Subjects and variables studied
The present investigation is concerned with the superior-subordinate perceptions and the consequent job related behaviour in three different organizations, viz., commonweal, service and business organizations.

Employees working in police, revenue, and postal and telegraph departments are included under the commonweal organizations. Employees working in the state welfare organizations, schools, colleges and hospitals are included in the service organizations and employees working in insurance companies, banks and finance corporations are included in the business organizations.

The above categorization was given by Blau and Scott (1962). From each of the three above organizations 100 clerical employees who had juniors working under them were selected. They were called 'superiors'. One hundred clerical employees working under these superiors were selected and they were called 'subordinates'. The distribution of the sample with mean age levels are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of sample with mean Age levels of superiors and subordinates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations</th>
<th>Job Level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonweal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.47</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sample was confined to the Andhra Pradesh state. Organizations which come under the commonweal, service and business categories, were visited and lists of the superiors and subordinates were obtained from the offices/branches. The superiors’ list was prepared and 100 superiors 100 of their immediate subordinates from each of the three organizations were randomly selected.

These 300 superiors were met personally and the questionnaires printed both in English and the vernacular, Telugu, were handed over to them with a request to fill in and return them the following day. In the same fashion the 300 subordinates were also met in their offices and were requested to fill in the questionnaires and return them the following day.

VARIABLES STUDIED

Dependent Variables

**Job satisfaction:** Job satisfaction is a general attitude which is the result of many specific attitudes in the areas like specific job factors (e.g., wages, supervision, steadiness of employment, conditions of work, advancement opportunities, recognition of ability, fair evaluation of work, social relations on the job, prompt settlement of grievances, fair treatment by employer), individual characteristics (e.g., age, health, temperament, desires, level of aspiration and so on) and group relationship outside the job (e.g., his family relationships, social status, recreational outlets, activity in organizations—labour, political or purely social).

A person who is ‘too good’ or ‘not good enough’ for a job in terms of his abilities and interests, is not likely to be satisfied with his job. One of the generalizations offered by Morse (1953) is—that level of satisfaction is a combination of both level of aspiration or need-tension level and amount of return from environment satisfaction exists when those two are in line and job
dissatisfaction exists when the return from the environment is much less than the need level of the individual.

**Job Involvement:** Job involvement refers the extent to which the self-esteem of individuals is affected by their level of performance at work on the degree to which individuals identify psychologically with their jobs. It is a specific cognitive belief state of psychological identification with the present job. Besides the situational variables (components of job and organizational environment) past socialization processes experienced by individuals in specific socio-economic and cultural milieu affect job involvement.

Lawler and Hall (1970) distinguished job satisfaction from job involvement. The definition of job involvement should be limited to the notion of psychological identification with one’s work or the importance of the total work situation in one’s life but the state of job satisfaction results from a satisfaction of the needs of the individual through the attainment of job outcomes or rewards without any regard to performance - outcome contingencies. Motivational formulation distinguishes job involvement from job satisfaction only on the basis that the former is a cognitive belief state and the latter is an affective state of the workers.

**Work Involvement:** The attitude of work involvement is largely decided by the socialization process. Since all societies engage in work, the young are trained in formal or in informal ways about the ways of work. Hence, people belonging to specific religious or cultural group hold more or less similar attitudes toward work, irrespective of their sex. Work involvement is the degree to which an individual’s work role is important in itself and forms the basis of self-identification. It is the issue of how central working is in one’s life when compared with other life roles (such as maintaining and raising a family or participating in the community). Viewed in this way, development of a generalized cognitive belief state of identification with work in general would
depend very much upon past and present socialization experiences. People belonging to different cultures tend to develop different salient needs influenced by different cultural and groups norms. However, the socialization training in any given culture that emphasizes the instrumentality of work roles in satisfying peoples' culturally determined salient needs is primarily responsible.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

INFLUENCE STRATEGIES

Power is exercised through the use of various behavioural strategies or methods. Both superiors and subordinates exercise their power but by using different methods, in different situations and for different reasons. There are different types of strategies used by superiors to influence their subordinates to get the work done by them. The strategies that are used, are exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, coalition and manipulation, showing dependency, upward appeal and assertion. The research studies describe various types of strategies like upward, downward and lateral influence in organizations and some of them are described below.

Assertiveness: This involves demanding, telling a person to comply, expressing anger verbally, pointing out rules, or becoming a nuisance. Kipnis (1976), Kipnis, et al., (1980) and Mowday (1978), found a greater use of these tactics in influencing persons at all levels (superiors, coworkers and subordinates).

Coalition: This involves such things as the use of steady pressure for compliance by obtaining the support of co-workers' and/or by 'obtaining the support of subordinates'. This technique is more often used to influence superiors than to influence subordinates or colleagues.
**Exchange:** This strategy is used by managers with superiors, peers and subordinates to get their work done. It involves such things as ‘offering an exchange’ or ‘offering to make personal sacrifices’. Kipnis et al., (1980) and Mowday (1978) mentioned the use of this strategy in organizations.

**Manipulations:** Informing or arguing in such a way that the recipient is not aware of being influenced is termed ‘manipulation’ (Mowday, 1978; Porter, et al., 1981). Allen, et al., (1979), pointed out that this category of tactics involve with holding, distorting the information (sort of outright lying) or overwhelming the target with too much information.

**Upward Appeal:** This involves bringing additional pressures for conformity on the target of influence by calling a person at a higher level in the organization to help.

**LEADERSHIP STYLES**

Leadership is generally considered as a process of influencing the activities of a group in an effort to achieve certain organizational goals. Style is a way of behaving and therefore every person may have his own style of functioning. Researchers emphasized on three basic styles, i.e., authoritarian, nurturant-task, and participative leader behaviour. Later two more styles viz., bureaucratic and task orientation have been added to have a more flexible approach to explain and understand the phenomena more comprehensively.

**Nurturant-Task Style:** The nurturant-task leader helps his subordinates to grow up and assume greater responsibility, gives responsibility as much as his subordinates can handle; openly shows affection for those who work hard; if subordinates need help he helps as much as he can; has affection for his subordinates and listens to their personal problems and family matters.

**Participative Style:** The participative leader places high value to maintaining partnership in the group and treats group members as equals, gives total freedom to subordinates even to the extent that they may disagree with
him; believes in joint decisions and interactions of seniors and subordinates, helps his subordinates as much as he can; believes that all have more or less equal potentials, and above all he is a friendly type.

**Bureaucratic Style:** The leader who has this style believes in hierarchical disposition, maintains fair impersonal relationship in the group; follows standard rules and regulations, believes in clean-out demarcation of responsibility and work, tries to confine himself to his own jurisdiction; and believes that if people follow everything in writing then there will be less probability of conflicts in the organizations.

**Authoritarian Style:** An authoritarian leader keeps important information to himself, considers power and prestige important for the control of subordinates; distinguishes considerably between his good and bad officers, takes most decisions himself and is confident of his own decisions; feels the necessity of strict supervision, cannot tolerate any interference, and feels that personal loyalty to the leader is an important virtue of a good subordinate.

The seven types of influence strategies that were studied as independent variables were also treated as dependent variables. This was done while considering the contribution of leadership styles, as perceived by the subordinates, to the influence strategies of the superiors.

Besides these four explanatory variables were considered, viz., 1. Job level, 2. type of organization, 3. educational qualifications and 4. job tenure.

1. **Job Level:** All the senior assistants of different offices/branches in the commonweal, service and business organizations were considered as superiors, whereas the junior assistants of the same offices/branches in the commonweal, service, and business organizations were considered as subordinates for the present investigation.

2. **Type of Organization:** All the organizations exist in multiple environments. They exist within the culture and social structure of the larger society and they co-exist in various relations to other organizations.
and groups of people who may be owners, managers, employees, customers, clients or simply 'the public at large'. (Schein, 1983; P.33).

In the present investigation three organizations were taken into consideration: 1. commonweal organization which benefit the public at large; 2. service organizations which benefit primarily their clients; and 3. business organizations which benefit primarily the owners/managers.

3. **Educational Qualifications:** In the present investigation three levels of educational qualifications were taken onto consideration: 1. Xth and Intermediate standards, 2. Graduate level, and 3. Post-graduate level.

4. **Job Tenure:** In assigning the subjects to different groups of job tenure the total years of service completed by them were taken into account. Thus the employees with a service of 12 years (1 - 12 years) were categorized as 'short', job tenured (SJT) employees, 13-24 years of service as 'medium' job tenure (MJT) employees and those who have put in 25 years and above were treated as 'long' job tenured (LJT) employees. Age was not considered in categorizing the employees.

**INSTRUMENTS USED**

**Influence Strategies:** The Ansari's (1990), downward influence strategy measures were employed to obtain information about how the superior go about changing the opinion of his subordinates, so that they agree with him. The scale containing 28 items was divided into seven types of strategies, viz., exchange and challenge, expertise and reason, personalized help, showing dependency, coalition and manipulation, upward appeal and assertion containing 5, 6, 3, 4, 4, 3 and 3 items each, respectively. The respondents have to respond on a 5 - point scale (very often 5, often 4, sometimes 3, seldom 2 and never 1). The maximum and minimum possible scores on exchange and challenge strategy are 25 and 5, on expertise and reason are 30 and 6, on personalized help are 15 and 3, on coalition and manipulation are 20 and 4, on
showing dependency are 20 and 4, on upward appeal are 15 and 3 and on assertion are 15 and 3, respectively. It is an indication that the strategy which gets the highest score is being used by the superior to influence his subordinate to agree with him (highest score on a particular strategy clearly indicates that the same is used by the superiors in influencing their subordinates to agree with them). The reliabilities are to be established by test-retest method and they are exchange and challenge (0.71), expertise and reason (0.73), personalized help (0.62), coalition and manipulation (0.59), showing dependency (0.72), upward appeal (0.69) and assertion (0.56).

**Leadership Style:** The Ansari's (1990) leadership behaviour measures were used to measure the leadership styles of the superiors as perceived by their subordinates. The scale has 26 statements divided into 4 types of leadership styles-nurturant-task, participative, bureaucratic and authoritarian, containing 9, 8, 3 and 6 items each, respectively. The respondents are to respond on a 5-point scale (quite true 5, true 4, doubtful 3, false 2 and quite false 1). The maximum and minimum possible scores on nurturant-task style are 45 and 9, on participative style 40 and 80 on bureaucratic style 15 and 3 and on authoritarian style 30 and 6, respectively. The higher the score the more the leaders are using that style (as perceived by their subordinates). The reliability values are also to be established by test-retest method for leadership styles nurturant-task is 0.83 for participative style it is 0.81, for bureaucratic style it is 0.72, and for authoritarian style it is 0.65.

**Job Satisfaction:** The Kanungo's (1982) job satisfaction scale was used to assess the employee's satisfaction on their jobs. The scale consists of 16 items to be responded on a 6-point scale - extremely satisfied to extremely dissatisfied. A response on extremely satisfied is given a numerical value 6, moderately satisfied 5, mildly satisfied 4, mildly dissatisfied 3, moderately dissatisfied 2 and extremely dissatisfied 1. The maximum and minimum possible scores on this scale are 96 and 16, respectively. The higher the score,
the higher is the job satisfaction of the employee and the lower the score, the lower is the job satisfaction. The reliability is to be established by test-retest method. The reliability for job satisfaction is 0.86, indicating its high reliability.

**Job Involvement:** The Kanungo's (1982) job involvement scale was used for the assessment of employees' involvement in their present job. This scale consists of 15 items with 5 filler items. Each statement has six response categories ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A response on the strongly agree category is assigned a numerical value 6, agree 5, mildly agree 4, mildly disagree 3, disagree 2, and strongly disagree 1. The maximum and minimum possible scores on this scale are 60 and 10, respectively. High score indicates high involvement and low score low involvement of employees in their present jobs. The reliability score of job involvement is 0.85 which is established by test-retest method for the study.

**Work Involvement:** The Kanungo's (1982) work involvement scale was used to find the work involvement of the employees in their work in general. The scale consists of 11 items with 5 filler items. Each item in this scale has to be responded on a 6-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A response on the strongly agree category is given a numerical value 6, agree 5, mildly agree 4, mildly disagree 3, disagree 2 and strongly disagree 1. The maximum and minimum possible scores on this scale are 36 and 6 respectively. A high score on this scale is considered to be high and a low score is considered to be low in work involvement. The reliability of work involvement is 0.71 which is established by test-retest method for the work.
STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

All the questionnaires thus collected were scored separately for each scale by using appropriate scoring keys and the values were tabulated. Since the items in the sub-scales of downward influence strategy measures and leadership behaviour measures were unequal in number the responses on these items were subjected to 'Angular Transformations' (Fisher and Yates) and the scores thus obtained from that table were used for the statistical analysis.

Thus, the scores obtained on various scales were subjected into statistical analysis such as means, SDs, Analysis of variance, Correlations and 't' tests to test the hypotheses formulated.