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SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Background of the study

Since human life is becoming increasingly organized at a very fast rate, the importance of managing organizations effectively and successfully has become a pressing demand on managers. Managers are called upon to design and maintain organizations in which individuals working together are enabled to contribute their best to accomplish organizational goals. In short, effective utilization of both human and material resources for the accomplishment of enterprise objectives is the supreme challenge and responsibility facing managers at all levels.

Therefore, the quest to understand managerial effectiveness has become a compelling necessity and a matter of great urgency. Managerial effectiveness is a complex phenomenon wherein multiple factors in the manager, in the organization and from the surrounding socio-cultural environment intertwine and interact resulting in various outcomes. To unravel and understand managerial effectiveness, investigations based on appropriate research designs and studies carried out from time to time are of great importance. The present investigation is a modest attempt in this direction.
Identification of the variables

The first task faced by the investigator was to identify the variables associated with managerial effectiveness. The evolution of the study and the empirical manner of the choosing of the variables for the present investigation has been discussed in some detail in Chapter III. The outcome of the efforts to identify the variables of managerial effectiveness led to the choice of four variables as of prime importance. They were: 1. Managerial motivation; 2. Leadership patterns; 3. Personality factors; and 4. Organizational climate.

Approach to the study

The basic approach adopted by the present investigator in the study of managerial effectiveness was the interactional model of human behaviour. The essential features of modern interactionism can be summarised as follows: 1. Actual behaviour is a continuous process of multidirectional interaction (feed back) between the individual and the situation he or she encounters; 2. The individual is an interactional and active agent in this process; 3. On the person side of interaction, cognitive factors are the primary determinants of behaviour, although emotional factors do play a role; and 4. On the situation side, the psychological meaning of the situation for the individual is the important deciding factor. Having
selected the variables for investigation, the next problem that confronted the investigator was appropriate tools for the collection of data.

**Instruments**

For the reasons already mentioned in Chapter III, the present investigator decided preferably to develop his own research instruments or if necessary select appropriate instruments after careful testing. To study managerial motivation, the present investigator developed the need satisfaction questionnaire (NSQ) modelled after the questionnaire of Porter and Lawler (1968) and the organization climate questionnaire (OCQ). Ghiselli's Self Description Inventory (SDI) was chosen after appropriate testing to measure personality factors. To measure leadership, the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) was adapted after suitable modifications. The details regarding instrumentation were discussed in Chapter III.

Managerial effectiveness was assessed using an Index (IME) developed by the present investigator exclusively for this purpose. The IME, a psychometrically evolved measure of effectiveness, received substantial validation from the discriminant function discussed in Chapter VI.
Hypotheses

In order to understand the nature of the relationship between managerial effectiveness and motivation, leadership, personality and organizational climate, the present investigator framed 39 hypotheses pertaining to the aforesaid variables and effectiveness. Hypothesis 1 is the principal hypothesis postulating the individual, collective and interactional effects of the variables on managerial effectiveness. The remaining hypotheses were distributed as follows: motivation (12); leadership (12); organizational climate (10); and personality (4).

Methods of Analysis

The data were subjected to analysis of variance and multivariate analyses. The multivariate analyses consisted of: 1. Factor analysis; 2. Discriminant function; and 3. Analysis of variance for profile. The two statistical methods of analyses used in the present investigation could be considered as analytic-synthetic approach to the investigation of managerial effectiveness. Analysis of variance has thrown light on the relationship between each variable and managerial effectiveness while the multivariate analyses have yielded global or synthetic effect of the variables with reference to managerial effectiveness.

The following are the conclusions of the study based on analysis of variance (ANOVA).
1. **Motivation and Managerial effectiveness**

1. No significant differences exist among the low effective, medium effective and high effective groups of managers with reference to 'need fulfillment' in the case of the following needs: 1. need for esteem; 2. need for self-actualization; 3. need for security; 4. need for autonomy; and 5. social need (need for belongingness).

2. But in the case of economic need fulfillment, significant differences exist between the high and low effective managers and the low and medium effective managers. Managers whose need for economic reward is more fulfilled are more effective than managers whose need for economic reward is less fulfilled.

3. On the second dimension of need, that is, need expectancy, significant differences exist among the three groups of managers on the following needs: 1. need for self-esteem; 2. need for autonomy; and 3. need for self-actualization. More effective managers expect higher levels of needs to be fulfilled than the less effective managers.

4. The low effective, medium effective and high effective groups of managers do not differ significantly on need for belongingness.
5. Managers differ significantly with reference to achievement motivation. The more effective managers are higher on achievement motivation than less effective managers.

6. In the case of security need it s relationship with managerial effectiveness is in the inverse order, that is, managers whose need for security is more is less effective than managers whose need for security is less.

7. There are no significant differences among managers in their need for power.

8. Even though when individually considered the expectancy levels of certain needs are not significant, significant differences are found when expectancy levels of all the needs are considered in an aggregate manner. This shows the cumulative effect of various needs on managerial effectiveness. This confirms hypothesis 10.

2. Reward obtained, effort expended and goal achievement

9. There is significant relationship between extent of reward obtained and managerial effectiveness.

10. Goal achievement as perceived by managers themselves is significantly correlated with reward. But the magnitude of the relationship is higher when it is assessed through self report than when it is assessed by a more objective measure (IME) as mentioned above.

11. There is significant relationship between effort and reward obtained.
12. Managerial effectiveness is related to the degree of effort expended by managers and the extent of reward obtained from their organizations.

3. **Leadership and managerial effectiveness**

   The leadership scale (LBDQ) assessed 12 different dimensions of leadership. The following are the results of ANOVA.

   13. Managerial effectiveness is significantly related to role assumption by managers.

   14. There are no significant differences among the low effective, medium effective and high effective groups with reference to the remaining 11 dimensions of leadership.

   15. Nevertheless, significant differences are found among the three groups of managers when all the leadership dimensions are collectively considered.

4. **Personality factors and managerial effectiveness**

   The interaction model of behaviour considers behaviour as an outcome of multidirectional interaction between individual and situation he or she encounters. Based on this model, the relationship between supervisory ability, initiative, self assurance and decisiveness of managers and their effectiveness were examined in the present study. The following are the findings of the investigation.
16. Managerial effectiveness and personality factors are significantly correlated, i.e., managers who are more effective are higher on supervisory ability, initiative, self assurance, and decisiveness than managers who are less effective.

5. Organizational climate and managerial effectiveness

Organizational climate and its effect on managerial effectiveness was examined with reference to 10 factors that constitute the organizational climate scale. The following are the results of the analysis of variance.

17. Managers who perceive the climate as more autonomous are more effective than managers who perceive the climate as less autonomous.

18. On the remaining 9 factors no significant differences are seen with reference to the low effective, medium effective and high effective groups of managers.

6. Results of multivariate analyses

Factor analysis

19. There are significant differences among the three groups of managers on the following factors: 1. organizational climate; 2. personality; and 3. leadership. On the remaining 7 factors no significant differences exist.
Discriminant function

20. The discriminant function substantially validates IME developed by the present investigator. The classification of managers into low effective, medium effective and high effective groups by discriminant function and IME are near identical.

21. The discriminant function shows the collective effect of the 10 factors with reference to managerial effectiveness, i.e., managers of different degrees of effectiveness are different regarding the 10 factors.

Profile analysis

Profile analysis generates three major types of informations: 1. level; 2. dispersion; and 3. shape. Profile analysis has shown the following results in the present investigation.

22. The low effective and the medium effective groups of managers' mean scores are somewhat close to the group mean while that of the high effective group deviates more from the group mean.

23. The shape of the profile, i.e., the 'ups' and 'downs' of the high effective group are more marked than that of the low effective and medium effective groups.
The results of the multivariate analyses show the collective and interactive effects of the factors on managerial effectiveness.

The present investigator started the study with the following assumptions: 1. managerial effectiveness is complex and multiple determined, and 2. motivation, personality, leadership, and organizational climate are key factors affecting managerial effectiveness. The results of the analyses of the present investigation have yielded two types of informations regarding the variables studied and managerial effectiveness, namely, analytic and synthetic. The informations and the inferences based on them converge to show that managerial effectiveness is complex and multiple determined as assumed and that motivation, personality, leadership and organizational climate affect managerial effectiveness individually, collectively and interactingly.