Chapter VIII

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS
INTRODUCTION

The importance of motivation and leadership in organisational setting have been well recognized and a serious thought is expended by both theoreticians and practitioners from all disciplines. As a result many researchers have investigated into the problem and varied conclusions have been drawn on the basis of their findings. A common denominator in all the findings of different studies has been that, higher the level of motivation greater the efficiency and effectiveness in organisational performance. Nevertheless, the process of motivation is closely related to the process and the practices of leadership in organisations. Thus, the study of motivation will be incomplete without leadership and vise versa. The present study, is thus, designed in the same pattern by covering motivation and leadership of the employees of two organizations viz., LIC and CBB in Nellore District.

The summary of the findings of the III to VII chapters of the study is presented in the following paragraphs. The main objectives of the present study is to investigate whether there is a relationship between SEOP variables and motivation, between SEOP variables and leadership styles, between self and subordinates perception of leadership styles, between SEOP variables and impact of the leadership on motivation of employees in LIC and CBB.
SUMMARY

Motivation and Leadership are closely related to each other and also to various other aspects like job satisfaction and communication. Motivation and Leadership are related to a process of influencing the behaviour, beliefs and feelings of the members of a group. The function of leadership however, covers a wide range of activities like coordinating, decision making, policy making, group representing, controlling, arbitrating, etc. Leadership is affected by many variables and involves with several skills like conceptual, designing, technical, human, creative and communicative. The effectiveness of leadership adumbrates the personality of the leader, past experience, expectations of superiors, the characteristics of subordinates, the requirements of the tasks, and the organisational climate and policies.

Motivation is the resultant feeling of the employee. It is the function of the expectation of individual and potentiality of the job to achieve the fulfillment of the needs. Motivation, thus, refers to the individual's complex reaction towards his job which is primarily directed towards the satisfaction of the needs. Hence, measurement of motivation, is affected by a wide range of variables relating to individual, social, cultural, organisational and environmental factors. The concept of motivation has been related with other concepts like absenteeism, labour turnover, meaningful work, technology, psychological well being and productivity.
In the 21st century, several theories have been profounded to understand its significance, process and impact on employees and organisations. The theories such as Maslow's need hierarchy theory, Herzberg's two factor theory and Vroom's valance instrumentality expectancy theory and so on were developed to explain the concept of motivation.

The Leadership is equally a complex concept having a bearing on motivation, morale, organisational climate, human relations and communication. Beginning with scientific management the organisational leadership has been emphasized in inanimate resource approach and slowly extended to human resources and responses. Leadership theories can be classified as trait theory, bahavioural theory and contingency theory. The trait theory has been put to rigorous research by Byrd, Gennings, Stogdill, etc., and resulted in the development of behavioural theory. The Ohio state study, Michigan study, Managerial grid, Likerts theory, Mc Gregor X and Y theory have opened new vistas on the behavioural dimensions of leadership. The controversy of trait and behavioural theories have given a lead to the contingency models of leadership like Fiedler's contingency model, Vroom and Yetton contingency model, Path goal theory, Life cycle theory, Tri-dimensional model, Learning model, etc.
FINDINGS

1. The following are major findings on motivation

1. There is no significant difference between the motivation of the employees of Life Insurance Corporation of India and Commercial Bank Branches.

2. There is no significant difference between the motivation of the Higher Level Executives of LIC and CBB.

3. There is no significant difference between the motivation of the Middle Level Executives of LIC and CBB.

4. There is no significant difference between the motivation of the Lower Level Executives of LIC and CBB.

5. There is no significant difference between the motivation of Clerical employees of LIC and CBB.

6. There is no significant difference between Higher Level and Middle Level Executives of LIC in motivation.

7. There is no significant difference between Middle Level and Lower Level Executives of LIC in motivation.

8. There is no significant difference between Lower Level Executives and Clerical Employees of LIC in motivation.

9. There is no significant difference between Higher Level Executives and Middle Level Executives of CBB in motivation.
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10. There is no significant difference between Middle Level Executives and Lower Level Executives of CBB in motivation.

11. There is no significant difference between Lower Level Executives and Clerical Employees of CBB in motivation.

12. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB Employees under their high degree of motivation.

13. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB Employees under their low degree of motivation.

14. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB Employees under their moderate degree of motivation.

II. The following are major findings of leader's self perception.

1. In LIC, among Higher Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among socio-economic and organization position variables (SEOP) is found in the case of age vs education and experience vs education and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.

2. In CBB, among Higher Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among SEOP variables is found in the case of designation vs experience, age vs experience and age vs education and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.
3. In LIC, among Middle Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among SEOP variables is found in the case of age vs experience, age vs education, age vs economic status and experience vs education and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.

4. In CBB, among Middle Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among SEOP variables is found in the case of age vs experience and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.

5. In LIC, among Lower Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among SEOP variables is found in the case of designation vs economic status, age vs experience, age vs education and experience vs economic status and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.

6. In CBB, among Lower Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among SEOP variables is found in the case of age vs experience and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.

7. In LIC, among Clerical Level, a significant inter relationship among SEOP variables is found in the case of age vs experience and experience vs education and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.
8. In CBB, among Clerical Level, a significant inter relationship among SEOP variables is found in the case of age vs experience, age vs education, experience vs education and education vs economic status and no significant inter relationship is found among other SEOP variables.

9. In LIC, among the Higher Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'age' vs 'nurturant', 'experience' vs 'bureaucratic', 'experience' vs 'task-orientation', 'experience' vs 'nurturant', 'education' vs 'bureaucratic' and 'education' vs 'nurturant' 'economic status' vs 'authoritarian' and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

10. In CBB, among the Higher Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'age' vs 'authoritarian', 'age' vs 'task-orientation', 'experience' vs 'participative', 'experience' vs 'nurturant', 'education' vs 'authoritarian', 'education' vs 'task-orientation' 'education' vs 'nurturant', and 'economic status' vs 'authoritarian' 'economic status' vs 'participative' and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.
11. In LIC, among the Middle Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'age' vs 'bureaucratic', and 'education' vs 'nurturant' and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

12. In CBB, among the Middle Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles does not exist.

13. In LIC, among the Lower Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'experience' vs 'task-orientation', 'education' vs 'participative', 'education' vs 'bureaucratic' 'economic status' vs 'task-orientation' 'economic status' vs 'nurturant' and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

14. In CBB, among the Lower Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'economic status' vs 'participative' and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.
15. In LIC, at Higher Level Executives, a significant interrelationship among leadership styles is found in the case of 'participative' vs 'task-orientation', 'bureaucratic' vs 'nurture' and 'task-orientation' vs 'nurture' and no significant interrelationship is found among other leadership styles.

16. In CBB, at Higher Level Executives, a significant interrelationship among leadership styles is found in the case of 'authoritarian' vs 'participative', 'authoritarian' vs 'task-orientation', 'authoritarian' vs 'nurture', 'participative' vs 'task-orientation', 'participative' vs 'nurture', 'bureaucratic' vs 'task orientation', and 'task-orientation' vs 'nurture' and no significant interrelationship is found among other leadership styles.

17. In LIC, at Middle Level Executives, a significant interrelationship among leadership styles is found in the case of 'authoritarian' vs 'bureaucratic', 'authoritarian' vs 'nurture', 'participative' vs 'nurture', 'bureaucratic' vs 'task-orientation' and 'task-orientation' vs 'nurture' and no significant interrelationship is found among other leadership styles.

18. In CBB, at Middle Level Executives, a significant interrelationship among leadership styles is found in the case of 'authoritarian' vs 'bureaucratic', 'authoritarian' vs 'nurture', 'participative' vs 'task-orientation', 'participative' vs 'nurture',
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'bureaucratic' vs 'task-orientation', 'bureaucratic' vs 'nurturant', and 'task-orientation' vs 'nurturant' and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

19. In LIC, at Lower Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among leadership styles is found in the case of 'authoritarian' vs 'bureaucratic', 'authoritarian' vs 'task-orientation', 'authoritarian' vs 'nurturant', 'participative' vs 'task-orientation', 'participative' vs 'nurturant', 'bureaucratic' vs 'task-orientation', 'bureaucratic' vs 'nurturant', and 'task-orientation' vs 'nurturant' and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

20. In CBB, at Lower Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among leadership styles is found in the case of 'authoritarian' vs 'bureaucratic', 'participative' vs 'bureaucratic' 'participative' vs 'task-orientation', 'participative' vs 'nurturant', 'bureaucratic' vs 'task-orientation', and 'task-orientation' vs 'nurturant' and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

III. The following are the major findings of subordinates perception on superiors leadership styles

21. In LIC, among the Middle Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'experience' vs 'participative' style,
'experience' vs 'bureaucratic' style, and 'experience' vs 'nurturant' style, 'economic status' vs 'participative' style and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

22. In CBB, among the Middle Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'experience' vs 'participative' and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

23. In LIC, among the Lower Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'designation' vs 'authoritarian', 'age' vs 'participative', 'age' vs 'task-orientation', 'age' vs 'nurturant', 'experience' vs 'participative', 'experience' vs 'bureaucratic' style, and 'education' vs 'bureaucratic' style and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

24. In CBB, among the Lower Level Executives, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of education' vs 'bureaucratic', 'education' vs 'task-orientation', 'economic status' vs 'participative' style and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.
25. In LIC, at Clerical Level, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'designation' vs 'authoritarian', and 'experience' vs 'bureaucratic' style and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

26. In CBB, at Clerical Level, a significant relationship between SEOP variables and leadership styles is found in the case of 'age' vs 'task-orientation', 'experience' vs 'task-orientation', 'education' vs 'authoritarian' 'education' vs 'participative' and 'education' vs 'nurturant' style and no significant relationship is found between other SEOP variables and leadership styles.

27. In LIC, at Middle Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among leadership styles is found in the case of 'authoritarian' vs 'participative', 'participative vs 'bureaucratic', 'participative' vs 'task-orientation', 'participative' vs 'nurturant', 'bureaucratic' vs 'task-orientation', 'bureaucratic' vs 'nurturant', and 'task-orientation' vs 'nurturant' style and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

28. In CBB, at Middle Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among leadership styles is found in the case of authoritarian' vs 'task-orientation', 'participative' vs 'bureaucratic', 'participative' vs 'task-orientation', 'participative'
vs ‘nurturant’, ‘bureaucratic’ vs ‘task-orientation’, ‘bureaucratic’ vs ‘nurturant’ and ‘task-orientation’ vs ‘nurturant’ style and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

29. In LIC, at Lower Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among leadership styles is found in the case of ‘authoritarian’ vs ‘task-orientation’, ‘authoritarian’ vs ‘nurturant’, ‘participative’ vs ‘task-orientation’, ‘participative’ vs ‘nurturant’, and ‘task-orientation’ vs ‘nurturant’ style and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

30. In CBB, at Lower Level Executives, a significant inter relationship among leadership styles is found in the case of ‘participative’ vs ‘bureaucratic’, ‘participative’ vs ‘task-orientation’, ‘participative’ vs ‘nurturant’, ‘bureaucratic’ vs ‘task-orientation’, ‘bureaucratic’ vs ‘nurturant’ and ‘task-orientation’ vs ‘nurturant’ style and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

'bureaucratic' vs 'nurturant', and 'task-orientation' vs 'nurturant' style and no significant inter relationship is found among other leadership styles.

32. In CBB, at Clerical Level, a significant inter relationship among leadership styles was found in all the cases.

IV. Major findings of the differences of leadership styles, self and subordinates perceptions

a) The following are the major findings of the differences of leadership styles at the inter levels about their self perception

1. In LIC, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Higher Level Executives as well as Middle Level Executives.

2. In LIC, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Middle Level Executives as well as Lower Level Executives.

3. In CBB, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Higher Level Executives as well as Middle Level Executives.

4. In CBB, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Middle Level Executives as well as Lower Level Executives.
b) The following are the major findings of the differences of the leadership styles at inter levels as perceived by their subordinates

5. In LIC, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Higher Level Executives as well as Middle Level Executives.

6. In LIC, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Middle Level Executives as well as Lower Level Executives.

7. In CBB, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Higher Level Executives as well as Middle Level Executives.

8. In CBB, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Middle Level Executives as well as Lower Level Executives.

c) The following are the major findings of the differences between leadership styles as judged by leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinate’s at different levels

9. In LIC, no significant difference is found in leadership styles at Higher Level Executives as judged by leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates.
10. In LIC, no significant difference is found in leadership styles at Middle Level Executives as judged by leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates.

11. In LIC, no significant difference is found in leadership styles at Lower Level Executives as judged by leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates.

12. In CBB, no significant difference is found in leadership styles at Higher Level Executives as judged by leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates.

13. In CBB, no significant difference is found in leadership styles at Middle Level Executives as judged by leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates.

14. In CBB, no significant difference is found in leadership styles at Lower Level Executives as judged by leader himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates.

15. No significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Higher Level Executives of LIC as well as CBB.

16. No significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Middle Level Executives of LIC as well as CBB.

The following are the major findings of the differences between leadership styles of employees of LIC and CBB self perception
17. No significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Lower Level Executives of LIC as well as CBB.

e) The following are the major findings of differences between leadership styles of employees LIC and CBB as perceived by their subordinates

18. No significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Higher Level Executives of LIC as well as CBB.

19. No significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Middle Level Executives of LIC as well as CBB.

20. No significant difference is found among different leadership styles at Lower Level Executives of LIC as well as CBB

V. Major findings of the impact of leadership on motivation

21. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB employees in impact of leadership on motivation.

22. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB Higher Level Executives in impact of leadership on motivation.

23. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB Middle Level Executives in impact of leadership on motivation.

24. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB Lower Level Executives in impact of leadership on motivation.

25. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB Clerks in impact of leadership on motivation.
26. There is no significant difference between LIC Higher Level Executives and Middle Level Executives in impact of leadership on motivation.

27. There is no significant difference between LIC Middle Level Executives and Lower Level Executives in impact of leadership on motivation.

28. There is no significant difference between LIC Lower Level Executives and Clerks in impact of leadership on motivation.

29. There is no significant difference between CBB Higher Level Executives and Middle Level Executives in impact of leadership on motivation.

30. There is no significant difference between CBB Middle Level Executives and Lower Level Executives in impact of leadership on motivation.

31. There is no significant difference between CBB Lower Level Executives and Clerks in impact of leadership on motivation.

32. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB employees in impact of leadership on motivation under their high degree of motivation.

33. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB employees in impact of leadership on motivation under their low degree of motivation.
34. There is no significant difference between LIC and CBB employees in impact of leadership on motivation under their moderate degree of motivation.

The above findings are drawn from the opinions expressed by the employees of both the organisations at a given movement of time. These findings are generally applicable to all the organizations and situations that would be prevailing similar to those, under reference.

CONCLUSIONS

From the overall analysis made by the researcher from empirical investigations presented in chapters III to VII about motivation and leadership in Life Insurance Corporation of India and Commercial bank branches reveals the following conclusions.

1. There are no proper perspectives about the significance of motivation among the employees of LIC and CBB.

2. The awareness process of employees in LIC and CBB varies with their SEOP variables.

3. There is a mixed trend in the relationship of SEOP variables and leadership styles of the employees in LIC and CBB in terms of significance or insignificance.

4. There was no significant difference as perceived by the subordinates and leaders in LIC and CBB.

5. There was no significant proof that the leadership has any impact on motivation among the employees of LIC and CBB.
6. The analysis of self perception in LIC and CBB reveals that at higher level, middle level and lower level executives, the dominant style is nurturant followed by task-orientation, bureaucratic, participative and authoritarian.

7. The analysis of subordinates perceptions on superior styles, reveals that at executives level the dominant style is nurturant followed by task-orientation, bureaucratic, participative and authoritarian.

**SUGGESTIONS**

Motivation and Leadership, are closely inter related and highly overlapping. Therefore, these issues cover a wide range of variables creating an incomprehensive picture while it is very difficult to adopt a specific package and approach to lead people with effective leadership and high motivation. Apart from this, there are other factors namely off the job factors which affect the behavior of the individuals. Thus, the performance of an individuals whether it is good or bad, is based finally on the out come of innumerable variables, umpteen factors and countless forces. Nevertheless, definitely unforeseen factors create an environment resulting in with bad relationship, low turnover, accidents, absenteeism, strikes and so on. Owing to these complexities a major suggestion to be made is that there should be an environment with the spirit of ‘give and take’ policy by leaders and subordinates.
There cannot be a uniform package that can be suggested to deal with all individuals in all organisations and at all times due to wide variance of their problems. As such, management should create an environment of right leadership and high motivation where an individual would feel and realize his role and responsibility to fulfill the goals of self, as well as of the organisation.

EPILOGUE

The present study is confined to the hierarchical level of executives and clerical staff of LIC and CBB in Nellore district. Motivation is the outcome of leadership. Improper leadership cannot create a properly motivated human resource in organisations. What all the efforts and resource employed for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of organisation will go in vain without competent leadership. Thus, there is a dire need to know the key factors for improving the leadership and consequently the motivation of employees. This demands different studies covering various types of organisations in different cultural contexts. Despite the literature and research findings available at the command of theoreticians and practitioners of leadership, it is an enigma yet and a puzzle to all those involved in the process of motivation and leadership.

Future studies, thus, cover a comparison between service sector organisations like Hospitals, Universities and manufacturing organisations in private and public sectors taking both 'on the job' and 'off the job' factors in different cultural settings in order to know the variables which have higher influence on motivation and leadership.