Chapter-V

DISCUSSION
The obtained findings have been interpreted and discussed in the light of available evidence and observations. Discussion has been taken up hypothesis-wise (See Chapter No.3 ‘Problem & Hypotheses)

**Leadership Style and Behaviour Pattern**

In the first hypothesis, it was expected that leadership style and Type A Behaviour Pattern (TABP) would be so related that certain styles would be belonging to TABP while others with TBBP. It was pointed out that due to emphasis on task (performance) in Bureaucratic, Authoritarian and Task Oriented leadership style as well as the prevalence of traits like hyperalertness, feelings of being under the pressure of time urgency, challenge of responsibility, hard driving, they would be significantly related with Type A behaviour pattern. On the other hand, due to emphasis on relaxed, easy going and carefree orientation among Type B people it was hypothesized that Participative, Nurturant and Nurturant task leadership styles would be negatively related to TABP. It might have been due to the structure of insurance company i.e. public sector. Moreover, there is a lack of other open vistas for the clients to cover their insurance. Therefore, these four subsidiaries of General Insurance Company have monopoly in this sector.

Notably Type B managers were found to be delegating nurturant task leadership style to the tune of 56%. At the same time, it was further noted that frequency in Type A managers were more for bureaucratic and
task oriented styles (32% of B and 27% of T). Though it was also found that among 125 managers studied, the prevalence of Type A behaviour pattern was only 38% (Table 4.3).

To explain why Type B managers were more ‘Nurturant Task’ oriented is a cumbersome task at present. As there is a dearth of empirical studies focussing TABP and leadership style. Moreover, the observed pattern of frequencies does not confirm the proposed hypothesis.

Therefore in order to interpret the obtained findings one approach could be the content analysis of leadership styles and behaviour pattern. After going through the entire theoretical aspect of Jenkins Activity Survey Manual (Measuring TABP) and Sinha’s Manual (For measuring leadership style), it was found that two things i.e. leadership style and behaviour pattern converged on one pole only i.e. Task orientation or high work oriented approach. This was the basic idea of proposing this hypothesis. But at the same time, it does not convey that Type B managers are not task oriented rather the obtained findings revealed that they are more task oriented but their approach to get the work done by their employees is through nurturance. Moreover, the obtained mean values of Type A managers delegating six different leadership styles i.e. Task Oriented, Authoritarian, Bureaucratic, Nurturant, Nurturant Task
and Participative confirms the fact (Fig.4.1) that Type A managers were equally likely in Task Oriented, Authoritarian, Bureaucratic styles and low on Participative, Nurturant, Nurturant Task.

Few empirical studies also find the negative performance of Type A managers. Brummet, Pyle and Flampoltz (1968) found that managers being Type A in their behaviour, suffer from stress at work and this job stress leads to the disruptive influence not only on the individual manager but also deteriorates the performance of entire organization on whom many individuals depend. Lazarus et al (1974) also found that the managers due to their Type A Behaviour Pattern bring a great loss to the job performance (organizational goals). Davis' (1982) Bureaucratic model of organization also states that Bureaucratic leaders are not effective leaders. They show their good performance only at the time of crisis. Weed and Mitchell (1976); Berg & Kenneth (1979) reported that High Task-High Relationship leadership style is preferred by organizational members and is effective in accomplishing organizational goals. Greenglass (1988) also stated that the more the TABP, the lesser may be the likelihood of participative leadership style. It is a conventional view that Bureaucratic, Authoritarian and Task oriented leadership styles in comparison to Nurturant, Nurturant Task & Participative leaders are found to be Type B in their behavioural approach. They are likely to develop more effective styles (especially Nurturant Task leaders) by
giving greater emphasis on Task orientation but with the supportive, nurturant and employee consideration perspective. Therefore, these managers are most preferred and acceptable.

The Type A behaviour pattern correlated negatively and significantly with Nurturant, Nurturant Task and Participative leadership styles. Whereas it correlated positively with Authoritarian leadership style, Bureaucratic and Task oriented leadership styles. Sinha (1984) reported that stress decreases the salience of Participative leadership style while increases the salience of Authoritarian leadership style whereas Nurturant Task is not effected by the stress. These findings have implication that stress perception/reactions to stress are part of TABP. Therefore it suggests that Type A would be less participative and more authoritarian. The pattern of emerged relationship further confirm the hypothesis. The pattern of relationship between leadership style and corollaries of TABP (i.e. Speed and Impatience, Job Involvement and Hard Driving) further reveal that Authoritarian leadership is associated with feelings of time urgency and perceptions of Hard Driving. On the other hand, Nurturant, Nurturant Task and Participative leadership styles are associated with low perceptions of Hard Driving. It was notable that none of the style significantly correlated with Job Involvement. Dedication to occupational activity was uncorrelated to leadership style.
Now the pattern emerged in regard to interrelationship between Type A behaviour pattern, leadership styles, on the basis of frequency analysis, comparison of leadership styles between Type A and Type B managers and correlations, is that the prevalence of Type B behaviour pattern is greater in the sample. They are more likely to delegate Nurturant task leadership style. Type B managers were higher on Nurturant, Nurturant Task and Participative leadership styles than Type A managers. Type A behaviour pattern correlated significantly negatively with Nurturant, Nurturant Task & Participative leadership styles and positively with Bureaucratic, Authoritarian and Task Oriented leadership styles.

An attempt to regress leadership styles on the basis of personality pattern revealed its little contribution despite high intercorrelations. It attests to the view that leadership style is the product of number of variables and Type A behaviour pattern may be only among one of them. Interestingly a subfactor of Type A behaviour pattern i.e. Speed & Impatience significantly predicted negatively three of the styles i.e. Nurturant, Nurturant Task and Participative. Thus the tendency of time urgency is likely to decrease the adoption of Nurturant, Nurturant Task and Participative leadership styles. The litmus test to the complex of Type A behaviour pattern and leadership styles would be an emergence of a compound Principal axis having bi-directional loadings in such a way that Type A behaviour patterns and three of the leadership styles...
styles (i.e. Type A, Speed & Impatience & Hard Driving with Nurturant, Nurturant Task and Participative Leadership style). However, the factor analysis did not support the view. It seems that Type A behaviour pattern is an independent factor whereas leadership styles were a different independent factor. Kirby, Paradise and King (1992) also reported that specific leader behaviours rather than personality, inspire followers to show higher levels of performance. Quite possible due to separate set of common variables, the two could not converge. The factor pattern though reveals that leadership styles are also effecting certain end variables and Type A behaviour pattern is also effecting the same end variables. However, the dynamics could not be unfolded.

**Leadership Style, Behaviour Pattern and Organizational Climate**

The discussion which goes by in the previous pages deals with the characteristics of managers (Leadership style, TABP, speed and impatience, Hard Driving and Job involvement). Now the question arises that the variation in these characteristics leads to what? Obviously, it is related to the effectiveness or the efficiency of the manager (leader). Immediately, it leads to another question that what exactly the term ‘Efficiency or Effectiveness’ mean? Here comes the end variables or performance parameters - productivity linked to well being. However, leadership style does not directly influence the end variables but produce an environment conducive to the attainment of organizational goals. The most suitable term in the area of organizational psychology for the
environment in the organization is ‘organizational climate’. The proposition is thus made that different leadership styles and quality of organizational climate would be differentially related. Ansari & Rub (1982) stated that the success of an executive is the vivid function of proper congruence between leadership style and organizational climate of a set-up. Habbibulah & Sinha (1980) stated that for the effectiveness of an organization a balance is required between leadership style and motivational climate.

None of the TABP and its associated factors were found to be significantly related with the organizational climate. It may be due to emotive action pattern is directed towards the self and perhaps not towards the subordinates.

Whereas Nurturant, Nurturant task and Participative leadership styles produce good quality of organizational climate. On the contrary, Bureaucratic and Authoritarian leadership styles produce poor quality of Organizational Climate. Some of the empirical findings may be cited in line of these findings. Sharma & Rajan (1984) support this view by stating Participative and Nurturant Task leadership styles as most important determinants in maintaining congenial organizational climate in terms of safety, security and grievance handling procedures. Boissoneau (1986) reported that participative mental health administrator as compared to autocratic administrator creates a work environment where workers feel comfortable and participate in decision making. It is so because the
participative administrator has a willingness to foster an open organizational environment, gives due consideration to individuality, encourages personal development and favours decentralized management. Singh & Dass (1979) reported that group members were found to accept more group decisions under Participative leadership than under Autocratic leadership. Prakasam, Deshpande & Kshirsagar (1979) documented that people-oriented leadership created a favourable organizational climate which was conducive for higher productivity. Ganguli (1977) studied large number of managers from variety of organizations and found that there was an interactive effect of leadership styles and the organizational climate. Leaders tended to use the benevolent autocratic style but shifted to the consultative style in organizations which had a participative working climate. Steve & Doherty (1993) also found the best organizational climate where authority is delegated through High quality High Relation Oriented approach (NT) of leader.

In factor analysis (Table 4.15), Nurturant leadership style and organizational climate loaded on the same factor confirming the view that employee centred leadership style creates positive organizational climate. However, none of the management styles emerged in relation to an organizational climate. It shows that leadership style (self-perceived)
influences the organizational climate but the management style (average of leadership styles) does not have direct impact on the organizational climate.

**Leadership Style, Behaviour Pattern and Psychological Well Being**

The humanistic side of an organization is to give due consideration to the general well being of their employees in addition to the development of the organization itself. It was hypothesized that leadership style and personality pattern would be differentially related to psychological well being of employees. The Psychological well being of those employees who work under managers of different leadership styles and different personality pattern reveal that Type A managers as well as Bureaucratic leadership style manager's employees were distressed or they had poor well being. It was also found that managers with sense of time urgency, perceptions of being hard drive also had low well being employees. On the contrary, leadership styles with participative approach (P), employee centred approach (N) as well as a balance of task and relation approach (NT) had employees whose well being was high. Nurturant leadership style and perceived participative leadership behavior style (P₁) were indicative of the psychological well being factor. When factor analysis was done for clerks, they were also assigned an average of leadership style of all those managers under whom he works, it was found that employees working with participative management
leadership styles were high on psychological well being (Table No.4.15). Choudhry (1953) stated that where there are supervisors who are of 'understanding' nature make the employees to feel comfortable, tension free and get the work done through persuasion while the supervisors who are 'rude' make use of fear to motivate the workers and often give suspension notice in order to warn others to be careful and don't bring good output. Singh, Warrier & Dass (1979) reported that the democratization of leadership process led to greater job satisfaction and high productivity.

**Leadership Style, Behaviour Pattern & Turnover (Productivity)**

The pattern that emerged in correlations shows the negative relationship between Bureaucratic leadership style and turnover (Table No.4.14). While nonsignificant relationship emerged in case of Authoritative and Task oriented leadership style. Further, the pattern of relationship between turnover and corollaries of Type A behaviour pattern (i.e. Speed & impatience, Job involvement & Hard Driving) reveal the significant negative relationship between Turnover and Type A and speed and impatience. It implies that bureaucratic managers and Type A managers (speedy, hyperalert and impatient) don't bring quantitative and qualitative output (in terms of achievement of organizational objectives). Interestingly, significant positive correlations were obtained between Nurturant task, Nurturant and Participative leadership styles in relation to turnover (output). It clearly states that these managers being soft in their
approach (Delunga, 1991) of delegation of leadership do not create panic in the organization. They opt high task-high human relational approach (Weed, 1976; Sinha J.B.P. (1987) and consequently bring good results (qualitatively as well as quantitatively). That's why these leaders are called 'Effective leaders' by empirical researchers (Sinha, 1979; Sinha, 1981). Chatterjee (1961) obtained high correlation between democratic leadership style and productivity. Roberts, Miles & Blankenship (1968) also reported that both member satisfaction and group performance are higher under an employee-oriented style than under a more disinterested and supportive style of supervision. Phillipensen (1965) reported that human relations leadership correlated positively with group effectiveness. Garland & Barry (1988) also reported that even socially supportive and democratic decision style instructors showed better performance as compared to those players who had autocratic instructors/coach.

Factor Analysis also supports the view as (Table 4.15) a separate 'Principal component' emerged that exhibited the significant positive loadings on Turnover in relation to Nurturant leadership style. Moreover, a separate factor reveals the significant positive relationship between participative management style, psychological well being and turnover. Under the participative approach of management, there is a most conducive organizational climate as there is good communication, high identity, less conflict resolution, high support, low responsibility, and high motivation. When the organizational climate is congenial, it is going to
have a direct impact on the psychological well being of employees and when the employees are keeping their mental health fit, they will be able to contribute more in the achievement of organizational objectives. Therefore, participative management style is the best and the most effective.

**Psychological Well being, Organizational Climate and Turnover**

Correlations show that where there is a harmonious or congenial organizational climate, the more will be the turnover and psychological well being. On the other hand, the lack of congenial organizational climate is going to deteriorate the performance and make the employees psychologically ill. Winefield (1993) reported that the payment of low salary, lack of support from co-workers, identity and over working hours lead to work dissatisfaction and low psychological well being. Suttle (1977) also reported that improving the quality of working life eventually leads healthier, more satisfied and productive employees and more efficient, adaptive and profitable organizations.

On the basis of the emergence of this factor, it is clear that the high productivity, positive organizational climate and high Psychological well being are being maintained by delegation of Nurturant & Participative leadership styles. But in addition to it, there is something else also which is creating more congenial organizational climate, making employees more cheerful and psychologically fit and healthy. Perhaps the factor could be looked into by way of looking into separate dimensions of
organizational climate (which has been measured from the clerical staff members) in relation to six separate management styles i.e. N, NT, B, T, F & P and other important end variables i.e. psychological well being and Turnover (Table 4.7).

A high degree of positive significant correlations were obtained among Bureaucratic, Authoritarian, Nurturant and Nurturant Task management styles. It means that self-perception regarding the delegation of leadership style is different as compared to when these leadership styles are actually pooled. While participative management style related only with Nurturant and Nurturant task management styles. On the other hand, task oriented management style emerged as a specific factor having no relationship with any management style.

In addition, different management styles create different kind of organizational climate and have differential impact on the turnover and psychological well being of employees (Table 4.2). Bureaucratic management (style) creates a climate having high perceptions of structure and responsibility. Thus the clerks who work under Bureaucratic Managers perceive more structure and responsibility. They also perceive that high responsibility is assigned to them. On the other hand, they perceive poor communication, less conflict resolution, poor decision making, low identity and less warmth and support. Therefore, Bureaucratic managers induce poor organizational processes and poor social climate leading to low turnover and low psychological well being of
employees. As Colbry, Shiela and Lynds (1995) reported that social support systems, self and family environment bear a significant relationship with the general well being of an employee. Sullivan (1996) has also reported that psychological well being of an individual is highly influenced by one’s colleague’s well being (due to prevailing organizational climate).

— Authoritative management style also increases structure, assigns more responsibility and has poor communication pattern. Thus this management style also induces poor social climate and consequently having a negative impact on the turnover and psychological well being of employees. Stogdill (1948) reported that autocratic management introduce restricted behaviour, therefore, leading to low productivity.

— Nurturant management style also increases individual responsibility and organizational structure and has nonsignificant contribution in the determination of turnover and psychological well being. Kakkar (1974) finds the Nurturant style to be most effective style in the context of organizational climate specially in terms of interpersonal relations in India.

— Similarly, Nurturant Task management style has also been found high on the dimensions of organizational structure and responsibility and playing hardly any role in the determination of
the performance of an organization. Sinha & Sinha (1977) reported that although authoritarian management was perceived to be autocratic and influential, yet it was reported to be insecure and unsuccessful. The nurturant task management was perceived to be active, strong and most effective management which can move employees towards harder efforts, work commitment and moderate degree of productivity.

Therefore, the underlying common pattern that exist in these 4 management styles (described above) is such that workers perceive more structure and responsibility.

On the other hand Participative management style deals with high identity, low conflict resolution, proper communication, high motivation, adequate performance standards, more support & low responsibility (because of sharing and co-operative approach). Thus, these dimensions under participative management style produce congenial organizational climate and ultimately contributing to high turnover and high psychological well being. However, the factor analysis (Table 4.17) does not support the role of positive organizational climate in the determination of end variables. The factor emerged confirms the view that participative management style is solely responsible for high turnover and high psychological well being. Richardson & Piper (1986) studied 2 types of leaders, first group was predominantly meaning attributive while second group was predominantly caring. When their
interactive effect was studied, it was found that Participative management style was more persistent and consistent in terms of meaning and caring attributive style.

Task oriented management style deals with less identity and less warmth. It means that the clerks who work under task oriented management do not identify themselves with that organization where they are working and ultimately contributing nonsignificantly to the organization.

On the basis of obtained information, it is clear that participative management style is more effective than nurturant management style. Because the more inclination to be nurturant and supportive has also negative impact on the performance. Moreover, the information obtained in relation to management styles serve only theoretical orientation, but it is not directly related to the proposed hypotheses.

Further, when psychological well being was predicted on the basis of organizational climate (dimensional approach) it was found that only three dimensions (Table 4.18) i.e. communication, motivation and responsibility were significant predictors, however responsibility was predicting the psychological well being negatively. This finding is very notable because number of research studies (Sharma, 1983; Repetti et al, 1991; Ray, 1993; Mcfadden, 1993, etc.) emphasise only the social
aspect, i.e., harmonious interpersonal relationship, warmth and support between co-workers and between subordinate and superior as most effective predictors determining the psychological well being.

Conclusions

— The prevalence of Type B Behaviour Pattern was found more at managerial level than Type A.

— Type B managers were found to be delegating Participative, Nurturant & Nurturant Task leadership styles while Type A managers were high in delegating Authoritarian & Bureaucratic leadership styles.

— Two clusters of leadership styles emerged while studying the interrelationship between different leadership styles. The first cluster comprised - Nurturant, Nurturant Task & Participative while the second cluster constituted Authoritarian, Bureaucratic and Task Oriented leadership styles.

— Leadership styles when predicted on the basis of four personality patterns, (i.e. Hard Driving, Job Involvement, Speed & Impatience and Type A), it was only Speed & Impatience which contributed negatively in predicting Nurturant, Nurturant Task and Participative leadership styles. While Hard Driving was found as a significant predictor in prediction of Task oriented leadership style.
Moderate congruence was observed between leadership style and leadership behaviour style.

Organizational climate has two underlying clusters of dimensions. Organizational Climate-I comprised of dimensions i.e. CR, S, D, CO, RS, W, M I, PS and Organizational Climate-II involved 5 dimensions i.e. R, OS, PS, M & I. Out of these dimensions, 3 dimensions i.e. M, I, PS were common in both of the clusters.

Psychological well being when predicted on the basis of different 11 dimensions of Organizational Climate, only three predictors contributed i.e. Communication, Motivation and Responsibility. But the former two contributed positively while the latter one contributed negatively.

Nurturant leadership style and Participative behaviour style were found most effective in increasing psychological well being, global organizational climate and productivity of branch.

Highly significant correlations were obtained between organizational climate, turnover and psychological well being.

Participative management style was found to be most effective because the general well being of employees working under them was better and the turnover (productivity) of their branches was higher.
Suggestions:

— If such study is to be conducted in future, the selection of sample should be made properly in the beginning itself by following extreme group design selecting Type A vs. Type B managers. After that, one should go for leadership analysis which might yield the proposed hypothesis.

— Managers of various levels were included in the sample in the present study. However, it was felt that only Branch Manager should be included in the sample because the turnover (productivity) of that branch can be assigned to him and the average well being of the workers can also be assigned to him.

— By selecting all the subjects of managerial cadre from the same branch, the same turnover is assigned to all the managers which resulted into loss of variability and Range restriction. It was one of the limitations of our study.

— As far as the effectiveness of ‘Theoretical model’ is concerned, it should have followed the ‘stepwise path analysis’ i.e. personality pattern ↓ leadership style ↓ dimensions of organizational climate ↓ psychological well being and turnover (productivity).