Chapter 3 – Analysis & Interpretation

Section A : Analysis on the basis of Demographic & Independent Variables
Section B : Analysis of Significance of Managerial Effectiveness
Correlation Analysis
Multiple Regression Analysis
Managerial effectiveness is fast becoming a competitive advantage for organizations. It is often defined in terms of output, i.e. what a manager achieves. This result oriented definition leads us to look for the factors that contribute towards the “results”. As an individual, a manager has to focus on developing his competence in managing himself and others besides interpersonal relationships at work. As the individual manager achieves his targets and goals, the organization performs and grows and his team achieves the target. Effectiveness involves doing the right things in the right way. Effective management starts at the personal level before moving to the personnel level. Effective managers are role models for the subordinates and play a vital role in improving the overall effectiveness of the organization. There are no specific personality traits common to all successful managers. Some of them are analytical while others are intuitive. Some are good decision makers while others are good planners. However, all these managers have one character in common, they are effective in whatever they do. Effectiveness is not something innate, the managers can be trained to be effective. Managerial effectiveness is thus defined as the goal achieving behaviour. Moreover, according to Bill Reddin, managerial effectiveness is a long term rather than a short term job and develops over a period of time. It cannot be confined to efficiency, productivity or profitability alone. Profit alone is not the sole aim of running business. Superior products whether foreign or indigenous do not sell automatically on their own or on merit alone. What is, in fact, required are the management skills for developing them successfully at affordable prices. As described by Peter F. Drucker, “management is a multi purpose organ which manages business, managers, workers and work”.

Like in the west, the growing field of management is going to offer us high and higher standards of living. We are rich in physical resources, we have the finest scientific and technical institutes in the world. We produce almost everything from pins, nails, aircrafts to computer and satellites in the orbit and
nuclear plants. Then, why does abject poverty firmly stay with us? The reason is poor management of our human and physical resources in the present day competitive world. There have been many attempts to answer the seemingly simple question, “who is an effective manager?” Undoubtedly, it is difficult to arrive at a single definition on the construct of managerial effectiveness. Assessment of managerial potential is a significant area of work for the stability and growth of business. The concept of managerial effectiveness is one of the priority areas because there are many managers who are highly effective, some are less effective and the remaining ones are ineffective. It is imperative to know which factors are important for a person to be effective and successful in his work. Infact, it is not simple to identify accurately the various variables which impinge on managerial work, within the context of managerial effectiveness. Scientists, speakers, writers and consultants have regularly addressed this issue. All of them sound very persuasive when they put forward their views, armed with logical arguments and dramatic stories. It is only when we are confronted by the harsh realities, do we stop to realize that management is far more complicated than any of the suggestions/arguments. Thus, the concept of effectiveness is dealt at different times by theorists as well as real life practitioners, differently. Therefore, this chapter has been devoted to the analysis on the basis of Demographic and Independent Variables which constitute Section ‘A’ of the chapter, whereas the analysis pertaining to the significance of managerial effectiveness on the basis of variables like communication styles, decision making, credibility and work culture have been dealt in Section ‘B’ of the chapter.

In view of this, data was collected from 150 managers from two types of organizations, i.e one private sector and another public sector. The results so computed have been presented in averages and in terms of comparison of the two groups i.e. t-ratio. Also relationship of different variables with managerial effectiveness is studied using Pearson Product Moment Correlation for the two groups separately. Using managerial effectiveness as criteria, step wise method of regression analysis was also applied to the independent variables like communication styles, credibility, decision making...
and organizational culture under study, for picking the best set of predictor variables.

For testing the first objective of this investigation pertaining to analysis of the prevalent correlates of managerial effectiveness taken in the sampled organization, mean scores of the managers from the two types of organizations i.e. private and public sector with regard to demographic variables, communication styles, credibility, decision making and organizational culture were taken. Further, the differences between the mean score of the two organizations were statistically tested using the t-test for unmatched scores. The scores of different variables are given below in the form of tables and graphs.

SECTION A:

ANALYSIS ON THE BASIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Table: 3.1 Comparative analysis of Demographic Variables of the managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Private Sector N=150</th>
<th>Public Sector N=150</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>45.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No. of Years)</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>16.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Family</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>31693.33</td>
<td>14135</td>
<td>23926.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experience</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>22.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No. of Years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Years in</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01 level
The analysis of demographic variables present the comparison between managers of two types of organizations i.e. private and public sector with regard to age, educational qualification, number of family members, salary and total number of years of experience and number of years of experience in the present position. (Please refer to Table: 3.1 and Figure: 3.1 and 3.2)

Figure : 3.1 Comparative analysis of demographic variables of managers

![Figure 3.1](image)

Figure : 3.2 Comparative analysis of salary

Results present the comparison between managers of the two types of organizations i.e. private and public sector with regard to demographic
variables namely age, educational qualification, number of family members, salary, total number of years of experience and number of years of experience in the present position.

Table: 3.1 reveals that there are significant differences between the two groups regarding age (t = 22.54, P < .01). Mean scores in private sector is less than the score in public sector organisation.

Similarly significant differences are found between the two groups with regard to salary (t = 5.71, P < .01), number of years of service (t = 21.34, P < .01) and tenure at the present position (t = 7.45, P < .01). The mean scores show that salaries in the private sector are better than those in the public sector. Number of years of experience is much greater in public sector organization in comparison to that of private sector. Similarly, tenure at the present position is longer in public sector than in the private sector.

There are no significant differences between the private and public sector organizations with regard to educational qualification (taken in terms of number of years of education) and number of family members. However, mean scores show slightly higher values in both the variables in public sector organization.

It can be deduced from the study that there are significant differences between the two groups regarding age. Mean scores in the private sector are less than the public sector organization. This is because, in the private sector, a person can reach the same position much faster and earlier. Promotions are strictly based on performance. A person can get promoted even more than once in a year. There is no condition of spending minimum number of years at a particular position. In the private sector, managers are more willing to perform, as rewards are given immediately and strictly on one’s performance. Also promotions are not based on seniority. In the public sector a person cannot be promoted before a senior how so ever good he may be.

It is found that better salaries are given in the private sector organization as compared to the public sector. Recognition for work is much better in private
sector. This could be because of the competitive atmosphere that prevails in
the private sector, where goals can be achieved only with super brains
working with maximum zeal. Recognition is given from time to time to
motivate the staff and to achieve maximum output. It is a give and take policy
on the part of the management by providing recognition, better working
conditions and a heavy pay bundle to the staff. They in turn are expected to
work towards drawing heavy profit for the organization. These findings are in
line with the findings of Krishan & Krishan (1984) where they observed that
employees in a private set up are more satisfied with their pay.

Results indicate that average length of service is much lower in private sector
organization than the public sector. This may be because the private sector
organization under study is a software company which has recently developed
in our country and the younger generation is getting expertise in this field.
The same level of management is taken in both the organizations and it has
already been explained that in the private sector organization, executives
reach the equivalent level of management much faster and earlier than the
public sector organization. Promotions are not based on seniority or minimum
number of years of service in a particular position.

The comparison between the public and private sector organizations indicate
that the number of years a person has been working in a particular position is
much less in private sector than in the public sector organization. It could be
due to the fact that in the public sector there is job security, departmental
policies are lenient and favourable as they have to comply with the norms put
up by the government. When an executive joins public sector, he wishes to
make a career and rise higher in that organization itself where as in the
private sector, managers keep changing jobs for better pay packages and
positions and also due to availability of jobs.

It is observed that there are no significant differences between private and
public sector organizations with regards to educational qualifications (taken in
number of years of education) and number of family members. However,
mean scores show slightly higher values in both the variables in public sector
organization. The results imply that at the same level of management, the
executives have similar educational qualifications, but they differ in age (they are younger in private sector) and draw much higher salaries in private sector. It shows that a person joins private as well as public sector organization with the same pre-requisite qualifications and expertise, but he rises much faster in the private sector, in terms of both salary and position. Due to the similar level of education and position in management, there are no differences in the size of the family.

COMMUNICATION STYLES

The comparative study of communication styles show the difference between the managers of private and public sector organizations with regard to different styles of communication, careful transmitter, open and two way, careful listener, informal, frank, brief and concise. (Please refer to Table: 3.2 and Figure: 3.3)

The results show that there is a significant difference between the two types of management as far as the dimensions of careful listener (t = 4.94, P < .01), frank (t = 2.40, P < .05) and brief and concise (t = 42, p < .01) communication styles are concerned. It is seen that there is no significant difference in the use of communication style of careful transmitter, open and two-way and informal between the private and public sector managers.

Table : 3.2 Comparative analysis of Communication Styles of managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Styles</th>
<th>Private sector N=150</th>
<th>Public sector N=150</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful Transmitter</td>
<td>22.39</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and two way</td>
<td>20.28</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful Listener</td>
<td>13.76</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>19.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>18.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief and Concise</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>16.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01 level
*significant at .05 level
The mean scores of the two groups of managers show comparatively higher values in private sector organization in all the dimensions of communication styles except one i.e. careful transmitter (mean of public sector being slightly higher than the other).

Among the various styles of communication, the managers of the two types of organizations are different from each other in some styles. On the careful transmitter style, mean of private sector is slightly lower than the public sector but differences are not significant. Careful transmitter focuses on the idea of careful organization of thoughts and choice of words, that means both the organizations are similar in focusing on the idea of thoughts and choice of words, but the mean scores reveal that managers in the public sector are slightly better in organizing their thoughts and choosing the words than the managers of private sector organization.

Figure: 3.3 Comparative analysis of Communication Styles of managers

It is observed that there are no differences between the managers of the two groups on the open and two-way style of communication. Open and two way
style lays emphasis on asking other's views and feedback. So, in other words managers of both the organizations have similar trend in asking other people's views and feedback. However, the managers of private sector show higher mean scores than the managers of public sector organization, which indicates that the managers in the private sector are more concerned for other people's views and feedback than the managers of public sector organization.

Managers of the two groups differ significantly on careful listener style of communication. Managers in private sector show more inclination and are more attentive and careful in listening to others than the public sector. It is worth mentioning that a place where subordinates and supervisors lack interest in one another and limit their interaction to the minimum, communication is certainly affected.

There is no significant difference between managers of private and public sector organization on informal style of communication. Managers of both the organizations are similar on the notion of natural, relaxed and being informal in communicating with others. The means of the two groups show that private sector managers are more natural, relaxed and informal in communicating with others and hence communication is better in private sector organization.

It is observed that frank style of communication shows significant differences between the managers of the two types of organization. It indicates that the managers of the two organizations differ in having a clear and assured communication style. It also shows that in the private sector, managers have more inclination towards clear and assured communicating style than public sector managers, which establishes better communication and in turn better results and performance.

Significant differences are found between managers of both the organizations on brief and concise style of communication. Managers in private sector show more notion of wordiness than manager in public sector organization.

In the present study, differences are found in the two types of organizations on communication styles. Managers in the private sector organization show better and effective communication in comparison to the public sector
organization. Before attributing any specific reason here, it needs to be mentioned, that a working place, where orientation is fairly good and where interpersonal relations and supervision are considerably important and satisfying, communication is easy and effective. If communication becomes selective and people start holding back crucial information as a way to control, the communication is less effective in that organization. Managers in the private sector are more concerned for other people’s view and feedback than the managers of public sector organization. Managers in private sector show more inclination and are more attentive and careful in listening to others and are more informal than the public sector. Results also show that in the present study, private sector managers are more frank, brief and concise while communicating than the public sector. These results are in accordance with the observations made by earlier scholars in their studies which state that effective communication is the key to progress for any organization. For instance a study done by Walton (1985) provided guidelines that managers used to making communication easier with employees in issuing directives, requesting people to change, saying ‘no’ apologizing, dealing with angry employees, praising people effectively and accepting praise. It is emphasized that learning to communicate effectively during high stress situations is vital to effective management. Similarly Gupta (1991) found that effective communication is the key to progress in any organization. It basically involves transfer of information from one person to another. Various barriers of communication in organizational context are high lighted, various suggestions are also given to make communication effective in the organization. Most of the organizations do not have effective communication system. It is proposed that in depth studies should be conducted to find out various barriers and endure better strategies. Another study by Vaught, Abraham and Yohannan (1992) on inter personal communicative competence (IICC) shows similar trends on the line of our results.

CREDIBILITY

The analysis on the basis of credibility shows the three dimensions of credibility namely, trustworthy, informative and dynamic being compared
between the private and public sector organizations. The scores are given in Table: 3.3 and a graph comparing the two groups is given at Fig: 3.4

**Table : 3.3 Comparative analysis of credibility of managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Private sector N=150</th>
<th>Public sector N=150</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Worthy</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>43.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>49.79</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>52.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>39.79</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>36.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01 level

The differences between the managers on informative ( t = 3.61, P < .01) and dynamic ( t = 5.42, p < .01) dimensions of credibility are found to be significant. The mean scores are higher in public sector regarding the dimension informative and the mean scores are higher in private sector regarding the dimension dynamic.

The results show that significant differences are found between managers of both the organizations on informative dimension of credibility. As per the mean scores, managers of public sector organization have higher scores than managers of private sector organisation or in other words, public sector managers are involved more to the extent to which an individual is seen as well qualified, skilled, experienced and well trained for a job situation than private sector managers. It means that in the public sector, management gives more importance to qualification, skill, experience & training whereas in private sector performance is most important.

**Figure 3.4: Comparative analysis of Credibility of managers**
In contrast to the above, there are no significant differences between the perception of managers on trustworthy dimension of managers credibility. However, the mean score is higher in private sector regarding trustworthiness. It means that managers of both the groups private and public sector are similar to the extent a person is viewed as fair, pleasant, friendly, just, honest and patient in dealing with others. These are supposed to be the personality traits and hence both the groups have obtained similar mean scores. The mean score of private sector managers is slightly higher than the public sector. It means executives in the private sector are more friendly, just, honest, pleasant and fair.

Managers of both the organizations differ on the notion of forcefulness, aggressiveness and energy i.e. dynamic dimension of credibility. The mean scores reveal that managers of private sector organization demonstrate a higher level of activity and energy in relating to others in order to be more efficient as compared to managers of public sector organization. It means in the private sector, managers are more result oriented. They are more forceful, aggressive and energetic. A study by Mehrish (1996) supports our results, where both Japanese and Indian organizations significantly differ on dimension of credibility, the Japanese scored higher.

**DECISION MAKING**

In the present study research efforts are focused on comparing both the organizations on various dimensions of Decision Making. The four dimensions, sensation, thinking, intuition and feeling are based on different approaches of decision making. The results are evident from Table: 3.4 and Figure: 3.5

Significant differences are found among the managers of the two groups on the dimension of intuition (\( t = 2.10, P < .05 \)), mean score is higher in private sector. In case of thinking (\( t = 5.16, P < .01 \)), the mean score is higher in public sector and for feeling (\( t = 3.14, P < .01 \)) dimension of decision making, the mean is higher in private sector. No significant difference is found
between the two organizations on the dimension of sensation. The mean score is, however, higher in case of public sector.

**Table : 3.4 Comparative analysis of Decision Making of managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Private sector N=150</th>
<th>Public sector N=150</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01 level
* significant at .05 level

Sensation reflects the ability of decision-maker to be realistic and see the world in terms of facts. This dimension is based on the practical approach to decision making. The managers of both the organizations when compared with each other show that there is no significant difference with regard to this dimension. It means that both the groups take similar practical approach in arriving at the decisions in an organization. The mean scores reveal that public sector managers have slightly higher scores in terms of using the practical approach to decision making.

**Figure : 3.5 Comparative analysis of Decision Making of managers**
Intuition, the second dimension of decision making is an indicative of ability of the decision maker to see the world in holistic terms and his/her creativity. It shows significant differences between the managers of both the organizations. The managers of private sector have higher score than the public sector organizations, indicating higher usage of distilled experience and making decisions with more creativity. It means managers in the private sector take decisions based on experience and creativity.

The thinking dimension of decision making is based on the rational approach, which reflects the ability of a decision-maker to be logical and analytical while arriving at a decision. The managers of both the groups differ from each other on this approach. The higher score in public sector reflects that public sector managers are more rational and logical as compared to the managers working in the private sector organization.

The implicit approach of decision making is indicated in the dimension of feeling, this is the ability of the manager to make decisions on the gut feeling. Managers of both the organizations show significant differences. Managers working in private sector seem to utilize more of the gut than do the managers in the public sector organization. The results of the study indicate that there are differences between private and public sector managers on all the three dimensions of decision making: intuition, thinking and feeling. It means decisions are taken in both the groups based on different approaches like rationality, gut feeling and creativity. If we compare our results on decision making with that of earlier findings on the subject, there seems to be some homogeneity.

Miller (1987) pointed out that rationality in decision making and the organizational structure are highly inter-dependent and organizational structures are very specific for managerial style as well. Moreover, in Japanese organization, any decision being made is more of a team effect. Dastur (1987) emphasised that modern decision making has to be a co-operative effort.
Mehrish (1996) supports the findings on the thinking & feeling dimensions of decision making. The managers from Indian management differ significantly from those under Japanese management on these two dimensions. The scores show that Indian manager have higher mean values on both thinking & feeling than the Japanese managers.

**ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS**

Analysing the two groups, private and public sector with respect to organizational culture and managerial effectiveness, significant differences are found between the managers of private and public sector organizations regarding organizational culture (\( t = 3.33, P < .01 \)) as well as managerial effectiveness (\( t = 2.96, P < .01 \)). Private sector managers show higher mean scores on both the variables. Table: 3.5 and Figure: 3.6 can be consulted for detailed results.

Organizational culture is defined as the prevailing pattern of values, myths, beliefs, assumptions and norms. It means managers in the private sector share values, belief and habits within an organization that interacts with the formal structure to produce behavioral norms. Culture gives people a sense of how to behave and what they ought to be doing, the culture existing within a firm has an impact on employee’s degree of satisfaction with the job as well as on the level and quality of their performance. Managerial effectiveness is defined in terms of output and achievement, hence a manager focuses on developing his competence in managing himself and others.

**Table : 3.5 Comparative analysis of Organizational Culture and Managerial Effectiveness of managers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Private Sector N=150</th>
<th>Public Sector N=150</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>171.17</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>163.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Effectiveness</td>
<td>165.35</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>160.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ** significant at .01 level*
Our findings which show higher mean scores in private sector have also been confirmed by the observations of the earlier scholars, like Srivastava (2000) who found positive correlation between organizational culture organisational performance, individual effectiveness and success. Similarly significant differences exist between the managers of both, private and public sector managers on managerial effectiveness i.e. both the output requirement of their position and job. Managers in the private sector are more effective than managers in the public sector as per the mean scores. When the attitude of managers is result driven, success alone becomes their motivating factor. This utterly deprives them of morals and ethics and they get burnt out faster, thus, making them less effective. The results have also been corroborated by Cangemei (1986) who described 21 characteristics of good managers, including self confidence and knowledge of one’s own limitations. Good managers are also responsible, decisive and strong principled. They know how to handle others / themselves, are stern, intuitive and perceive mistakes as a way to learn.
CONCLUSION

Thus, on the basis of above analysis we may infer that managers in the private sector are younger, draw higher salaries and reach the same level of management earlier than their counterparts in public sector where rigid government rules are applicable. Managers in the private sector show higher use of many of the communication styles, like being more concerned for others viewpoint and feedback, more attentive, careful in listening to others and are more informal than those in the public sector. It indicates better communication in private sector. It may also be brought to attention that both the groups are similar to the extent a person is viewed as fair, pleasant, just, honest, trustworthy or credible. The mean scores also reveal that managers of private sector organizations demonstrate a higher level of activity and energy in order to be more efficient as compared to public sector. Different approaches to decision making are used by the managers in both the groups. Managers in the private sector are creative, realistic and take decisions based on the gut feeling whereas in the public sector they are more logical, participative and use analytical approach to decision making. Private sector managers perceive their organizational culture to be better than the public sector and they also feel that they are more effective, more competent and achieve better results.

SECTION B:

ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

The study is an attempt to show the impact of communication styles, credibility, decision making and organizational culture on managerial effectiveness in the public sector as well as private sector organizations in India.
Pearson’s product moment correlation was used to assess the relationship between demographic variables, communication styles, credibility, decision making and organisational culture with managerial effectiveness.

**RELATIONSHIP OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS**

It is observed from Table: 3.6 that managerial effectiveness is not related significantly to any of the demographic variables i.e age, educational qualification, number of family members, salary, total experience and experience in the present position in private sector organizations.

The Table clearly shows that managerial effectiveness is significantly and positively related with age and total experience at .05 level of significance and with salary at .01 level of significance in managers of public sector organization.(Please refer to table: 3.6).

It is important for a manager to be competitive and productive. It is essential to keep an organization vital and strong, researches indicate that some behavioral dimensions help managers to become effective in the organizational settings.

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Private Sector N=150</th>
<th>Public Sector N=150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.17 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Qualification</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Family Members</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.22 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Experience</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.16 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in Present Position</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

** significant at .01 level
* significant at .05 level
It means in the private sector the output requirement of the position and job of a person and effectiveness of managers is not related with factors like age, education, family size, salary and experience. In the public sector organizational effectiveness is related with age, experience and the salary a person gets.

The present findings are in accordance with the research findings of Dubey (1993) that no significant correlation was found between demographic variables and managerial effectiveness for supervisors and executives.

**RELATIONSHIP OF COMMUNICATION STYLES WITH MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS**

It is Clampitt’s premise that because communication is at the core of managerial effectiveness, managers must have a clear view of their abilities and challenges involved in the process. It is also the ability an individual displays to effectively communicate with clients, colleagues, subordinates and supervisors in professional manner and at the personal level. The style of communication one uses could be different for different people.

*Table : 3.7 Relationship of Communication Styles and Managerial Effectiveness in Private and Public Sector Organization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Style</th>
<th>Private Sector N=150</th>
<th>Public Sector N=150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Careful Transmitter</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and two way</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careful Listener</td>
<td>0.18 *</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.28 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief and Concise</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01 level
*  significant at .05 level

The analysis of significance of managerial effectiveness on the basis of communication styles shows that managerial effectiveness is significantly and positively related with the dimension of careful listener at .05 level of
significance in the private sector organization. It is also seen that managerial effectiveness is significantly and positively related to the dimension of informal behaviour at .01 level of significance and to careful transmitter dimension at .05 level of significance in public sector. No significant relationship is found in both private and public sector organizations with rest of the dimensions of communication styles namely open and two way, careful listener, frank, brief and concise, which is evident from table: 3.7

It is observed that in the private sector managerial effectiveness is significantly and positively related only with careful listener style of communication, which means managers in private sector are more attentive and careful in listening to others. Managerial effectiveness is not related significantly with rest of the communication styles like careful transmitter, which means to focus on the idea by careful organization of thoughts and choice of words. Open and two-way style of communication is also not related to managerial effectiveness, this style focuses on other people’s viewpoint and feedback. It means effectiveness of a manager does not depend on other people’s views and feedback. Similarly managerial effectiveness is not related significantly to informal, frank, brief & concise styles of communication. This indicates that there is no relation between managerial effectiveness and being natural, relaxed and informal in communicating with others. And so is clear and assured communicating style not related to effective output in managers. The brief and concise style which lays emphasis on notion of wordiness is also not related significantly to managerial effectiveness in the private sector organization.

In the public sector organisation, managerial effectiveness is related positively and significantly to careful transmitter and informal styles of communication. It indicates that effectiveness of managers is related to the idea of careful organization of thoughts and choice of words and notion of natural, relaxed and informal communication with others. The rest of the communication styles, open and two way, careful listener, frank, brief and concise are not related significantly to managerial effectiveness. Hence it can be brought to light that, effectiveness is not related with asking for other people’s views and
feedback, being attentive and careful in listening to others, along with clear and assured communicating style and notion of wordiness.

Although most correlations are not significant, but in both the groups in the present study, correlations are positive, except for one, in the private sector, (which is the relationship between open and two-way style and managerial effectiveness). Hence, it can safely be deduced from the present research that better communication leads to better managerial effectiveness. Our results are in accordance with the study done by Amsa & Aithal (1989) who studied regional managers in a commercial bank and found that there are “more effective” and “less effective” managers. Regional managers (RM) differed in terms of degree to which they displayed the various communication behaviour patterns like participative, supportive, positive and responsive.

**RELATIONSHIP OF CREDIBILITY WITH MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS**

It is observed that there is no significant relationship between managerial effectiveness and the three dimensions of credibility in the private sector organization. Whereas all the three dimensions of credibility namely, trustworthy, informative and dynamic are related significantly and positively to managerial effectiveness at .01 level and .05 level of significance in the public sector organization. The results are reflected from Table: 3.8

**Table 3.8 - Relationship of Credibility and Managerial Effectiveness in Private and Public Sector Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credibility</th>
<th>Private Sector N=150</th>
<th>Public Sector N=150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.24 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>(-)0.03</td>
<td>0.16 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.18 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** significant at .01 level  
* significant at .05 level

Recent decades have witnessed an explosion of interest in leadership effectiveness of managers where credibility is yet another insight. If people
trust their leader, they will offer their best. Persuasive managers are taken to be persons of good sense, goodwill and good moral character.

The different dimensions of credibility i.e. trustworthy, informative and dynamic are not related significantly with managerial effectiveness in the private sector organization. This implies that in private sector organization, managerial effectiveness is not related with a person being fair pleasant, friendly, just, honest and patient in dealing with others. Similarly the extent to which an individual is seen as well qualified, experienced and trained for a job is not significantly related with being an effective manager. Also the notion of forcefulness, aggressiveness and being energetic is not related with managerial effectiveness. This indicates that credibility of the person does not lead to managerial effectiveness automatically.

In the public sector all the three dimensions of credibility i.e. trustworthy, informative and dynamic are related to managerial effectiveness. It is related to a person’s fairness, pleasantness, friendly, just, honest and patient dealing with others. Similarly the extent to which an individual is seen as well qualified, skilled, experienced and well trained for a job is significantly related with being an effective manager. Also the notion of forcefulness, aggressiveness and energetic i.e. dynamic dimension is related significantly & positively with managerial effectiveness. In this group, credibility leads to managerial effectiveness. Effective managers, by being credible, create opportunities for them to live up to and practice what they declare and profess. The results in the public sector are in line with the results obtained by Ragnekar (1990) and Dubey (1993) who in their respective studies found credibility as an important variable contributing to managerial effectiveness.

**RELATIONSHIP OF DECISION MAKING WITH MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS**

The results in Table: 3.9 reveal that no significant relationship exists between managerial effectiveness and any of the dimensions of decision making namely sensation, intuition, thinking and feeling in both private and public sector organizations.
Decision making lies at the core of managerial process. At every level managers need to make decisions. A number of researches in the recent past have aimed at investigating this aspect of manager’s job.

**Table: 3.9 Relationship of Decision Making and Managerial Effectiveness in Private and Public Sector Organization.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making</th>
<th>Private Sector N=150</th>
<th>Public Sector N=150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensation</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that in both private sector and public sector there is no significant relationship between managerial effectiveness and any of the dimensions of decision making i.e sensation, intuition, thinking and feeling. It means managerial effectiveness is not related with the ability of the decision maker to be realistic and see the world in terms of facts, the dimension based on practical approach to decision making. The second dimension of decision making is called intuitive which is indicative of the ability of the decision maker to see the world in holistic terms and his/her creativity, this is also not related to managerial effectiveness. Similarly the rational approach which reflects the ability of a decision maker to be logical and analytical while arriving at a decision and feeling, which is based on the implicit approach of decision making and indicates the ability of a manager to make decisions based on the gut feeling are also not significantly related with managerial effectiveness. In an investigation, Cosier and Alpine (1982) suggested that some individuals may have unique intuitive abilities that may adjust in decision making. Rao (1983) appraised the viability that decision making is an integral part of management process. Decisions are influenced by internal and external factors and have temporal variations which emphasize the dynamic nature of decision process. Dastur (1987) pointed out that modern decision making has to be a co-operative effort, decision making which affects an employee’s
career must be discussed with him prior to being taken and must be fair. Decision making is a state of art and it needs to be updated continually if not continuously. Evidence indicates that group performance is frequently better than that of the average group member. When information is lacking, the group can generally bring more information resources to the decision. However, the present study has not shown any significant correlation between decision making and managerial effectiveness.

**RELATIONSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE WITH MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS**

*Table 3.10 Relationship of Organizational Culture and Managerial Effectiveness in Private and Public Sector Organization*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Private Sector N=150</th>
<th>Public Sector N=150</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between organizational culture and managerial effectiveness is positive, but it is not found to be significant in both Public and Private sector organizations, as is reflected in Table: 3.10

When organizational culture has been taken as an independent variable, there are very few research evidences where such an attempt has been made to find relationship between organizational culture and managerial effectiveness. The results of the present study are not significant, but in both the groups the co-relation is positive, it means work culture influences managerial effectiveness positively. We have found that there are no differences in private and public sector organizations. Peter and waterman (1982) argued that companies with strong cultures are highly successful. The studies in support of the findings and hypothesis have been done by Gangopadhyay (1988), who wrote that the efforts to replace the bureaucratic form of work organization by an alternate design has been initiated in Indian work units for at least two decades. All these efforts are aimed at producing healthy cultural basis of work.
MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

An attempt has also been made to predict managerial effectiveness with the help of communication styles, credibility, decision making and organizational culture. A stepwise multiple regressions were done to reach the best possible equation. It helps in picking up the best set of predictor variables in determining the statistical significance of their prediction of criteria. Using managerial effectiveness as criterion, stepwise method of regression analysis was applied to the independent variables under this study.

Stepwise Multiple Regression is

\[ Y = A = B_1 X_1 + B_2 X_2 + B_3 X_3 + \cdots + B_n N \]

Where \( Y \) = Dependent Variable

\( A \) = Constant

\( X_1, X_2, X_3 \cdots X_n \) = Independent Variables

\( B_1, B_2, B_3 \cdots B_n \) = Regression Coefficients.

\( R \) = Significance of variance for different variables

**Table : 3.11 - Determinants of Managerial Effectiveness in Private Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief about subordinates</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Reinforcing</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Management</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making and Problem Solving</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Example Setting</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Creativity</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Co-ordinate</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Conflict</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of Tasks</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Independent variables assumed are communication styles, credibility, decision making and organisational culture, managerial effectiveness is taken as the dependent variable. The results are presented in the Table: 3.11 and 3.12 for the managers of private and public sector organizations and they show the various independent variables contributing to managerial effectiveness in the two types of organizations.

An attempt has also been made to predict managerial effectiveness with the help of communication styles, credibility, decision making and organizational culture.

In the present study managerial effectiveness is created and treated as dummy variable, credibility, communication styles, decision making and organizational culture are taken as independent variables.

**Table : 3.12 Determinants of Managerial Effectiveness in Public Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belief about Subordinates</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Example Setting</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Co-ordinating</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivating Reinforcing</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making and Problem Solving</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of Tasks</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Function</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Management</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Conflict</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Creativity</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Managerial Effectiveness

1. Belief about subordinates
2. Innovation and creativity
3. Assignment of tasks
4. Planning and co-coordinating
5. Motivating and Reinforcing
6. Managing conflict
7. Communication
8. Discipline / example setting
9. Client management
10. Control function
11. Decision Making and Problem solving
12. Mutual Understanding
13. Organising
14. Empowerment
15. Training and development
16. Delegate

Credibility

1. Trustworthy
2. Informative
3. Dynamic

Communication Styles

1. Careful transmitter
2. Open in two way
3. Careful listener
4. Informal
5. Frank
6. Brief and concise

**Decision Making**
1. Sensation
2. Intuition
3. Thinking
4. Feeling

**Organisational Culture**

**Demographic Variables**
1. Age
2. Educational Qualifications
3. Number of family members
4. Salary
5. Total experience
6. Experience in present position

The results show that 92% of variance out of the total 93% is due to the effect of different dimensions of managerial effectiveness namely, belief about subordinates, training and development, discipline/example setting, communication, planning and coordinating, motivating reinforcing, decision making and problem solving, assignment of tasks, control function, client management, managing conflict, innovation and creativity, delegation, empowerment, educational qualification, salary and feeling. Further when the variables of educational qualification and salary are added there is no change in the percentage variance though their contribution is significant. When the variable thinking (a dimension of decision making) is added, the variance increases to 93%. (Please refer to Table: 3.11)

Similarly in the public sector, results show that the entire variance i.e., 100% variance is due to the contribution various dimensions of managerial effectiveness, namely; belief about subordinates, training and development, discipline/example setting, communication, planning and co-ordinating,
motivating, reinforcing, decision making and problem solving, assignment of
tasks, control function, client management, managing conflict, innovation and
creativity, delegation, empowerment, mutual understanding and organizing.
(Please refer to Table: 3.12).

CONCLUSION

The present study highlights the importance of some behavioural dimensions
in organizational effectiveness. The results indicate that in the private sector
managerial effectiveness is not related with any of the demographic variables
like age, education, family size, salary and experience. Effectiveness is
positively and significantly related to age, experience and salary of a person in
the public sector organization. Managerial effectiveness is positively related
with communication styles and some of the relationships are significant in the
public sector whereas only one style is significantly related to effectiveness in
the private sector organization. It means, it is important to communicate
effectively, but the style is not important. There is no significant relationship
between credibility and managerial effectiveness in private sector, whereas all
the dimensions of credibility are significantly and positively related to
managerial effectiveness in the public sector organization. The results show
that in both the groups there is no significant relationship between managerial
effectiveness and any of the dimensions of decision making but most of the
relations are positive. We have found that managerial effectiveness has
positive relationship with organizational culture in both the organizations, but
the relation is not significant. It means work culture influences managerial
effectiveness positively. The most important factors which emerge in the
private sector are to organize, open communication and effective
management by developing a positive culture. The important factors in the
public sector are co-ordination, developing credibility and communicating
effectively.