INTRODUCTION
In the realm of human enterprise the man with ideas works as the prime mover. Undeniably, the person with the right perception, motivation and urge matters the most in ensuring the success and development at micro as well as macro levels. The effectiveness of the individual in charge depends on many factors imbedded in the socio-economic cultural-technological climate of the organization on one hand and on the subtle psychological configurations on the other hand. The organization scientists have fully recognized the importance of these behavioural determiners which contribute to the effectiveness, success, development and excellence in industrial performance. This realization has led to the advancement of theories, models, and strategies of managerial effectiveness in terms of general as well as specific factors. Present investigation selected to study some of the major psychological and organizational parameters as the correlates of managerial effectiveness in public and private sector electronic units. This study has definitiveness in terms of its method, objectives and analysis which may ultimately give insight in developing some specific and realistic guidelines and strategies to enhance the production, satisfaction and quality of work climate.

Effectiveness, whether it is organization or manager-specific, is universally accepted as a major goal for modern management (Luthans et al., 1988). Ansari (1990) believes that the central theme in the study of managers has been that of effectiveness and the basic difference between successful and
unsuccessful organization is that the former are characterized by effective managers.

Drucker (1974) highlighted the importance of managerial effectiveness very aptly. He said, "Even the most efficient business cannot survive, let alone succeed, if it is efficient in doing the wrong things, that is, if it lacks effectiveness..... Effectiveness is the foundation of success. Efficiency is a minimum condition for survival after success has been achieved. Efficiency is concerned with doing things right and effectiveness is doing the right things." This clearly implies that effectiveness is concerned with the achievement of results, whatever results these may be, for whatever purposes or for whatever persons and distinguishes effectiveness from efficiency.

Burgoyne (1976) was of the view that there is a need to clearly outline functions of a manager before managerial effectiveness could be defined. A manager's major objective is to achieve organizational goals; in other words, there is a strong emphasis on performance. Typically, managerial performance has been discussed in terms of efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency is a concept based on the physical and engineering sciences and concerns the relationship between 'inputs' and 'outputs'. In organizations, the inputs are the human, physical, and financial resources available to the manager. Efficient managers achieve high levels of output (goal accomplishment) with a given base of inputs. When managers are able to minimize the cost of the resources used
to attain goals, and still attain the goals, they are functioning efficiently. Effectiveness is the degree to which the goals of an organization are met. In essence, effective managers, have selected the correct approaches, and therefore, have achieved their goals. It is necessary that a manager needs to be both effective and efficient in his job.

In describing managerial work, Mintzberg (1980) has contributed much to the action view of managerial work. After reviewing the relevant studies, Mintzberg concluded that the manager's job can be described in terms of various roles or organized sets of behaviour identified with a particular position. The roles identified by Mintzberg (1980) consist of three interpersonal roles (figurehead, leader and liaison), three informational roles (monitor, disseminator and spokesperson) and four decisional roles (entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator and negotiator). The ten roles suggest that managers, are in fact specialists required to perform a particular set of specialized roles that are dependent on the functional area in which they work.

According to Sen et al. (1977) "A manager is said to be effective if he meets the output requirements of his job consistently over a period of time." Effectiveness of managers within this scope is a function both of individual, as well as the organization. The individual contributes to his effectiveness through his intrinsic abilities and competence; the organization provides the constraints...
and the facilities that determine the overall outcome of individual efforts.

Mohan (1988) opined that numerous researchers have investigated the concept of managerial effectiveness over the years. The dictionary definition of effectiveness is in terms of results or consequences, bringing about effects in relation to purpose and giving validity to particular activities, he added.

Editorial team of Indian Management recently undertook a nationwide research survey sponsored by All India Management Association to discover indices of management effectiveness as pointed by the professionals in business and industry and those outside it, but connected with organizations in some way. In this connection, Shankar et al. (1984) interviewed a cross-section of top managers in public and private sectors as to what in their view was effective management. They reported that according to S. Neelamegham (Professor, Faculty of Management Studies, Delhi University), following were the indices of effective management: achievement of results; productivity indices; profitability; organizational criteria like organizational climate and quality of working life and society criteria i.e. the extent to which organization is able to meet the expectation of different groups such as share holders, employees etc. According to S.S. Baijal (Managing Director, Indian Explosives) the first point that he would like to mention as an indicator of effective management is the "quality of performance"
which is not quantifiable but at the same time it just cannot be ignored. The second aspect is innovativeness that is the ability to clearly picture the future and accordingly innovate in time for future needs. "Capacity utilization is the next important factor followed by financial control, personnel development, organizational morale and a vigorous and a virile management.

Vinay Bharat Ram (Deputy Managing Director, D.C.M.) opined that effective management is one which (a) sets short term goals within the context of long term policies, so that there is no dichotomy between the two, (b) is geared to implement these goals effectively, relying on logical organizational structure and an effective information system.

R.D. Gupta (General Manager, Balmer and Lawrie) opined that effective management is the management which produces the desired results and achieves the goals laid down by the organization within the parameters that have been fixed. Management is one of the most important inputs in the effectivity of management and in the larger context of economic growth of a country, and especially so for India.

Paolillo (1987) viewed that the field of management has matured greatly since the turn of the twentieth century. The evolution of management thought has clearly moved from the early process view of managerial work, which focused on the organizational activities carried out by managers (planning, organizing, controlling, and so on) to the action view emphasizing
the skills needed or roles adopted by managers for effectively dealing with numerous challenges and problems confronting their organizations.

May and Kruger (1988) suggested that managers should adhere to the four principles of empowerment: self mastery, integrity, executive communication and partnership.

According to Pearson (1989) priority of every general manager should be towards developing a distinctive work environment, spearheading innovative strategic thinking, managing company resources, productivity, directing the people, development and deployment process, building a dynamic organization and overseeing day to day operations. Individually, none of these things are totally new or unique, but successful general managers are better at seeing the inter-relationship among these six areas, setting priorities and making things happen. As a result, their activities in these areas make a coherent and consistent patterns that moves the business forward. Focussing effort in these six areas will help any general manager become effective.

Bakshi (1988) felt that the cultural background, values and beliefs of the managers have a crucial impact on managerial performance. Some of the major problems faced by the managers in a developing country like India are technological, social and cultural gaps. Effectively managing the changing environment, within and without is one essential managerial function. According to Bakshi (1988) the ultimate, complete and eternal methodology of rising to
the challenges of the future is taken the form of the divine trinity: Preserve the relevant; destroy the irrelevant and create what is needed. This eternal magic formula is valid for all the times to come.

Parameshwar (1988) opined that the Indian society has following socio-cultural features and value systems that could have an impact on managerial and organizational behaviour, viz. joint family system; caste system; external help vs self help; patriarchy and heterogeneous society. In Indian conditions, a manager is needed to have cosmopolitan outlook to break the barriers of caste, creed and language.

Chakraborty (1989), based on his assimilation of the Indian management context, offered for consideration the following enumeration of a value system which could be organically more valid and resonant for the Indian psyche. He said that these are the values and beliefs Indian managers should follow and implement: they must respect the individual; they should cooperate and have trust in each other; they should not be jealous of each other; their mind should be pure; they should offer top quality product and service; they should believe that work is worship; they should not be greedy; they should have sound ethics and morale; they should be self-disciplined and self restrained; they should believe in customer's satisfaction; they should be creative and they should have the inspiration to give and should be detached from egoistical demands.
Reddin (1970) opined that effectiveness is not a quality a manager brings to a situation. It is achievement of results, the accent is on performance and on actions relative to goals. Effectiveness is best seen as something a manager produces from a situation by managing it appropriately. **Managerial Effectiveness is achieved through managerial styles.**

To manage a situation, the executive uses a style called 'Managerial Style'. Brown and Sisson (1984) defined Managerial Style as that which embodies a coherent approach to the problem of motivating and controlling employees, of handling grievances and conducting relationships with organized labour.

According to Allcorn (1988), managers are effective not only because they demonstrate good administrative skills and technical know-how but an appropriate managerial style is equally important. Managerial styles so profoundly affect employee morale and productivity that successful managerial style may ultimately mean a successful organization.

Mohan and Jahangiri's (1985) attempt to identify managerial effectiveness, initially originated with the examination of managerial styles, which are concerned with the processes through which a leader attempts to influence the activities of an individual or a group.

Gallaher (1988) defined style as the way responses are delivered, as opposed to the content of responses. For example, one can walk briskly or slow with arms swinging broadly or not...
At all. The behaviour in each case is walking (content) but the way it is performed (style), varies from individual to individual.

Hersey and Blanchard (1980) defined leadership style* of an individual as "the behaviour pattern that a person exhibits when attempting to influence the activities of others as perceived by those others. A person's leadership style involves some combination of either task behaviour or relationship behaviour." The managerial styles may be effective or ineffective depending on the environment or the situation in which a particular style is used. Thus, it is the appropriateness of the style to the situation which is more important (Partap and Srivastava, 1985).

Hersey and Blanchard (1985) gave a detailed review of models of managerial styles. They opined that managerial styles seemed to be a reflection of two of the earliest schools of thought in organizational theory, viz. 'Scientific Management' and 'Human Relations'. Some of the theorists of the Scientific Management movement proposed that an organization be as rationally planned and executed as possible to create more efficiency in administration and consequently increase production. Management was to be divorced from human affairs and emotions (Taylor, 1911).

In the 1920's and 1930's the trend started by Taylor was replaced by the Human Relations movement, initiated by Mayo and

* The terms managerial style and leadership style have been used interchangeably in the present text.
his associates. These theorists argued that in addition to finding the best technologic methods to improve output, it was beneficial to management to look into human affairs. It was claimed that the real power centres within an organization were the interpersonal relations that developed within the working unit. The study of these human relations was the most important consideration for management.

In essence, then, the scientific management movement emphasized a concern for task (output), i.e. task orientation, while the human relations movement stressed a concern for relationships (people), i.e. relationship orientation. The recognition of these two concerns has characterized the writings on managerial styles ever since the conflict between the scientific management and the human relations schools of thought became apparent.

Some of the managerial styles proposed from time to time are: Authoritarian - Democratic Leader Behaviour (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1957); Employee Orientation and Production Orientation Styles put forth by the Michigan group of researchers (Katz et al., 1950, 1951); Initiating Structure versus Consideration Style (Stogdill and Coons, 1957); Managerial Grid (Blake and Mouton, 1964); Leadership Contingency Model (Fiedler, 1967) and Reddin's (1970) 3-Dimensional Managerial Style theory.

The present study has used Reddin's 3-Dimensional Managerial Effectiveness Model.
Reddin (1970) incorporated a third dimension of effectiveness in his theory along with the dimensions of task orientation (TO) and relationship orientation (RO). Task Orientation (TO) is the extent to which a manager directs his own and his subordinates' efforts characterized by initiating, organising and directing. Relationship Orientation (RO) is, the extent to which a manager has personal job relationships, characterized by listening, trusting, and encouraging (Reddin, 1970).

According to Reddin (1970) effectiveness results from a leader using a behavioural style that is appropriate to the demands of the situation. The situational factors to be taken into account include: the manager, the subordinate, the superior, the co-worker and job demand for technology. His theory is an example of the contingency approach. Effectiveness is the extent to which a manager achieves the output requirements of his position. It is best seen as something a manager produces from a situation by managing it appropriately. To manage a situation, the executive uses a "Managerial Style".

The styles' labels used in the 3-Dimensional model are shown in figure A. The labels 'integrated', 'dedicated', 'related' and 'separated' form the 3-Dimensional basic styles and were chosen to avoid the suggestion that some styles are much better than the others (Reddin, 1970). The 'integrated' style, with high task orientation (TO) and high relationship orientation (RO), is so named as it describes managerial behaviour which combines task orientation
FIG. A  THE 3-DIMENSIONAL MANAGERIAL STYLE MODEL
(Reddin, 1967, 1970)
and relationship orientation. The 'dedicated' style describes managerial behaviour with high task orientation but low relationship orientation, i.e. behaviour which is dedicated to the job. The 'related' style having high relationship orientation alone is related to subordinates. The 'separated' style is a basic style with both low task orientation and low relationship orientation.

The Eight Managerial Styles

Any basic style may be more effective or less effective depending on the particular situation in which it is used. Each basic style has its more effective or less effective counterpart.

The vital distinction between the more effective and less effective styles does not lie in the managerial behaviour expressed in terms of task orientation and relationship orientation. Any amount of either or both do not guarantee effectiveness. Effectiveness results from a style's appropriateness to the situation in which it is used (Reddin, 1970).

Reddin (1970) identified eight managerial styles and grouped them according to their levels of effectiveness measured in terms of task-oriented and relationship-oriented behaviour. Reddin (1977) again emphasized that each manager's effectiveness depends not only on his or her orientation, but also on the appropriateness of that orientation to a particular situation. For example, both the "missionary" and the "developer" styles have low task and high interpersonal orientations. In case of missionary style, this orientation is inappropriate to the situation, hence the manager is
ineffective - while the developer style which has a similar orientation, is effective because the orientation is appropriate to a different situation. Less effective leadership styles include the compromiser, the autocrat, the missionary, and the deserter. These managers' styles do not fit their situations and employees lack confidence in them. The less effective or more effective versions of the basic styles are shown in Table 1-A given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Style</th>
<th>When used inappropriately and therefore less effectively</th>
<th>When used appropriately and therefore more effectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deserter</td>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocrat</td>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Benevolent Autocrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromiser</td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reddin (1967, 1970) gave a detailed description of all the eight managerial styles.

**Bureaucrat Style**

According to Reddin (1970) the bureaucrat style is simply the separated style used appropriately i.e. a manager who is using low task orientation and low relationship orientation in a situation where, such behaviour is appropriate and who, is therefore, more effective.
The bureaucrat manager follows orders, rules and procedures to control the action of employees for the benefit of the organization. He is reliable and dependable, he maintains the system as a going concern; he watches details and is efficient; he is rational, logical, self controlled; fair, just and equitable. He is not really interested in either task or relationship but by simply following rules, does not make this obvious and thus does not let it affect morale of employees.

Singh (1979) further added that bureaucrat manager wants to operate in a system because he considers the system as sacrosanct. The defiance of organizational framework perturbs him. Since he is a system and rule bound manager, he produces only few ideas, does not push for production, and does not take initiative. Such a manager uses rules for the benefit of organization (Allcorn, 1988).

**Developer Style**

According to Reddin (1970) the developer style arises when the related style is being used appropriately, i.e. a manager who is using a high relationship orientation and a low task orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate, and who is therefore, more effective.

The developer manager maintains open communication channels, he listens; develops talents of others and coaches them; he understands others and is supportive; he cooperates and work well with others. He is trusted by others and he trusts others. He sees his job as primarily concerned with providing a conducive work atmosphere.
Singh (1979) felt that the developer manager perceives his job as primarily related to the development of the subordinates. Delegation of authority and responsibility is high. Such a style is conducive to organizational commitment on the part of subordinates. Such a manager has keen interest in his subordinates (Allcorn, 1988).

**Benevolent Autocrat Style**

According to Reddin (1970) the benevolent-autocrat style is dedicated style, used appropriately i.e. a manager who is using a high task orientation and low relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is appropriate and who is, therefore, more effective.

The benevolent autocrat manager is decisive and shows initiatives; he is industrious and energetic; he is committed and finishes all the tasks set before him; he is evaluative of quantity and quality; he is conscious of cost, profit and sales. He obtains results. He places implicit trust in himself and is concerned with both the immediate and the long run tasks. He is effective in that he has a skill in inducing others to do what he wants them to do without creating any resentment. He creates with some skills, an environment which minimizes aggression towards him and which maximizes obedience to his commands.

According to Singh (1979) such a manager has little sympathy with participation and believes in taking unilateral action. He
basically adopts economic rewards for getting work done and follows feudalistic approach in managing the enterprise system. Such a manager achieves goals without alienating others (Allcorn, 1988).

**Executive Style**

According to Reddin (1970) the executive style arises, when, the integrated style is used appropriately, i.e., a manager who is using a high task orientation and a high relationship orientation in a situation where such a behaviour is appropriate and who is, therefore, more effective.

The executive manager uses team work in decision making; he uses participation appropriately; he induces commitment to objectives; encourages higher performance and coordinates others in work. He sees his job as effectively maximizing the efforts of others in relationship to short and long run tasks. He sets high standards for production and performance and recognises that because of individual differences and expectations, he will have to treat everyone differently. He is effective in that his commitment to both task and relationship is evident to all. His effectiveness in obtaining results with both these dimensions also leads naturally to optimum production.

According to Singh (1979) conflicts and disagreements are welcome by this manager. Team management is emphasized. There is a basic belief that effective management can only be achieved through group action, in which all the individuals are involved in
the managerial functions: planning, organization, motivation and control. This style acts as a powerful motivational instrument. According to Allcorn (1988) this leader is perceived as setting standards and treating employees according to their individual needs.

**Deserter Style**

According to Reddin (1970) the deserter manager is essentially a separated manager in the wrong situation, i.e. a manager who is using low task orientation and a low relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is inappropriate and who is, therefore, less effective.

The deserter manager works to rules, avoids involvement, responsibility, or commitment; he gives very few useful opinions or suggestions; is uncreative, unoriginal and narrow minded; he hinders others, makes things difficult, resists change; is uncooperative, incommunicative and gives up very easily. His output is minimum. He often displays his lack of interest in both task and relationships. He is ineffective, not only because of his lack of interest but also because of his effect on morale. He may not only desert, but may also hinder the performance of others through his intervention or by withholding information. According to Singh (1979) deserter manager is a withdrawn manager.

Allcorn (1988) stated that such a manager is perceived as uninvolved and passive and unable to provide needed leadership and direction.
Missionary Style

According to Reddin (1970) the missionary manager is one using the related style in a situation in which it is inappropriate, i.e. a manager who is using a high relationship orientation and a low task orientation in a situation where such behaviour is inappropriate and who is, therefore, less effective.

The missionary manager avoids conflict and initiation; he is pleasant, kind and warm and seeks acceptance of himself; he tries to make things easier for others; he is dependent, gives no directions and is unconcerned about output, standards or control. A missionary manager believes that happy people produce more so he puts harmony and relationship above other considerations, sacrificing organizational objectives in the pursuit of inter-personal harmony. He is ineffective because his desire to see himself and be seen as a 'good person' prevents him from risking a disruption of relationships in order to get production.

According to Allcorn (1988) such a manager is seen as sacrificing organizational objectives.

Autocrat Style

According to Reddin (1970) the autocrat arises when dedicated behaviour is used inappropriately, i.e. a manager who is using a high task orientation and a low relationship orientation in a situation where such behaviour is inappropriate and who is, therefore, less effective.
The autocrat manager is critical and threatening; he makes all the decisions, demands obedience and suppresses conflict; he wants action and results immediately; he only has downward communication and acts without consultation. He puts the immediate task before all other considerations. He sees workers solely as extensions of machines demanding instant obedience. He is ineffective in that he makes it obvious that he has no concern for relationship and has little confidence in others. While many fear him because of his harsh approach, they also dislike him and are motivated to work only when he applies direct pressure.

Singh (1979) opined that such a manager stated that people are basically lazy, dislike work, are shirkers and do not want to take responsibility. They need control, goading and strict supervision. He relies more on negative punishment for achieving the target. All his decisions are unilateral and centralised. According to Allcorn (1988) this manager is perceived to have little confidence in others and is generally disliked by employees.

Compromiser Style

According to Reddin (1970) compromiser style is integrated style used inappropriately, i.e. this is a style of a manager who is using a high task orientation and a high relationship orientation in a situation that requires a high orientation to only one or the other, or neither, and who, is therefore, less effective.

The compromiser as the name suggests never does anything well. He over uses participation; he is yielding and weak; avoids
decisions and usually produces grey acceptable decisions; emphasizes task and relationships when inappropriate; he is an idealist but ambiguous and thus distrusted. He recognizes the advantages of being oriented to both task and relationships but is incapable or unwilling to make sound decisions. Ambivalence and compromise are his stock-in-trade. The strongest influence in his decision making is the most recent or heaviest pressure. He tries to minimize immediate problems rather than maximize long-term production. He attempts to keep people who can influence his career as happy as possible. He is an idealist, who is convinced that optimum production is a dream. The compromiser has a devastating effect on a subordinate who prefers to work from a clear plan. His ambiguous and vacillating approach earns him only distrust.

According to Singh (1979) predictability of his behaviour is poor because he lacks conviction and values. According to Allcorn (1988), this leader appears ineffective and easily influenced by others and by events. The results for the organization are short-term compromises that sacrifice long-term effectiveness.

A review of literature reveals that the issue of effective style of leadership is crucial yet controversial. A lot of studies have been conducted and reviewed to determine which is a more effective style of leadership with special reference to Indian setting.

Anderson (1959) reviewed forty-nine studies in which authoritarian and democratic leadership styles have been experimentally compared, to find out which one of these two styles
is more effective. He wrote that the evidence available failed to demonstrate that either authoritarian or democratic leadership style was consistently associated with higher productivity.

Korman's (1966) review of over 25 studies dispelled the idea of a single best style of leadership style. Leadership styles must vary according to situations.

In general, the growing trend of democratization of the workplace in the West highlights the importance of participative leadership which has been shown to be effective as well as satisfying in the long run; the reverse is true for autocratic leadership. The autocratian-democratic dichotomy of leadership styles has attracted the attention of Indian researchers too (Ansari, 1990). Early researchers, such as Murphy (1953), Meade (1962) and Meade and Whittaker (1967) stated that because Indian culture by and large is authoritarian, it is authoritarian leadership which would promote organizational productivity in the Indian set up. But this assertion has lost ground in recent years. Indeed, many Indian investigators have tried to prove that people-oriented leadership (democratic, considerate or participative) is universally effective (Venkoba Rao, 1970; Daftuar and Krishna, 1971; Kakar, 1971; Pestonjee, 1973; Sarveswara Rao, 1973; Singh and Pestonjee, 1974 and Pandey, 1976), i.e. if it is effective in the West, it can also be effective in a developing country like India.

However, some evidence is also available to the contrary. Sharma (1973) stated that the headmasters of open-climate type
schools were high on 'initiating structure'. Saiyadain (1974) reported that employees high on social competence felt more satisfied with autocratic supervisors.

Sinha (1976) described three leadership styles and elaborated which one was best suited to the special characteristics of Indian socio-cultural life. At one extreme of the styles' continuum is the authoritarian leadership style with a self-oriented and demanding leader who would not be effective. At the other extreme is participative leadership style with employees taking part at all levels of organizational decision making. This style emphasizes high productivity, high quality and low cost and assumes that employees share these objectives. Sometimes the commitment to a work ethic may not exist. In such circumstances of transitional stage to democratization, a leadership style called "Authoritative Leadership" or "Nurturant Task Leadership" may be essential to envisage. This style lies in the middle of the two extremes. The Nurturant task leader structures his/her subordinates' role clearly so that communications are explicit, structured and task-relevant. He initiates, guides and directs his subordinates to work hard and maintain a high level of productivity, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Responsibilities are pinpointed and areas of decision-making are synchronized with them. He, thus, creates a climate of purposiveness and goal orientation. His task orientation, however, has the mix of nurturance. He cares for his subordinates, shows
affection, takes a personal interest in their well being, and above all is committed to their growth.

Authoritarian, Authoritative and Participative management thus lie on a continuum. In all the three styles, the leader shows high effort investment. Sinha (1980) said that until an organization has achieved a moderate degree of productivity, it requires authoritative leadership or Nurturant Task Leadership style (NT) to move employees toward greater achievement. When moderate productivity has been achieved and employees have absorbed the structure of the organization, the organization is ready for the Participative style of management.

Sinha (1980) further added that as Indian industry has still to achieve the moderate productivity level so the Nurturant Task Leadership style would be the most effective style of leadership in India. He further added that four typical characteristics of the Indian subordinates led him to the formulation of NT style. The first has been identified as the preference for personalized over contractual relationship with the leader. This relationship is commonly manifested by "visiting the home of the superior, doing personal chores for his family, sending him delicacies cooked in one's home, etc." While Sinha (1980) treats this personalized relationship as one of the dominant socio-cultural values, Ansari (1987) has identified it as one of the powerful influence strategies in Indian organizations. The second typical characteristic of the Indian subordinates has been identified as the tendency to depend excessively on their superiors for directions, guidance, and
support. The evidence indicating the presence of excessive dependence in Indians have been independently provided by many authors (Sinha, 1970; Chattopadhyay, 1975 and Kakar, 1978). It has been experimentally demonstrated that if a high dependent person is put under a task-oriented superior, he or she performs better than a low dependent person (Sinha, 1980). The third dominant characteristic of the Indian subordinates is that they readily accept the authority of their superiors and yield to their demands (Kakar, 1971 and Sinha, 1980). The fourth characteristic of Indians is that work is not valued in itself. Yet, the subordinates seem to be willing to put extra efforts to maintain a personalized relationship with their superior.

The Nurturant Task model received meaningful support from later findings too. Till date, the usefulness of the model has been investigated in over forty experimental and field studies (Sinha, 1983; Ansari, 1986 and Sinha et al., 1986). In these investigations, (i) the Nurturant Task style has been shown to be distinct from other leadership styles; (ii) it has been found to have a positive impact on several indicators of effectiveness - commitment, facets of job satisfaction and perceived effectiveness and (iii) it has been found to be effective for those subordinates who want to maintain personalized and dependent relationship and willingly accept the authority of the superiors. Evidence (Ansari, 1987 and Ansari and Shukla, 1987) also exists that Nurturant Task leaders receive more of favourable ratings on the evaluation of their leadership than
autocratic leaders. Interestingly on some occasions they have been rated even higher than Participative leaders (Sinha et al., 1986).

Though researchers have provided sufficient data regarding usefulness of the Nurturant Task model in India. Khandwalla (1988) opined that 'exhortations to leaders to be Nurturant Task or Participative in disregard of macro-organizational realities would be nonsensical'.

Mohan and Jahangiri (1985) in their study of Indian Educational Administrators reported that most common managerial style followed by the Indian Educational Administrator was Benevolent-Autocrat followed by Developer, Executive, Bureaucrat, Missionary, Autocrat, Compromiser and Deserter style.

Managerial effectiveness has decisive impact on job attitudes e.g. morale, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, organizational parameters, e.g. organizational effectiveness, group cohesiveness and increased production etc. Thus, need for a detailed study of managerial effectiveness is imperative. The above review of literature prompts one to conclude that there is no one managerial style which is universally effective. Researchers have abandoned the quest for identifying universal traits of ideal leaders. Today, managerial effectiveness has come to be recognised as a function of complex interaction between managerial ability, personality, motivation, subordinates' characteristics, organizational culture etc. Therefore, aim of the present study was to investigate the relationship between managerial effectiveness measured through
managerial styles with various personality and organizational parameters, viz. Eysenckian personality dimensions, motivation, organizational commitment and Quality of Working Life.

Managerial effectiveness depends upon matching the internal organizational structure to the demands of the task environment. It would therefore appear that effective functioning of public and private organization would depend on different criteria because each must adapt to different environmental contingencies, e.g., there are differences in the source of funding and ownership, legal and political environment, difference in criteria for accountability and control. These have differential implications for the effectiveness of managers in the two sectors (Solomon, 1986).

It was decided therefore to study the effect of organizational ownership pattern i.e. public and private on managerial effectiveness and its correlates, viz. personality, motivation, organizational commitment and Quality of Working Life.

Managerial functions vary according to hierarchical level. Reddin (1970) and Mintzberg (1980) said that managerial effectiveness depends upon results achieved by a manager by fulfilling the requirements of his job. Managers occupying different status in the organization have different roles to play and different functions to perform. Hence hierarchical level is an important variable influencing managerial effectiveness and its correlates. In the present study therefore it was decided to study the effect of managerial hierarchy on managerial effectiveness and its correlates, viz. personality, motivation, organizational commitment and Quality of Working Life.
MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS AND OWNERSHIP PATTERN

In recent years there has been an increasing interest in research comparing the private and public sectors, with a view towards improving productivity in the public sector (Solomon, 1986). Despite the apparent importance of the topic and the numerous dimensions on which public and private organizations can be compared, few empirical studies have appeared in the literature (Rainey et al., 1976).

The categorization of the organization into public and private sectors for the purpose of studying their cultures has been done on the presumption that in India, the fact of an organization being public or private would make a difference in their cultures. In organizations, culture may be defined as an amalgam of beliefs, ideologies, language, rituals and myths (Pettigrew, 1979).

Bhatt (1987), viewing the similarity in pattern with other countries like South Korea, said that public enterprises in India are found mainly in infrastructures like transport, communications, power, and financial services; these are the sectors which have external economies. They are also found in strategic industries like tele-communications, steel, fertilizers, mining, motor vehicles, petro-chemicals and electronics; these industries have long gestation lags, are capital intensive, use sophisticated technology and have strategic significance for development.

Solomon (1986) opined that among the environmental factors most often cited in the literature as differentially affecting
organizations in the two sectors, are differences in the degree of market exposure and the sources of funding (Walmsley and Zald, 1973; Lindblom, 1977 and Turk et al., 1979). Managers in the private sector operate in a competitive and dynamic environment, where profitability is the ultimate criterion of success. In order to achieve these objectives, they are expected to be responsive to market and customer demands and to implement organizational policies that facilitate efficient and economically rational action. The private sector economic dynamics are defined as a dependence on the market for resources, which provide incentives and automatic penalties that reinforce policies for cost reduction, operating efficiency and effective performance.

Managers in the public sector are required to maintain constituencies, seek multiple goals, and obtain funding through an appropriation process, which is susceptible to political influences (Porter and Van Maanen, 1970 and Rainey et al., 1976). The culture of public sector is one of conflicting values, where the special restrictions and limitations posed by the competing objectives interfere with the actual attainment of productivity and efficiency goals. The common practice of obtaining resources through an appropriation process creates conditions in which political considerations take priority and reduce the relative emphasis on operational and allocational efficiency (Levine, 1969; Schultz, 1970; Niskanen, 1971; Drucker, 1973; Savas, 1974 and Rainey, 1979).
Because public sector managers are also expected to meet demands of public responsiveness, they are faced with constant conflict between the goals of accountability and efficiency (Whorton and Worthley, 1981).

In the private sector, the extent to which certain actions will be encouraged and rewarded is generally determined by the degree to which they help meet the goals of increased efficiency. Conversely, the public sector, facing multiple and competing goals and additional constraints might assign a lower priority to policies that reward efficiency, yielding more to the vagaries of the political climate.

Foundation of Organizational Research (FORE) recently undertook a nationwide research survey on how professionals perceived what were the ingredients of effective management. The sample of 523 managers in public and private sectors were taken. According to managers the indicators of management effectiveness were: the affective dimension; organization - public interface; output performance and behavioural indices of alienation. In other words, to assess the effectiveness of management in Indian organizations, one must look first at the affective dimensions (as expressed in job satisfaction, morale and team-work, and sense of belongingness among employees). Secondly, one must look at the state of organization - public interface (consumer satisfaction and
public image). Thirdly, one must look at output performance (productivity and profitability) and lastly, one must look at the turnover rate, absenteeism and employee grievances. There are, however, some differences in the perceptions of public sector managers as to the importance level of some of these indicators. Profitability, according to the public sector managers was a less important indicator of effectiveness. In India the objective of public sector is not merely making profits. Social objectives such as employment generation, backward area development etc. are deliberately pursued, along side profitability. Also public sector managers looked upon government regulations with surrounding community less of a constraint than did private sector managers because public sector is more a part of the government than the private sector and is constrained to follow government policy towards social responsibilities of business.

Other researchers have also tried to distinguish between characteristics of public and private sectors. Rainey et al. (1976), while comparing public and private sector organizations suggested that there were some important distinctions between public and private sectors which have different implications for managers to be effective. The points of distinction according to Rainey et al. (1976) are (i) purposes, objectives, and planning i.e. public sector managers may have less flexibility and autonomy in defining purposes; (ii) selection, management and motivation, i.e. there may be greater constraints on a public sector manager to select
and control subordinates and (iii) controlling and measuring results, i.e. a public administrator may find it not only harder to measure results but also, partially as a consequence of that difficulty, harder to attain results and effective performance.

Rainey et al. (1976) further added that in public sector organizations, degree of market exposure (reliance on appropriations) is less, i.e. less market exposure results in less incentive to cost reduction, operating efficiency, effective performance. Less market exposure results in lower allocational efficiency. Legal, formal constraints (courts, legislature and hierarchy) in public sector are more. There are more constraints on procedure and spheres of operations (less autonomy of managers in making such choices). Political influences in public sector are more. There is greater diversity and intensity of external informal influences on decisions (bargaining, public opinion, interest group reactions) in public sectors.

Talking in terms of organizational environment transactions, there is more coerciveness in public sectors, i.e. there is a likelihood that participation in consumption and financing of services will be unavoidable or mandatory (Government has unique sanctions and coercive powers) (Rainey et al., 1976). They further added that breadth of impact too is more in public sector. There is broader impact, greater symbolic significance of actions of public administrators. In public sector there is a greater public scrutiny of public officials and their actions. There are greater public
expectations that public officials will act with more fairness, responsiveness, accountability and honesty.

Regarding authority relations and the role of the administrator in public sector there is less decision-making autonomy and flexibility on the part of public administrators. There is weaker, more fragmented authority over subordinates at lower levels i.e. subordinates can by pass senior officers and appeal to alternative authorities. As regards organizational performance, there is greater cautiousness, rigidity and less innovativeness. There are more frequent turnover of top leaders and political appointments result in greater disruption of implementation of plans (Rainey et al., 1976). Also, there is a greater difficulty in devising incentives for effective and efficient performance.

A few other researchers outlined difference in public and private sector organization. Lachman (1986) reported that role attitudes and job satisfaction of employees also differ between the two sectors. Public sector managers report lower organizational commitment, lower satisfaction of work needs and lower job satisfaction than do private sector managers.

These studies thus clearly point out that organization's affiliation to either public or private sectors, implies different institutional milieux and role requirements for managers. Several studies have been reviewed here highlighting the managerial effectiveness of public and private sectors.
Wood and Greenfeld (1979) in their study of ninety eight female and eighty two male managers from private industry and government industry concluded that managers in the private sector were more likely to be in the fast track (frequent promotion) and high fear of success (FDS) category, while managers in the public sector were more likely to be in slow track-low fear of success category. More differences in background factors occurred between sectors than between sexes, reported this study.

Lau and Pavett (1980) used Mintzberg's (1973, 1975) framework of managerial roles to compare high level managerial jobs in public and private sectors by examining job content, job characteristics, required skills, knowledge and abilities. Results from 210 public and 220 private managers indicated that both groups performed the same kinds of activities in terms of job content and job characteristic roles.

Mohan and Jahangiri (1984) in their study of Indian Educational Administrators from public and private sectors found that perusal of the overall basic style revealed that organizational ownership did not have significant influence over basic managerial styles. In other words managerial effectiveness was not a function of organizational ownership, they reported.

Fartap and Srivastava (1985b) conducted their study to investigate differential leadership style and effectiveness in executives belonging to private, public and government sectors, and to study relationship between styles and effectiveness in the
executives. The sample consisted of eighty executives from private, public and government sectors respectively. The study aimed at investigating leadership style and effectiveness directly with the help of the Leadership Effectiveness and Adaptability Description (LEAD) questionnaire developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1980). This questionnaire identifies four leadership styles, viz. style 1: high task-low relationship (telling); style 2: high task-high relationship (selling); style 3: low task - high relationship (participating); and style 4: low task - low relationship (delegating). The questionnaire also measures the extent of style adaptability (effectiveness).

They reported that public sector executives had the highest mean score on effectiveness with private and government executives getting second and third positions respectively. However, the pattern for all the groups was the same as that of the total sample, i.e. they share a common style of high task - high relationship. It is observed that public executives show the highest preference for style 2, i.e. in the three sectors the scores on styles 1 and 3 do not differ significantly. This shows that executives of all the three organizations adopt styles 1 and 3 with equal emphasis. Their results showed that style 2 (high task - high relationship) obtained the highest score. Style 4 was adopted by the smallest number of respondents. The results revealed that managers in India do not believe that their subordinates can look after themselves. According to the situational leadership theory,
when the maturation level of the followers is very high, low task-
low relationship (style 4) should prevail, as at that stage the
followers do not need any direction or guidance from their superiors
and are intrinsically motivated. In terms of Maslow's model they
are at the peak of higher order need realization. Indian managers
seem to think that permissiveness at this stage of development
of subordinates' maturity is not warranted. Instead, they concentrate
on good relationship and are also considerate in their dealings with
workers without forgetting their duty towards the main
organizational objective of achieving results. Therefore, Indian
managers like to be fully task-oriented and at the same time show
consideration. These results are similar to claims made by Sinha
(1980) and associates that Nurturant Task leader is the most common
style adopted by Indian managers. Correlations between leadership
styles and effectiveness showed that style 3 (low task - high
relationship) was positively and significantly related to
effectiveness and was significant at 0.05 level. Results also showed
insignificant relationship between style 2 and effectiveness. This
means that the preponderance of responses in style 2 reflects low
adaptability of leaders towards varying situations and thus it may
not contribute their effectiveness as leaders. Though the number
of responses in favour of style 3 were small, the correlation with
leadership effectiveness was significant at 0.05 level.

Partap and Srivastava (1985) drew the following conclusions
on the basis of their study:
(i) There is not much difference in leadership effectiveness and styles across different types of organizations.

(ii) Style 2 (high task - high relationship) was found to be predominant among executives of all the organizations. Results on style 1 (high task - low relationship) and style 3 (low task - high relationship) showed that Indian executives did think on the lines of 'concern for the people' but many of them still like to be benevolent - autocrats rather than participating managers.

(iii) The positive correlation of style 3 with effectiveness dimension makes it obvious that efforts in the direction of participation may be successful. The efforts to increase participation and decrease direction or telling must be made according to maturity level of workers.

Silfvast (1985) conducted a study on 131 middle to upper level managers ranging from public and private sectors. In his study he revealed that managers in both the public and private sectors required all skills (i.e. Communication, Interpersonal, Adaptive - like, Planning, Negotiation, Conceptual, Decision making, and Organizational) for effective functioning.

Examining of differences in the two groups' perceptions of skill importance in the two sectors showed the following significant differences: (i) negotiation, decision making and organizational skills were seen by both groups as being more important in their own settings, (ii) communication, planning and
conceptual skills were seen as being used equally in both sectors by the public group, but were seen as being less important in the public setting by private managers. A key difference between groups in their perceptions of ideal managers was that the public sector group reviewed most skills as equally important for the ideal manager in either sector. The private group saw most skills as more important to the ideal private sector manager particularly planning, interpersonal, decision making and organizational skills.

Sokoya (1985) reported no significant difference in the value orientation of public and private sector managers in Nigeria.

Ali (1986) in his article reviews the assertion of numerous scholars regarding great differences in attitudes, styles, behaviours and beliefs between public and private managers (Rhinheart et al., 1969; Buchanan, 1975; Rainey et al., 1976; Rainey, 1979; Farrow et al., 1980; Rainey, 1983 and Ali 1984 a,b). Ali (1986) felt that these authors attribute differences to the nature of the work and to the organizational environment prevalent in these sectors. Therefore, it might be suggested that public, mixed and private organizations have different orientations and that these orientations seem to find their expression in managerial beliefs and values. Accordingly, managerial beliefs about work are not similar across sectors or organizations.

Ansari (1986) opined that public sectors in India because of being owned by the government, are more bureaucratic in character
and their employees enjoy more job security as compared to private sector organizations.

Mohammed (1987) hypothesized that state owned units are less efficient because different property rights lead to different penalty/reward system and ultimately, to different economic behaviours. Property right theory argues that non-transferability of rights to future benefits and the absence of exclusive residual claim to the firm's income weaken the link between individual's efforts and rewards in the state owned enterprise setting. This presumably reduces public agent's motivation to take more care in making decisions that ultimately affects the state owned enterprises' performance. In contrast, it is argued that owners of private firms have great economic incentive to monitor the performance of their firms and will utilize market information to scrutinize the performance of firm's managers with a view to increase their efficiency.

Zabid (1987) in his paper examined the work roles of public enterprise managers. The classification of the work roles and the importance of the work roles across hierarchical levels, functional speciality, business sector and the size of the organization, is based on Mintzberg's framework of managerial roles. In his review he found that managers in the public sector ranked the role of technical expert higher than those in the private sector.
Vasudeva and Pal (1988) in their study found that the main effects of supervisory styles and type of industry were found to be significant. The output was higher under relation oriented supervisors in private undertakings.

Kumar and Ghadially (1989) reported that managers in private sector organizations had more positive attitudes towards employees and interpersonal trust compared to their public sector counterparts. However, public sector managers reported higher experiences of Machiavellianism and alienation. They further opined that if one accepts the arguments of high bureaucratization in public sector organizations, one may visualize a link between bureaucratization and negative experiences of Machiavellianism, alienation, lower levels of interpersonal trust and inferior outlook towards co-workers.

Das and Agarwala (1990) also compared job satisfaction of private and public sector engineers. The results indicated that engineers from private sector concerns had significantly better job satisfaction than engineers from public sectors.

Bhardwaj and Chadha (1990) compared job satisfaction and communication among public and private sector managers. The aim of their study was to see how far a better communication leads to a better job satisfaction. A total of 70 supervisors were taken with 35 each from the private and public sector. They found that in the private sector supervisors communicated more frequently either vertically, horizontally or diagonally within or between the departments as compared to the public sector supervisors. Regarding the job satisfaction dimension too, the private sector
scored higher in four out of the five dimensions viz. satisfaction with work, satisfaction with promotion, satisfaction with co-workers and satisfaction with supervision.

The above review with a few exceptions clearly shows that organizations differ according to their affiliation. Majority of studies point out private sector to be at an advantage and imply that different styles may be effective in different sectors. Hence it is hypothesized that managerial effectiveness measured through managerial styles will differ depending on the affiliation of the organization.

MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS AND LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT

The statement "a manager is a manager is a manager" - that managers at different hierarchical levels face much the same problems and demands and that personnel decisions affecting them can be made from a uniform set of premises, is contestible and far from true. On the basis of evidence available in India and abroad, it seems probable that there are fairly sharp differences in managerial skills, activities, leadership styles and motivation which are linked to differences in hierarchical position and functions of managers (Balaraman, 1987).

The tendency to see managers at all levels and in all positions as basically similar is erroneous and even the academic training given to the future managers has tended to become
diversified and specialized, testifying to the fact that skills, roles and functions needed to be efficient vary across different levels of managerial hierarchy. According to Nealey and Fiedler (1968) situational variables like followers' characteristics, leader power, and group task, may vary markedly from level to level within many organizations, thus, there would seem to be ample grounds for hypothesizing that different organizational levels place somewhat different demands on managers.

Katz (1974) proposed that the relative importance of three broad managerial skills (conceptual, technical and human) is dependent on the manager's rank in the organization. Conceptual skills should be most important at top managerial levels, technical skills at the lower levels, and human skills should be important at all levels.

Mintzberg (1980) proposed that differences in managerial work involve the relative importance of the roles across hierarchical level and functional speciality. Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) focus considerable attention on external roles (e.g. liaison, spokesperson and figurehead) that link the environment with the organization. At lower levels of the organization, however, work is more focussed, more shortened in outlook, and the characteristics of brevity and fragmentation are more pronounced. As a result, the external managerial roles are relatively less important and real time internal roles (e.g. disturbance handler and negotiator), concerned with daily operating problems and maintaining the workflow, become relatively more important at lower levels.
When examining the effect of hierarchical level on the importance of Mintzberg's (1980) managerial roles; Alexander (1979), McClelland and Segrist (1980), and Paolillo (1981) found that perceived absolute importance of both internal and external roles increased with management level.

Pavett and Lau (1983) reviewed that another set of skills, not addressed by Katz (1974) may be important for managerial success, and these involve political behaviours. Self-serving behaviours, such as enhancing one's position, building a power base, and establishing the right connections, fall under the label of politicking. Given the hierarchical nature of organizations, political skills should be most important to middle level managers.

Chatterji et al. (1988) were of the opinion that with growing realization that the effectiveness of a manager depends upon the organizational environment to a great extent and as functions of managers vary widely depending upon the level in which they have to function, the researchers have begun to focus on differential managerial role requirements at different hierarchical levels.

Jaques (1990) explaining the need of hierarchy in organizational set-up said that managerial hierarchy is and will remain the only way to structure unified working systems with hundreds, thousands, or tens of thousands of employees. Thirty five years of research have established that managerial hierarchy is the most efficient, the hardest, and in fact the most natural structure
ever devised for large organizations. Properly structured, hierarchy can release energy and creativity, rationalise productivity, and actually improve morale (Jaques, 1990).

Studies have been done to investigate the relationship between levels of management and managerial effectiveness.

Jago and Vroom (1977) investigated the relationship between the hierarchical level of managerial personnel and individual differences in their leadership style, specifically the degree to which they are disposed to the use of participative vs autocratic decision making strategies. Analysis of self report data collected from 354 employees on four different hierarchical levels of management suggested a greater propensity for use of participative methods at higher organizational levels. Subordinate descriptions of subjects' immediate superiors further supported this relationship.

Pavett and Lau (1983) planned a study based on the contingency approach to management, i.e. managerial roles would vary according to levels. They reported that traditionally, managers have been treated as a homogeneous group. Majority of management theory does not give much attention to difference between levels of management or functional areas of management. A promotion system of choosing management successors from among lower level managers assumes that because they are successful at lower level, their success at higher levels is guaranteed. On the other hand,
the contingency model of management posits that although there is a common set of roles that managers perform, effective managers behave differently in different situations. To test the hypothesis, Pavett and Lau (1983) took a sample of twenty Chief ExecutiveOfficers, one hundred and twenty one middle level managers and thirty nine lower level managers. They examined the differences between hierarchical levels of the rated importance of the eleven managerial roles. The data, yielded significant differences between top and lower level managers on eight of the eleven roles. Of these eight roles, significant differences were also found between middle and lower level managers for six of the roles. As predicted, the external roles of liaison, spokesperson and figurehead were rated as significantly more important at higher levels of management. Also as predicted, the leader role was rated as significantly more important for lower level managers than for either middle or top level managers. Three roles did not produce significant difference between levels. They are: entrepreneur, disturbance handler and technical expert. Also, as predicted, conceptual skills were required to a greater extent by the Chief Executive Officer level than at lower levels. No significant differences were found between levels for human, technical or political skills. Pavett and Lau (1983) discussed their results in detail and thus indicated that hierarchical level contributes to differences in the rated importance of the managerial roles. Although the operational definition of
Mintzberg's roles used here varied from previous studies, the present results differ only slightly from those of Alexander (1979) and Paolillo (1981). Specifically, all three studies indicate that the roles of disseminator, figurehead, negotiator, liaison and spokesperson are more important at the higher managerial levels than at the lower levels. Lower level managers rated leadership as most important for successful job performance than did either middle managers, or Chief Executive Officers. This result is not similar to the results of either Alexander (1979) or Paolillo (1981), who found no significant differences in the leadership roles across levels. According to Mintzberg (1980), leadership involves inter-personal relationships, motivational activities, and an integration of individual and organizational goals. Because lower level managers are closest to the actual supervision of nonmanagerial personnel, these behaviours should be relatively important at this level.

Blau (1986) using a sample of 100 managers (average age 38 years) of different levels within a government agency, examined the relationship of managerial level to effort level, direction of effort, and managerial performance. Results indicated that management level was significantly related to effort level and several directions of effort scales. Management level was also found to moderate the relationship between direction of effort and managerial performance. Middle level/upper level managers put in more hours per week than lower level managers. More successful
middle level/upper level managers seemed to invest more of their effort on subordinate related behaviours.

Cahoon and Rowney (1986) in their results from a study of managers and their organization, reported that organizational development strategies should be appropriate for the individual manager's needs which are different at different levels. The entry level managers require an emphasis on technical skills and task clarity. These factors have limited relevance for the middle level executives for whom the focus should be on self awareness and interpersonal skills. Strategies for top level managers should emphasize flexibility of function.

Cox (1986) conducted a study to examine the differences of leadership styles, role perceptions, attitudes and behaviours of service industry managers. Management attitudes moved from theory X perspective to theory Y perspective from lower to top management. Lower management saw people tending towards the mature along Argyrias's maturity/immaturity continuum while top management, saw people tending towards the immature.

Misra (1986) reported that, in sum, successful managers exhibited relatively more behaviours classified as "networking" (interacting with outsiders and socializing/politicking) and managing conflict and considerably fewer human resources management behaviours categorized as motivating and staffing. However, managers at the very top of the organizations studied,
did not do as much socializing and politicking as the middle managers and first line supervisors. Perhaps these managers, having got to the top, no longer needed to depend upon socializing/politicking. Research on the generalizability of these results in Indian organization may be a step in the right direction.

Ford and Noe (1987) examined the influence of managerial levels and managerial attitudes toward training utility on self reported training needs, using 506 lower and middle level managers across four functional areas. Subjects completed a training needs survey consisting of items related to basic managerial, interpersonal, administrative, and quality control skills. Results showed that managerial level had some effect on reported utility of administrative and quality control skills.

Kumar and Ghadially (1989) compared the attitudes of managers across levels to employees and interpersonal trust. However, they found no difference across hierarchy.

A majority of studies reveal hierarchy to be an important factor in determining managerial effectiveness. Hence it is expected that managerial effectiveness will differ according to level of managers.