CHAPTER - I

Introduction
In Indian set-up, clerical employees hold a pivotal position and are responsible for moving files which ultimately helps the decision-making process and the accomplishment of goals. Most of the delays, in the bureaucratic decision-making process, are attributed to the delays made by the clerks. This gives an impression that as if the whole administration of an organization is dependent upon the clerical staff. In more advanced countries, an appointment is fixed, or a man is hired or fired from his job, the decisions are taken over a telephone call and the formal order follows later. But in India, we have a bureaucratic system of routing a particular order or decision through a number of sections. Naturally, the decisions or the orders, etc., take more time. This needs more people on the pay-roles. If the clerk does his job well, the delays are reduced and decisions are made quickly. The clerks, in this system, who have already put in some years of service, naturally, would be promoted to higher positions as senior assistants. In any organizations, a number of junior clerical employees work under the supervision of senior clerks, i.e., senior assistants.

Very few researchers have focused their attention on their functioning. In view of this fact, their perceptions of their superiors and subordinates and their job related aspects, such as, job satisfaction, job involvement and work involvement, etc., should be studied to gain insights into their functioning in different organizations. In this the perceptions of superior and subordinate are considered as processes influencing the activities of a group in an effort to achieve certain organizational goals. If superior-subordinate relations are well, by implication, their perceptions should be good. In the work environment, superiors use different styles of leadership and strategies. In general, it would appear from such synthesis that leadership is defined as initiation of structure, a locus of group processes, as an art of inducing compliance, as the exercise of influence, as an actor behaviour, as a goal achievement, as an effect of interaction, as a differentiated role, and as a personality.
Various researchers, in the field of leadership studies, particularly in the twentieth century, have caused the development of a variety of models of leadership styles. Style is a way of behaving and therefore every superior may have his own style of functioning. The first attempt to delineate the dimension of leadership behaviour was made by Lippitt and White (1938) under the general guidance of Kurt Lewin. They differentiated two main non-overlapping types, viz., authoritarian and democratic, besides referring to another style, viz., laissez faire.

A number of theorists believe that the use of a particular leadership style will bring about high performance levels in areas, such as, production and satisfaction. These 'styles' or personal behaviour leadership approaches have been the most widely used in practice and have been widely published, researched and applied in organizational settings. Each of the approaches attempts to identify what leaders do when leading.

"Some superiors (leaders) may resort to either task-oriented style like 'authoritarian' or 'person oriented' style like 'nururant-task' to influence their subordinates. The authoritarian leader expects and demands complete loyalty, unconditional submissiveness and full compliance from his subordinates. On the other hand, the participative leader places high value on maintaining partnership in the group and treats group members as equals, gives total freedom to his subordinates. The nurturant-task leader cares for his subordinates, shows affection, takes personal interest in their well-being and above all, is committed to their growth. The nurturant-task leaders are close to the authoritarian leaders in being strict, in publishing their ideas through and in controlling other ideas and activities. The nurturant-task leaders are close to the participative ones in encouraging the members, giving due share to their ideas and yet maintain control over them (Sinha, 1980, P.101)."

The superior who believes in hierarchical disposition maintains fair interpersonal relationships, follows standard rules and believes in clear-cut demarcation of responsibility and work is said to be having bureaucratic style of leading his subordinates. Whatever may be the leadership style of the superiors, their predominant responsibility lies in making people work
toward achieving the organizational goals? In this process, they will be using different tactics to influence their subordinates to get the work done by them to attain the organizational goals.

Ansari (1990) investigated the bases of power, leadership styles and influence strategies. In his study, he hypothesized that the higher the leader is on participative behaviour, the more he or she will perceive the importance of expert and referent bases of power, whereas, the higher the leader is on autocratic behaviour, the more he or she will perceive those bases of power such as reward, coercion, and connection which induce compliance. Further, the higher the leader is on participative behaviour, the more will be the use of non-controlling influence tactics, viz., ingratiation, personalized help, etc., whereas the higher the leader is on autocratic behaviour, the more will be use of controlling tactics, viz., assertiveness sanctions, etc. The general conclusion of his study is that there is a meaningful correspondence between bases of power, leadership styles and influence strategies. If a participative manager has referent power, then he makes frequent use of such tactics as personalized help, showing dependency, and positive sanction. Likewise, a task-oriented manager with expert power very often employs influence strategies such as expertise and reasons, etc. The bureaucratic manager often relies on such tactics as exchange and challenge, upward appeal, and coalition and manipulation. Similarly, an authoritarian manager with coercive power relies more often on negative sanctions and threat.

Under some conditions, the nature of the subordinates, will suggest the use of the dedicated style. They may simply expect to be managed that way because of either prior experience or training. The subordinates may lack decision skills or be quite, willing to obey, may fear punishment or over value rewards, and may lack knowledge or be simply insecure.

The dedicated style is appealing to these subordinates who are not frightened by it and who also agree on the direction taken. It is disliked intensely by separated subordinates who prefer to be left alone or by those who have their own independent ideas on policy. The style is more effective
in crisis situations and less effective in administration, research, or educational setting except by top superiors.

The styles of leadership and strategies, etc., influence the perceptions of superior and subordinates about each other and their job related attitudes, viz., job satisfaction, job involvement and work involvement.

In every organization, participative relations are very important to accomplish the organizational goals. The superior should be satisfied with his subordinates' working conditions and the subordinates should be satisfied with their superior's expertise and involvement in the work. The type of organization and its goals have a great deal of impact on the type of superior-subordinate perceptions.

In the area of organizational psychology, it is thought necessary to study how certain aspects of organizational behaviour, leadership styles and influence strategies inherent in the superior-subordinates' perception influence the job related attitudes, viz., job satisfaction, job involvement and work involvement of the clerical employees in the commonweal, service and business organizations.

Hence, in the present study, it is aimed at studying the effect of superior-subordinates' perceptions of clerks on their job satisfaction, job involvement and work involvement in the commonweal, service and business organizations.