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1. Summary

The present investigation was undertaken with a view to studying boss-subordinate relationships within the broad parameters of managerial leadership and work motivation.

The sample consisted of 99 groups of individuals operating within the boss subordinate relationship. Each group consisted of an average of 3 to 4 subordinates. The total number of people who contributed to the data for this study numbered 387. A total of 16 organisations were covered in this survey 4 of them were multinationals 4 were in the public sector and 8 were in the private sector.

The various parameters under study and the tools used to measure them were:

1) Needs of Bosses - a modified version of the EPPS

2) Leadership styles of Bosses - LEAD(Self) and LBS(I)

3) Perceptions of subordinates regarding leadership styles of bosses - LEAD(Others) and LBS(II)

4) Need deficiency and importance of Subordinates - PNSQ

The classification of leadership styles in the American Situational Leadership Theory was compared with the classification of styles of the Indian Nurturant Task Leader Model, the former being measured by the LEAD instrument, and the latter by the LBS.
Both these instruments have two versions - one the self-rating format, and the other a subordinate-rating format. Both these versions were used in this work. Computations of Pearson's r between LEAD(Self) and LBS(I) scores of bosses indicated emergence of the following groups of correlated styles

1) Style 1, Authoritarian, Task-oriented Style

2) Style 2

3) Style 3, Participative

4) Style 4, Participative

5) Task-oriented, Nurturant Task, Nurturant, Participative Style

In the second portion of the study, using the previous analysis as a basic foundation, the need patterns of various leadership styles were investigated. The need categories identified for the purpose of this study were n.Ach, n.Aff, n.Nur and n.Dom, measured by a modified version of the EPPS. The boss's scores on this scale were correlated with their leadership styles measured by the LEAD(Self) and LBS(I) instruments. Two trends relating motivational patterns of various leadership styles emerged. The first one was that n.Dom has an inverse relationship with the Authoritarian-Participative continuum of leadership styles envisaged by Sinha (1980). The second trend that emerged was that Task orientation has a positive relationship with n.Ach and an inverse relationship with n.Aff and n.Nur.

The next aim of this work was to gauge the perceptions of the subordinates regarding the leadership styles of his superior (LEAD-Other and LBS-II) and to relate these perceptions to his need deficiencies in various need categories. The different need categories considered were security, social, esteem, autonomy, and self actualisation. Deficiencies and importance of these need categories were measured by the PNSQ. In the
correlation analysis of the LEAD(Other) and LBS(II) scores with the PNSQ scores, various trends emerged

(1) Style 2 was found to be related to activation of the autonomy need as was reflected in the higher scores on importance of that need category

(2) Style 3 related to importance of the security need

(3) Style 4 was related to satisfaction of esteem and activation of actualisation needs

(4) Bureaucratic Style was related to the deprivation of the autonomy need.

There was a further analysis of the gaps in interpersonal perceptions of leadership styles. Here, the LEAD(Self) and LBS(I) scores of the boss were compared (t-ratio) as well as correlated (Pearson’s r) with the LEAD(Others) and LBS(II) rating of the boss by subordinates. The framework of the Johari Window was applied to the results. It was observed that reality is very often not truly represented either by the boss or by the subordinate, thus resulting in a large Blind arena. Managers need to be open to feedback and disclosure about their leadership personalities in order that this Blind arena may be reduced and the Public arena may be expanded. This would result in a common shared perspective, and therefore, result in improved boss-subordinate relationships.

In the subgroup analysis, it was observed that MNC bosses are more impersonal reflected in lower n. Aff than their counter parts in PUB and PVT Sectors. Similarly, the PUB sector bosses are seen to be high in people and low in task orientation. The security need of subordinates in PUB sector is more satisfied than the MNC Subordinates. The need for 'pay' is better satisfied in the MNC subordinates. Technical managers are more bureaucratic than non-technical managers and this is reflected in corresponding deprivation
of security and autonomy needs of the technical subordinates. Analysis of high experience versus low experience groups indicates that the younger bosses have more achievement drive, less authoritarianism and bureaucratism as compared to their older bosses. The younger subordinates perceive more authoritarian behaviour in their bosses and also give less importance to security and social needs. The analysis of high and low effectiveness groups (Style Adaptability) indicates that the effective boss is higher in people orientation. This is reflected in correspondingly higher scores on n.Aff, n.Nur, Style 3, P, NT, and N Styles, and lower scores on S1 and F Styles.

**2. Suggestions For Further Research**

During the analysis of the data generated in this study, time and again, it was the delegating Style 4 that emerged with far reaching implications. When compared with the NT model, Style 4 showed positive correlations with Participative Styles and negative correlation with Authoritarian Style. When correlated with need satisfactions, it was found to be related to activation of the self-actualisation need. However, when the past literature was reviewed and also in the present sample, it is found that delegation as a style of functioning is reported in an extremely small proportion of the Indian population, and in spite of this, was giving indications of being an important variable. If the implications of these trends are to be understood, and also, other aspects of delegation are to be studied, it might emerge as a significant means of improving job satisfaction and overall managerial effectiveness. It is, therefore, suggested that in order to study these effects of Style 4, some further research be conducted on samples where the delegating style of functioning is manifested in larger amounts. If, in the Indian context, such a sample is not readily available, then perhaps it could be studied under simulated conditions in groups of individuals along with lines of the Lewin, Lippit & White (1939) studies where styles of leadership were
experimentally created. Such research would pave the way for bringing in more delegating behaviour in the managers of tomorrow.

### 3. Conclusion

The nature of boss-subordinate relationships has and always will be an issue for study by researchers. The dynamics of the leader-led influences make good material for scientific structured research. The ultimate objective of such research is, however, to provide the practicing managers a scientific foundation for developing a subjective 'gut-feel' kind of a response to changing situations. In other words, the aim is to give directions for training and development in basic managerial skills and for developing the competence of managers to deal with various situations.

It may be true that today's managerial training aims at developing more democratic or participative styles of decision making. This is probably so because on the whole the population of subordinates may be at moderate to high levels of maturity or preparedness. Situations with extremely mature followers, for whom delegation would be an appropriate style may or may not arise in the current situation. However, when reactions are elicited in informal situations from practising managers, they all agree that the newer and younger generations of followers (who may be the leaders of tomorrow) are bringing in higher and higher levels of maturity or preparedness. Such a trend has also been observed in the present study. Therefore, the day is not far, when situations will arise where delegation is appropriate. When that happens, the manager needs to be prepared for it. More research on the issues related to the delegating style of functioning will be required before a strategy for developing this style into the manager's style range, can be chalked out. It is hoped that in the future, more research in this area will be undertaken.