CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Writing about "The Effective Executive", two decades ago, Peter. F. Drucker (1967, p. VIII) wrote, "we need all the knowledge of executive effectiveness we can get. On it depend the institutions of our society – the government agency as well as the business corporation, the research laboratory, the large university, the modern hospital as well as a modern army or air force. On effective executives depend, therefore, our individual well being, if not in the last analysis, our survival".

Drucker continues to say, "To be effective is the job of the executive. "To effect" and "to execute " are, after all, near synonyms. Whether he works in a business or in a hospital, in a governmental agency, in a labour union or in an insurance corporation, the executive is first of all expected to produce results. And this is simply saying that he is expected to be effective."

Executives or managers are the people in an organisation who conceive of the services an enterprise can render, mobilise the necessary means of production, co-ordinate activities both within the enterprise and with the outside world, and inspire people associated with the enterprise to work toward common objectives (Newman et al., 1987, p. 2). The managers in an organisation, thus, enjoy a status of importance and instrumentality by virtue of
being the ACTIVATING ELEMENT in the organisation. They are the people placed in positions of authority and accountability for getting the objectives of the organisation fulfilled.

W.H. Newman, E.K. Warren, and A.R. Mc Gill (1987, p.2) portray "Managing" as the guidance, leadership and control of the efforts of a group of individuals toward some common goal. According to them the key function of managing is a special kind of activity comprising clarifying the group's goals, coordinating members' efforts, allocating scarce resources, representing the group in negotiations with other groups making tough decisions so that group activities may proceed, inspiring co-operative action, exercising discipline when a member is lazy or goes off on a target - all necessary for effective and efficient group action to achieve desired results.

Without managers to perform the above activities the enterprise's output would be inadequate, productivity would suffer and resources would be wasted. The cases of many organisational failures add testimony to this fact. George R. Terry (1960, p.493) has observed with the support of statistical data that of every one hundred new business establishments started, approximately fifty, or one half, go out of business within two years. By the end of five years only one third of the original one hundred will be in business. The causes of these failures can be traced to the lack of capacity of the individual
managers to be effective in producing results. Hersey and Blanchard (1982, p. 82) attribute these failures to the ineffective leadership of the managers who are responsible for their enterprises.

On the other side are the organisations flourishing well with outstanding performers. These are the enterprises that possess within them teams of executives who are quite capable in producing effective results for their organisation. They are the people whom Peter F. Drucker (1954, ss.p.82) depicts as the basic and scarcest resources of any business enterprise. On all sides today, there is a continual search for such persons who have the necessary ability to manage enterprises effectively.

But, even in the most successful of the organisations, it is quite possible that there are differences between managers in the level of effectiveness with which they produce results for the organisation. Individual differences do occur among managers in their performance effectiveness, despite the enterprise's thrusts and efforts to conscientise its managers about the extreme importance of effectiveness at executive job.

Organisational researchers concerned with this problem have tried to build theoretical models to explain the reasons for differences in performance effectiveness among executives. A review of management literature and research endeavours in this regard indicates that there are many psychological as well as
other factors associated with performance differences among executives. Though a definite cause-effect relationship could not be established between the variables of performance effectiveness, behavioural scientists have gained considerable insights into the determinants of managerial effectiveness.

In explaining performance differences among managers, knowledge of motivation theories can be of considerable help to those concerned with motivating managers to perform. A number of motivation theories/models are available in management literature today that are widely tried out in organisations the world over, to motivate both managers and workers.

Another explanation for differences in performance effectiveness of managers can be found in the ability of the managers to lead their subordinates to effective task performance. A good number of leadership theories are currently in use among management practitioners who have benefited positively from the informed applications of these findings.

In the following sections a summary is made of the available literature on motivation, leadership and other variables selected for this study that are believed to be associated with performance effectiveness of managers.

In studying motivation we are interested in understanding why people choose to do certain things rather than others, and
also why different people put different amounts of efforts or intensity into the activities they engage in. Arnold and Feldman (1986) state that a person's motivation is a key determinant of his or her behaviour on the job. Motivation refers to all of the forces operating within a person to cause him or her to want to engage in certain kinds of behaviour rather than others. Even if all the other factors are present to facilitate effective individual behaviour on the job, these factors will amount to nothing unless the person is not motivated to perform well (Arnold and Feldman, 1986).

Theoretically there are three major ideas implicit in explaining human behaviour (Leavitt, 1978, p. 7). The first is the idea of CASUALITY, the idea that human behaviour is caused. Casuality is implicit in the beliefs that environment and heredity affect behaviour and that what is outside influences what is inside. Second, there is the idea of DIRECTEDNESS, the idea that human behaviour is not only caused but is also pointed towards something, that behaviour is goal-directed. Third is the idea of MOTIVATION, that underlying behaviour one finds a "Motive" or "a want" or a "need" or a "drive".

With the help of these ideas, human behaviour can be regarded as a system of doubleplay from MOTIVE TO BEHAVIOUR to GOAL (Leavitt, 1978, p.7). And it is also helpful to think of
behaviour as an effort to eliminate tensions by seeking goals that neutralise the cause of tensions. In other words, the ultimate condition of mankind can be thought of as an equilibrium condition in which one need not behave. Generally such a view is called a DEFFICIENCY model of motivation (Leavitt, 1978, p.8).

In recent years a strong case has been made for what has been called "growth motivation", a self generating view of at least some major human needs (Maslow, 1954, 1971; Weiner, 1972). It is in the nature of man, this argument runs, to reach out for something more, no matter what his state of satisfaction.

Growth models are thus open-ended in their view of human potential. They see the human beings as continually developing, moving on from one level of motivation to the next higher one and so on; and thereby continually repositioning himself to accomplish ever "higher" ends (Maslow, 1954).

This position is important because it leads one towards a more optimistic posture in approaching the question of motivating people. If one views motivation as arising exclusively out of deficiency, then one begins to think about ways of creating deficiencies for others in order to motivate them. The growth motivational view, on the contrary, points out that it is when human beings are satisfied in their more basic needs that the "higher" needs are likely to flower. It is when people are freed
from the simple deficiencies that they can really begin to work as complete human beings (Leavitt, 1978, p. 9).

The often quoted classifications of human needs considered relevant for organisational behaviour are presented in the figure (2.1). The figure shows the needs or motives postulated by various theorists in juxtaposition to each other and illustrates thereby the considerable similarity of their approaches.

Maslow (1954) felt that the basic human needs were arranged in hierarchal order and argued that higher order needs would not become active until lower order needs could be satisfied. The strength of this theory lies in drawing attention to the variety of needs and motives which operate in human beings.

Alderfer (1972) takes the Maslow needs and groups them into three basic categories—needs for existence, needs to relate to others and needs for personal growth.

Herzberg's (1966) hygiene and motivational factors indicated in the figure can be seen as more specifically job-related and reflect some of the concrete things people want from their work.

McClelland's (1961, 1976) theory of basic needs is probably most applicable to understanding the motivations of entrepreneurs and managers. McClelland identifies three basic needs—need for
A Comparison of Basic Motivational Categories proposed by Maslow, Alderfer, McClelland, and Herzberg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASLOW CATEGORIES</th>
<th>ALDERFER CATEGORIES</th>
<th>McCLELLAND NEEDS</th>
<th>HERZBERG FACTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Hierarchy)</td>
<td>(Implied Hierarchy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Physiological needs
2. Safety needs
3. Affiliation, love, social needs
4. Self-esteem needs (feed-back from others)
5. Self-actualization needs

achievement (n-Ach), need for power (n-pow) and need for affiliation (n-Aff). Each individual acts out of a need for achievement or for affiliation or for power and the intensity of his/her need will vary according to the situation. On the average, individuals are likely to have some bias toward either achievement, power or affiliation.

In summary, what can be said of the various need theories is that they have provided a useful set of categories for analysing human motivation and have drawn attention to the fact that human needs may be hierarchically organised; though the hierarchy itself may vary from person to person. Moreover, from the above need theories it is also distinguishable that human motives can be classified into "deficiency motives" and "growth motives" stated earlier in this section.

The problem of managerial motivation:

Extensive research efforts have been made to make use of the available need theories in solving the problem of individual motivation in organisations. The theories cited above and many others are being tried out by both academicians and practitioners all over the world. Most of these theories have proved fertile in one way or other in producing effective results from the individuals in organisations.

However, when the problem of motivation is confined to the field of managerial motivation, not all theories of motivation
may be regarded as equally relevant.

In answering the question, "what motivates or what motives do we find among the highly successful managers?", the works of McClelland have fascinated the academic world more than anybody else's. Organisational behaviour theorists today believe McClelland's needs (n-Ach, n-Pow, n-Aff) as a much relevant motivational model to understand the motivational dynamics of managers. Edgar Schein, an organizational psychologist, states that McClelland's theory of basic needs is probably most applicable to understanding the organisational careers of entrepreneurs and managers (Schein, 1980, p. 85). Drawing upon the findings from a great deal of work done over the last couple of decades, Leavitt (1978, p. 21) concludes that McClelland's power and achievement motives seem to be the operational motives for successful managers. Managerial motivational theorists like Gallerman, Jay Hall and others also agree upon the singular importance of McClelland's need theory in understanding the motivations of high performing managers (Gallerman, 1963; Hall, 1976).

This research study being an attempt to portray the characteristics of high performing bank managers the investigator has chosen Achievement orientation of managers as one among the variables for studying the performance differences among managers. Accordingly, in the following pages a brief summary of
the literature on the concept is presented.

Need for achievement is one among the secondary motives in human beings. A motive must be learned in order to be included in the "secondary" classification (Luthans, 1985, p.189). Numerous important human motives meet this criterion. Some of the more important ones are achievement, power and affiliation or as they are commonly referred today, n Ach, n Pow and n Aff. (Luthans, 1985, p.190). Some scholars are also emphasizing that needs such as autonomy, n Aut, are also important to organizational behaviour (Harrell and Albert, 1979, pp.259-267).

Perhaps the most thoroughly researched of the secondary needs is the need for achievement (Hampton, 1986, p.422). Although it does not have a long history as the other motives, more is known about achievement than about any other motive because of the tremendous amount of research that has been devoted to it.

Till date McClelland has been the one person closely associated with study of achievement motive. Beginning in 1947, McClelland thoroughly investigated and wrote about all aspects of achievement motivation (McClelland, 1953, 1961).

McClelland's research has led him to believe that the need for achievement is a distinct human motive that can be distinguished from other needs. More important, the achievement motive can be isolated and assessed in any group. McClelland defines n Ach as a desire to perform in terms of a standard of excellence or to be successful in competitive situations;
essentially it is the need to do something better than has been done before (O' Shaughnessy, 1976, p.92). People with a need for achievement seek to "accomplish things" and to improve their performance (Morgan, et al, 1979, p.224). For people in whom this motive is strong, McClelland continues, it is aroused by a task that is neither too easy nor too difficult—one the individual thinks can be achieved by his competence.

What are some of the characteristics of people with a high need for achievement? McClelland and some of his associates have identified certain of the important characteristics useful in describing achievement motivated people (McClelland et al., 1953; McClelland, 1961; McClelland and Winter, 1969; Atkinson and Feather, 1966; Atkinson and Raynor, 1978). Important among these characteristics is "realistic goal setting" and "moderate risk taking". Achievement oriented people set moderately difficult but potentially achievable goals. With managers, setting moderately difficult but potentially achievable goals may be translated into an attitude towards risks. Many people tend to be extreme in their attitude towards risks, either favouring wild speculative gambling or minimising their exposure to losses. Gamblers seem to choose the big risk because the outcome is beyond their power and, therefore, they can easily rationalise away their personal responsibility, if they lose. The conservative individual, on the contrary, chooses minimum risks where the gain is small but
secure, perhaps because there is little danger of anything going wrong for which that person might be blamed. Achievement motivated people take the middle ground, performing a moderate degree of risk because they feel their efforts and abilities will probably influence the outcome. In business, this aggressive realism may be regarded as the mark of the successful entrepreneur.

A characteristic of the achievement motivated persons, according to McClelland, is that they seem to be more concerned with personal achievement than with the rewards of success. They find accomplishing a task intrinsically satisfying in and of itself, or they do not expect or necessarily want the accompanying material rewards. They do not reject rewards, but the rewards are not essential as the accomplishment itself. They get a bigger "kick" out of winning or solving a difficult problem than they get from any money or praise they receive. Money, to achievement-motivated people, is valuable primarily as a measurement of their performance. It provides them with a means of assessing their progress and comparing their achievement with those of other people. They normally do not seek money for status or economic security.

Another characteristic of the achievement-oriented people is the desire for immediate and concrete feedback on how well they are performing. Accordingly, achievement-motivated people are
often found in jobs or careers, such as sales or certain management positions, in which they are frequently evaluated by specific performance criteria. In addition to concrete feedback, the nature of the feedback is important to achievement motivated persons. They respond favourably to information about their work. They are not interested in comments about their personal characteristics, such as how co-operative or how helpful they are. Whereas affiliation-motivated people might want social or attitudinal feedback, achievement-motivated people might want task-relevant feedback. They want to know the actual level of achievement as feedback.

Why do achievement-motivated people behave as they do? McClelland claims it is because they habitually spend time thinking about doing things better. Once a performance goal is selected, they tend to be totally preoccupied with the task until it is successfully completed. They cannot stand to leave a job half finished and are not satisfied with themselves until they have given their maximum effort. In fact McClelland has found that whenever people start to think in achievement terms, things start to happen. Accordingly achievement-motivated people tend to get more raises and are promoted faster because they are constantly trying to think of better ways of doing things. Companies with many such people grow faster and are more profitable (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p.39).

In an attempt to elaborate on or reinterpret McClelland's
basic theory of achievement motivation John W. Atkinson collaborated with McClelland in the very early studies of achievement motivation and since then has focused his research on the need to achieve.

Atkinson's views are closely allied with expectancy theory (Atkinson, 1977, 1982). According to Atkinson, the tendency to achieve success is a result of:

1) The individual's motivation toward achievement
2) The individual's expectation of success.
3) The individual's valuation of success—how attractive success is as an incentive.

This theory adds two important ideas: that fear of failure can act as a force leading to success, and that long-term career oriented striving is an important factor in success. People may be conservative in their short-term achievement efforts simply to preserve the possibility that will be successful in the long run.

In a further modification of the concept of achievement motivation, Atkinson has hypothesized that certain motivations are extinguishable. A highly achievement motivated person, for example, may strive hard and well for sometime to win a prospective promotion. But if this person's achievement need is not gratified, it ultimately will burn up and needs lower in the hierarchy will begin to control behavior.

Ideas like these represent important extensions of Mc
Clelland's views. Taken as a whole, achievement motivation theory, in its various forms, is important because it takes certain of the needs considered by Murray (1938) and Maslow (1954) and specifies how they relate to work performance.

McClelland has even extended his analysis to countries where he related the presence of a large percentage of achievement-motivated individuals to the national economic growth (McClelland, 1961, P.205). If two societies are equivalent in every respect except achievement motivation, a more rapid economic development can be expected in the one with higher achievement needs. The argument is simple: if a nation develops a large number of people who are driven by motives to achieve, to build and develop things, then that resource (achievement-motivated people) will generate economic development. Thus, if investigators find evidence of strong achievement motivation, they may be able to make predictions about economic growth in that society.

By studying social motives revealed in a culture's popular literature (especially children's books) and relating them to its economic history, researchers have found that high need for achievement correlates with various indices of economic growth, such as the consumption of electricity (Morgan, et al., 1979, p.226). These studies have shown that high need for achievement comes 'before' spurts in economic growth and thus predicts them.
Although the relationship between need for achievement and economic growth is suggestive, it is not the proof that need for achievement causes economic growth; they may both be caused by other factors. However, the knowledge of the social motives dominant in a society may help us understand its history and predict its future. This application of psychology to history and future trends is relatively new, but it may turn out to be a major contribution.

Source of the achievement need:

Why are some people high in n Ach and others low? Research suggests the tentative answer that achievement motivation grows out of "independence training" (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p. 39). McClelland has found that achievement-motivated people are more likely to be developed in families in which parents hold different expectations for their children than do other parents.

More importantly, those parents expect their children to start showing some independence between the ages of six and eight, making choices and doing things without help, such as knowing the way around the neighbourhood and taking care of themselves around the house. Other parents tend either to expect this too early, before children are ready, or to smother the development of the personality of these children. One extreme seems to foster passive, defeated attitudes as children feel unwanted at home and incompetent away from home. They are just not ready for that kind of independence so early. The other extreme yields either
over protected or over disciplined children. These children become very dependent on their parents and find it difficult to break away and make their own decisions.

In a research study conducted by Winterbottom (1953) it has been observed that there is a relationship between the independence training given to boys by their mothers and need for achievement. The number of demands to act independently does not seem so important as how EARLY these demands are made.

There is some evidence that people low on achievement motivation may have been exposed early to lack of success and have a strong fear of failure. Atkinson (1953, pp. 381-90) has reported that whereas students with high achievement motivation remember tasks they have been unable to complete better than completed tasks, students with low measured achievement motivation show the opposite pattern of memory.

The reason independence training and the achievement need are tied together is not too hard to see. Independence training itself is a kind of achievement training (Morgan, et al., 1979, p. 225). Through exhortation, rewards and probably a little punishment, some parents teach their children to approach challenging tasks with the idea of mastering them. Children who are successful at little tasks gain confidence and seek other challenges. Further success enhances the tendency to try to do one's best to accomplish things and to improve performance.
Finally, this approach to life's problems becomes so persistent and so much a part of the child's personality that we can say there is need for achievement. Thus the roots of adult achievement needs (and perhaps a number of other social motives, too) are to be found in the ways parents treat their children.

Culture strongly influences rearing practices and shapes the strength of the need for achievement. It has been claimed, for example, that American Indian societies, which value achievement, place great stress on inculcating independence during childhood (Lloyd, et al., 1984, p.427). Attempts have been made to use literary references to achievement in historical societies in order to measure the prevalent level of achievement motivation during different periods so that these could be correlated with the society's productivity and other indices of success. This has been done for ancient Greece, England between 1550 and 1800 and America over the past 180 years. The studies revealed a good correlation between measures of success and achievement motivation (Lloyd, et al. 1984, p.427). Clearly, there must be a complex interaction between societal success and achievement motivation.

Developing achievement motivation:

Given all we know about the need for achievement, can this motive be taught and developed in people? McClelland (1965, pp.6-24) was convinced that this could be done. He and his colleagues showed that need for achievement could be activated in
students in situations which emphasise competition and social acceptability. This illustrates the importance of social conditions in exciting specific needs. Social factors in childhood not only provide the bases for the acquisition of complex human motives, the social conditions present on a given occasion may also selectively stimulate an acquired motive.

But can achievement motivation be developed in adult human beings? McClelland (1965, pp.6-24) argued that this is possible. In fact, he has developed training programmes for business people that are designed to increase their achievement motivation. He has also developed similar programmes for other segments of the population. These programmes could have tremendous implications for training and developing human resources.

ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE - A REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL STUDIES:

Following McClelland's identification of n Ach, considerable research efforts have been directed towards this need. Many studies have arrived at interesting conclusions regarding the relationship between this need and the success or effectiveness of managers and entrepreneurs.

A good deal of evidence has been put forward to show that successful managers tend to be high in achievement motivation. Evidence of the comparative effectiveness of presidents of a substantial number of research and development corporations and
of sales representatives in certain types of sales jobs indicates that a strong need for achievement is often associated with better performance (Wainer and Rubin, 1969, pp.178-84; Scharge, 1965, pp.56-69). Where the task is entrepreneurial, where success calls especially for calculated risk taking, the need for achievement seems particularly helpful. But a strong need for achievement is also linked with more intense dissatisfaction when the job lacks challenge, feedback and recognition (Patchen, 1970, ss: p.423). Summarising the findings of many studies, Morgan et al (1979, p.224) report that people who are high in achievement need generally do better on tasks than those who are low. They sometimes do better at the outset of a task, presumably because their high need has previously motivated them to learn things and develop work habits that make them more proficient. In some cases they learn new tasks faster; in others they accomplish more in less time. Whatever the form of their superior achievement, they do in general excel at tasks that are difficult enough to discriminate different levels of performance.

There is some research evidence to show that high achievement needs can also be fuelled by an individual's fear of failure. Chusmir (1984, pp. 17-23) found that in organisations managers may be strongly motivated to take action by their fear of failing to meet personal or organisational goals and by the fear of possible public embarrassment when the failures are recognised.
For some individuals, fear of success can be a motive (Begly and Boyd, 1987, pp. 79 - 93). Such people fear the stress and burden of their success and the envy and dislike it may awake in others (Kearney, 1984, pp.1005-7).

Achievement-motivated people can be the backbone of most organisations, but what can we say about their potential as managers? Hersey and Blanchard (1982, p.40) state that people with a high need for achievement get ahead because as individuals they are producers, they get things done. However, when they are promoted, when their success depends not only on their own work but on the activities of others, they may be less effective. Since they are highly task-oriented and work to their capacity, they tend to expect others to do the same. As a result they sometimes lack the human skills and patience necessary for being effective managers of people who are competent but have a higher need for affiliation than they do. In this situations, their overemphasis on producing frustrates these people and prevents them from maximising their own potential. Thus while achievement motivated people are needed in organisations, they do not always make the best managers unless they develop their human skills.

More recently, Jay Hall and his colleagues (1979) have reported the results of a comprehensive study that compared the managerial styles and methods of 16000 high-, medium-, and low-achieving managers. Their main findings are summarised below:
1) Low n Ach managers are characterised by pessimistic outlooks and have a basic distrust of the intent and competence of their subordinates. High n Ach managers are the opposite. They are optimistic and view their subordinates favourably.

2) High n Ach managers readily use participative methods with their subordinates, while moderate and low n Ach managers do not tend to involve their subordinates in the decision-making process.

3) High n Ach managers tend to be very open in their interactions and communications with others (both bosses and subordinates) while moderate achievers are preoccupied with their own ideas and feelings, and low achievers tend to avoid interacting and communicating altogether.

4) High achievers show concern for both people and production whereas moderate achievers show high concern for production and low concern for people, and low achievers are concerned mainly with self-preservation and do not seem to care about people or production.

Some of these results do not really coincide with Mc Clelland's profile of high and low achievers. It must however be cautioned that Hall's findings tend to attribute all the popular
notions of "good" management (for example, participation, open communication, and dual concern for people and production) to the high n Ach manager.

In researches conducted by McClelland (1966) he has revealed that entrepreneurs—people who start and develop business or other enterprise—showed very high need for achievement and fairly high need for power but were quite low in their need for affiliation. Managers generally showed high on achievement and power and low on affiliation, but not so high or low as entrepreneurs.

McClelland found the pattern of achievement motivation clearest in people in small companies, with the president normally having very high achievement motivation. In large companies, interestingly enough, he found chief executives to be only average in achievement motivation and often stronger in drives for power and affiliation. Managers in the upper middle level of management in such companies rated higher than their presidents in achievement motivation. Perhaps as McClelland indicated, these scores are understandable. The chief executive had "arrived" and those below are striving to advance.

McClelland (1983, pp.99-112) and Stahl (1983, pp.775-91) found that people who succeed in competitive occupations were well above average in achievement motivation. Successful managers, who presumably operated in one of the most competitive of all
environments, had a higher achievement need than other professionals.

McClelland and David H. Burnham (1976, pp.100-110) report that successful managers have a greater need to influence others for the benefit of the organisation than for self-aggrandizement. Managers who use their power with self control will be more effective than those who wield power to satisfy a need to dominate others or those who neglect to use their power out of strong need to be liked. When a manager continually eases rules and changes procedures to accommodate subordinates, they will suspect that he or she is not flexible but weak and indecisive. McClelland concluded that good managers exercise power with restraint on behalf of others. Such managers encourage team spirit, support subordinates, and reward their achievements thereby raising morale.

In the mid-1980s, Thomas Begley and David P. Boyd (1987, pp. 79-93) studied the literature on the psychological roots of entrepreneurship. They tried to find out how the "founders" of small business, in otherwords, entrepreneurs, differ from people who manage existing small business. In addition, Begley and Boyd wanted to know how entrepreneurial attitudes affect the bottom lines of small companies.

They first considered need-achievement as described by McClelland. "Most studies", Begley and Boyd discovered, "support the prevalence of high n Ach (need achievement) among practising
entrepreneurs. Further more, in studies of successful entrepreneur, a high achievement orientation seems invariably present".

The second dimension Begley and Boyd considered, following the psychologist Julian B. Rottar, was "locus of control" — the idea that people can control their own lives as distinguished from a belief in luck, fate, and a variety of external forces. As the two researchers see it, achievement orientation logically implies that people can control their own lives and that the exercise of need-achievement is difficult to imagine without the influence of that conviction. Both founders and managers tend to think that they are pulling their own strings.

The third dimension that Begley and Boyd studied was the willingness to take risks. The two found that entrepreneurs who are willing to take moderate risks seem, on average, to earn higher returns on assets than both entrepreneurs, who, on the one hand, takes no risks, or, on the other, those who take what may be extravagant risks.

In the motivational theory literature spanning over the sixties and seventies, McClelland and his colleagues (McClelland 1961, 1966, 1970, 1975; McClelland, Atkinson, Clark and Lowell, 1976; McClelland and Burnham, 1976; McClelland and Winter, 1969) extensively documented the importance of the need for achievement and the need for power in many organizational, industrial and
entrepreneurial studies. Although they also defined the need for affiliation, little predictive power for n Aff in industrial or organisational situations has been demonstrated (Schachter, 1959), except for a few studies which have found low n Aff among executives (McClelland and Boyatzis, 1982, pp. 737–43). Earlier emphasis was on n Pow as it relates to managerial/entrepreneurial behaviour and economic achievement (McClelland, 1961, 1966, McClelland et al, 1976; McClelland and Winter, 1969). Lately McClelland et al's work has focused on n Pow, as it relates to managerial/executive behaviour and effectiveness (McClelland, 1970, 1975; McClelland and Burnham, 1976). However, in their statement that n Pow is the dominant motive for executive success, McClelland and Burnham (1976, pp. 100–110) noted that their remark was based on research with top level executives. They had then asserted that "power is the great motivator" for top level executives.

In a widely cited and well researched book on managerial behaviour and performance, Campbell, Dunnette, Lawler and Weick (1970) addressed achievement and power motives for managers. In their analysis of what effective managers actually do, they noted the frequency of behaviour aimed at influencing others (n Pow) and the frequency of behaviour concerned with setting and accomplishing goals (n Ach). They remarked: "Better managers tend to show a life time pattern of high achievement, power and
economic motivations". (Campbell et al, 1970, p. 361). This view seems to be gaining acceptance as evidenced by Steers' comment: "Hence, based on these findings, it would appear that the most successful managers may be those who combine a power orientation with an achievement orientation" (Steers, 1981, p. 76).

One of the most recent and extensive treatments of the relationships of n Ach to n Pow is a chapter in a book of readings in honour of McClelland (Veroff, 1982). "Achievement motivation directs people to meet socialised standards of excellent performance and thus to highly efficient task-centered strivings, whereas power motivation directs people to doing whatever draws most attention to their own effect on the world. The two motives seem to be fused in instances, where the standard of excellence is to win in a social competitive activity or to solve a problem that will be given a great deal of recognition" (Veroff, 1982, p. 100). Since problem solving by managers frequently is recognised by superiors, subordinates and peers, and since managers frequently compete with other organisational units for resources or priorities, it appears that management provides multiple instances for the two motives to be fused.

There are also other studies to support the motivation theories of McClelland as applicable to managerial samples. Cummin (1967, pp.78-81) tested a mixed sample of middle and top level managers and found that the more successful managers scored
higher in n Ach and higher in n Pow than the less successful managers. n Aff did not discriminate between the successful and non successful in Cummin's (1967) study. Wainer and Rubin (1969, pp. 178-84) found that both n Ach and n Pow were significantly related to company performance for research and development entrepreneurs. However, n Aff was not significantly related to company performance. Varga (1975, pp. 571-590) reported that the simultaneous presence of both n Ach and n Pow was significantly correlated with research and development effectiveness for scientists, engineers, and executives. Varga did not investigate n Aff. McClelland and Boyatzis (1982, pp. 737-43) found that a combination of high n Pow and low n Aff characterised long-term success for upper level managers, but that a combination of high n Ach and high n Pow characterised effectiveness for lower level managers.

Based upon McClelland's theory, Veroff's (1982) analysis of n Ach and n Pow, Campbell et al's (1970) and Steers' (1981) proposition and other empirical research, Michael J. Stahl, (1983, pp.775-91) hypothesised that the presence of both high n Ach and high n Pow was indicative of high managerial motivation and that the lack of both was indicative of low managerial motivation. His findings proved that a person who scored high on both n Ach and n Pow was high in managerial motivation and that one who scored low on n Ach and n Pow was low on managerial motivation. He further found that managers with high managerial motivation
had higher managerial performance than others.

In his original work, "The Achieving Society" (1961), McClelland had chosen India as one of the countries to collect evidence for his findings on the relationship between achievement motivation and economic development. McClelland had arrived at the conclusion that one of the reasons for India's slow economic development was the widespread lack of people with the need for achievement or the entrepreneurial spirit. Apart from McClelland, other researchers have also studied achievement motivation among Indian people, but most of these studies have been undertaken among youth and students. Very few studies have been undertaken to find out the relationship between the performance of executives and their need for achievement. Frazer (1961) conducted a longitudinal study among young Indian entrepreneurs and found that the men with high n Ach showed more entrepreneurial spirit than those with low n Ach. While studies like these explain the spread of enterprise in the Indian society, practically very little efforts have been made to find out the presence of achievement motivation among executives working in the highly competitive sectors of our economy. The field of banking, the context in which this research investigation was conducted is a highly competitive field of commercial activity in the country. But this investigator has not been able to find out any studies aimed at understanding the relationship between achievement motivation and performance
of bank executives. One of the aims of this study has been to throw some light on the level of achievement orientation among our bank executives and how this variable is associated with their performance.

LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION:

The successful organisation has one major attribute that sets it apart from unsuccessful organisations: dynamic and effective leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p.82) Peter F. Drucker (1954, ss:p.82) points out that managers are the basic and scarcest resource of any business enterprise. On all sides today there is a continuous search for persons who have the necessary ability to lead effectively. This shortage of effective leadership is not confined to business but is evident in the lack of able administrators in government, education, churches and every other form of organisation. Thus when we regret over the scarcity of leadership talent in our society, we are not talking about a lack of people to fill administrative bodies, what we are agonising over is a scarcity of people who are willing to assume significant leadership roles in our society and can get the job done effectively (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p.82).

What then is leadership in organisation? Given all other things, what type of leaders are likely to manage their organisations effectively? The answers to these questions are reviewed and presented briefly in the following pages.
According to Hugh J. Annold and Daniel C. Feldman (1986) leadership is an influence process that involves the exercise of influence on the part of the leader over the behaviour of one or more other people. George R. Terry (1960) defined it as the activity of influencing people to strive willingly for group objectives.

Tannenbaum, Weschler and Masserick (1959) defined leadership as an interpersonal influence exercised in a situation and directed, through the communication process, toward the attainment of a specialised goal or goals. Koontz and Odonnel (1959) stated that Leadership is influencing people to follow in the achievement of a common goal. Hersey & Blanchard (1982) defined leadership as the process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts toward goal achievement in a given direction.

From the above descriptions it could be summarised that leadership essentially involves one person (the leader) consciously trying to influence other people (the followers) to do something that he or she wants them to do. In other words leadership means accomplishing goals with and through people. Therefore a leader must be concerned about tasks and human relationships. These leadership concerns seem to be a reflection of two of the earliest schools of thought in organisational theory viz. scientific management and human relations. The function of the leader under scientific management or classical
theory was obviously to set up and enforce performance criteria to meet organisational goals (Taylor, 1911). The main focus of a leader was on the needs of the organisation and not on the needs of the individual. The function of the leader under human relations theory was to facilitate co-operative goal attainment among followers while providing opportunities for their personal growth and development (Mayo, 1945). The main focus, contrary to scientific management theory, was on individual needs and not on the needs of the organization.

Past writers have felt that concern for task tends to be represented by authoritarian leader behaviour, while a concern for relationships is represented by democratic leader behaviour. For instance, Lewin et al., (1939) classified leader behaviour into Authoritarian, Democratic and Laissez faire type. This feeling was popular because it was generally agreed that leaders influence their followers by either of two ways: 1) They can tell their followers what to do and how to do it or (2) They can share their leadership responsibilities with their followers by involving them in the planning and execution of the task. The former is the traditional authoritarian style, which emphasizes task concerns. The latter is the more non-directive democratic style which stresses the concern for human relationships.

The differences in the two styles of the leader behaviour are based on the assumption leaders make about the source of their power or authority and human nature. Hersey and Blanchard
(1982, p. 86) believe that the authoritarian style of leader behaviour is often based on the assumption that the power of the leaders is derived from the position they occupy and that people are innately lazy and unreliable (Theory X). The democratic style assumes that the power of the leaders is granted by the group they are to lead and that people can be basically self directed and creative at work if properly motivated (Theory Y).

There are a wide variety of styles of leadership possible between these two extremes. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1957, pp. 95-101) depicted a broad range of styles as a continuum moving from authoritarian or boss-centered leader behaviour at one end to democratic or subordinate centered leader behaviour at the other end. According to them, leaders whose behaviour is observed to be at the authoritarian end of the continuum tend to be task oriented and use their power to influence their followers. Leaders whose behaviour appears to be at the democratic end tend to be group oriented and thus give their followers considerable freedom in their work.

In the early studies of the survey research centre at the university of Michigan, there was an attempt to approach the study of leadership by locating clusters of characteristics that seemed to be related to each other and various indicators of

* These terms were popularised by Douglas Mc Gregor through his work "The Human Side of Entreprise" (New York: Mc Graw-Hill Book Company, 1960).
effectiveness. The studies identified two concepts, which were called employee orientation and production orientation (Katz et al. 1950, 1951).

According to the Michigan findings, leaders who are described as employee-oriented, stress the relationships aspect of their job. They feel that every employee is important and take interest in every one accepting their individuality and personal needs. Production orientation emphasises production and the technical aspects of the job (Katz et al. 1950, 1951). These two orientations parallel the authoritarian (Task) and democratic (Relationship) concepts of the leader behaviour continuum.

Reviewing the findings of numerous studies (Dorwin Cartwright and Alvin Zander 1960) claim that group objectives in a leadership situation fall into one of two categories: (1) The achievement of some specific group goal or (2) The maintainance or strengthening of the group itself.

According to Cartwright and Zander (1960, p. 496) the type of behaviour involved in goal achievement is illustrated by these examples: The manager "initiates action............keeps members attention on the goal............clarifies the issue and develops a procedural plan". On the other hand characteristic behaviour for group maintainence are : The manager "keeps interpersonal relations pleasant............arbitrates disputes.....provides encouragement.................gives the minority a chance to be heard............stimulates self
direction.......... and increases the interdependence among members". Here, goal achievement seems to coincide with the task concepts discussed earlier (authoritarian and production orientation) while group maintenance parallels the relationship concepts (democratic and employee orientation).

Research findings in recent years indicate that leadership styles vary considerably from leader to leader. Some leaders emphasize the task and can be described as authoritarian leaders; others stress interpersonal relationships and may be viewed as democratic leaders. Still others seem to be both task oriented and relationship oriented. There are even some individuals in leadership positions who are not concerned about either. No dominant style appears. Instead various combinations are evident. Thus, task and relationship are not "either/or" leadership styles as suggested in the preceding continuum. They are separate and distinct dimensions that can be plotted on two separate axes rather than on a single continuum (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982, p.88).

The leadership studies initiated in 1945 by the Bureau of Business Research at Ohio State University attempted to identify various dimensions of leader behaviour. Defining leadership as the behaviour of an individual when directing the activities of a group toward goal attainment the Ohio team eventually narrowed the description of leader behaviour to two dimensions: Initiating structure and Consideration (Haplin, 1959). Initiating structure
refers to the leader's behaviour in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of the work group and in endeavouring to establish well-defined patterns of organisation, channels of communication and the methods of procedure. On the other hand, Consideration refers to behaviour indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and the members of the staff.

To gather data about the leadership style of leaders, the Ohio studies staff developed the Leader Behaviour Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), an instrument designed to measure initiating structure and consideration of leaders. The staff did also develop a Leader Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) to gather data about the self-perception that leaders have about their leadership style. The LBDQ was completed by leader's subordinate(s) superior(s), or associate(s), but the LOQ was scored by the leaders themselves.

In studying leader behaviour the Ohio Studies staff found that initiating structure and consideration were separate and distinct dimensions (Stogdill and Coons, 1957). A high score on one dimension does not necessarily lead to a low score on the other. The behaviour of a leader could be described as any mix of both dimensions. Thus, it was during these studies that leader behaviour was first plotted on two separate axes rather than on a single continuum. Four quadrants were developed
to show various combinations of initiating structure (Task behaviour) and consideration (Relationship behaviour).

Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton (1978a) have popularised the leadership concepts discussed so far in their "Managerial Grid" and have used them extensively in organisation and management development programmes. In their "Managerial Grid" five different types of leadership based on concern for production (i.e. task) and concern for people (i.e. relationship) are located at different grid points, in four quadrants, similar to those identified by Ohio State studies.

The five leadership styles are described as follows:

1. Impoverished Management (1, 1)
2. Country Club Management (1, 9)
3. Organisation Man Management (5, 5)
4. Authority-Obedience Management (9, 1)
5. Team Management (9, 9).

In essence, "Managerial Grid" has given popular terminology to five points within the four quadrants of the Ohio state studies. However, Hersey and Blanchard (1982) pointed out one significant character of the Grid framework that "CONCERN FOR" is a predisposition about something or an attitudinal dimension. Therefore, the Managerial Grid, they say, tends to be an attitudinal model that measures the values and feelings of a manager.
Virtually every major research programme on leadership has recognised the distinction between task and people orientation though under different labels. The important research groups and the labels use by them to indicate the two dimensions are presented in fig (2.2).
FIGURE 2.2

COMPARISON OF LEADERSHIP STYLE DIMENSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH GROUP</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>PEOPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>Initiating structure</td>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey and Blanchard</td>
<td>Task behavior</td>
<td>Relationship behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan (Likert)</td>
<td>Production centered</td>
<td>Employee centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiedler</td>
<td>Low LPC (Task)</td>
<td>High LPC (Relationship)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake and Mouton</td>
<td>Concern for production</td>
<td>Concern for people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bales</td>
<td>Task leader</td>
<td>Socioemotional leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benne and Sheats (1948)</td>
<td>Task functions</td>
<td>Group building and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>maintenance functions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A REVIEW OF LEADERSHIP THEORIES/MODELS:

After identifying the two central concerns, task and relationship, of any leadership situation, leadership researchers have been concerned with the question "Is there a best style of leadership?" In trying to answer this question many theoretical models have emerged out. A few of those that have attracted academic interest are summarised in the following pages.

One very popular approach to identifying leadership styles of practicing managers is Blake and Mouton's managerial grid (1978a). The two dimensions of the grid are concern for people and concern for production. These two dimensions are equivalent to the consideration and initiating structure functions identified by the Ohio State studies and the employee-orientation and production-orientation used in the Michigan studies.

The five basic styles identified in the grid represent varying combinations of concern for people and production. The 1, 1 manager has minimum concern for people and production and this style is sometimes called the "impoverished" style. The opposite is the 9,9 manager. This individual has maximum concern for both people and production. Blake and Mouton imply that the 9,9 is the best style of leadership. They state that there should be no question about which leadership style is the most effective. It is that of the manager who in the terminology of the Managerial Grid is the 9,9 "team builder" (Blake and Mouton,
Blake and Mouton (1981, pp. 439-55) recently provided empirical evidence that their interactive notion of leadership style (that is concern for people interacting with concern for production) has more predictive validity than additive situational approaches. The 5,5 manager adopts the "middle-of-the-road" style and the other two styles represent the extreme concerns for people (1,9 "country club" manager) or production (9,1 "task" manager).

Rensis Likert (1967) proposes four basic systems or styles of organisational leadership that had evolved from the many years of research by the Michigan group.

The manager who operates under a system 1 approach is very authoritarian and actually tries to exploit subordinates. The system 2 manager is also authoritarian but in a paternalistic manner. This benevolent autocrat keeps strict control and never delegates authority to subordinates. The system 3 manager uses a consultative style. This manager asks for and receives participative input from subordinates but maintains the right to make the final decision. The system 4 manager uses a democratic style. This manager gives some direction to subordinates but provides for participative decision by consensus and / or majority.

To give empirical research backup on which style is most effective, Likert asked thousands of managers to describe in
terms of the four systems of management cited above, the highest and lowest producing department with which they had experience. Quite consistently, the high-producing units were described according to system 3 and 4 and the low-producing units fell under system 1 and 2. These responses were given irrespective of the manager's field of experience or of whether the manager was in a line or staff position.

The above two models support either an integrated leaderships style (high concern for both production and people) or a permissive-democratic human relations approach. These styles might be effective in some organisational settings, but they may be inappropriate in others. Effective leader behaviour is regarded by some theorists (Fiedler, 1967; Reddin, 1970) as dependent on the specific situations or environment that is uniquely characteristic of each. The formula for effective leadership under this view may be read as: Effectiveness is a function of (leader, follower and situation) or E = f (l, f, s,). Effective leaders are able to adapt their leadership style or leader behaviour to the needs of the followers and the situation. The concept of adaptive leader behaviour might be stated as follows: The more managers adapt their style of leader behaviour to meet the particular situation and the needs of their followers, the more effective they will tend to be in reaching personal and organisational goals.
According to the frequently cited leadership Contingency Model developed by Fred E. Fiedler, (1967) three major situational variables seem to determine whether a given situation is favourable to leaders: (1) Their personal relations with the members of the group (leader-member relations) (2) the degree of structure in the task that the group has been assigned to perform (task structure) and (3) the power and authority that their position provides (position power). Leader-member relations seem to parallel the relationship concepts discussed earlier, while task structure and position power seemed to be associated with task concepts. Fiedler defines the FAVOURABLENESS of a situation as the degree to which the situation enables the leader to exert his influence over his group.

In Fiedler's model the most favourable situation for leaders to exert influence over their group is one in which they are liked by the members (good leader-member relations), have a powerful position (high position power) and are directing a well defined job (high task structure). On the other hand, the most unfavourable situation for leaders is one in which they have poor leader member relations, have little position power, and face an unstructured task to be performed by subordinates.

In his analysis Fiedler has concluded that:

1. Task-oriented leaders tend to perform best in group situations that are either very favourable or very
unfavourable to the leader.

2. Relationship oriented leaders tend to perform best in situations that are intermediate in favourableness.

Recognising that the effectiveness of leaders depends on how their leadership style interrelates with the situation in which they operate, an effectiveness dimension was added to the two dimensional model by William J. Reddin (1967, 1970).

Reddin's styles are essentially similar to the styles first identified by the Ohio State studies and used by Blake and Mouton in their grid. Reddin goes beyond the Blake and Mouton grid by adding an effectiveness dimension to the task and relationship dimensions.

If the effectiveness of a leadership style depends on the situation in which it is used, it follows that any of the basic styles may be effective or ineffective depending on the situation. Reddin has identified four effective and four ineffective leadership styles.

The difference between the effective and ineffective styles is often not the actual behaviour of the leader but the appropriateness of this behaviour to the environment in which it is used. In reality, the third dimension is the environment. It is the interaction of the basic style with the environment that results in a degree of effectiveness or ineffectiveness.
Another popular leadership approach to management training and development is the Life Cycle (later termed Situational) approach to leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982). It is an extension of the Managerial Grid and Reddin's 3-D approach. Following the original Ohio State studies, Hersey and Blanchard's approach identifies two major styles— the task style and the relationship style.

Taking the lead from some of Fiedler's work on situational variables, Hersey and Blanchard incorporated the maturity of the followers into their model. The level of maturity of the followers is measured by three criteria:

1) Degree of achievement motivation.
2) Willingness to take on responsibility.
3) Amount of education and/or experience.

Although they recognise that there may be other important situational variables, Hersey and Blanchard focus only on the maturity level of subordinates in their model.

The key for leadership effectiveness in this model is to match up the situation with the appropriate style of leadership. They have identified four styles of leadership viz: (1) Telling (2) Selling (3) Participating and (4) Delegating (Hersey and Blanchard (1982)).

This situational approach seems to be of some value in training and development of leaders in that it can point out the
need for flexibility in the leader's behaviour towards subordinates.

The other widely recognised modern theoretical development for leadership studies is Martin G. Evan's (1970, pp.277-98) and Robert J. House's (1971, pp. 321-38) Path-Goal theory derived from the expectancy framework of motivation. This theory attempts to explain the impact that leader behaviour has on subordinate motivation, satisfaction and performance. It incorporates four major types of leadership styles:

1) Directive leadership
2) Supportive leadership
3) Participative leadership
4) Achievement oriented leadership.

This path-goal theory suggests that these various styles can be and actually are used by the same leader in different situations. Two of the situational factors that have been identified so far are the personal characteristics of subordinates and the environmental pressures and demands facing subordinates.

Using one of the four styles contingent upon the situational factors outlined above, the leader attempts to influence subordinates' perceptions and motivates them, which in turn, leads to their role clarity, goal expectancies, satisfaction and performance. In other words, the leader attempts to make the path to subordinates' goals as smooth as possible.
But to accomplish this path-goal facilitation, the leader must use the appropriate style contingent on the situational variables present.

The VROOM-YETTON (1973) normative leadership model attempts to provide a specific normative model (how decisions ought to be taken in a given situation) that a leader could actually use in making effective decisions.

The model contains five leadership styles, seven situational dimensions, fourteen problem types, and seven decision rules. The leadership styles consist of variations on autocratic, consultative and group styles, and the situational dimensions are of two general types (1) The way in which the problem affects the quality and acceptance of a decision and (2) The way in which the problem affects the degree of participation. The seven situational dimensions are stated in the form of "Yes-No" questions, and the answers can help diagnose the situation for the leader.

From the preceding discussions it is almost observable that researchers and theoreticians still continue to differ sharply in what they advocate as the "correct" leaderships style.

Some theorists say that an integrative style, such as high concern for production and high concern for the people is the best (eg: Managerial Grid). Others claim that a permissive
A democratic approach is ideal for leadership effectiveness (e.g. Likert's model). At the same time, most of the modern theorists move toward a contingency approach which in effect says that effectiveness depends upon the task, the motive of the subordinates and other historical and environmental factors. However, one clear conclusion follows: There is NO consistent evidence that any given prescription of leadership style is the best one.

Hersey and Blanchard (1982, p. 101) claim that the above issue can be resolved if we are able to distinguish between the attitudinal model and behavioural model in the study of leadership. For example, in examining the dimensions of the Managerial Grid (Concern for production and concern for people) they say that these appear to be "attitudinal" dimensions. According to Hersey and Blanchard, concern or orientation is a feeling or an emotion toward something. On the other hand, the dimensions of effectiveness models like path-goal model or the situational leadership model are dimensions of observed behaviour. Thus, these models describe how people behave whereas the attitudinal models describe the attitudes or predispositions of leader toward production and people.

Although attitudinal models and behavioural models examine different aspects of leadership, they are not incompatible. Although high concern for both production and
people (9,9 attitude) is the basic ingredient for effective managers, Hersey and Blanchard (1982, p.102) hold that it may be appropriate for managers to engage in a variety of behaviour as they face different problems in their environment. For example, if a manager's subordinates are emotionally mature and can take responsibility for themselves, the appropriate leader behaviour for working with them may be low task and low relationship. In this case, the manager delegates to those subordinates the responsibility of planning, organising and controlling their own operations. The manager plays a background role providing socio-emotional support, only when necessary. In using this style appropriately, the manager would not be "impoverished" (low concern for both production and people). In fact, delegating to competent and confident subordinates is the best way a manager can demonstrate his 9-9 attitude. The same is true of a directive high task/low relationship style. Sometimes the best way to show concern for people and production (9,9) is to direct, control and closely supervise their behaviour when they are insecure and do not have the skills yet to perform the job.

In summary, the discussions so far tend to show that there is no normative (best) style of leader behaviour. Effective leaders adapt their leader behaviour to meet the needs of their followers and the particular environment. If their followers are different, they must be treated differently. On the contrary,
when it comes to leadership attitudes or orientation, only very few leadership models have been developed and these models indicate that the best results are produced when the leaders are both task-oriented and people-oriented.

**Leadership Studies in India:**

The research studies reviewed so far pertained to those conducted in the western countries. In India leadership research is only a few decades old with only very few models for practical use in our organisations. However, a number of studies have been conducted in this field. A brief review of the important leadership studies conducted in India is presented below.

In a study of leadership behaviour in an engineering concern, Ganguli (1964, ss: p.70) found that nearly half (46.9 percent) of the managers preferred the autocratic style of leadership. Quite interestingly, 31 percent of the workers also indicated their preference for autocratic leadership. Only 12.30 percent of the managers preferred democratic climate. Thiagrajan and Deep (1970, pp.173-80) in a study covering four cultures reported that authoritarian leaders are more influential than the persuasive, and the persuasive more than the participative leaders. Kumar and Singh (1976, pp. 275-90) observed that authoritarian leadership is no less preferred than the participative style. Myers (1960,ss: p.70) reported that many of the Indian top managers are relatively authoritarian in their relationships and dealings with their lower level managers.
and labour. In a study that focussed on the participative predisposition of managers in the public sector, Dhingra (1973) also found that the non participative predisposition was found to be higher among the managers at the top level. In the same study it was also found that only 16.23 percent of the sample of managers had a clear participative or mixed predisposition. Interestingly, the 'Staff' managers were relatively more participative than the 'Line' managers.

Regarding decision-making, Cascio (1974) in a cross cultural study covering 627 managers from 21 countries, found that Indian managers preferred to deal in their decision-making processes with the uninvolved passive subordinates. Of the 37 managers in the Indian sample only 29.4 percent preferred the participative style. In a cross-national study including the United states, Britain, Germany, France, Netherlands, Japan and India, among others, Bass and Berger (1979, p.126) observed that an important characteristic of the Indian managers was their concern for rules and dependence on authority. The Indian managers seemed to rely more on authority than persuasion.

Based on extensive research data, J.B.P. Sinha (1978) has developed a leadership effectiveness model for India. In his model, Sinha depicts the effective leadership style as "Nurturant Task (NT) style". The Nurturant Task style has two main components: Concern for task and Nuturant-orientation. The NT
style requires that the effective leader structures his and his subordinates' roles clearly so that communications are explicit, structured and task-relevant. He initiates, guides and directs his subordinates to work hard and maintains a high level of productivity, both quantitatively and qualitatively. Responsibilities are pinpointed and areas of decision making are synchronised with them. He, thus, creates a climate of purposiveness and goal-orientation.

The Nurturant-Task leader's task orientation, however, has a mix of nurturance. He cares for his subordinates, shows affection, takes a personal interest in their well-being, and above all, is committed to their growth. He wants them to grow up and mature so that they can assume greater and greater responsibilities and spare the leader for other tasks.

The Sinha model of leadership, thus, highlights importance of the human side of dealing with and caring for the subordinates. There are quite a few other studies also that have highlighted the importance of People orientation for leaders. In a field investigation conducted among supervisors, Chatterjee and James (1965, pp.8-12) reported that the effective supervisors were those who had concern for production and an equal concern for the welfare of workers. These supervisors put less pressure on the workers, accepted the worker's suggestions and encouraged cohesiveness in the work group.
Bose (1965, pp.117-25) in a study covering sixty eight supervisors and four hundred workers from three industrial organisations, found that employee-centered supervision was positively related with the morale of workers. In another study conducted in a large engineering undertaking, Kakar (1971, pp.298-307) found that affiliation (employee orientation) of supervisors was significantly related to the work performance and work satisfaction of the subordinates.

The above review of literature indicates that the dominant predisposition of the Indian managers is toward Production or Task orientation. At the same time, certain of the studies uncover the fact that Employee or People orientation on the part of the leaders is an important factor that is linked with the satisfaction and morale of workers. It has to be admitted, however, that most of these studies on leadership have been chiefly concerned with identifying the dominant orientation (authoritarian or democratic) of managers. Practically lesser efforts have been focussed on relating these orientations with the performance effectiveness of managers in producing results.

Another observation that may be made about the studies on leadership conducted in India is that these have been largely confined to the industrial organisations and factory-set up. In the development of the country the tertiary and commercial
sectors do play an equally important role. Effective management of organisations operating in these sectors calls for the application of effective leadership. However, research literature on leadership in commercial and related organisations like banking and insurance is very scanty and there exists a gap in our understanding of what types of leadership are effective in these organisations.

**TYPE A BEHAVIOUR PATTERN**

The causes and consequences of job stress among executives have been a constant concern of modern management researchers. There is good reason to believe that the modern executive is under stress because the world around is becoming more competitive and less predictable with each passing day. A common response to the pressure caused by this acceleration of changes is to try and speed up. The hurried individual trying to keep up with these changes talks fast, walks fast and acts as if slowing down to relax is tantamount to failure, and life is a continual race against the clock (Kriegel and Kriegel, 1984, p.XIV). Cardiologists Ray Rosenman and Mayer Friedman (1974) labelled this supercharged behaviour Type A behaviour pattern (TABP). Perhaps the most talked about personal characteristic in the job stress literature today is the Type A personality.

What then is precisely meant by Type A behaviour pattern? What are the consequences of Type A behaviour for the individual?
Can Type A behaviour pattern be controlled and changed? The following is a short review of the literature pertaining to these and related questions.

**Type A Behaviour Pattern and Coronary Heart Disease**

Heart disease is becoming the number one killer of human beings especially in the advanced western countries. The industrialised countries mainly are ravaged by the epidemic of coronary disease. About a million people die annually in the United States from cardio-vascular diseases of which more than 500,000 are heart attacks, and 200,000 are strokes (Dastur, 1980, p.89). A large percentage of these deaths occur between the ages of thirty-five and fifty and are classified as premature deaths (Charlesworth and Nathan, 1984, p.189).

In India medical scientists have significantly lowered the rates of deaths from infectious diseases by preventive measures. However, the incidence of diseases of the heart and blood vessels is on the increase. Dr. Padmavathi, in a presidential address to the Cardiological Society of India said, "The incidence of heart disease in India is the biggest threat of all, which needs largest preventive measure " (Dastur, 1980, p.89). Heart disease the number one killer in U.S.A. and Europe, ranks third in India among the killers, the first being T.B and the second, infection (Dastur, 1980, p.90). About 40 years ago heart disease was No. 7 on the list of killers; it has moved very rapidly to its present third position. (Dastur, 1980, p.90).
Because of its great prevalence and the toll it takes on relatively young people, considerable attention has been given, during the recent decades, to investigate causes and intervention for coronary heart disease. Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) is the term given to cardiovascular diseases that are characterised by an inadequate supply of oxygen to the heart (Houston, 1988, p.1). The major symptomatic forms of CHD are angina pectoris that is, severe chest pain, and myocardial infarction (MI) that is, heart attack. Coronary atherosclerosis (narrowing of coronary arteries) is considered the common substrate for the different forms of CHD.

There are a number of factors that traditionally have been regarded as conferring risk for CHD, among which are age, high blood pressure, diabetes, cigarette smoking, obesity, high serum cholesterol level and low levels of physical activity (American Heart Association, 1987). It appears, however, that the traditional risk factors are unable to account for the majority of new cases of CHD (Jenkins, 1971, pp.244-255, 307-17). Recognition of these findings has increased the interest of researchers in considering the role that personality, behavioural and social factors may play in the development of CHD.

Prior to 1950's several clinicians (Dunbar 1943; Kemple, 1945; Menninger and Menninger, 1936, Osler 1892) observed that certain personality or behavioural attributes such as being
hard driving, ambitious, aggressive and so forth, seemed to
classify coronary-prone individuals. However, these
observations had only very limited effect on research and theory
concerning risk for CHD.

It was not until work began in the mid-1950's by
cardiologists Friedman and Rosenman on the Type A behaviour
pattern that serious, widespread consideration was given to the
role that personality and/or behavioural factors may play in CHD.
Individuals exhibiting the TABP are said to be characterised by
impatience, chronic time urgency, enhanced competitiveness,
aggressive drive, and hostility (Rosenman, 1978).

The TABP gained attention and some scientific credibility
as investigators reported findings associations between the TABP
and prevalence of CHD in retrospective studies (Jenkings, 1971,
p.244-55). The TABP gained more attention and substantially more
scientific credibility when an association between the TABP and
the incidence of CHD was found in a prospective study, namely the
Western Collaborative Group Study (WCGS) (Rosenman et al., 1975,

Enthusiasm regarding the Type A concept burgeoned in the
1970s. Widespread interest in Type A was stimulated by the
publication in 1974, of a book for a general audience entitled
"Type A behaviour and your heart" by Drs.Meyer Friedman and Ray
Rosenman. In the scientific community, a growing number of investigators devoted attention to issues of assessment of TABP, the psychological processes that might link Type A and CHD, the psychological correlates of Type A, the development of the TABP, and interventions for Type A. In this connection, an influential book entitled "Behaviour Patterns, Stress, and Coronary Disease" by David Glass, appeared in 1977. This book reviewed an extensive programme of research concerning the psychological correlates of Type A.

Interest in the TABP and the evidence linking it to CHD was sufficient that the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI), U.S.A. sponsored a multidisciplinary conference, the Forum on Coronary-prone Behaviour, which was held in 1977 to review intensively the scientific status of the TABP. Also in 1978, the NHLBI sponsored a conference of distinguished scientists who were "neutral" on the topic of Type A. The charge to this group was to carefully review and evaluate the data related to the TABP and CHD. The conclusion of this group was that Type A behaviour was associated with an increased risk for CHD in employed, middle-aged U.S. citizens over and above that conferred by the traditional risk factors (Review Panel, 1981, pp.1199-1215). Moreover, it was concluded that the risk conferred by Type A was comparable to the relative risk associated with the traditional risk factors. The review panel's findings were published in 1981.
and stood as a landmark because, for the first time, a psychosocial factor had received authoritative recognition as a risk factor for CHD.

This brief chronology of the link between the Type A behaviour pattern and coronary heart disease thus places the status of TABP as a risk factor beyond dispute. Theoretical formulations of the TABP hold that it arises out of the interaction between the individual and the environment (Friedman and Rosenman, 1974). For those in active employment, the occupational environment may be particularly important in this respect.

**Type A behaviour - Definition and Description**

The concept of Type A behaviour pattern evolved in the mid-1950s after repeated observation of a relatively specific action-emotion complex, particularly in younger and middle aged patients with coronary heart disease. These patients, although were rarely despaired of losing, appeared to be in a chronic struggle to achieve poorly defined goals or to obtain an excessive number of things from their environment and to be in habitual conflict with others and with time (Rosenman et al., 1988a). It was observed that these patients grappled aggressively with their perceived challenges and, in this regard, appeared to differ from individuals with anxiety or neuroses who tend to retreat from such challenges (Rosenman et al., 1988a).
In the formulation of the TABP, Type A individuals of both sexes were considered to have the following characteristics: (1) an intense, sustained drive to achieve self-selected but often poorly defined goals; (2) a profound inclination and eagerness to compete; (3) a persistent desire for recognition and advancement; (4) a continuous involvement in multiple and diverse functions subject to time restrictions; (5) habitual propensity to accelerate the rate of execution of most physical and mental functions; (6) extraordinary mental and physical alertness; and (7) aggressive and hostile feelings (Friedman & Rosenman, 1959, pp.1286-96; Rosenman & Friedman, 1961, pp.1173-84; Rosenman et al., 1964 pp.15-22).

The marked increase of CHD in most industrialised societies in the twentieth century (Rosenman and Chesney, 1982) may have resulted, in part, because these societies fostered the TABP by offering rewards to those who performed more quickly, aggressively, and competitively (Rosenman et al., 1988b). The increased incidence of CHD has been associated with urbanisation and population densification and the consequent increased need for finely synchronised, interdependent services. This new environment stimulated competitiveness and the hostility-anger dimensions that are associated with the unique new stresses not experienced either by earlier generations or by non-industrialised contemporary populations. Therefore it was considered that the TABP may not stem solely from personality
attributes, but rather that this cluster of specific behaviours and style of living emerges from the interaction of certain personality attributes, with the environmental milieu (Rosenman 1978).

It is the enhanced competitiveness of Type A persons that leads to an aggressive and ambitious achievement orientation, increased mental and physical alertness, muscular tension and explosive and rapid stylistics of speech. An associated chronic sense of time urgency leads to restlessness, impatience and the habitual acceleration of most activities. This in turn may result in irritability and the enhanced potential for Type A hostility and anger, which is covert in most Type A individuals.

TABP is thus defined as an action emotion complex involving: (1) behavioural dispositions (e.g. ambitiousness, aggressiveness, competitiveness, and impatience); (2) specific behaviours (e.g. muscle tenseness, alertness, rapid and emphatic speech stylistics and accelerated pace of most activities) and (3) emotional responses (e.g. irritation, hostility, and anger) (Rosenman et al., 1988b).

The TABP is considered to be neither a stressor situation nor a distressed response, and as such it is not synonymous with stress. It is based on an underlying set of values, thoughts, and approaches to interpersonal relationships; in turn these are manifested by characteristic gestures, facial expressions,
respiratory pattern, motor activity and pace and speech stylistics. It should be emphasised that the TABP stems from the interaction of an individual's attributes and predisposition, environmental milieu, and perception of milieu stressors as challenges. Because of these interactive process an aggressive, hostile and time-urgent style of living emerges that is often associated with increased psychophysiological arousal. In part the TABP may be considered a response to maintain control over events that threaten the individual's sense of control over the environment (Glass, 1982, pp.193-202). This attempt at control is reflected in the Type A drive and accelerated pace, and it often includes a vocational commitment in which other aspects of life are neglected (Rosenman et al., 1988b).

In describing the action-emotion characteristics of the Type A behaviour pattern, Friedman and Rosenman (1974, 1983) include the following in their portrait of the Type A individuals. Type A individuals always move, walk, eat and talk rapidly. They tend to emphasise words in their speech. They tend to "hurry" to the end of their sentences. Type A individuals are impatient with the rate that things happen. They tend to interrupt others and finish the sentences of people who are speaking slowly. They find it difficult to wait for others to do things they might be able to do faster. They hurry themselves in every activity they can.
Another characteristic of Type A individuals is polyphasic thinking. This means that they are thinking of two or more things at the same time. They listen to a conversation and at the same time dwell over other matters. They may think over business difficulties while they are driving to work or playing a game. They may try to eat and read at the same time.

When others are saying something that does not relate to what they want to talk about Type A individuals always struggle to bring the conversation back to their interest. They have a difficult time relaxing or doing nothing even if they are on a vacation. They are often so preoccupied that they do not appreciate things around them that are not related to their main goals.

Type As are more interested in getting things done than in getting enjoyment from doing things. They try to schedule more and more in less and less time. They often find themselves having more than can be accomplished and having allowed little time for unexpected interruptions or emergencies.

The Type A personality is extremely competitive and these people try to achieve more than the others. Their goals are often more money, more possessions, higher positions, more friends, and more activities. They tend to judge themselves by the number of successes rather than the quality of their successes. In addition, they look upon their successes as the
result of their ability to do things faster than others rather than as a result of their abilities. They often exhibit gestures that suggest constant struggle such as grinding their teeth or clenching their fists. Taken together, Friedman and Roseman depict the Type A individuals as hard driving, competitive, impatient, aggressive and achievement striving.

Linking Type A behaviour to organisational context, Brief et al (1981, pp.11-12) observed that Type A employees (managers, sales persons, staff specialists, secretaries or rank-and-file operating employees) experience considerable stress. They are the ones who:

1) Work long hard hours under constant deadline pressures and conditions for overload.
2) Often take work home at night or on weekends and are unable to relax.
3) Constantly compete with themselves, setting high standards of productivity that they seem driven to maintain.
4) Tend to become frustrated by the work situation, to be irritated with the work efforts of others, and to be misunderstood by superiors.

An ironic situation for organisations is that when it comes to performance, the Type A individuals are more hard driving, competitive, aggressive, and ambitious than Type Bs (Friendman
and Rosenman, 1974; Jenkins, Rosenman and Friendman, 1967). Hughes et al., (1983, pp.279-89) observed that Type As spend significantly more time moving about and exploring and less time sitting still than do type Bs during both waiting and the relaxation periods. A direct consequence of these performance-oriented behaviours is that type As are typically on a "fast track" to the top of the organisation. They are more successful than their less striving counterparts, Type Bs (Steers, 1981, p.76).

Does it mean that the Type A behaviour pattern is something that may be quite tolerated and maintained in organisations? Research evidence, though incomplete, answers in the negative. Kreigal and Kreigal (1984, p. XIV) argue that, although some Type As do perform well under pressure and claim they like the pressure, such people pay a price. Their struggle with the clock is a never ending exercise in futility. The time pressures leave them frustrated, nervous and hostile (Pelletier, 1979, ss: p. XIV). Rosenman and Friendman (1974) have found that Type As are three times more likely to develop heart diseases than their less driven colleagues. Research also has shown that they are more susceptible to burnout and other diseases that come from stress (Kreigal and Kreigal, 1984, p. XIV).

While Type As use achievement to justify their behaviour, they do not often perform nearly as well as they could. They become hyperactive and rush around trying to do too much, too
quickly, and as a result accomplish little of quality. (Kreigal and Kreigal, 1984, p, XIV). Despite their "fast track" career in organisations, at the very top they do not tend to be as successful as Type Bs, who are more patient and take a broader view of things (Steers, 1981, p.355). As physicians, Friedman and Rosenman were interested not only in diagnosing Type A behaviour, but also in alleviating it. The key they say, is to shift from Type A to Type B behaviour pattern.

**What is Type B behaviour?**

Drs. Friedman and Rosenman (1974) state that Type B individuals are free of all the habits described of Type A individuals. They feel less pressure. They seldom feel any sense of time urgency or impatience and rarely get angry or irritable. They keep a steadier pace rather than working against the clock. Type Bs are not preoccupied with their achievements and accomplishments. They spend more time analysing the situation before acting and therefore make less mistakes. They are more likely to try to extend the deadline or to accept a lower standard of work from themselves in the short run. They are likely to "let things roll off their backs" rather than fight every issue. The Type B people tend to enjoy their recreation, finding it fun and relaxing and they work calmly and smoothly. They are almost free from the "hurry sickness".

These descriptions of the Type B behaviour pattern lead
naturally to the questions, 'How to change from Type A to Type B behaviour?'. Drs. Friedman and Rosenman have a set of clear suggestions to accomplish this:

1) Stop polyphasic thinking.
2) Stop watching the clock and counting numbers.
3) Stop interrupting people.
4) Learn to enjoy food; for eg. take a long lunch.
5) Avoid irritating people and non-essential activities.
6) Take some time out of everyday to enjoy life; plan trips and vacations that are relaxing.
7) Avoid tiring business trips as far as possible.
8) Plan vacations that are not tied with business.
9) In fine, improve the quality of life one is living.

Type A behaviour pattern and performance: Review of related studies

Independent of its important relation to medical outcomes, the Type A and B behaviour patterns hold promise for allowing insight into a host of other phenomena. More recently researchers have begun to recognise the general implications that Type A and B behaviour may hold for a broad range of psychological phenomena (Sanders and Malkis, 1982, pp.71-86; Strube, 1987). The difference between Type As and Bs in their competitive drive, sense of time urgency, and hostility in
response to frustration have been found to predict differences in such areas as quality of intimate relationships (Becker and Byrne, 1984, pp. 82-88; Rosenberger and Strube, 1986, pp. 277-86) investment of time as a resource (Strube and Lott, 1984, pp. 395-409) performance in the presence of others (Gastorf, Suls, and Sanders, 1980, pp. 773-80) and levels of job-related stress (Rhodewalt, Hays, Chemers, and Wysocki, 1984, pp. 149-59).

Two separate lines of research suggest that Type A behaviour might have paradoxical effects on group performance and group processes. First, considerable evidence exists indicating that Type As value control over the environment (Dembroski, Mac Dougall, Musante, 1984, pp. 15-26) and respond more adversely than Type Bs to its loss (Brunson and Mathews, 1981, pp. 906-18). This desire for control has been found to result in a reluctance by Type As to relinquish to others (Miller, Lack and Asroff, 1985, pp. 492-99; Strube, Berry, and Moergen, 1985 pp. 831-42; Strube and Werner, 1985, pp. 688-701). In fact, this reluctance to relinquish task control has been shown to involve a relatively autocratic or "mindless" (Langer, 1978) decision style (Strube et al 1985) and to occur when another person could more capably carry out the task for mutual benefit (Strube and Werner, 1985). These findings suggest that in a group decision-making context, Type A leaders may be less able than Type B leaders to effectively use the input from group members. Consequently, groups led by Type
As may arrive at lower quality solutions than groups led by Type Bs.

Type A behaviour, however, may have a completely different effect on group members' perceptions of leadership. Type A behaviour can be described as a dynamic, active, and purposeful pattern that may be perceived as highly linked to competence. That is, people tend to believe in an exaggerated or "illusory" correlation (Chapman & Chapman, 1967, pp. 193-204, 1969, pp. 271-80) between active, dynamic behaviour and competence. This expected relation between behavioural style and competence may exceed the actual relation and result in the perception by observers that Type As are more competent than a careful assessment of their performance would warrant. (Strube, Lott, Heilizer and Gregg, 1986, pp. 403-412).

These findings suggest that Type A behaviour may have the paradoxical effect of creating the perception of effective leadership while ultimately resulting in poorer group performance. Partial support for these speculations can be found in a study by Sanders and Malkis (1982, pp. 71-86). These investigators found that in an unstructured group discussion, Type As were more likely than Type Bs to be perceived as the leader, and less likely to be viewed as the least helpful member. But Type A leaders arrived at poor quality decisions than Type Bs.
However, there is negative aspect of this impression formation that should be mentioned. Because the favourable impressions others form of Type As are based on their behavioural style, which may be only partly related to actual competence, Type As may be expected to perform at levels they may not be capable of achieving or sustaining. This mismatch between actual capabilities and expectations of others may be in part responsible for the greater job stress and job pressure reported by Type As (Burke and Weir, 1980, pp. 28-38; Howard, Cunningham and Rechnitzer, 1977, pp. 825-36).

Common descriptions of the TABP (Byrne, 1981, pp. 371-77; Friedman, 1969; Herman, Blumenthal, Black and Chesney, 1981, pp. 405-413) reveal the prominence of certain occupation related attributes as ambition, competitiveness, personal striving and achievement orientation. Moreover, there is clear support for the view that the presence of the TABP is positively associated with occupational status (Byrne, Rosenman, Schiller and Chesney, 1985, pp. 242-61; Chesney and Rosenman, 1980; Zyzanski 1978). The basis for this is encapsulated in Jenkin's (1978) comment that Type A behaviour, with its achievement orientation, may lead to upward mobility, and similarly, the culture of professions and administrations values the same traits that are at the foundation of the Type A value system. There is abundant evidence from occupational studies (Chisney and Rosenman, 1980)
as well as those with behavioural and physiological foci (Rosenman and Chisney, 1980, pp. 1-45) that Type As apply themselves to activities of perceived importance with unusual effort and tenacity. Howard, Cunningham and Rechnitzer (1977, pp.825-36) reported that the TABP among individuals sampled from a managerial population was associated with more working weeks/year, more discretionary work hours/week and more days/year spent on occupation-related travel than among individuals without the behaviour pattern. These data underscore the importance of an occupational time commitment in excess of organisational expectations as a manifestation of the TABP. Byrne & Reinhart (1989, pp. 123-134) suggest that this time commitment is instrumental in facilitating occupational achievement among those with the TABP. Such people do not achieve occupational advancement simply by way of a fortuitous match of a behaviour pattern and the demands imposed by a particular job but rather because the behavior pattern they are endowed with emphasises personal effort, manifest in large degree as a time commitment to the occupation.

Chesney and Rosenman (1980) have suggested that when the occupational environment allows unhindered expression of the TABP, the Type A individual enjoys job satisfaction, experiences no work-related distress and shows no elevation in risk factors for CHD. Where the nature of the job frustrates expression of
TABP, thus inhibiting progress toward occupational advancement, the reverse may well be true. Under these circumstances, one might expect to observe an increase in the risk of coronary events. Glass (1977) has suggested that Type As possess a heightened concern for mastery or control of their physical and social environment and therefore, situations which deprived the individual of environmental control are more stressful for people possessing the Type A behaviour pattern. The study by Chisney and Rosenman (1980) showing greater anxiety among Type A in high as opposed to low structure work environments also points to the "need to control" explanation of the moderating effects of the Type A behaviour pattern.

Begley and Boyd (1987, pp.79-93) found that "founders" of small business-entrepreneurs and managers of small business have much higher rates of Type A behaviour than do other business executives. Waldron (1976, pp.2-13) found the TABP to be more apparent in men than in women and advanced this as a possible explanation for sex differences in rates of CHD. It has also been shown, however, that among employed women the TABP is as strongly associated with occupational success as it is among employed men (Waldron, 1978, pp.79-87).

The relationship between Type A behaviour pattern and role stress has also been studied by some researchers. A number of recent studies have shown that role stress is associated with a
variety of work attitudes and behaviour. Clearly a number of organisational factors might also influence the amount of role stress a person experiences. However, it is also likely that the amount of experienced role stress will partly depend on the personality predispositions of the individual concerned.

There is some evidence that this is the case for role overload following work initiated by Friedman and Rosenman and their associates on Type A behaviour. Jenkins et al., (1967, pp.371-79) view the Type A person as hard-driving, persistent and involved in his work. He also possesses an enhanced sense of time urgency, especially in relation to vocational deadlines. Type B individuals have a relative absence of these characteristics. It is suggested that Type A people experience more overload at work than Type B people, and indeed there is some evidence for this (Sales, 1969, pp.325-36; French & Calan, 1973). This high level of role overload in Type A person and the attendant psychological strain it produces is said to be an intervening link in the apparent association between Type A behaviour and coronary heart disease (Sales, 1969). Caplan and Jones (1975, pp.713-719) have also found that the relationship between workload and anxiety was greater for Type A people than for Type B, supporting the commonly held view that overload generates more psychological strain in type A people.

The above review of literature regarding TABP phenomenon obviously reveals that the concept was of western origin and
that considerable research efforts have been made there in exploring its implications. The implications of Type A behaviour being both physical and psychological for the individual, it may be viewed that knowledge regarding the dynamics of TABP can be useful for all populations of humans. However, in India though research efforts on TABP have been initiated, literature indicating its occurrence among the managerial populations are hardly available indicating sufficient scope for research in this line.