasks to subordinates by the leader with ultimate aim to bring in perfection in every level of trade until the followers reach the optimum point of fear and excellence. These leaders have the charisma to turn on this state as custom or tradition to the subordinates. Eventually organizational development and revenue generation is evident.

**Philosophical Connotation**

Racing is less treasured compared to being chased. People run fast while chased, than in a race. Here chasing is a force-factor. Every individual needs force to accomplish the tasks. This ‘force’ could be in form of pressure, fear, discipline, dedication, circumstance and people. Theory of LIM Law suggests, ‘force’ by pressure & fear, which eventually leads to discipline & dedication. Force factor is vaccinated with permissible limit, consequently best output is experienced in the environment.

Numerous theories has evolved since 1950s to 2015 viz. Managerial Grid Model / Leadership Grid model, Role Theory, Fiedler's contingency theory, Hersey-Blanchard Situational Leadership Theory, Path-goal theory, Vroom-Yetton-Jago decision-making model of leadership, Cognitive Resource Theory, Strategic Contingencies Theory, Leader-member Exchange (LMX), Burns Transformational Leadership Theory, Bass Transformational Leadership Theory, Kouzes and Posner's Leadership Participation Inventory etc. (www.leadership-central.com). List is massive that it cannot be restricted to one research paper. Scholars have derived large number of leadership theories. Every successful case studies in corporate has led to one leadership theory. It could be awful to note, but it's a fact that every successful leader portrays an own theory. To an extent this can be argued as healthy too.

**LIM LAW PROPOSITION**

Every leadership style is situation oriented (Contingency Theory). It’s fact that decisions are to be taken depending upon the circumstances with baseline of principles. Traditional leadership behavior followed until Henry Ford era is like control-oriented, whereby the leader does all major tasks such as planning, recruiting, administering, organizing etc. but the execution part was delegated to subordinates. For instance, it was Colonel Sanders (Founder, KFC) who did everything to stabilize his fast-food concept; the execution like preparation and serving strategies was delegated to his line managers. Presently with exorbitant competition prevails and leader is a mere mechanic to fix and strategize issues thus the role-of-all is next thing to impossibility. Leaders have to focus on result and get things to work. Figure 4.1 illustrates the comparison of traditional and current style.

As illustrated in Figure 3.1 majority of the roles are executed by both leader and employees together in current result-oriented leadership. One-man show is non-existent. Ultimate objective of LIM Law is again about result-oriented leadership. The grip on employees are triggered not to enforce ‘control’ but to ensure ‘results’. Few leaders who purposefully wanted to have ‘control’ in their organization have gained not more than short-term success ((Kirkpatrick and Locke, 1991). This makes the author to do literature review on power vs. authority. Both power and authority is dealt consistently by several authors in management field. Evidently power has more credibility than authority. Later is by designation. Leaders possessing control always finds themselves with good grip among employees. Thus in traditional control-oriented leadership it was still successful. However as situation compels to adopt new behavior, current result-oriented leadership is been depicted. Power is not like designation chart, i.e. it can flow in every direction like it can flow right from superior to lower people or junior to senior or between the persons
working at the same level, but different departments of the one organization or between personnel working at all levels of the same organization. Whereas Authority is exercised to get things done through other employees. It is devoted to the position, i.e. any person who gets the designation enjoys the authority attached to it, the higher the position, and the higher would be his or her authority.

Figure 3.1: (Source 'Art of Management and Leadership Style, Avon Nelson) Power vs. Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIS FACTOR</th>
<th>POWER</th>
<th>AUTHORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Power means the ability or potential of an individual to influence others and control their actions.</td>
<td>The legal and formal right to give orders and commands, and take decisions is known as an Authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is it?</td>
<td>It is a personal trait.</td>
<td>It is a formal right, given to the high officials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Knowledge and expertise.</td>
<td>Position &amp; office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>Power does not follow any hierarchy.</td>
<td>Authority follows the hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resides with</td>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legitimate</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Culture and Power

One of the most widely used approaches to understanding the sources of power comes from the classic research by French and Raven (1968). They propose five sources of power vested in the individual: legitimate power, reward power, coercive power, expert power, and referent power.
The first three sources of individual power—legitimate, reward, and coercive—are position powers. Although they are vested in individuals, the individuals’ access to them depends on the position they hold. In the case of legitimate power, most managerial or even supervisory titles in organizations provide the ability to influence others. People with formal titles also typically have access to both rewards and punishments. They can give raises and assign perks, and demote or fire. All three of these sources of individual power depend on the organization that grants them, not the person who holds them. Once the access to title, rewards, or punishment is taken away by the organization, a leader or individual relying on such sources loses power.

Potential Reactions to Individuals Sources of Power

The last two sources of power—expert and referent—are more personal; they are based on who the person is rather than the position he holds. Access to these two sources of power does not depend solely on the organization. A person does not need to have a formal title to be an expert. Additionally, he or she can be respected and liked by others, which provides power to influence others. In the case of expert power, people may influence others because of special expertise, knowledge, information, or skills that others need. We listen to the experts, follow their advice, and accept their recommendations. Alan Greenspan provides an excellent example of expert power. His knowledge, expertise, and an established record of success were the bases of his power. Although Greenspan also held legitimate power, in many other cases those with expert power might not hold official titles or have any legitimate power. Referent power operates in much the same way. Individuals with referent power can influence others because they are liked and respected. As with expert power, this power does not depend on the position or the organization. Greenspan was well liked for his ability to work with others. Employees at ZCoB respect Weinzerig and Saginaw for their vision and leadership style.

The respect and friendship come on top of other considerable sources of power. Because these two sources of power are based on the person, not the position, they cannot be taken away and often provide the power holder with more influence. When a legitimate authority source asks them to, people comply with requests and implement decisions (Yukl and Falbe, 1991). Similarly, we comply to receive rewards or avoid punishment. In the case of coercive power, repeated use may even lead people to resist either openly or passively. Conversely, when an expert or someone we admire makes a request, we will not only comply, we are likely to be committed to the decision. The use of expert and referent powers has been found to be related to higher follower satisfaction and performance (Yukl and Falbe, 1991).

Given these possible reactions, it is critical for leaders to use all different sources of power and rely more heavily on the personal sources. If leaders overuse positional power, they are unlikely to obtain the commitment and buy-in that are necessary to pursue many goals in organizations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literatures were reviewed pertaining to LIM Law primarily. For several years, leadership theories have been the source of numerous studies in Management. Both practically as well as theoretically, many have tried to define trustworthy leaders to stand apart from the crowd. Hence there are as many theories...
on leadership similar to study on philosophy and researchers those have studied to publish ultimately their leadership theory. Few widespread theories are listed down to recap and re-study the existing theories.

**Great Man Theory (1840s)**

The Great Man theory progressed around the mid-19th century. There was no scientific certainty behind this theory, but it insisted that human characteristic or combination were responsible for identifying great leaders. The Great Man theory assumes that the traits of leadership are essential, similar to Theory of Lim Law. It conveys great leaders are born. This theory sees great leaders as those who are destined by birth to become a leader. Furthermore, the belief was that great leaders were groomed when they are raised up with managerial environment. Thomas Carlyle, a writer and teacher, popularized the theory. Just like him, the Great Man theory was inspired by the study of influential heroes.

**Trait Leadership Theory (1940s)**

The Trait leadership theory believes that Leaders are either born or are made with certain qualities that will make them excel in leadership roles. It insisted certain qualities such as intellect; responsibility, creativity and other values are put in anyone to make him/her a commendable leader (Matthews, Deary & Whiteman, 2003, p. 3). This theory focused on analyzing physical, mental and social characteristic in order to gain more understanding of what are the characteristics that are common among leaders. This theory reflects few parts of Theory of LIM Law.

**Behavioral Theory (1950s)**

In reaction to the trait leadership theory, the behavioral theories are offering a new perspective, one that focuses on the behaviors of the leaders as opposed to their mental, physical or social characteristics. Thus, with the evolutions in psychometrics, notably the factor analysis, researchers were able to measure the cause an effects relationship of specific human behaviors from leaders. From this point forward anyone with the right conditioning that 'leaders are made not born.' The behavioral theories first divided leaders in two categories. Those that were concerned with the tasks and those concerned with the people. Throughout the literature these are referred to, as different names, but the essence are identical.

**Contingency Theory (1960s)**

The Contingency Leadership theory debates that there aren’t any single way of leading and every leadership style should be based on certain situations, which signifies that there are certain people who perform at the maximum level in certain places; but at minimal performance when taken out of their element. To a certain extent contingency leadership theories are an extension of the trait theory and also have significance of Theory of LIM Law, in the sense that human traits are related to the situation in which the leaders exercise their leadership. It is generally accepted within the contingency theories that leader are more likely to express their leadership when they feel that their followers will be responsive.

**Transactional Leadership Theory (1970s)**

Transactional theories, commonly known as Exchange theories of leadership, are characterized by a transaction between the leader and followers. This theory illustrates the value of being positive and mutually beneficial relationship between leader and follower. For the transactional theories to be effectual and to have motivational result, the leader must find means to align to adequately reward and punish his subordinates, which should be directly proportionate. In other words, transactional leaders are most efficient when they develop a mutual reinforcing environment.

**Transformational Leadership Theory (1980s)**

The Transformational Leadership theory illustrates that a person interacts with others and is able to create good relationship that will build trust and later result in an increase of motivation, in both leaders and followers. The essence of transformational theories is that leaders transform their followers through their inspirational nature and charismatic personalities. Rules and regulations are flexible, guided by group norms. These attributes provide a sense of belonging for the followers as they can easily identify with the leader and its purpose.

In this manuscript, the reasoning and structure of one kind of leadership is been defined. This theory is inspired after accumulating the rules and results of few leaders’ leadership pattern. Also this theory is an extension of Contingency Theory and Transactional Theory. As stated earlier LIM Law stands on 2 vital forces that treasure leadership skills viz. Creativity and Personality traits.
Transformational leadership factor

**LIM Law Focusing on Creativity**

For several obvious reasons Limkokwing insists on creativity and innovation. 'I have always put my faith in the creativity of people', says Tan Sri Lim as he sat back to reflect. He was convinced that creativity will provide strength for new regional cohesion in Southeast Asia and believed that Malaysian could provide the lead. He wanted every inch of the complex to be supposed by the creativity of industry (AmbiMathe 2011, The Man who designed the future). And on Innovation, he claims that Innovative human capital is what every economy is looking for and fighting to keep because of the enormous value that is now attached to new ideas. Creativity and Innovation was such factors that Limkokwing wanted to adopt in his managerial leadership style. According to a survey of 1,500 executives in 60 countries conducted by IBM in 2010, creativity is the most crucial factor for success in the future (IBM, 2010 Global CEO Study). CEOs participating in the survey believe that creative leaders make more changes, invite disruptive innovation, and are comfortable with ambiguity, all essential for leaders in today's complex organizations. Creativity—also known as divergent thinking or lateral thinking—is the process of bringing into reality something novel and useful.

It is not just about doing something unusual and unexpected; it is about making things work better. It includes elements such as emotional stability, ambition, need for originality, and flexibility (Martinson, 2011). Lateral thinking focuses on moving away from the linear approach advocated by rational decision-making (De Bono, 1992). Caterina Fake, cofounder of the photo-sharing site Flickr, likes to let her curiosity guide her. She states: "I work on whatever instinctively feels the right thing at the moment" (Buchanan, 2010: 69). David Rockwell, the architect who designed the 2009 Academy Award set and the Walt Disney Family Museum, says, "The key is to stay curious.

As you have success in certain areas, you have to find ways to keep alive that sense of discovery, of not knowing all the answers" (Sacks, 2009: 133). Patrick Le Quement, French carmaker Renault's chief designer, is credited with many of the company's cutting-edge and highly unusual designs. He believes that being original is the key to his creativity, stating, "it's worth alienating most of your customers if you can make the rest love you" (Wylie, 2004a: 90).

Creativity is a necessary component of leadership because leaders are often expected to develop new ideas and directions that others will follow. Some research suggests that creative leaders can encourage creativity in employees (Collins and Cooke, 2013) and in their organizations (Mathisen, 2012). Creative leaders listen intently to all sources, especially to bad news, in order to know where the next problem is emerging. They value subjective as well as objective information. They turn facts, perceptions, gut feelings, and intuitions into reality by making bold and informed decisions. Other factors found to be important are modeling creative and unconventional behaviors, delegation, monitoring the process, and showing followers how their work affects the organization (Basadur, 2004). Creative leaders must not only be creative but also have considerable technical expertise to lead their followers through the challenges of creative decision making (Mumford and Licuanan, 2004). Creative leaders typically share four characteristics (Sternberg and Lubart, 1995)
LIM Law Focusing on Personality Traits

Although strong evidence of a consistent relationship between specific traits and leadership effectiveness is lacking, interest in understanding the personal characteristics of leaders continues. In 1974, a thorough review of traits by Stogdill, together with other findings, reestablished the validity of the trait approach, reviving research on the topic. In general, activity level and stamina, socioeconomic class, education, and intelligence, along with a variety of other traits, appear to characterize leaders, and especially effective leaders. The role of situational characteristics, however, is also recognized.

Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) have proposed a modern approach to understanding the role of traits in leadership: Several key traits alone are not enough to make a leader, but they are a precondition for effective leadership. Kirkpatrick and Locke list a number of traits that facilitate a leader’s acquisition of needed leadership skills. The key traits are as follows:

1. Drive, which includes motivation and energy
2. Desire and motivation to lead
3. Honesty and integrity
4. Self-confidence
5. Intelligence
6. Knowledge of the business

Some of the traits, namely intelligence and drive, cannot be acquired through training. Others, such as knowledge of the industry and self-confidence, can be acquired with time and appropriate experience. The trait of honesty is a simple choice. Studies of managers and leaders in other cultures found similar traits present in successful leaders. For example, successful Russian business leaders are characterized by "hard-driving ambition, boundless energy, and keen ability" (Puffer, 1994: 41). Chinese business leaders value hard work and an impeccable reputation for integrity. Being hard-driving to the point of being a workaholic is not an uncommon trait in U.S. business executives either. Surveys indicate that 60 percent of people in high-earning jobs work more than 50 hours a week; 35 percent more than 60 hours a week (Armour, 2007).

The current approach to understanding the role of leadership traits suggests that, as many of us believe, leaders are indeed gifted in at least some areas. Those gifts and talents alone, however, are not enough. Experience, correct choices, and exposure to the right situations are the keys to allowing those gifts to bloom.

Several traits play a role in leadership and can contribute to a leader’s effectiveness in several ways (Zaccaro, 2007).

ILLUSTRATIVE PRAGMATIC

To substantiate Theory of LIM Law, historical evidences are narrated in this section. Parallel leadership traits of Limkokwing, Rupert Murdoch, Akio Morito, Lee Iacocca were found similar with Jack Hartnett, the president of D.L. Rogers Corp., who is a successful man in terms of winning in game of Business. D.L. Rogers owns 54 franchises of the Sonic roller-skating and hamburger chain, which generates $44 million in revenues for the company. Hartnett’s restaurants make 18 percent more than the national average, and employee turnover is incredibly low with a supervisor’s average tenure at 12 years (Department of Labor Shortage Skills, 1998, Bedford, Texas). He knows what he wants, how to keep his employees, and how to run his business for high profit. He runs the business on Sinatra principle, which says 'My Way'; he can tolerate very little deviation from what he wants, his instructions, and his training. He is absolutely sure he knows the best way, and more than one employee is scared of disagreeing with him. He likes keeping people a little off balance and queasy (unsettled) so that they will work harder to avoid his fury. Hartnett will fire those who break any of his principles. One of Hartnett commandment is, ‘I will only tell you one time.’ Interestingly, he believes that his style shows that he really cares about his people: "The success of our business is that we really care about our owner-operators—we don't have managers. Our No. 1 focus is to take care of our people" (Ruggless, 1998).

Hartnett restaurants run like clockwork. He does the top-level hiring himself and is reputed to spend as long as 10 grueling hours with prospective managers and their spouses. Hartnett says, “I want them to understand this is not a job to me. This is a lifetime of working together. I want partners who are going to die with me”. If you are one of the selected few, you are expected to be loyal and obedient. Once a quarter, you can also expect a Hartnett "lock-in" meeting, where Jack will take you away along with other supervisors to a secret location with no chance of escape. You can expect to be blindfolded, put through survival exercises, and sleep in tents before you go to a luxury resort to discuss business.
For all their trouble and unquestioning obedience and loyalty, D.I. Rogers' employees and supervisors find a home, a family, a community, and a place to grow. If you have problems with your husband, like Sharon, the wife of one of the D.I. Rogers' supervisors, you can call Jack. He will listen to you, chew your spouse out, and send him home for a while.

Hartnett says, "I don't want you to come to work unhappy, pissed off, upset, or mad about anything, because I don't think you can be totally focused on making money if you're worried" (Ballon, 1998: 63). He pays his employees considerably above national averages, plays golf with them, and gets involved with their personal lives.

Hartnett wants to create a bond that lasts. A few years ago, he spent $200,000 to take 254 managers and their families to Cancun, Mexico, for four days. They got training on better time management and marketing techniques, and on how to be a better spouse.

Hartnett also likes to have fun. Practical jokes, including gluing supervisors' shoes to the floor, are common. But he also works hard. Eighty-hour weeks are common, and he starts his days earlier than most. He is not above taking on the most menial jobs in the restaurants.

CONCLUSION

'Do what you love' is intelligence whereas this model teaches 'Love what you do' is genius. Theory of LIM Law is directional by force and leads the employee to starting enjoying what they are instructed to do. Illustrative paradigm in earlier section demonstrates that leaders insist result-oriented practice in their organization and this meticulously applies in this theory. On one end, the leader retains all control and makes all decisions without any consultation or even before obtaining any information from the subordinates; few leaders use extreme autocratic or delegation styles; rather, most rely on a style that falls somewhere in between. Similarly, organizations are either entirely team based or make no use of teams at all. Experimentation suggests that Decisions are not delegated by the leaders, whereas results are derived essentially by enforcement of rules and codes depending upon situation. This proves as extension of Contingency theory.
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APPENDIX 1

Leaders give training to their staffs, which could be formal or informal, but it has got great value proposition in long run. These training yield significant results. Following Figure 6.1 depicts the required elements of Effective training.
Many of us have been faced with supervisors and bosses who appear to have strong narcissistic characteristics. Here are some suggestions in how to deal with them. These do not all work, and different ones work depending on the situation and the person you are dealing with:

- Keep your cool; do not react with an emotional response. Self-control is essential.
- Remain professional, even if the boss is not. You can’t control his or her behavior; but you can control your reaction.
- Make sure you clearly understand and are able to describe the type of behavior you are facing (e.g., too much criticism, inaccurate feedback, yelling).
- Document everything! Keep careful notes of incidents.
- Make sure that your work and behavior are impeccable and beyond reproach.

Keep track of any feedback from coworkers and customers that can be used to document your good performance.

- Do not get defensive; respond with levelheaded comments without taking the abuse. Seek help from HR if that is available, especially if there are legal ramifications (e.g., discrimination, sexual harassment, or other ethical or legal violations).
- Maintain good working relationships and a strong network at work.
- Go up the chain of command as a last resort; provide facts and evidence—not just emotional reactions.
- Unless the situation is dangerous, don’t make a quick decision about leaving; carefully plan for contingencies and an eventual exit.
- Plan an exit strategy; look for another position. Only you can determine when it’s too much; with planning, you can leave on your own terms.