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MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS AND PERSONALITY
EYSENCKIAN THEORY OF PERSONALITY

The study of personality is one of the most fascinating and intriguing areas in psychology. Modern social and behavioural science in general and psychology in particular aims at utilizing and controlling human personality to the full development and progress of the individual and society (Mohan, 1985).

Over the years Eysenck (1947, 1960, 1963, 1967, 1969, 1970, 1980) developed and modified a formidable personality theory which posits three independent major dimensions of personality, viz. Extraversion/Introversion (E/I), Neuroticism/Stability (N) and Psychoticism (P). Eysenck (1963) also proposed a psychobiological model to parallel these three dimensions (Eysenck, 1969, 1981 and Eysenck and Eysenck, 1985). The model is a hierarchical one which conceptualizes that each of the three broad dimensions are subdivided at a lower level into narrower and more specific traits. Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) contended that a large portion of the total common variance produced by the correlations between various personality traits could be accounted for by these three higher order factors, i.e. Extraversion, Neuroticism and Psychoticism. These superfactors have been sufficiently often replicated to suggest stable and permanent dimension of personality structures (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1976; Eysenck and Zuckerman, 1978 and Eysenck, 1981).

Eysenck and Eysenck (1968, 1975) defined Extraversion as the outgoing, uninhibited, impulsive and social inclination of a person. The Neuroticism/Stability dimension was the second major
personality dimension deduced by Eysenck (1947, 1963, 1970). Neuroticism (N) refers to a general emotional over responsiveness, emotional lability and liability to neurotic breakdown under stress. A high scorer on Psychoticism may be described as being solitary, hostile, not caring for people, aggressive, he is often troublesome and does not fit anywhere. He may be cruel and inhumane, lacking in feeling and empathy and altogether insensitive (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975). In addition Eysenck's Personality Questionnaire also measures Lie (Social Desirability) Scale. The Lie (Social Desirability) Scale which was first incorporated in the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) to measure a tendency on the part of the subjects to 'fake good', now measures an independent, stable personality factor which possibly denotes some degree of 'social naivette' (Social Desirability) (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975).

Recently, Perera and Eysenck (1984) further reported that the Lie (Social Desirability) Scale which was originally regarded simply as a scale to detect faking, has recently been recognised as a personality dimension of some intrinsic interest apart from faking; the social desirability aspect of the lie score is probably of the greatest importance in cross-cultural projects, because norms on this factor seem to reflect the degree of social permissiveness of the country or culture under observation and the degree of conformity of the subject. All these dimensions of personality have been found to be cross-culturally valid (Eysenck and Eysenck, 1983 and Mohan et al., 1987).
A number of studies have been conducted to investigate sex differences in Eysenckian dimensions of personality. Several researchers reported males to score significantly higher than females on Psychoticism (Eysenck, 1978; Avtar, 1984; Chen et al., 1985; Bhandari and Sarup, 1987; Mohan and Sheoran, 1987; Tambs et al., 1989 and Wong and Reading, 1989). However, no significant sex differences on Psychoticism have been reported by Mohan and Gulati (1989).


On Neuroticism, females have been reported to score significantly higher than males (Mohan, 1976; Mohan et al., 1981; Gulati, 1982; Chen et al., 1985; Mohan and Virdi, 1985; Sarup, 1986; Mohan and Sheoran, 1987; Mohan and Gulati, 1989; Tambs et al., 1989 and Wong and Reading, 1989). No significant sex differences on Neuroticism were reported by Furnham (1984) and Bhandari and Grewal, (1990).

Females have been found to score significantly higher than males on Lie (Social Desirability) Scale (Eysenck, 1959; Guttman, 1966; Eysenck and Eysenck, 1975; Avtar, 1984; Chen et al., 1985; Mohan and Sheoran, 1987 and Tambs et al., 1989). Mohan and Gulati
(1989), Wong and Reading (1989) and Bhandari and Grewal (1990) reported no significant sex differences on Lie (Social Desirability) Scale.

Mohan and Jain (1984) and Rana (1989) reported no sex differences on all the four Eysenckian personality dimensions, viz., Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and Lie (Social Desirability) Scale.

Inderriaden (1987) reported that recent leadership research has focussed on the relationship between individual behaviours and effectiveness from the perspective of personality. The contingency of situational leadership theorists also consider the moderating effect of leaders' characteristics, subordinates' characteristics and work group factors on the relationship between leader behaviour and work group performance (Graen et al., 1978; McMahon, 1972 and House and Mitchell, 1974).

**MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS AND PERSONALITY**

Several researchers have highlighted the central role of Personality in Managerial/Leadership behaviour and identified the personality patterns of effective managers. The psychological literature abounds with studies in which the relationship between leadership characteristics and behaviours and several aspects of work group effectiveness have been measured (Stogdill, 1974 and Mohan, 1985). Bass (1981) in his research on the personality of leaders indicates that personality is an important factor in
emergence as a leader and in maintaining that role. Mohan (1985) claimed that the rise of behavioural sciences, particularly of psychology and the awareness to update and modernise management and administrative sciences has brought the study of managerial personality to the fore. Ghosh (1989) viewed leadership both as a personal quality and also as an organizational function. The first refers to a special combination of personal characteristics and the second refers to the patterns of power and authority in an organization.

Muthayya (1969, 1970) studied executive personality in administrative set ups connected with development administration. He used Eysenck Personality Inventory in studying the administrative officers belonging to middle and higher levels of the set up. These officers were found to be introverted and emotionally stable as per comparative norms.

Kumar (1970) had found successful executives to be achievement oriented, challenging, stimulating, task oriented and creative.

In a recent study Merenda et al. (1975) found that perception of business executives by the MBA students of an Indian University on Activity Vector Analysis, clustered around the pattern of aggressive decisiveness.

Mohan (1977) in a comparative study of executives found them to be introverted with high drive and courage and qualities of effective decision making, a sense of responsibility and kind
heartedness. Mohan and Kapoor (1977) viewing the MBA's as potential managers found them to be higher on Extraversion and Neuroticism as compared to other Panjab University students (Mohan and Jaspal, 1975 and Mohan et al., 1975) and highly motivated.

Hogan (1978) stated that the leaders tend to be bright, sociable, self confident and responsible. His results support the notion that there is a stable set of personality dimensions that characterize leaders across situations. He said that according to Freud (1960) the leader awakens in his followers memories of the primal father and they respond accordingly. Thus the leader is like the primal father, i.e. he is "of a masterful nature, absolutely narcissistic, self confident and independent" (Freud, 1960). His data suggested that although all leaders may be dominant, self confident and independent they are not necessarily egocentric, narcissistic and tyrannical.

Singh (1982) opined that the early attempts to examine managerial styles emphasized the analysis of personality traits. A number of studies demonstrated that managers/leaders, as compared to the non-leaders, were more intelligent (Gibb, 1947 and Mann, 1959), had greater self confidence (Richardson and Hanawalt, 1944), self assurance and self knowledge (Cox, 1926), and had better personality integration (Mann, 1959). Leaders were found to be more extrovert and sociable (Mann, 1959) and moderately equitarian in personality (Bass, 1960).
Walker, L. A. (1984) reported that managerial personnel had above average need levels in Dominance than normal population.

Mohan (1985) administered Eysenck's Personality Inventory to twenty administrators, twenty senior police officers, forty six bank officers, twenty six MBAs and five hundred university students. The attempt was to compare the executives in different positions on Extraversion, Neuroticism and self and ideal perception.

With the exception of bank officers only, all the other groups of executives (administrators, police officers and MBAs) showed lower means on Extraversion than university students. According to Mohan (1985) this implies that they plan things, are thoughtful, prefer a few chosen friends and theoretically condition better and have higher cortical arousability than the university students. The scores of three other categories of executives when compared with general management group in Britain (Eysenck, 1967) indicated that the Indian executives were more introverted than the British. On Neuroticism - all these Indian executive groups obtained higher mean scores in comparison to the students, administrative officers (Muthayya, 1970) and business managers in Britain (Eysenck, 1967). This implies clearly their high level of drive. If one tries to draw conclusions on the basis of these means, it could be safely said that these executives tend to be introverted on the whole and very highly motivated, opined
Mohan (1985). In typical Eysenckian terms it implies an executive personality high on cortical arousal as well as autonomic energization. Probably successful administration and management depends on cool decision making and then fervent implementation thereof (Mohan, 1985).

Most important self and ideal self personality traits were measured through Activity Vector Analysis - An adjective checklist. In the present study the administrators, saw themselves as considerate, generous and balanced and considered the 'Ideal executive' should be bold, balanced and courteous. The police officers viewed themselves as loyal, god-fearing and considerate and considered their ideal self to be bold, loyal and tactful. The bank officers saw themselves as mature, persistent and capable and their ideal self as bright, capable and soft-hearted. MBAs found themselves as bright inspiring and decisive and aimed at being forceful, tactful and persuasive. Mohan (1985) reported that these observations indicate that these executives were emotionally balanced, humane in approach, loyal to the organization, effective in decision making with a lot of persistence, intelligence and consideration. When one compares the perceptions of different groups of executives in the present study, it may be noted that emphasis on effectiveness, control, brilliance, human considerations, owning up the responsibilities and tactfulness is rather obvious.
This study finds an executive to be introverted individual with very high drive and possessing qualities of effective decision making, courage, sense of responsibility, kind heartedness, capacity to lead people and even god-fearing. The sketch appears to be of an efficiently bold man with positive value system and dynamism to direct people towards carefully planned targets.

Mohan (1985) concluded that a good image of the personality of an executive tends to include some major characteristics and traits. The foremost among these is the knowledgeability and decisive competence of the persons who have to hold responsible positions. Effectiveness in communication, morale building, rapport followed by an understanding of the people, situations and the problems form the next set of qualities considered important for the success of an executive. Emotional stability, sense of responsibility and impartiality in official dealings compounded with a positive value system helps in promoting welfare and improvement. Above all a human approach, a wholistic angle and commitment to the organization lend colour and drive to the personality of an executive. He further opined that an executive cannot afford to be incompetent, arrogant and alienated from his people. He cannot be unrealistic and show tantrums, moods, whims and idiosyncracies.

Gibson (1987) in his appraisal of managerial performance 'strongly confirmed' the validity of core personality constructs associated with managerial behaviour.
Jackson et al. (1987) reviewed research on the personal attributes of personnel executives and human resource managers and reports on two surveys of 328 male and 125 female personnel executives to demonstrate their vocational interests and personality patterns. Results revealed high degree of similarity between male and female personnel executives. Notable exceptions between the sexes were that while both sexes were high in achievement and dominance compared to the norms, women were somewhat higher on these traits and expressed low interest in family activities.

Mohan and Rattan (1987a) in their study, aimed at determining the personality of the executives belonging to three services i.e. the Indian Administrative service, Indian Police Service and Indian Revenue Service. It is seen that both the Indian Administrative Officers and Indian Police Service officers scored higher on Extraversion as compared to their counterparts in a study conducted by Mohan (1977). However both the Indian Administrative Officer (IAS) and Indian Police Service (IPS) executives scored lower on Neuroticism as compared to the mean score obtained by the IAS and IPS executives in the study by Mohan (1977). Results revealed that the executives of three services obtained higher mean scores on Extraversion and Social Desirability and comparatively lower mean scores on Neuroticism and Psychoticism. Mohan and Rattan (1987) opined that it can be safely concluded that these executives were found to be extraverted and emotionally stable individuals.
Armstrong (1988) said that there is good evidence that there are certain basic personality traits which tend to characterize leaders in a wide variety of situations. Leaders tend to be better adjusted, more dominant, more extraverted, less conservative and have a better understanding of people than the rank and file.

Ghosh (1989) in her study investigated the effect of certain biographical factors on the leadership styles of a group of fifty-six lower and middle level managers. She assumed that only born and first born individuals would have authoritarian type of leadership than the individuals having a number of brothers and sisters. It was also expected that the middle and later born individuals and those coming from a large family would be more nurturant and democratic in their leadership styles. However, results showed that biographical factors like birth order, number of siblings and family size did not play any important role in managerial style of managers.

Sehgal and Rana (1991) studied the relationship between Reddin's managerial styles, viz. Deserter, Missionary, Autocrat, Compromiser, Bureaucrat, Developer, Benevolent-Autocrat and Executive with Eysenckian dimensions of personality, viz. Extraversion, Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Lie (Social Desirability) Scale in 240 hotel managers. They found no relationship between Deserter, Missionary and Autocrat managerial styles and Extraversion, Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Lie (Social
Desirability) Scale. Compromiser and Benevolent-Autocrat managerial styles were negatively and significantly related with all the Eysenckian dimensions of personality. Bureaucrat, Developer and Executive managerial styles were significantly and positively related with all the Eysenckian personality dimensions.

OWNERSHIP PATTERN AND PERSONALITY

Following studies have been conducted to study the effect of organizational ownership pattern on personality.

Rainey et al. (1976) gave attributes of public sector employees relative to private sector employees. They said that regarding personal characteristics of employees of public sector, there are variations in personality traits and needs. They are higher on dominance and flexibility and higher on need for achievement; lower on work satisfaction and lower on organizational commitment in comparison to private sector employees.

Warrier (1983) after intensive interviewing of thirteen private and public sector managers indicated that while public sector managers were concerned exclusively with work related values, these values were secondary to the private sector managers, their most important concern being interpersonal relationship. The differences in the value systems between the two groups were attributed to the differences in the culture of these organizations, bureaucratic in the public sector and non-bureaucratic in the private sector. Warrier (1983) hypothesized
that such differences in organizational culture call for different personality types, if they are to succeed as managers.

Eddy (1984) highlighted the characteristics of public sector managers. He opined that the successful public sector manager was a "conceptual leader" who was sensitive to the organizational and environmental factors which shape the work of public sector organization.

LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT AND PERSONALITY

Some studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of levels of management on personality. De Uries et al. (1986) contended that the global psychological orientation of key organization members are major determinants of the neurotic styles of their organization. This has many consequences. Top executives may create shared fantasies that permeate all levels, influence organizational culture and underlie dominant organizational adaptive style. This style greatly influences decisions about strategy and structure. Pathological organizational types seemed in many ways to mirror the types of dysfunctions common to the most widely discussed neurotic styles among top level individuals.

Schilit (1986) examined the upward influence capabilities of sixty middle level managers and three non-managerial personnel with managerial responsibilities in a variety of strategic decisions. It was found that (i) middle level managers tended to be successful in their upward influence and interactions but exerted
influence primarily in less risky strategic decisions; (ii) middle level managers who had been working for their superiors for a long period of time were extremely influential in strategic decision and (iii) middle level managers who were high in their need for Achievement or need for Power or who had an internal locus of control were more influential in strategic decisions than were middle level managers who were low in need for Achievement or need for Power or who had an external locus of control.

Armstrong (1988) quoted the British expert on leadership; John Adair, in his book, who gave the following ranking of the twelve attributes rated most valuable for the top level managers by successful chief executives. They are decisiveness; leadership; integrity; enthusiasm; imagination; willingness to work hard; analytical ability; understandings of others; ability to spot opportunities; ability to adapt quickly to change; ability to meet unpleasant situations and willingness to take risks.

The reviewed studies do not give clear picture of the personality characteristics of effective managers. It does suggest, however, that organizational ownership pattern, and hierarchy would require different managerial personality patterns to achieve effectiveness.
MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS AND MOTIVATION
MOTIVATION

Human resources constitute a key input in any organization. It is the people, who with their skills and talents, can help meet organizational needs, in terms of financial and physical resources (Rajagopalan, 1986). The problem of handling human resources is quite different from that of physical, material and financial resources because the former are not standardised, interchangeable or passive. Membership in organizations is a central part of the lives of most people. Psychologists have found that people vary considerably in their ability to behave in certain ways (Porter et al., 1975). With the growing realisation on the part of the organization of the importance of human resources, efforts have been directed towards effectively harnessing these resources. One needs managers who are not only professionally competent but committed and motivated. Motivated behaviour is one that ensures peaked performance and one may subsume that managerial motivation is the key factor in determining managerial effectiveness.

Managerial motivation is also an important determinant of organizational effectiveness. Venkataraman and Valecha (1981) are of the opinion that motivation is very closely linked with job performance, productivity and organizational effectiveness. Thus, the topic of motivation at work has received considerable and sustained attention in recent years among both practising managers and organizational researchers.

Rajagopalan (1986) reported that motivation comes from the Latin word 'movere', which means 'to move' and has been
defined as 'all those inner striving conditions described as wishes, desires, drives etc. It is an inner state that activates or moves (Bernard et al., 1964) and' ...the combination of forces which initially direct and sustain behaviour towards a goal (Lindsley, 1957).

The study of motivation is concerned with 'how behaviour gets started, is energised, is sustained, is directed, is stopped and what kind of subjective reaction is present in the organism while all this is going on' (Jones, 1957).

According to Dubin (1974) a simple definition of motivation relevant to business and organization may be that 'it is the complex of forces starting and keeping a person at work in an organization.' Among the diverse factors that influence the behaviour, the needs of an individual are most important (Kumar, 1976). It refers to those forces operating within an individual which impel him to act or not to act in certain ways. Motivation in an organization is the willingness of an employee to respond to organisational requirements.

Rajagopalan (1986) grouped the theories on motivation under two major divisions, viz. the content and the process theories. The content theories of motivation are those which attempt to determine such needs of an individual that energise and direct his behaviour. The process theories of motivation are those which explain how behaviour is energised and directed. Content theories of McClelland et al. (1953), Maslow (1954), Herzberg et al. (1959),
McGregor (1960) and Atkinson (1964), bring out an account of what needs, values or expectations are important. Atkinson's theory of motivation (1964) is an example of content theory.

Litwin's (1984) study relied on recent systematic research and theory-building in the field of human motivation carried out by McClelland (1962), Atkinson (1964, 1968), and others. Atkinson (1964) developed a formal model of motivational behaviour which puts considerable emphasis on environmental determination of motivation. Litwin (1984) said that the assumptions underlying Atkinson's model may be restated as follows:

(a) All individuals have certain basic motives or needs. These motives represent behaviour potentials and influence behaviour only when aroused.

(b) Whether or not these motives are aroused depends upon the situation or environment perceived by the individual.

(c) Particular environmental properties serve to stimulate or arouse various motives. In other words, a specific motive will not influence behaviour until the motive is aroused by an appropriate environmental influence.

(d) Changes in the perceived environment result in changes in the pattern of aroused motivation.

(e) Each kind of motivation is directed to the satisfaction of different kinds of needs. The pattern of aroused motivation determines behaviour, and a change in the pattern of aroused motivation will result in a change of behaviour.
Several motives have been identified and studied (Atkinson, 1958). The most significant of these motives in work settings as identified by Atkinson (1958) are: the need for Achievement, defined as the need to excel in relation to competitive or an internalized standard of excellence; the need for Affiliation, defined as the need for close interpersonal relationships and friendships with other people; and the need for Power, defined as the need to control or influence others and to control the means of influencing others. The present study has also included need for Approval in its purview along with need for Achievement, need for Affiliation and need for Power.

**need for Achievement**

Costley and Todd (1983) reported that for over twenty years, McClelland and his associates (1962, 1984) have studied achievement motivation in both laboratory settings and organizational environments. Their studies led to the identification of achievement motivation as a distinct human need that varies in intensity among people. As the researches advanced, it became clear that the need to achieve was the key to economic growth and entrepreneur success (McClelland, 1984).

Steers and Porter (1979) reviewing the characteristics of an individual high on need for Achievement state that: "He likes situations in which he takes personal responsibility for finding solutions to problems. Another characteristic of a man with a
strong achievement concern is his tendency to set moderate achievement goals and to take calculated risks. The man who has a strong concern for achievement also wants concrete feedback as to how well he is doing."

Costley and Todd (1983) listed few more characteristics of individuals high on achievement motivation viz. (i) they are more concerned with the achievement itself than with any rewards that result from their success; (ii) since those with high achievement motivation are primarily concerned with individual accomplishment, they tend to have a desire for specific feedback on how successful they are in reaching objectives and (iii) individuals with high achievement motivation spend more time thinking about performing high level accomplishments than do individuals with low achievement motivation. McClelland's (1961) research had reported that when people begin thinking in terms of achievement, their levels of achievement increased.

Mohan and Rattan (1987) opined that need for Achievement is a striving to increase or keep as high as possible one's own capabilities in all activities in which a standard of excellence is thought to apply.

According to Meichenbaum et al. (1989), "the need for Achievement is a learned, internalized desire to perform well and to strive for excellence in a variety of activities."

Andrewes (1967), Hindlichs (1967), Birney (1968), Kumar (1970), Anatharaman and Deivsenspathy (1979) and Maitra (1983)
found successful and effective executives to be high on achievement motivation.

Lawless (1979) explained why good managers/effective managers need to be high on need for Achievement. Lawless (1979) refers to the achieving personality and said that many effective managers fall into this personality category. It is a category that has provoked considerable discussion because it relates so closely to managerial behaviour. The need for Achievement was defined by the psychologist Murray (1964) many years ago as follows:

"To accomplish something difficult. To master, manipulate, or organise physical objects, human beings, or ideas. To do this as rapidly and independently as possible. To overcome obstacles and attain a high standard. To excel oneself. To rival and surpass others. To increase self regard by the successful exercise of talent."

Persons scoring high on need for Achievement thus would prove to be good managers, opined Lawless (1979). Research studies have also supported this point. The vast majority of successful entrepreneurs and managers ranked high on need for Achievement regardless of their country of work or social stratum.

McClelland (1984) said that successful businessmen and executives are not motivated by greed and self interest; their success, prestige, and income are due more to their high need for Achievement.

Some studies have been conducted to discover the relationship of need for Achievement with managerial success.
Fineman (1975) stated that a number of researchers have looked for a direct relationship between a manager's need for achievement and his performance, but with mixed success. In his investigation the hypothesis tested was that a positive correlation between need for Achievement and performance would be more likely to occur when a manager perceives the job climate in strong achievement terms. Data gathered from a sample of a total of 382 managers from food manufacturing and heavy engineering firms tended to support this.

Singh (1978) conducted a seven-year follow-up study of agricultural entrepreneurs of high and low achievement motivation. The findings indicated that agriculture entrepreneurs with high need for Achievement continued to increase their productivity more than their counterparts, low on need for Achievement.

Singh and Srivastava (1983) planned their investigation to study the potential effects of need for Achievement on the relationship between employee's performance and job satisfaction. The following conclusions were drawn from their study:

1. The need for Achievement appeared to represent an important variable in the job performance - job satisfaction relationships.

2. Satisfaction level was significantly higher for high need for Achievement group than their counterparts.

3. The findings very clearly indicated the presence of a strong relationship between need for Achievement and productivity as also between satisfaction and productivity.
(4) Performance level for high need for Achievement group was better than for low need for Achievement group.

(5) There were no cross-cultural differences between Indian and American workers so far as the effect of need for Achievement on job performance and job satisfaction relationship is concerned.

Pearson (1986) reported that supervisors tended to rate high achievement motivated engineers more successful compared to low achievement motivated engineers.

Dalal and Sethi (1988) found that high need for Achievement subjects showed a tendency to attribute success to their own efforts and to attribute failure to both lack of effort and task difficulty.

**need for Affiliation**

If a person spends his time thinking about the warm, friendly, companionate relationships he has, or he would like to have with others, he has a need for Affiliation. Such persons want others to like them, and are likely to pay attention to the feelings of others (Steers and Porter, 1979).

Misra and Tripathi (1980) gave the following characteristics of individuals high on need for Affiliation. They said that those high on need for Affiliation tend to describe themselves as friendly, warm, trusting, talkative, cheerful, kind, loyal, helpful, praiseworthy, accepting and generous.
McClelland (1982) said that affiliation is an important motive as it can reduce the negative effects of stress. Caring for others and being cared for by others can counteract some of the potential harm stemming from a high powered life style.

Costley and Todd (1983) stated that the need for Affiliation for human companionship and reassurance produces a desire to interact with people. Indications are that everyone has affiliation needs and experience some desire to give and receive attention but the intensity of affiliation motivation varies among individuals. Some people have very high affiliation motivation while others are relatively low on this motive.

People prefer to be with other people. This general tendency to stay with other people, is referred to as the affiliation motive (Houston, 1985) Most people need the protection afforded by group membership.

Human beings differ on the need for the company of others. According to Meichenbaum et al. (1989), people who tend to seek out others, value being with them, and care about them are said to be exhibiting a need for Affiliation. Such people have learned that others can offer comfort or aid. Others can provide information important to attaining goals and can act as models or spur one on to greater efforts.

Costley and Todd (1983) opined that individuals can satisfy their affiliation needs in organizations by (i) receiving approval
and reassurance from employees and managers; (ii) conforming to the desires of work groups and management; (iii) helping and supporting others in the organization and (iv) having frequent interpersonal contacts and good interpersonal relations. Individuals with strong affiliation motivation tend to take jobs characterized by a high level of interpersonal interactions, such as public relations, personnel, sales and teaching. For individuals with high affiliation motivation, social relationships will usually take precedence over task accomplishment. Trying hard to get along with others and enjoying the company of others are indications of high affiliation motivation.

Costley and Todd (1983) further stated that the satisfaction of employees' affiliation needs can be beneficial to an organization. Research findings indicate that when employees' affiliation needs are satisfied by association with others on the job, there is a decrease in absenteeism and turnover. When there are cooperative work group affiliations, productivity tends to be high and costs low. Most individuals dislike being isolated and desire to have contact with other people.

Several studies have been conducted highlighting the relationship of need for Affiliation with managerial effectiveness. According to Steers and Porter (1979) men with strong need for Affiliation seek out jobs which offer opportunities for friendly interaction. In business these men often take supervisory jobs where maintaining good relationships is more important than decision making. People who have institutionalized helping roles,
such as teachers, nurses and counsellors, also demonstrate strong need for Affiliation. They further added that while strong need for Affiliation does not seem to be important for effective managerial performance, and might well be detrimental, recent research has suggested that some minimal concern with the feelings of others and with the companionate quality of relationships is necessary for superior managerial and executive capability.

Boyatzis (1984) observed that a manager with a high need for Affiliation would strive for approval from his subordinates and superiors; he would be sensitive to others' facial expressions and their feelings (Atkinson and Walker, 1956), and if the manager and his subordinates were to disagree, the manager would change his attitude to one which was more acceptable to the subordinate's, especially if the manager likes the subordinate (Burdick and Burnes, 1958 and Byrne, 1961). If this manager with a high need for Affiliation was given a choice as to which of his subordinates he would like to work with on a task, he would choose the subordinate with whom he has a close, friendly relationship even if this person is less competent to perform the task than another subordinate (French, 1956). He would also choose a subordinate less likely to reject his offer, rather than choose a more qualified subordinate (Rosenfeld, 1964).

The manager with a high need for Affiliation is so concerned about his relationships that performance objectives of his job become confused. The goal of building and maintaining
friendly relations supersedes a concern over the effectiveness of his organizational unit's performance toward corporate objectives. He sincerely believes that friendly relations are necessary for healthy corporate performance.

In contrast to above findings, several studies have shown that a person with high affiliation motivation demonstrates behaviour which contributes to the effectiveness of corporate performance. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967) reported that effective "integrators" (managers whose function is to integrate the work of various people or units) rank higher in the need for Affiliation than their less effective peers.

Boyatzis (1972) tried to resolve these contradictory results by proposing a new theory of affiliation motivation in which he claimed that there are two forms of the motive; one is called affiliative assurance and the other affiliative interest. With these two types of affiliation motivation in mind, prior findings are reconciled into clear patterns of behaviour; one would lead to effective performance of a manager's job and the other would not. A preliminary attempt to separate the affiliative assurance motive from the affiliative interest motive demonstrated support for Boyatzis's theory, but lacked enough substantial results to consider it as a definitive theoretical and methodological solution to the problem of measuring affiliation motives.

Boyatzis (1984) stated that a manager with a high affiliative assurance motive will basically be concerned about obtaining
assurance as to the security and strength of his close relations. He will be anxious about not being rejected. This concern leads him to look for 'proof' of others' commitment to him and to avoid issues or conflicts which may threaten the stability of the relationship. He would tend to be jealous or possessive of his subordinates (and possibly of his superior), search for communications which support the closeness of the relationship and look for signs of approval from others around him. He would avoid conflict situations by smoothing things over, or abdicating his role in intervening to resolve the conflict. It is this assurance form of affiliation motivation which would interfere with a person's work as a manager. It would be his "grasping" on to close relationships which would drain his energy and absorb his time. He would spend time seeking approval and security, rather than doing his job. Such a manager would not look forward to a transfer or promotion of him or his subordinates, but, instead would like to keep them all in the family. The objectives of this manager's organizational unit would be ambiguous to his subordinates. Although corporate objectives would be clear, the manager would actually be spending time working on the relationships, and at times, at the expense of performance objectives.

On the other hand, the manager with predominantly an affiliative interest motive, however, would want the subordinates to feel a part of the human organization. The rules of behaviour in his relationships would include interpersonal concern and
openness and because the relationship is in the context of the whole organization, there would be a sense of closeness evolved from working together towards performance objectives. This would not threaten, or diminish, the manager's feelings of closeness to his subordinates. This type of manager can evaluate a subordinate's piece of work, give him negative or positive feedback, and not communicate a positive or negative overall evaluation of the subordinate as a person. As a result of the openness and concern over the subordinate's welfare, a climate of trust would be established which would encourage the subordinate to make his motives or concerns clear to the manager. This would enable the manager to direct the subordinate's work more effectively, designing his subordinate's job in a manner which responded to his motives or concerns. Such a manager would be enthusiastic about the transfer or promotion of one of his subordinates, not feeling the separation as a loss and would look forward to establishing a close relationship with a new subordinate.

It is the affiliative interest form of the motive which could lead to increased managerial effectiveness. Such a person's show of "concern" would not occur at the expense of goal oriented behaviour. Boyatzis (1984) concluded that a healthy and productive organization is a humane effort towards corporate performance objectives. By increasing the behaviour which would appear to emanate from an affiliative interest motive, a manager may create
a climate of interpersonal concern and trust which builds the
capability of the organization to reach its objectives and grow.

**need for Power**

Psychologists state that if a man spends his time thinking
about the influence and control he has over others, and how he
can use this influence to win an argument, to change other people's
behaviour, or to gain a position of authority and status, then he
has a high need for Power (Steers and Porter, 1979).

According to McClelland (1975), power motivation is the
desire of individuals to exert control over the events that affect
their lives.

Costley and Todd (1983) reported that power motivation
was specifically related to an individual's relationships with other
people. Everyone has some concern for the impact they have on
others and would like to have a degree of control in interpersonal
relations. In the simplest terms, the goal of power motivation is
to feel powerful. Power is an important factor in the operation
of any organization. An organization cannot function without people
who have the motivation to obtain power and to influence the
behaviour of others. A manager's job involves getting things done
through the effort of others, and he or she must be motivated
to influence other people. Leadership and power appear to be two
closely related concepts.

DuBrin (1985) made a distinction between socialized power,
i.e. people who crave power so that they can perform a social
good and self-serving power, i.e. those who crave power to serve their own ends.

Ragins and Sundstorm (1989) stated that power has usually been defined as a property of the individual, of interpersonal relationship, or of the structure of an organization. Together, these three approaches suggest a working definition of power. They elaborated each of these approaches to need for power.

(i) need for Power as a property of the individual - Early views of power from political science and sociology treated need for Power as an individual's ability or perceived ability to influence others (Etzioni, 1961) or to change others' behaviour (Weber, 1947; Dahl, 1957). These definitions implicitly treated power as a personality trait (McClelland, 1975) or as an acquired skill.

(ii) need for Power as the property of interpersonal relationships - An alternative definition holds that a person only has power with respect to other individuals in specific relationships (Pfeffer, 1981). Psychologists have viewed power as an aspect of interaction (Cartwright, 1959; Dansereau et al., 1975 and Yukl, 1981). This perspective focuses on dyadic processes and perceptions rather than on the qualities of one person.

(iii) need for Power as the property of the organization - Mechanic (1962) argued that power results from access to and control over persons, information and resources, which comes from
the individual's position in an organization. Power has also been treated as the capacity to affect outcomes or goals in organizations (Salancik and Pfeffer, 1974, 1977 and Mintzberg, 1983) and as a structural phenomenon created by the division of labour (Pfeffer, 1981).

Hence Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) gave a working definition of power as: "Power is defined as influence by one person over others, stemming from a position in an organization, from an interpersonal relationship, or from an individual characteristic."

**Characteristics of people high on need for Power**

Fodor and Farrow (1979) demonstrated experimentally that individuals high on the need for Power showed partiality towards ingratiating followers. In another study, high power motivated individuals were found to inhibit group discussion more than low power motivated individuals. As a consequence, the number of alternatives considered were fewer and the quality of decisions lower for groups led by high power motivated individuals (Fodor and Smith, 1982). High power motivated individuals became more highly activated when supervising others than low power individuals. Males high on need for Power reported that they had more arguments, played competitive sports more, had less stable interpersonal relations, favoured more assertive foreign policies, experienced more emotional problems and were more impulsively aggressive than males low on need for Power (McClelland, 1985).
Singh's (1986) results indicated that subjects scoring higher on need for Power tended to be reserved, forthright, trusting, conservative group adherents, interested in people, and less interested in economic values. Thus managers high on need for Power would behave differently than managers low on need for Power. According to McClelland (1984) since managers were primarily concerned with influencing others, it seems obvious that they should be characterized by a high need for Power and that by studying the power motive in managers one could infer about the way effective managers' work.

House and Singh (1987) in their review referred to McClelland (1985) wherein he has argued that the power motive is especially relevant to the practice of management and to the field of organizational behaviour. House and Singh (1987) reviewing concept of power motive said that several studies of the relationship between the power motive and leadership performance and executive success have recently been reported in the psychological literature. Ragins and Sundstrom (1989) also reported that need for Power, as defined by McClelland (1975), has been found to be closely related to managerial success.

Costley and Todd (1983) pointed to research done by McClelland (1984) that indicated that power motivation of managers can result in two very different management styles identified as personal power and institutional power, personal power can be thought of as "power over" and institutional power as "power with" others.
Managers with a personal power style try to be dominant. They can be inspirational and gain strong personal loyalty from employees. The personal power style can result in the managers being overbearing and interfering with the work of others because of their own need to dominate. They may reject organizational responsibility and focus on their desire to be in a superior position. Personal power has been associated with being aggressive, acquiring prestige symbols and developing dominance-submission relationships. Managers with a personal power style want employees to be loyal and responsible to them personally, not to the organization.

The institutional power manager is concerned with organizational problems and actions that will result in attaining organizational objectives. Managers with this style concentrate their efforts on influencing others to make commitments to effective task performance. They do not try to obtain personal submission or to dominate individuals. The manager with institutional power style wants loyalty to the organization and is concerned with group goals. Helping people to identify and achieve group goals, and providing support for individual effort, are characteristics of the institutional power style. According to McClelland (1975) individuals with a high institutional power orientation have the following characteristics: they feel responsible for developing an effective organization; they like work and doing things in an orderly way;
they are willing to sacrifice some of their self-interest for the welfare of the organization; they believe people should receive just rewards for their efforts; and they are more mature and willing to get advice from others.

Some other researchers have also investigated the relationship between managerial effectiveness and need for Power. Chattopadhyaya (1983) investigated the relationship between motivation and leadership in Indian enterprises. The hypotheses tested and proved were that (i) child rearing practices are at the base of omnipotent and impotent ambivalence in the child, and (ii) the striving for power by senior managers dampens enthusiasm in junior managers.

Cornelius and Frank (1989) in their study examined the validity of McClelland's Leadership Motive pattern (i.e. a successful leader should be moderate to high on need for Power, low on need for Affiliation and high on activity inhibition) for two levels of management personnel in a professionally oriented service industry organization. Three types of outcomes were used - attitudinal variables taken from survey responses of subordinates; objective measures of administrative performance taken from company records and a variable representing the importance of "status" of the location in which the manager worked. Results indicated that the Leadership Motive pattern was not related to administrative job performance or subordinates' morale. In fact,
for the subsample of first line supervisors, it was need for Affiliaton that was related to job performance and favourable subordinates' attitudes, and not need for Power or the Leadership Motive pattern. The results of this study were interpreted in light of the technical/professional nature of the employee sample. These results thus contribute to a growing literature that suggests the motivation to influence others may not be critical for managerial success in technical/professional settings.

Krausz (1986) discussed the relationship between types of power and leadership styles in organizations and the effect that these types of power and leadership styles have on the culture, climate and performance of an organization. Four derivative leadership styles were considered: coercive, controlling, participative and coaching. Using a transaction analysis approach, behavioural responses stimulated by different leadership styles were described. The most probable consequence of the coercive and controlling leadership styles was the establishment of a symbiotic relationship between the leader and group. In the coaching leadership styles the leader related to the group in a semi-symbiotic way. The participative leadership style was symbiosis-free so that individuals relate as equals.

need for Approval

As a construct, the need for Approval was developed by Crowne and Marlow (1964). They described a person high on
approval motive as an individual who needs to gain approval constantly from others, who is afraid of rejection if he behaves unlike others and who often conforms to group pressures and cultural norms. The goals and needs of the approval dependent person would appear to include social recognition and status, protection and dependency, love and affection. It seems reasonable to assume that the high need for Approval individual has learnt that conformity, submission and the normative anchoring of his behaviour entail the fewest risks of social rejection and threats to self esteem.

Individuals dependent upon the favourable evaluations of others appear to have difficulty in recognizing and contending with hostility. In a sense, high need for Approval individuals are more "normal" in that they exemplify many of the values of that particular culture to which they belong. They say the right things about themselves, appear to hold "proper" attitudes, reflect common language usage in their associations, set goals of acceptably intermediate risk, do not show hostility and seem in general to reflect the congeries of virtues defining the "adjusted" individual. On closer scrutiny, however, those identified as approval dependent seem to resolve some social and personal conflict in ways that result indirectment to themselves (Crowne and Marlow, 1964).

Lobel (1982) in his review said that some researchers have also investigated another aspect of need for Approval that includes the two components of this construct. Crowne and Marlowe
(1964) regarded need for Approval as a single personality characteristic and included in need for Approval both "dependence on evaluation of others" and "avoidance of self criticism". Other investigators (Jacobson and Ford, 1966; Millham, 1974 and Ramanaiah et al., 1977), however, stated that the construct is composed of two components; the approach or the attribution component, which is the tendency to attribute desirable characteristics to oneself, and the avoidance or the denial component, which is the tendency to deny undesirable characteristics in oneself. These investigators argued that it is possible that some people try to defend themselves against negative evaluation but do not try to gain a positive evaluation from others. Several researchers found moderately significant correlations between the two components (Ford, 1964; Greenwald and Clausen, 1970; Millham, 1974 and Ramanaiah et al., 1977). Some researchers (Rump and Court, 1971 and Millham, 1974) found different relationships between the two components and certain behaviours. These results suggest that the two components are partially independent of each other. Thus, it is possible that child-rearing variables are differentially related to these two components. On the basis of the studies cited above, Lobel (1982) opined that it was reasonable to assume that parental practices which emphasize the importance of approval by others and conformity to societal norms and conventions would tend to increase need for Approval in their children. It is also logical to assume that child-rearing variables that would foster fear of rejection and low self-esteem would be related to need for Approval.
Two groups of child-rearing variables have been identified to increase the child's need for Approval: (i) the mother's use of withdrawal of love and (ii) mother's stress on sex-role appropriate behaviour.

Regarding the first, Lobel (1982) hypothesized that the use of withdrawal of love would be positively correlated with need for Approval and tested it in his study. The rationale was that mothers who use withdrawal of love increase their children's fear of rejection and fear of loss of love. The children would learn that love is contingent upon approval. Thus, they would seek approval by the parents in order not to endanger their love. This behaviour would later be generalized towards other people. Lobel (1982) hypothesized that the use of love withdrawal would be related to both components of need for Approval, as it involves both defense against negative evaluation and wish for a positive evaluation.

Lobel's study found support for this hypothesis for girls only. For males, no relationship was found between need for Approval and maternal variables. The implication is need for Approval has different meanings for males and females. Crandall (1966) concluded that socially desirable responses were related to social interaction in girls and to achievement motivation in boys. There are studies that suggest that females are motivated by the desire for love rather than mastery even in achievement situations. Males, on the other hand, are motivated toward mastery
Sears et al. (1957) found that girls were more often disciplined by love-oriented techniques than were boys. Barry et al. (1957) demonstrated that there was more pressure towards obedience and nurturance in girls and toward self-reliance and achievement in boys. All these studies suggest that females relate approval to love and interaction. Hence, socialization processes dealing with love and interaction are related to need for Approval in females and not in males.

**MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS AND MOTIVATIONAL PATTERNS**

Several studies have been done to investigate the motivational patterns of successful/effective managers. Chatterji et al. (1988) reported that managerial motivation was definitely related with managerial effectiveness. Various researchers still reviewed studies relating managerial effectiveness with a combination of needs, viz. need for Achievement, need for Affiliation, need for Power and need for Approval.

Sinha (1971-76) in his review stated that there have been a number of studies identifying the motivating needs, values, styles and interaction patterns of Indian managers and workers. Among the motivating factors, money has been referred to by many (Das, 1971; Kalro and Misra, 1973; Kulkarni, 1973; Roy, 1973a,b and Agrawal, 1975) both for managers as well as for industrial and extension workers. Next in importance was job security as a motivating factor (Singhal and Upadhyaya, 1972; Kulkarni, 1973 and Paliwal and Paliwal, 1974). Status has been emphasized over money (Ganguli, 1979) for the middle as well as younger managers.
Once money and security needs are met, other motivators such as advancement and responsibility (Dass, 1971; Singhal and Upadhyaya, 1972 and Kalro and Misra, 1973) and self actualization (Kanungo et al., 1975) assumed salience.

Verga (1975) administered the French Test of Insight to 118 executives, scientists and engineers working in seventeen pharmaceutical and chemical industry projects. Analysis showed that:

(a) need for Achievement was significantly related with both technical and economic success;
(b) need for Power was a stray factor making for both technical and economic success when present in conjunction with need for Achievement.

Steers and Porter's (1979) review of studies of motivation of managers has revealed that although strong achievement motivation distinguished the successful manager or entrepreneur from other people, the men in top management, and particularly organization presidents were strongly motivated by the need for Power. McClelland and Boyatzis (1982) studied leadership motive patterns. TAT protocols for 237 managers obtained at the managers' entry into the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, and scored, and correlated with the levels of promotion attained after eight and sixteen years. As predicted, the leadership motive pattern (moderate to high need for Power, low need for Affiliation and high Activity Inhibition) was significantly associated with
managerial success after eight and sixteen years, for the non-technical managers. Among these managers need for Achievement was also associated with success, but only at lower levels, when individual contributions are more important than the ability to influence people.

Based on McClelland's (1962) discussion, Wainer and Rubin (1984) tested the proposition that the degree to which an entrepreneur is motivated by need for Achievement directly influences his skill as an entrepreneur and consequently his enterprise's performance. The major hypothesis tested concerned the relationship between an entrepreneur's level of need for Achievement and his company's performance. In addition to the relationship between need for Achievement and company performance, the authors were interested in the interrelationships among the three needs - need for Achievement, need for Power, and the need for Affiliation, with respect to company performance. McClelland's (1962) discussion of the joint product of need for Power and need for Affiliation in relation to dictatorship stimulated this aspect of the inquiry. He had reported that need for Power was not related to economic growth but was related to style of leadership. More specifically, the combination of a high need for Power and a low need for Affiliation was associated with the tendency of a country to resort to totalitarian methods as a style of leadership.

Wainer and Rubin (1984) proposed that need for Achievement has behavioural manifestations different than either
need for Power or need for Affiliation in terms of the individual's relationships with people. The authors believe that need for Power and need for Affiliation are interpersonally oriented needs. Implicit in their definitions is the existence of other human beings whom the need for Power or need for Affiliation motivated individual can influence and control, or with whom he can be friends. The need for Achievement, on the other hand, appeared to be a more internalized need. The need for Achievement motivated individual, may need other people to help him satisfy his need for Achievement, but the nature of his relationship with them, or more appropriately his effectiveness with them, will be determined by other needs. The authors concluded that need for Achievement is a primary consideration determining non-interpersonally related behaviour which leads to high company performance. It was believed that need for Power and need for Affiliation are primary considerations determining interpersonal behaviour that affects company performance. Thus, need for power and need for Affiliation, may be looked upon as having strong implications as determinants of management style. The major hypothesis tested in this study by Wainer and Rubin (1984) predicted a positive relationship between an entrepreneur's level of need for Achievement and his company's performance. The findings strongly supported the conclusion that high need for Achievement was associated with high company performance.
A secondary aim in the study of Wainer and Rubin (1984) was to explore the question of whether a certain pattern or combination of needs was most often associated with high company performance. It was hypothesized that need for Power and need for Affiliation were needs whose behavioural manifestations were interpersonal in character. The results of their study suggested that the combination of a high need for Achievement and a moderate need for Power characterized the highest performing companies in the sample. The authors explained this finding in terms of the relationship between need for Power and various styles of leadership: the lower the individual's need for Power, more permissive or laissez-faire his style of leadership would be; the higher his need for Power, the more autocratic or authoritarian his style of leadership would be. The middle of the need for Power spectrum represents a mixed influence of the two extreme styles which is best described as democratic style of leadership.

Chusmir and Hood (1986) found that several of Miner's (1978) managerial motivational patterns appeared to be related to need for Achievement or need for Power. The presence of both high need for Power and high need for Achievement was indicative of managerial motivation (Stahl, 1983). So, the authors concluded that firms should hire their low and middle managers from candidates who score high on both need for Achievement and need for Power.
Mahmoud (1987) in his study examined motivational profiles within the Arab culture. The association of needs for Achievement, Affiliation and Power with effectiveness (salary, promotion and GPA) and job satisfaction in the Arab culture were investigated. Findings then were compared with reported findings for the American culture. His results indicated that while the Arab culture is affiliation oriented, need for Affiliation was negatively associated with effectiveness (Promotion and GPA) for managers and students. Also need for Power was positively associated with effectiveness (salary) for managers. However, this relationship tended to be negative in case of the technical population (engineers and medical doctors). The motivational cross-cultural comparisons revealed no differences between the students. However, managers exhibited different motivational profiles due to culture. Based on the managerial comparison, the Arab culture exhibited higher affiliation, while the American culture exhibited higher power and achievement. Effective Arab managers, regardless of their managerial level, tended to be similar to the American executives in terms of their motivational profile (high need for Power and low need for Affiliation).

OWNERSHIP PATTERN AND MOTIVATIONAL PATTERNS

Studies have been conducted to see the effect of type of organization on managerial motivation. Singh (1979) examined the relationship between organizational ownership pattern (public and
private sectors) and the managerial power profiles. His findings led to the following conclusions:

(a) In the public sector organizations 'formal' power style was the most dominant style. Formal power is viewed in terms of the influence which normally flows from organizational position. An individual's influence is mainly accepted because he has a position which legitimises his power through tradition, appointment, hierarchy, rules, laws, etc.

(b) The desire for 'upward' power was fairly high in the public sector. This was, however, average in the private sector. Upward power is defined as an individual's ability to influence superior's behaviour and decisions pertaining to his area of operation. It also indicates a state of affairs where superiors heavily lean, accept and rely on the ideas and judgements of subordinates for organizational decisions.

(c) Valence for intra-individual power (persuasion and professional) was lower in both the public as well as the private sectors. Persuasion skill refers to an individual's ability to convince people. It also indicates an ability to work in a group (participative management) without causing conflicts. Professional skill is an influence which the power holder derives from the knowledge and expertise he has acquired in his professional career.
In the private sector, tendency to use sanctioned power (economic rewards and punishment) was the most pronounced power style. This was, however, rated average in the public sector. Sanctioned power refers to an individual's ability to administer corporate rewards and punishments for getting the work done. Power holder's judgement is normally decisive for the careers of the subordinates.

Naulin (1982) studied the factors that motivate public and private sector managers. Results of a motivation questionnaire returned by forty two middle managers indicated that both sectors perceived work and responsibility as the top motivator. Salary was also cited as a motivator for both groups.

Cheraghi (1983) addressed research questions to identify some of the motivational factors which public and private employees perceived as: most and least important; contributing most and least to dissatisfaction and most and least motivating.

The public and private sector employees' responses were compared. Findings of the study indicated significant differences between public and private sector employees on the importance, satisfaction with and motivation potential of nine reward categories. Public sector employees considered indirect economic benefits to be significantly less important than did private employees. Public sector employees were significantly less satisfied with the way their social, esteem and autonomy needs were met than were private
sector employees. Public sector employees were more satisfied than private sector employees with their indirect economic beliefs. The motivating potential of indirect economic benefits was significantly less for public than for private sector employees. Public sector employees were significantly more motivated by esteem and autonomy rewards than private sector employees. There were no significant differences between the two groups in terms of the degree to which they were motivated by social rewards, self actualization need, compensation, improved working conditions and direct economic benefits.

Srivastava (1984) in his comparative study of public and private sector employees hypothesized that it was the group of private sector employees that would be higher on need for achievement than public sector employees. His results supported this hypothesis.

Das (1991) compared need for Achievement of engineers in public and private sectors and found that engineers employed in private sector had higher need for Achievement in comparison to those employed in public sectors.

Yaney (1988) reported that different levels of employees with many different aspirations were influenced by varied motivations.

The review seems to be equivocal regarding what would be the motivational pattern associated with managerial effectiveness.
There is some direction that different motive patterns are required by manager in different organizations and of different hierarchical levels to be effective.
MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS
AND
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

In the past decade or so, the concept of organizational commitment has grown in popularity in the literatures of organizational psychology and organizational behaviour (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). The research on organizational commitment has been gaining momentum in recent years (Sheldon, 1971; Porter et al., 1974; Steers, 1977; Stevens et al., 1978; Marsh and Mannari, 1979; Angle and Perry, 1981; Morris and Sherman, 1981 and Bateman and Strasser, 1984).

Bateman and Strasser (1984) review that organizational commitment has been shown to be related to (a) employee behaviours, such as job search activities, turnover, absenteeism and to a lesser extent, performance effectiveness (Porter et al., 1974; Porter et al., 1976; Marsh and Mannari, 1977; Steers, 1977; Abelson and Sheridan, 1981; Angle and Perry, 1981; Farrell and Rusbult, 1981 and Bluedorn, 1982); (b) attitudinal, affective and cognitive constructs such as job satisfaction, job involvement and job tension (Hall and Schneider, 1972; Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972; Porter et al., 1974; Stone and Porter, 1976 and Stevens et al., 1978); (c) characteristics of the employee's job and role, including autonomy and responsibility (Koch and Steers, 1978), job variety and task identity (Steers, 1977) and role conflict and ambiguity (Morris and Koch, 1979 and Morris and Sherman, 1981) and (d) personal characteristics of the employee, such as age, sex, need for Achievement and job tenure (Sheldon, 1971; Hall and
Schneider, 1972; Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972; Steers, 1977; Koch and Steers, 1978 and Angle and Perry, 1981). The range of these correlates coupled with the belief that organizational commitment is a relatively stable attitude over time when compared to job satisfaction (Porter et al., 1974), suggests the importance of pursuing a thorough understanding of the operation of this major construct.

Organizational commitment has been defined and measured in several different ways (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). The various definitions and measures share a common theme in that organizational commitment is considered to be a bond or linking of the individual to the organization. The definitions differ in terms of how this bond is considered to have developed. The most commonly studied type of organizational commitment has been attitudinal, most often measured with scale developed by Porter and his colleagues (Porter et al., 1974 and Mowday et al., 1979). Attitudinal organizational commitment is defined as, "the relative strength of an individual's identification with and involvement in a particular organization. Conceptually, it can be characterized by at least three factors: (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values; (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization and (c) a strong desire to maintain membership in the organization (Mowday et al., 1982)".
The second most popular form of organizational commitment studied has been calculative commitment. Built upon the work of Becker (1960), calculative organizational commitment is defined as "a structural phenomenon which occurs as a result of individual's organizational transactions and alterations in side-bets or investments over time" (Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972). In this sense, individuals become bound to an organization because they have side bets, or sunk costs (e.g., a pension plan), invested in the organization and cannot "afford" to separate themselves from it. McGhee and Ford (1987) also endorsed this view of organizational commitment.

Meyer and Allen (1984) and Allen and Meyer (1987) used the terms affective commitment and continuance commitment, respectively to characterise Porter et al.'s (1974) and Becker's (1960) discrepant views of the construct. It was noted that, although both affective and continuance commitment reflect links between the employee and the organization that decrease the likelihood of turnover; the nature of the links are quite different. Employees with a strong affective commitment remain with the organization because they want to, whereas those with strong continuance commitment remain because they need to do so. Consequently, one might expect the on-the-job behaviour of those who are affectively committed to the organization to differ from that of employees whose primary link to the organization is based on continuance.
commitment. Those who value and want to maintain membership should be willing to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization (Mowday et al., 1982). In contrast, those who feel compelled to remain to avoid financial or other costs may do little more than the minimum required to retain their employment.

Allen (1985) stated that organizational commitment has a third component also besides affective and continuance commitment and that is the normative component. The normative component refers to the employee's feelings of moral obligation to the organization.

A few authors have been promoting some new ideas about commitment. Kanungo (1982) attempted to make a distinction between job involvement, work involvement and commitment, and opined that involvement in a specific job is different from involvement with work in general. The former is a belief, descriptive of the present job and tends to be a function of how much the job can satisfy one's present needs. But involvement with work in general or centrality of work in one's life, is a function of one's post-cultural conditioning or socialization. Thus, job involvement as a specific belief regarding one's present job is different from organizational commitment which refers to a general attitude toward an organization as a whole.

Reddy (1985a) quoting Balaji (1985) gave the following definition of organizational commitment, "It is an affective attitude in which an employee feels emotionally attached to his or her employing organization as a whole".

O'Reilly and Chatman (1986), Reichers (1986), Curry et
al. (1986) and Brooke and Russell (1988) endorsed the definition of organizational commitment as given by Porter et al. (1974) in their reviews.

Organizational commitment is a very important variable in the organization. Organizational commitment has been reported to be associated with organizational adaptability and low turnover (Angle and Perry, 1981; Bateman and Strasser, 1984; Meyer and Allen, 1987; Pierce and Dunham, 1987; Kluge, 1988 and Meyer et al., 1989). Relationship between organizational commitment and job satisfaction was reported by Bateman and Strasser (1984), Raju and Srivastava (1986), DeCotiis and Summon (1987) and Meyer et al. (1989).

Romzek (1989) examined the effect of employee commitment on individual's network and career satisfaction. Data on public employee's attitudes indicated that the individual consequences of employee commitment are positive, supporting the notion that psychological attachment to a work organization yields personal benefits for individuals. These results contradict the notion that people necessarily pay a high personal price for high levels of employee commitment and caution against viewing psychological attachment as a zero sum phenomenon.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) viewed that the concept of organizational commitment has received a great deal of empirical attention both as a consequence and an antecedent of work-related
variables of interest. As a consequence, organizational commitment has been linked to several personal variables, role states and aspects of the work environment ranging from job characteristics to dimensions of organizational structure. As an antecedent organizational commitment has been used to predict employee's absenteeism, performance, turnover and other behaviours.

Mowday et al. (1982) have suggested that gaining a greater understanding of the processes related to organizational commitment has important implications for employees, organizations and society as a whole. Employee's level of commitment to an organization may make them more eligible to receive both extrinsic (e.g., wages and benefits) and psychological (e.g., intrinsic job satisfaction and relationships with coworkers) rewards associated with membership. Organization's value commitment among their employees, which is typically assumed to reduce withdrawal behaviours such as lateness and turnover. In addition, committed employees may be more likely to engage in "extra roles" behaviours, such as creativeness or innovativeness, which are often, what keeps an organization competitive (Katz and Kahn, 1978). From a larger perspective, a society as a whole tends to benefit from employee's organizational commitment in terms of lower rates of job movement and perhaps higher national productivity or work quality or both.
Several studies have been done to investigate the relationship between managerial effectiveness and organizational commitment.

Relations between participatory leadership and organizational commitment were reported by Jermier and Berkes (1979) and Rhodes and Steers (1981). Both of the studies examined and found a positive relationship between organizational commitment and participatory leadership. Jermier and Berkes (1979) found that participatory leadership was most effective at influencing the commitment levels of police officers working in unpredictable environments. Rhodes and Steers (1981) found a higher correlation between participatory leadership and organizational commitment in worker-owned, as compared with conventional organizations.

Morris and Sherman (1981) studied the relationship of leadership style among other variables as correlates of organizational commitment. The results indicated that leadership behaviours may constitute an important and underresearched component in the commitment process. It was not surprising, then, that high structure/high consideration behaviour mixes on the part of leaders tended to be associated with high levels of commitment among subordinates within the sample.

Bruning and Snyder (1983) studied the relationship between leader communication and organizational commitment and found a
large positive correlation between the two. They said that presumably, a leader who provides more accurate and timely communication to subordinates enhances the work environment and thereby is likely to increase employees' commitment to the organization.

Schermarhorn (1986) described a team development approach that creates shared commitment to performance improvement by focusing the attention of managers on the individual worker and his/her task accomplishment.

Srinivasan and Kamalanabhan (1986) investigated the relationship between types of leadership styles and job involvement. It was found that three leadership styles (autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire) differed significantly, with democratic being the most and autocratic the least adopted style. Job involvement had no influence on the type of leadership behaviour.

Block (1987) opined that commitment is created when managers ask their people what they want. He said that managers should engage in acts that give others a feeling of ownership and should confront passive, non-assertive behaviour. It is suggested that managers should devote 25 per cent of each meeting to issues, morale, and motivation and that they should conduct an attitude survey of their subordinates. All these activities would enhance organizational commitment.

Shukla et al. (1987) analyzed leadership styles and power bases in sixty male Indian bank workers. Results indicated that (a)
Sinha's (1980) Nurturant Task Leadership style was negatively associated with connection power bases; and (b) coercive power style was significant negative predictor of subordinate satisfaction.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) in their review on group cohesiveness quoted Stone and Porter (1975) and Welsh and Levan (1981) who reported positive correlations between group cohesiveness and organizational commitment, although Howell and Dorfman (1981) had obtained a negative relationship.

Mathieu and Zajac (1990) in their review and meta-analyses of antecedent correlates and consequences of organizational commitment reported correlations between organizational commitment and leader initiating structure and leader consideration. Most studies assessed leader behaviour with one of the several forms of the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire. The results of the meta-analyses showed medium positive correlations for each behaviour (initiating structure: $r_t = .289$; consideration: $r_t = .335$). They classified that given the proliferation of contingency theories of leadership, these findings were not surprising.

**OWNERSHIP PATTERN AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

Studies were conducted to understand the effect of ownership pattern on organizational commitment. Chattopadhyaya et al. (1977) reported a study of 208 middle managers from twenty industrial organizations in the public sector. Instruments included Personality and semantic differential measures of work motivation,
alienation organizational commitment and need perception. Results depicted that subjects were moderately but not intensely mediocre and fairly alienated with a deep sense of inefficiency.

Gilberg's (1984) research survey examined whether sectoral affiliation was a significant variable in commitment. Contrary to many other studies this study did not find any significant difference in commitment between public and private sector managers.

Lincoln and Kalleberg (1985) tested the hypothesis that organizational commitment is higher among Japanese than US workers and that this commitment gap may be an outcome of the greater prevalence of welfare corporatist structures in Japanese firms. With data from a survey of 8,302 employees in ninety eight plants in Japan and the U.S., a multilevel model of the processes shaping individual's organizational commitment and work satisfaction was estimated. Results indicated that participatory work structures and employee services (paternalism) were more typical of Japanese plants, yet function in both countries raise commitment and morale. They concluded that this is consistent with a theory of corporatist control.

Ramu's (1985) study ascertained from middle level executives of a state public enterprises, their perception of the management processes and practices prevalent in their organizations. It covered twenty three enterprises. According to the study, in
spite of good intention of the state Government, and a keen desire to include sophisticated management philosophy in the public enterprises, the actual management processes, as perceived by the executives, were not at all progressive. The executives felt that their involvement in work was marginal and there was a lot of external pressure. The author also concluded that the actual management practices of State Public Enterprises was nothing but pseudo-management.

Solomon (1986) reviewed that previous research comparing behaviour in the private and public sector reveals differences in levels of satisfaction between the two sectors. Paine et al. (1966), Porter and Mitchell (1967), Rhinehart et al. (1969) and Buchanan (1974) reported lower levels of need satisfaction with work and lower levels of organizational commitment on the part of government employees. With specific reference to the public sector, Buchanan (1975) suggests that a deficiency in goal clarity which characterizes the multiple, conflicting and often intangible objectives typical of the public sector, contributes to lower satisfaction and commitment levels of public sector employees.

Srivastava (1986) administered the Rensis Likert's Scale of twenty two items on organizational climate to fifty civil servants and fifty bank employees in Delhi. Among other significant differences it was found that civil servants had a more positive attitude than bank employees to their organization.
Choudhary (1988) opined that employees of any level did not differ significantly on job involvement, in public sector, but differed significantly in the private sector.

**LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT**

Several studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of managerial levels on organizational commitment.

Usually top level managers have been found to be older followed by middle level managers and lower level managers. In our sample also same trend has been seen, i.e. the mean age of top level managers was 38.68 years followed by middle level manager of mean age of 33.63 years and the lower level managers having mean age of 28.90 years.

Stevens et al. (1978) found in their study that as predicted, age, organizational tenure and the importance of performance and technical skills in promotion were positively related to organizational commitment.

Morris and Sherman (1981) studied the relationship of age among other variables as correlates of organizational commitment. The results concerning age were consistent with findings reported by other investigators (Sheldon, 1971; Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972 and Stevens et al., 1978) i.e. organizational commitment increased with increase in age.

The purpose of the paper by Luthans et al. (1985) was to compare levels of organizational commitment among American,
Japanese and Korean employees by means of a self report measure of organizational commitment rather than by inference from other indicators of commitment. The results of this study indicate that Japanese and Korean employees, who showed no differences in levels of organizational commitment were both less organizationally committed than U.S. employees. Researchers have also found age to be positively related with organizational commitment (Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972; Koch and Steer, 1978; Morris and Sherman, 1981 and Welsch and Levan, 1981). Tenure has also been found to be positively related to organizational commitment (Koch and Steers, 1978; Stevens et al., 1978 and Welsh and Levan, 1981). These two variables, age and tenure, have been most frequently examined and have been most consistent in their relationship to organizational commitment. In addition and importantly, this study also reported that the positive relationship holds across countries as well. In other words, these findings are consistent with Marsh and Mannari's (1977) and Mobley and Hwang's (1982) conclusions that organizational commitment is not based on culture-specific norms and values.

Reddy (1985a) found that with job tenure organizational commitment declined between ten and fourteen years, but increased slightly beyond fifteen years of service. In the previous studies, employee's age and job tenure tended to be positively correlated with organizational commitment (Hall and Schneider, 1972 and Angle and Perry, 1981). The explanation often given for this type of
findings was that increasing age and job tenure tend to reduce the feasibility of obtaining alternate employment and therefore, restrict the individual to the present organization (Angle and Perry, 1981).

Reichers (1986) found that neither tenure, as a measure of sunk costs, nor intrapsychic conflict were significantly correlated with organizational commitment.

Verma (1986) in his study found that high level of managerial respect and job status is necessary for organizational commitment.

Singh (1987) used the occupational level as independent variable and job involvement as dependent variable in his study. He found no significant difference between the job involvement scores of senior and junior employees, but senior employees scored higher on organizational commitment than junior employees.

Results of studies reviewed do point out that the organizational commitment of public sector employees is expected to be less than private sector employees. Some studies also reveal differences in organizational commitment due to hierarchical level. No clear cut conclusions, however, emerged relating managerial effectiveness with organizational commitment.
MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS AND QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE
QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

Working for a living is one of the basic activities in a man's life. Quality of work life is inextricably bound with quality of life. Those interested in the welfare of human employees in the industrial societies have been forced to examine quality of work life and judge its impact on human well being. Efforts are being made to make work more and more satisfying and rewarding experience. It is this changing meaning of work which led to the development of the "quality of work life" movement.

In a bid to find out what it is which motivates people to work, social scientists in general and psychologists in particular, have gone through long and twisting channels. It involved gradual development and application of various concepts like job enlargement, job enrichment, organizational structure and climate, organizational effectiveness, job design, worker participation, organizational development, etc. The quest for searching for what motivates people resulted in the filtering out the concept of Quality of Working Life (QWL) from a variety of studies conducted in industrial and organizational psychology and related disciplines.

During the past decade, Quality of Working Life movement's growth has been attributed to three major problems experienced by the industrialised societies (Pomonis and Baumgartel, 1980). The first was a widespread and possibly growing dissatisfaction and/or alienation of blue collar, white collar employees, as well as managerial personnel from their work, and the organizations in which they were employed. The second was the declining rate
of growth in labour productivity in the face of scarce resources. The third was the growing recognition of the paramount role of individual's "quality of work life" in physical and mental health, family and community well being.

Toole (1973) however, gave a different perspective to the quality of work life by stating that satisfaction with work appears to be a better predictor of longevity of life than known medical or genetic factors. Various aspects of work account for much, if not most, of the factors associated with heart disease. As such, the quality of work and non-work life are to a greater extent inseparable. In fact, a poor work situation can actually have a deleterious effect upon the individual's physical, psychological and social well being (Cuinn and McCullough, 1974). Wilensky (1969) and Runcie (1980) also confirmed a correlation between Quality of Working Life and non-work life.

Thus, one may state that towards the turn of the last decade psychologists got seriously interested in the concept of Quality of Working Life and contributions of Herrick and Maccoby (1972), Taylor et al. (1974), Cherns and Davis (1975), De (1975), Emery and Emery (1976), Miller (1977) and Carlson (1978) in this area are noteworthy. The term 'Quality of Working Life' (QWL) first appeared in the early 1970's and has since increasingly found its way into the professional management literature. It now commands the attention of every effective supervisor and manager (Mali, 1981) and improvement in the Quality of Working Life is
becoming a catch slogan of today's employers and employees. Changes or developments, commonly referred to as job structuring, work organization, job enrichment or job design are apparently incorporated within the spectrum of humanization of work or Quality of Working Life (International Labour Organization, Geneva, 1977).

**Quality of Working Life: The Concept and its definitions**

According to Reddy (1985b) the term Quality of Working Life, though coined by Davis in 1972 at an International conference at Arden House, New York, can be traced back for its germinal idea in one or the other form to the 1950's. The British Coal Mining Industry and the Norwegian Shipping Industry carried out a lot of profound diagnostic work regarding the impact of job structures and technology and Quality of Working Life in the 1950's (Trist and Bramforth, 1951; Herbert, 1954 and Aubert and Amer, 1959).

Quality of Work Life is basically permitting "every employee to develop himself through his work and to take on responsibility" (Gulowsen, 1971).

De (1975) wrote that "Quality of Working Life is an indicator of how free the society is from exploitation, injustice, inequality, oppression and restrictions on the continuity of growth of man, leading to his development to the fullest". Thus, Quality of Working Life and the quality of life in society have a direct linkage.

Spink (1975) defined the Quality of Working Life as "the degree of excellence in work and working conditions, which
contribute to the overall satisfaction of the individual and enhances the individual as well as organizational effectiveness".

Glaser (1976) opined that the term "quality of work life" recently has come to mean more than job security, good working conditions, adequate and fair compensation and more than even equal employment opportunity or job enlargement. The quality of work life requires an organizational climate and structures that really encourage, facilitate, reward, question, challenge or suggest ways to improve the existing modus operandi in any way. It also requires expeditious, respectful and appropriate response to such inputs. Further Glaser (1976) attempted to thread the various definitions into a coherent whole and outlined quality of work life activities as follows:

- Achieving sustained commitment from management to an open, nondefensive style of operations that includes sincerely inviting employees to speak up regarding problems or opportunities (a related element is provision of a practicable means for having members of the workforce participate in refining and implementing promising suggestions).

- Establishing a work environment that encourages continuous learning, training and active interest regarding both the job and the product or service to which the job contributes (such an environment enables an employee to use and develop personal skills and knowledge, which in turn effects involvement, self esteem and the challenge obtained from the work itself).
- Making the job itself more challenging by structuring it so that an individual (or work team) can self-manage and feel responsible for a significant, identifiable output if that kind of responsibility is desired.
- Affording opportunities for continued growth, that is, opportunities to advance in organizational or career terms.
- Training of supervisors to equip them to function effectively in a less directive, more collaborative style.
- Breaking down the traditional status barriers between management and production or support personnel—achieving an atmosphere of open communication and trust between management and the workforce.
- Providing not only feedback with regard to results achieved but also financial incentives, such as cost-savings sharing where feasible.
- Evaluating and analysing results, including failures, leading to revised efforts toward continual improvement.

A typical quality of work life philosophy, contended Barnes (1979), revolves around creating trust, growth equity and excellence in the organizational setting.

Nadler and Lawler (1982) stated that there were two "distinctive elements" of quality of work life programs. These are a concern of the impact of work on people and second is the concept of employee involvement and participation in decision and
problem solving. Nadler and Lawler (1982) gave a working
definition of Quality of Working Life concept. According to them,
"Quality of Working Life is a way of thinking about people, work
and organizations". Thus the focus of Quality of Working Life is
not only on how people can do work better, but on how work may
cause people to be better. It is a concern that is different from
other productivity or organizational enhancement efforts, because
of its focus on the outcomes for the individual, opined the authors.

Delamotte and Takezawa (1984) further added that the concept
of "Quality of Working Life" and "quality of life" emerged
relatively recently in the industrialized nations where English was
the primary language. Parallel concepts and innovative moves
towards like goals, developed, however, almost simultaneously.
Several other industrial countries used synonyms like "Humanization
of work", "Improvement of working conditions", "Workers' protection", "Working environment", and "Democratization of the
work place".

Sorensen et al. (1985) reflected viewpoint of other authors
when he said that Quality of Working Life programs are purposeful
efforts to change the organization from a traditional model to one
based on new assumptions, behaviours and values.

Van Pleistsen and Francois (1987) defined Quality of Working
Life as one of the main outputs of the process of mutual interaction
between the structural elements of an organization, viz. the
individuals, formal arrangements, dominant coalition environment,
task/technology and the social system. The level of Quality of Working Life is a function of personality factors and the congruence over the medium term, and the adaptability of the elements over the long term. Quality of Working Life forms part of the organizational functioning as well as individual motivation.

Wyatt (1988) highlighted the usage of concept of Quality of Working Life in various countries. He said that Quality of Working Life as a way of democratising and humanising the work place has been investigated and applied mainly in different parts of the western industrialised world including Europe, Canada, U.S.A., Japan and Australia. Wyatt (1988) said that Quality of Working Life has not, however, been given as much attention in the South East Asia region. According to him Quality of Working Life (QWL) is qualitative concept. It is a sense of overall well being with the work process from the perspectives of both employer and employee. In a very important way, Quality of Working Life involves the notion of a quality working experience. The very experience of working, as well as the consequences of working, may be desirable. Quality of Working Life means, at the upper end, a working experience that is physically and spiritually life enhancing. This life enhancing characteristic is from both the perspective of the employee and organization. Multinational organizations should concern themselves with how the local people conceive of Quality of Working Life given their total life work situation.
Quality of Working Life in India

Reddy (1985b) stated that there is a view in the Third World countries, where one hardly finds quality of life, why should one speak of the Quality of Working Life? Surrounded by innumerable problems like poverty, population explosion, pollution and low wages, the Third World countries can hardly afford to think of Quality of Working Life of their workers. Nevertheless, there is another view that by reversing the same logic that Quality of Working Life can be used as a launching pad for the improvement of the quality of life of the citizens of developing countries by way of higher productivity, better quality of marketable goods and thereby greater prosperity of the countries.

Sinha and Sayeed (1980) reported that in the Indian setting work has already been initiated on Quality of Working Life by many, but a major headway is yet to be made. Here, initially the orientation to Quality of Working Life remained sociological, but lately there has been a gradual switch over to psychological aspects of Quality of Working Life. Ganguli and Joseph (1971), De (1977 a,b) and Sinha (1977) were amongst the few who tried to approach Quality of Working Life from a psychological perspective.

Dimensions of Quality of Working Life

The concept of Quality of Working Life is essentially multidimensional. Many dimensions have been identified by various
authors as dimensions of Quality of Working Life at the work place. Walton (1972) offered the following conceptual categories or criteria for Quality of Working Life: (a) adequacy in compensation; (b) safe and healthy working conditions; (c) immediate opportunity to use and develop human capacities; (d) opportunity for continued growth and security; (e) social integration in the work organization; (f) constitutionalism in the work organization; (g) work and total life space and (h) social relevance of work life.

In the Indian setting too, many researchers have worked in the area of Quality of Working Life and have given various dimensions. Joseph (1978) gave four dimensions, viz. growth, mastery, involvement and self control. Ganguli (1979) presented a somewhat different list. Ghosh and Kalra (1982) delineated fifteen dimensions. Sinha and Sayeed (1980) put forth seventeen dimensions in their scale of Quality of Working Life. These dimensions are: economic benefits, physical working conditions, career orientation, advancement on merit, effect on personal life, mental state, union management relations, self respect, supervisory relationship, intra-group relations, sense of achievement versus apathy, confidence in management, meaningful development, control, influence and participation, employee commitment, general life satisfaction and organizational climate. The present study has also used the Quality of Working Life Inventory by Sinha and Sayeed (1980).
Importance of studying the Quality of Working Life is self evident. Quality of Working Life was found to be related to job satisfaction and job involvement (Goodman, 1980; Sayeed and Sinha, 1981; Yager, 1981; De Jong and Verghage, 1985; Montgomery, 1986 and Fisher, 1988), motivation (Yager, 1981), greater worker participation, improved product quality, improved working conditions, cost reduction, over all worker's satisfaction and lower absenteeism rate (Yager, 1981; Ferris and Wagner, 1985; Williamson, 1985; Marks et al., 1986 and Bocialetti, 1987), workers' health and safety (Becker, 1986).

De Jong and Verghage (1985) investigated relationships between various indicators of quality of life, depression, facilitating anxiety, social support and work load among forty Dutch entrepreneurs in small and medium enterprises. Results indicated that perceived quality of work situation and of social contacts contributed significantly to general satisfaction with quality of life and negatively with depression. In subjects with a high work load, a high level of facilitating anxiety was associated with a relatively high quality of social contacts, and these subjects scored lowest on depression.

The Quality of Working Life is a large concept inclusive of the concept of organizational climate and sometimes the two have been used interchangeably in the present study.
Several studies have been done to investigate the relationship between managerial effectiveness and Quality of Working Life. McGregor (1980), Emery and Emery (1975), Strauss (1976) and Datta (1976) established through their studies that organizational structure plays a significant role in developing the human personality. They conclude that a bureaucratic culture inhibits the human growth. Thus, it will be seen that such a structure is inadequate for inducing commitment to work. Similarly bureaucratic organizational system, based on direction and control, acts as deterrents to commitment to work. This approach frustrates gratification of the socio-psychological needs of individuals. Greenberg et al. (1969) in their study found that such a corporate culture does not provide adequate authority for making decisions. It inhibits the individual ability to influence changes. Such structures lack democratisation and discourage the jobs that allow for individuality, self expression, advancement to the top positions; what is worse, such structures deemphasises self actualisation, hinders personal growth, and creativity (Argyris, 1957; Arkoff, 1974 and Srivastava, 1976).

Miller (1975) did a follow-up study of Rice's (1954) weaving experiments in Ahmedabad mills. He observed that where work groups retained their autonomy and supervisors and managers conceived the task as providing the necessary boundary conditions,
the results of the original experiments were fully sustained, i.e. indeed productivity was as high and the quality of cloth produced even higher in 1969-70 that it had been in 1954. Implication of this study for the management of production system in general was that results have hinted at a supervisory style which is more conducive to workers' productivity. The analysis of the supervisory styles in public sector mills indicated that a supervisory style characterized by task-orientation coupled with concern for the individual was primarily responsible for the low rate of loitering among low loitering mill workers. This could be fairly true for most other Indian organizations and perhaps for the organizations in some other parts of the world also. However, one needs more empirical evidence from other organizations to generalize these observations, opined Miller (1975).

Sinha (1980) has explored the relationship between organizational climate and managerial styles. With the help of factor analysis, he identified certain important climate factors, viz. authoritarian task-orientation, status acceptance, working conditions, efficiency, involvement, interpersonal relationship, work relationship and bureaucratic climate. He concluded that the organizational efficiency and executive job-satisfaction were influenced primarily by the organizational climate and only moderately by the socio-cultural values and union strength. Besides, whatever effect the leadership styles have on organizational efficiency is through the organizational climate.
Mueller (1984) on 'Participative Organization' stated that change strategies are often successful, but when they are not, they can be expensive and debilitating. The purpose of his thesis was to isolate critical variables that might help predict situations in which change to participative style of management might be more or less successful. His results revealed that both power and culture could be strong resistors to change and change to participative style of management may be appropriate in a variety of cultural settings, but that stronger cultures were harder to change than weaker ones. Further, organizations led by managers who used non-legitimate coercive power style were more likely to be changeable than those led by managers who exercised a more participative style and were trusted by their staff. In a situation where managers were resisting change, that change would be more effective with coercive/weak managers than with participative/strong managers.

Grosch (1986) studied participative decision making and Quality of Working Life. He found that by the end of his study, operating room staff in the three quality circles improved significantly on measures of involvement, job stress and burn out due to depersonalization.

Solomon (1986) reported that management practices that address improvements of methods and efficiency, task autonomy and significance, reward systems and task clarity are of direct
relevance to efficiency. Others, such as participation, openness, and task variety, are indirectly related to efficiency.

Beer and Walton (1987) stated that organizational development has long recognized the importance of culture and considered culture management to be within its purview. Much of it asserts a positive correlation between type of organizational culture and organizational effectiveness (Ouchi, 1981; Deal and Kennedy, 1982 and Denison, 1984). Not surprisingly, these cultures look much like Beckhard's (1969) definition of a healthy organization, i.e. delegating, result oriented, information-sharing, developmental, egalitarian, employee-centred cultures are believed to enhance adaptiveness, productivity, innovation and performance (Kanter, 1983; Denison, 1984 and Walton, 1985). Reviewing the characteristics of excellent companies, Peters and Waterman (1982) in their book 'In Search of Excellence' cited the elements of these companies' shared values-achieving productivity through people, giving importance to people as individuals and tolerance of failure.

Raudsepp (1987) offered twenty four guidelines for creating an organizational culture that harnesses and focuses employees energies to achieve innovative results. Suggestions include the following: create an interactive climate in which employees can stimulate ideas in each other, promote responsible individuality and maturity, and allow creative people to take part in decision-making and long term planning.
OWNERSHIP PATTERN AND QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

Some studies have been done to highlight the effect of organizational affiliation on Quality of Working Life. Nakra (1971) stated that the public sector in India is a victim of the absence of well defined policies and the presence of suffocating atmosphere of suspicion, mistrust, lobbying and patronage. Consequently managerial motivation deteriorates under such circumstances in public sector organizations.

Narain (1971) studied a large sample of middle and high level managers of a number of public enterprises and reported that there was a lack of consistency in management policies, inadequate job description and communication and governmental tradition of work and auditing which were responsible for inefficiency in public sector enterprises.

Organizational climates in public and private sectors have been compared systematically by Roy (1971) and Sinha (1973). In Roy's (1971) study urban elites of Delhi reported their image of the public and private sectors in India. The public sector compared to the private sector was perceived to be less efficient, not because there is anything inherently wrong in the basic concept of the public sector but because it was perceived to be suffering from nepotism, arbitrariness in union management relations, inexperienced managers, lacking adequate management system, and interference by government and political forces in the name of
public accountability. Sinha (1973) came to more or less same conclusions on the basis of his study of over 800 executives of two public and two matching private sector organizations. He found the public sector inferior in the following climatic dimensions: chances of promotion, efficiency, responsibility, social relationships, initiative and reward and working conditions. There was lesser coordination, poor leadership which was ineffective in face of external interferences and diffused reinforcement pattern. These factors led to inefficiency, lack of involvement and dissatisfaction among public sector executives.

Smith and Nock (1980) in their study of public and private sectors challenged the conventional wisdom of organizational theory which regarded public and private organizations as analytically equivalent "complex organizations". They compared public and private sector workers' perception of the character and Quality of Working Life and found workers to perceive and evaluate their jobs in substantially different ways. Blue collar workers in the public sector were more satisfied than private sector blue collar workers. Conversely white collar government workers were less positive about the social relations and intrinsic aspects of their work than private white collar workers.

Monga and Maggu (1981) have reported that the perception of organizational members about various organizational parameters determines significantly their commitment to organization and work. They attempted to find out the Quality of Working Life's
influence on the individual and organizational health of the public sector in India. They concluded that the Quality of Working Life in the Indian public sector is poor and there exists a significant gap between what the managers expect and what they have. They concluded that there was too much bureaucratization, rule-orientation and adherence to traditional management styles in public sector organizations. Monga and Maggu (1981) further opined that the quality of corporate functioning (inputs) exercises an important influence on individual behaviour. Walton (1914), Friedlander and Neuton (1962), Kaczka and Kirk (1968), Lawler and Hall (1969), Cawsey (1973) and Printerhard and Karasick (1973) asserted that the organizational climate was related to various determinants of quality of work life, such as job satisfaction, group cohesiveness and task involvement etc. But when such a climate or proper inputs are missing, the organizational efficiency and effectiveness as well as the Quality of Working Life is likely to suffer.

Approximately 1600 employees from a number of Australian government and private sector organizations participated in a survey measuring the Quality of Work Experience (QWE) conducted by Ceccioppe and Mock (1984). Government employees, particularly those in high status job, rated the QWE significantly below the level of their private sector counterparts. An association was also found between type of organization and motivation for work. Subjects working in public sector organizations were motivated more
by factors such as providing service or product that helped other people or self-development and self-fulfilment than private sector employees. Those in private organizations were motivated more by extrinsic factors such as money in order to obtain an enjoyable and pleasurable life. High status government employees were more intrinsically oriented than all other occupational groups. The lower rating of government employees' work experience may be related to the lack of fulfilling intrinsic factors in their work situation.

Lachman (1985) examined the hypothesis that task environment accounts for differences that have been found by comparing perceptions of role environments for public and private Chief Executive Officers in Israel. Results indicated that the pattern of perceived environmental influences was very similar for the two sectors. Explaining these results the author said that this similarity in Chief Executive Officers' perceptions of their institutional milieux does not fit the interpretational framework of sector differentiation. Another theoretical framework, organization-environment interface, does however, explain the obtained lack of differences. This theory suggests that the environment is an important determinant of organizational structure and management practices, and presumes that similar task environments elicit similar organizational characteristics and managerial reactions (Burns and Stalker, 1961 and Lawrence and Lorsch, 1967). Since the organizations in this study have similar task environments i.e. they are all industrial, production oriented
organization, of similar size and similarly distributed among technologies - their Chief Executivbe Officers may be expected to perceive similar environments similarly.

Partap and Srivastava (1985a) however reported significant differences between private and public sector employees in terms of job satisfaction and organizational climate. Employees of the private sectors obtained significantly higher scores than public sector employees.

Solomon (1986) compared job characteristics and organizational climate in private and public sectors. Perceptions and satisfaction of 240 top managers from a variety of private and public organizations in Israel were compared. Solomon (1986) had hypothesized that in broad terms, the more an organization's survival depends on functioning within a competitive market, the more it will emphasize and reward efficient performance. First hypothesis was that use of performance - based rewards would be significantly more prevalent in the private sector compared to public sector organizations. The second hypothesis was that policies that promote efficiency would be significantly more prevalent in private sectors organizations compared to public sector organizations. Third hypothesis was that satisfaction with job and organizational climate characteristics would be significantly higher among private sector compared to public sector managers. Results yielded significant main effects for sector ownership and provided strong support for the three hypotheses of the research.
De (1987) advocated that public enterprises should have an open system to be more effective. He cited cases of several public sector undertakings, e.g. BHEL, State Bank of India (Gurgaon Road Branch) whose working clearly pointed out the wisdom of involving workers, supervisors and managers in innovatively planning work and improvement of working life where response is more than expectedly satisfactory.

Bhardwaj and Chadha (1991) reported that out of the eleven dimensions of organizational climate, the managers working in private sector were found to be significantly different from public sector supervisors on organizational climate dimensions of orientation, interpersonal relations, supervision, communication, decision-making, managing problems, managing mistakes, managing conflicts and risk taking. Managers in the private sector were found to be more satisfied than public sector supervisors on promotion, satisfaction with coworkers, satisfaction with supervision and satisfaction with work.

LEVELS OF MANAGEMENT AND QUALITY OF WORKING LIFE

Many studies have been conducted to investigate the effect of levels of management on perception of Quality of Working Life. Rao and Chattopadhyay (1974) studied one hundred and twenty-six workers, twenty-two supervisors and nine managers of eight small scale industries and found no consistent differences in their perception of their organizations. Sinha (1981) also opined that
it is not always true that the managers, supervisors and workers have differential perception of an organizational climate.

Lewis (1982) opined that middle managers perceived themselves as having the most influence downward and the least influence upward in organizations. This perception influenced their attitudes towards personal, job and company dimensions. On the personal level, middle managers with less influence were more likely to be resentful about how they were treated and were less satisfied with the rewards they received. Concerning their jobs, managers with less influence were less satisfied with the rewards they received, were less willing to innovate and were lower on job involvement. On the company level middle managers with less influence were less committed to the organization and were more likely to look for the job alternatives.

Hartenstern and Huddleston (1984) reported that for Quality of Working Life measures to be successful, management must have shared values with workers.

Leigh and Futrell (1985) administered to 395 marketing managers enrolled in an executive development program the Job Descriptive Index to measure job satisfaction, a demographic questionnaire and measures of perception and attitudes related to social power, management control systems, and organizational climate. They reported that subjects at higher managerial levels had more favourable perception of their jobs and were more satisfied with them.
Sondhi and Bhardwaj (1986) studied the Quality of Working Life among workers and managers in a private paper manufacturing factory in India. Subjects with higher status had a much favourable view of their working conditions than did subjects with lower status. Differences in perceptions and attitudes were attributed to differences in work atmosphere and work experiences.

Bocialetti (1987) in his article examined some unintended effects of a Quality of Working Life movement in a metals processing plant. The project lasted eighteen months. Overall analysis demonstrated that many desired effects were achieved. However, when more detailed analysis was performed, it was revealed that workers of relatively low seniority benefitted more than, and sometimes at the expense of workers with relatively high seniority. Additionally, data revealed that as a result of efforts to improve Quality of Working Life senior workers suffered negative effects (i.e., lost ground), whereas status of junior workers remained unchanged.

Dhillon and Shuja (1990) investigated the relationship of age, tenure and job level to perception of work and work environment. The data analysis revealed (i) a significant difference between managers and non-managers in their perception of work and work environment and (ii) perception of work and work environment was found to be positively correlated with age, tenure and job level.
Researches reviewed above justify the conclusion that perception of Quality of Working Life would vary according to organizational ownership pattern and managerial hierarchy. No such inference, however, can be made regarding managerial effectiveness and perception of Quality of Working Life.