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DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

In the introductory part of this report, various historical and contemporary issues related to managerial leadership, work motivation and their dynamics were discussed at length. Later on, the specific thrust of this research to investigate the ramifications of managerial leadership and work motivation in an interpersonal boss-subordinate situation, was identified. The four fold objectives and the related hypotheses were laid out. These related to a comparison of Western and Indian thinking on the subject of leadership; the motivational correlates of various leadership styles; and associated need deficiencies; and lastly, the study of interpersonal differences in self perception and subordinate perception of leadership styles.

The method of this study was to administer scales measuring, self perception of styles of leadership and effectiveness and also the perception of subordinates of their bosses in terms of these leadership styles and effectiveness. Apart from this, the need structure of the boss was also studied and the need deficiencies and importance of the subordinate also assessed.

The statistical analysis was done in such a way that the hypotheses framed earlier could be tested. The results obtained from this statistical analysis will be interpreted and discussed in this chapter.

In the first instance, the comparison of Western and Indian Thinking on Leadership Styles will be discussed. The salient points that emerge from this discussion will then form a basis for interpretation of the results of the rest of the study. In the second instance, the variables studied in the boss will be discussed. Here the motives as related to various
leadership styles will be examined in the light of the results obtained in the present work. Next, the variables studied in the subordinate, i.e., the perceived leadership styles and patterns of need deficiency will be examined. In the last instance, the nature of the interpersonal perception between the boss and his self ratings on leadership styles on one hand, and the subordinate ratings on the other hand will be discussed.
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I EVALUATION OF THE HYPOTHESES

A) Situational Leadership Theory And Nurturant Task Leader Model

In this section of the analysis the scores of bosses on LEAD(Self) were correlated with scores on LBS(II). The results were presented in Table 2 and yielded many issues for discussion. A number of significant correlations that were expected in the hypotheses did emerge.

- Style 1, Task and Authoritarian

Hypotheses #1 suggested that there is expected a positive correlation between Style 1, Authoritarian (F) and Task (T) styles. This hypothesis has been upheld. Style 1 has a correlation (significant at 0.05 level) of 0.21 with F style and 0.20 with T style. In turn, Authoritarian and Task styles show a significant positive correlation \( r = 0.22 \) between themselves. Thus, the logic that governed the framing of the Hypothesis #1 seems to have been in order. Style 1, of the Situational Leadership Theory and Authoritarian and Task Oriented Styles of the Nurturant Task Model of Leadership are closely related to each other because they are common in one respect, that is, high task-orientation. The opposite finding of Verma (1986) (where a negative correlation between Authoritarian and Task Styles was obtained) therefore is not supported in this study. This may be so because in Verma's (1986) study, she found that the items of Participative, Nurturant and Task orientation were overlapping and hence suggested that the scale needed reframing. Since then, the Leader Behaviour Scale has undergone some revisions and it was the revised version that was used in the present study.
Style 2, NT, and Participative

Hypothesis #2 had postulated a positive correlation between Style 2, NT, and P scores. In the present work, however, none of these correlations has emerged significant. The possible reason for this may be that although all these three styles are a combination of high task behaviour and high relationship behaviour, their manifestations are different. Style 2 (when effective) is referred to by Hersey and Blanchard (1972) as a 'selling' style where the leader attempts two way communication and socio-emotional support to get the followers psychologically to 'buy' into decisions that have to be made. Here most of the direction is still provided by the leader. On the other hand, the NT style conceived by Sinha (1980) is a 'Nurturance-contingent-upon-task-performance' style (a typical NT item on the LBS would read as..."I am kind only to those subordinates who work hard") Here the socio-emotional support is provided by the leader only if the follower meets the task requirements. This element of socio-emotional support being contingent upon task accomplishment is absent in the Situational Leadership Theory where group consensus is sought for all decision making. Thus the prediction of Sinha (1980) wherein he foresaw that the image of the NT leader is difficult to be conceived of in Western countries seems to be true.

Though both P and NT styles are conceived of by Sinha (1980) as having high task orientation, high people orientation, low self orientation, low anxiety, low insecurity, low rigidity, other variables are manifested differently in these two styles. These are: preference for structure, power orientation and control over subordinates all of which are high in the NT leader and low in the P style. Similarly, cognitive complexity required for the participative style is high as compared to medium cognitive complexity required by the NT style (Sinha, 1980).
Thus it can be seen that most of the direction for goal accomplishment is provided by the leader in the NT style as well as Style 2. Conversely, the direction for goal accomplishment is provided by the followers in the Participative Style. Therefore, the reasons for the correlations expected in Hypothesis #2 not emerging are clear. These three styles (S2, P & NT) though both having elements of both high task behaviour and high leadership behaviour, give different thrusts to leadership behaviour and are, therefore, manifested differently.

- **Style 3 and Nurturant Style**

  In the third hypothesis it had been postulated that a high correlation between Style 3 and Nurturant style may be expected. This has, however, not been held true in this investigation. This again relates to Sinha’s prediction that the concept of Nurturance is unique to the Indian psycho-cultural context. Hence, there is no correlate of either the N or the NT style in the Situational Leadership Theory.

  However, Style 3 has shown significant correlation with Participative style ($r = 0.25$). When leadership Style 3 is viewed in relation to the maturity of subordinates, as has been done by Hersey & Blanchard (1972), it can be found that for M3 level of maturity (high-to-moderate) S3 assumes a ‘participative’ stance where the leaders and followers......

  “share in decision making through two-way communication and much facilitating behaviour from the leader since the follower(s) have the ability and knowledge to do the task” (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982). In other words, high relationship orientation manifests in a great deal of facilitating behaviour, and there is a low task orientation since the participants have the required maturity to carry on the task without the leader having to supervise closely. This, then could explain the reason why, in the present work a high correlation, between Participative style and S3 has been obtained.
Style 4

In the next hypothesis (#4) it had been expected that Style 4 will not be related to any of the styles on the LBS(I). The statistical analysis has, however, yielded a significant positive correlation with Participative style ($r = 0.20$) and a significant negative correlation with Authoritarian style ($r = 0.2$). If, however, Table 4 (which gives means and standard deviations of the total sample of bosses) is to be examined, it can be found that the scoring on Style 4 is almost negligible ($\bar{x} = 0.21$ and $SD = 0.62$). An examination of the raw scores indicates an extremely high proportion of zero scores, and the few instances where there has been scoring on Style 4, the scores are very low (in most such cases, a score of 1 was obtained).

The present research is not the only investigation in the Indian context where low or zero scores on S4 have been obtained. Earlier studies by Mohan (1987, 1989) on bureaucrats, teachers and police officers, Mohan and Madhok (1989) on managers, and Gupta (1985) have also reported similar results. This extremely low scoring on S4 indicates a lack of the delegating style in the Indian executive ethos. This is not surprising since the most popularly endorsed style is the NT style. The typical NT leader would, having a high task orientation....."structure his and his subordinates roles explicitly.....guide and direct his subordinates to work hard.....pinpoint responsibilities and synchronise areas of decision making" (Sinha, 1980). In other words, he would be in complete control of the situation. Now, in the context where the NT style is most popular (as in the present sample) the concept of delegation would logically be unpopular since it would mean letting go of the control over the subordinate. That is probably why, in this study too, as in other studies in the Indian culture (reported earlier in this section), the delegation style is very nominally reported.

Now, Style 4, when effective (i.e. where followers have high maturity levels) has been defined as a 'delegating' style where low task and low relationship orientation are manifested in ..... "letting follower(s) 'run their own show' through delegation and general
supervision since the followers are high in both task and psychological maturity”. In such situations where Style 4 is ineffective (where subordinates have low or moderate levels of maturity) the leadership is perceived as ..... “providing little structure or socio-emotional support when needed by members of the group” (Hersey and Blanchard, 1972).

The present study, regardless of the low scoring, has obtained a significant positive correlation of Style 4 and Participative (r = 0.20), and a significant negative correlation of Style 4 and Authoritarian style (r = -02). Now, Hersey and Blanchard (1972) have described S4 as a 'delegating' style where much of the decision making is delegated to the followers and little socio-emotional support is provided. The Participative style has been conceived of by Sinha (1980) as sharing and delegation of decision making while providing full socio-emotional support. This common factor of delegation of task activities could explain the significant positive correlation obtained (r = 0.20). On the contrary, the Authoritarian style is conceived of as being rigid, strictly controlling of subordinates, self-centered etc. (Sinha, 1980). This being on the direct opposite end of the continuum perceived by Sinha (1980) (see Chapter One for details of Nurturant Task Leader Model) would clearly give the reason for the significant negative correlation obtained in the present study (r = 0.21). Thus, it can be seen that delegation as a style of leadership, is rarely seen in the Indian situation. However, in those few cases where managers in the present sample have reported some score on this style, those same managers have also scored higher on the desirable Participative style and lower on the undesirable Authoritarian style.

The issue now seems to be whether or not the delegating style (S4) is really desirable in the context of increasing overall managerial effectiveness. Chattopadhyay (1975, 1980) has pointed out that the average Indian subordinate is 'dependency prone'. He seeks out situations where this dependency need is satisfied. Sinha (1970) has some evidence that dependency prone subordinates work harder than the independent minded subordinate
under a Task-oriented or NT leader. According to him..... “Such an NT leader is expected to make his subordinates work hard and to help them develop job skills. The job skills (or in terms of Hersey & Blanchard, 1972 : task relevant maturity) would bring in them a sense of competence and self confidence. They would like to have some delegation of authority in correspondence with their expertise and experience. The dependency need would be weakened and substituted by a need for independence and participation”. (Sinha, 1980).

Thus it is seen that Sinha (1980) in defining his strategy of effective leadership has conceived of a situation where, depending on the increasing maturity of the subordinate, the leader, in order to maximise effectiveness should move from an NT to a P style.

However, one can conceive of a situation where the level of preparedness of the subordinates goes beyond the stage where the Participative style will be the most effective. It is such a level of preparedness which Hersey and Blanchard (1972) have talked about as M4 level of task relevant maturity, for which a delegating style is the most appropriate. By analogy, Sinha (1980) has pointed out the roots of the NT style in the Indian family system. Here he says that in the Indian psycho-cultural context the process of a benevolent father’s renunciation and fading out in favour of his son is reflected in the cultural value of giving up Grihashth Ashram for Vanprasth and eventually for Sanyas Ashram. Through this process he gains a spiritual kind of power and status and commands respect without really interfering in the affairs of his son.

The foregoing discussion, gives clear indications for management development effort to improve the flexibility of the Indian managers, the majority of whom have rated themselves very high on the NT style. They should be able to adapt their style from NT to Participative and finally to the delegating Style 4, in accordance with the level of preparedness of the subordinate in fact Mohan (1989) in her study of the effects of human relations training on managerial effectiveness has reported that as a result of training, it is S4 that has
shown a significant increase in her sample. The implications of her findings if taken together with the findings of the present study, are obviously far reaching. On the one hand there is, in this study, a positive correlation of S4 and Participative style and a negative correlation of S4 with Authoritarian style. On the other hand in Mohan's (1989) research there is significant evidence of human relations training serving to enhance the delegating capacities of a manager and of Style 4 being related to leader effectiveness. This confirms the fact that with management development efforts in human relations training, the abilities of an executive to adapt his leadership style from Nurturant-Task to Participative and finally to the delegating Style 4, depending on the maturity level of the subordinates, can be enhanced. Such an effort will benefit organisations through better managerial qualities and leadership effectiveness, ultimately resulting in improved work efficiency, morale and motivation.

Bureaucratic Orientation

The last hypothesis (#5) in this section had postulated the correlates of Bureaucratic Orientation. It was suggested that a positive correlation between Bureaucratic Orientation, Authoritarian, Task and Style 1 may be expected, and a negative correlation between Bureaucratic Orientation and Participative, Nurturant Task, Nurturant, Style 2 and Style 3 may be expected. The results of the present study lend only partial support for this hypothesis. Bureaucratic orientation has shown significant positive correlations with Style 1 ($r = 0.22$) and Authoritarian style ($r = 0.40$), and significant negative correlation with Style 3 ($r = -0.24$) only. The positive relationship expected with Task-oriented style and the negative relationships expected with Participative, Nurturant Task, Nurturant, and Style 2 failed to show up. The correlation of Bureaucratic with Participative style was of the order of -0.13 (emerging but not significant). The trend foreseen by Sinha (1980) wherein he predicted that Bureaucratic Orientation will have a negative relationship with Participative style and a positive relationship with Authoritarian style does seem to be emerging and provides only partial support for the hypothesis.
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OVERVIEW

What then, is the scenario that emerges from interpretation of results in this section? It is quite clear that some commonalities do exist between Leadership styles identified in the Situational Leadership Theory and in the Nurturant Task Leader Model. Style 1, Authoritarian and Task Oriented styles are closely related; Style 2 does not correlate with any LBS(I) styles; Style 3 correlates with Participative style; and Style 4 correlates positively with Participative and negatively with Authoritarian styles. The NT and N styles did not find any correlates in the American theory, thereby suggesting that the concept of Nurturance-contingent-upon-Task-performance or perhaps the concept of Nurturance itself, is a behavioral construct uniquely found in the Indian psycho-cultural context. While describing the concept of the NT Leader, Sinha (1980) says that the dimension of 'Consideration' of the Ohio State Studies (ref. Chapter One) has a people orientation of the fraternal type whereas his concept of people orientation in the N.T. leader is that of a benevolent paternal or big brother type or in other words, having an element of nurturance. In fact, Sinha (1980) also says that this concept of a benevolent father or big brother image..."is difficult to be conceived of in Western countries which have a radically different type of family structure and financial relationship" Sinha (1980) has also suggested that perhaps this kind of a benevolent father figure style may not be uncommon in oriental countries, such as Japan where the... “source of the leader-subordinate relationships lies in the Japanese family system which provides basic structural framework for all types of secondary organisations and modes of decision making. The ethos of the family life instead of being authoritarian reflects the themes of solidarity/harmony and cooperation (Yoshino, 1968)” in the present study.

If the intercorrelations of the LBS(I) styles are to be examined, it will be found that the NT style has very high correlations with Nurturant ($r = 0.44$), Participative ($r = 0.45$)
styles. Task Oriented and Nurturant style have highly significant correlation coefficient of 0.42, whereas Participative and Nurturant styles have a highly significant correlation coefficient of 0.61. The implication here is that Nurturant-Task, Participative, Task and Nurturant styles seem to be closely interrelated to each other. This finding is supported in Verma's (1986) factor-analytic study where she found a great deal of overlapping between Nurturant, Participative and Task styles. In the version of the LBS used by her, there was no Nurturant Task dimension whereas in the revised version used by the present investigator, the dimension of Nurturant Task Style has been included.

Thus, the conceptual overlaps of the Situational Leadership Theory and the Nurturant Task Leader model have been discussed. This interpretation will now serve as the basis for the interpretation of the results in the rest of the study.

8) Motivational Patterns and Self Perception of Leadership Styles

It is an acknowledged fact that various needs in humans are manifested in various behavioral patterns. Using the same line of thinking, it might also be correct to say that motivational patterns in bosses would relate to preference for or manifestation of different styles of leadership behaviour. The discussions in this section would make the response to this issue more clear. However, before these discussions are commenced, the issue of Indian and Western classification of leadership styles needs to be clarified. The Hypotheses # 6 through # 9 had postulated similar patterns of motives for those leadership styles that had been expected, in Hypotheses # 1 through # 5, to be related with each other. It has been found, from the previous discussion that with two major exceptions, Hypotheses # 1 through # 5 have been upheld. The first exception was that there is no correlate of the NT or even the Nurturant Style in the Situational Leadership Theory. The second major exception was that the Participative style, instead of being correlated with S2 was found to be correlated
with S3 and S4 instead. Therefore, using these results as a basis for discussing the motivational patterns of various correlated leadership styles, the ensuing discussion will discuss the motivational correlates of the following correlated groups of leadership styles individually.

Style 1, Task and Authoritarian

Style 2

Style 3 and Participative Style

Style 4

Nurturant and Nurturant Task Styles

■ Style 1, Task and Authoritarian

It had been expected in Hypotheses # 6 that Style 1, Authoritarian and Task Styles would be positively related to n.Ach and n.Dom, and negatively related with n.Aff and n.Nur. The statistical results of the present work give some support for this hypotheses. Style 1 has shown a significant negative correlation ($r = -0.20$) with n.Aff; Authoritarian Style has shown positive correlation ($r = 0.21$) with n.Dom and; Task Style has shown a positive correlation with n.Ach ($r = 0.22$) and a negative correlation with n.Nur ($r = -0.21$). If the intercorrelations of these needs are to be examined, it will be found that n.Ach shows significant negative correlation. With n.Aff ($r = -0.25$) and with n.Nur ($r = -0.4$). Similarly n.Dom shows significant negative correlations with n.Aff ($r = -0.55$) and n.Nur ($r = -0.57$). The trend emerging from these results is the higher the n.Ach of a manager, the higher will be his task orientation. A higher n.Ach seems to make a person emphasise task performance, be controlling, assertive, and he drives his subordinates hard towards organisational goals. The person with high n.Ach not only gets into entrepre neurial occupations but also tends to behave in more expansive and successful ways (McClelland & Winter, 1961). n.Ach may be
critical for having a task-oriented leadership, but for effective leadership high affiliative motive must accompany n.Ach (Dwivedi, 1979). This is not true of the Style 1, Authoritarian or the Task style leader. Affiliative and nurturing behaviour are alien to him. He is likely to view such behaviour as interfering with performance and goal achievement and also overall effectiveness. Such a person would be good in dealing with groups of low levels of maturity (M1) according to Hersey and Blanchard (1971) where he would be ..... "seen as having well defined methods for accomplishing goals (achievement oriented) that are helpful to followers". However, when such a person is put into a situation where there are subordinates with moderate- to-high levels of maturity, he would be ..... "imposing methods....unpleasant.....not providing socio-emotional support (low Affiliation and Nurtureance).

- **Style 2**

In Table 2, if the motivational correlates of Style 2 are to be examined, it will be found that none of the correlations expected in Hypotheses # 7 have emerged. The reason for this may lie in the social desirability factor. That the Style 2 is a highly desirable style is obvious because it is the style that is high in both people orientation and task orientation. Therefore, it appears to be the most attractive alternative since it seems to achieve the twin objectives of task accomplishment as well as satisfaction of people. This makes Style 2 the most popularly endorsed among the styles measured by the LEAD(Self) instrument. Regardless of a person's needs and motives which are a part of his private personality, he must put on a facade of at least appearing to be democratic in his approach. Hence, irrespective of what his needs or motives may be, he consciously or sub-consciously endorses the most socially desirable style of functioning. This would then give the probable reason why, in the present work, no significant correlations have emerged in this section of the analysis.
■ Style 3 and Participative Style

In Hypothesis # 8 it had been expected that Style 3 will have a positive correlation with n.Aff and n.Nur and a negative correlation with n.Ach and n.Dom. In the previous analysis it was found that Style 3 and Participative style were correlated, therefore, it may also be expected that this P style would also be associated with a similar motivational pattern. However, when Table 2 is examined, it may be found that only one of these expected correlations has emerged. Participative style has shown a significant negative correlation with n.Dom ($r = -0.21$). In fact, Sinha (1980) when describing the different styles in his model has predicted that the Participative Style will show low degree of power-orientation and also low degree of control over subordinates. It is only to be expected that a person high in the Participative score will be low in n.Dom because he likes to share his decision making powers, delegate his authority and share his responsibility. He works with his subordinates as an equal member and not one who considers himself as superior or in a higher position over his juniors. He mixes with them on their own level and as 'one of the boys'. These are all characteristics that would be contrary to what may be expected of a person high in n.Dom. Therefore, the negative correlation of P with n.Dom is quite expected. The same finding is also reported by Habibullah and Sinha (1980) who found a negative correlation between P style and the variable of 'control' in the organisation climate.

■ Style 4

In Hypothesis # 9, it had been expected that Style 4 will not be associated with any of the needs studied in the present work. This hypothesis has been upheld in the results of the analysis undertaken, since none of the correlations emerged significant. In the present sample, as in most other Indian studies cited earlier, the manifestations of Style 4 were either very low or absent. It is this absence of scoring on Style 4 that is the cause of the lack of significant motivational correlates.
Nurturant and Nurturant Task Styles

The motivational correlates of the Nurturant and the Nurturant Task styles were not posited in any separate hypothesis. This was so because the NT style had at that stage been clubbed with Style 2 and the N style had been clubbed with Style 3. However, these two styles (N and NT) were found in the previous section, to be uncorrelated to any of the other styles of the American theory, and are thus being considered separately.

Logically, it would be reasonable to expect that the N and NT styles would be linked with high amounts of n.Aff and n.Nur since they both stem from high people orientation. Habibullah and Sinha (1980) have, in fact, found a positive correlation between affiliative climate and the NT style. However, in the present work, none of the four needs investigated has shown any significant correlations with these two styles. Here again, the explanation that the high scores on NT and N Styles may stem from the factor of social desirability irrespective of need structure of the individual, may hold good. The same argument has been used to explain the lack of motivational correlates of the LEAD Style 2. It is quite possible that there is a distortion of reality due to the need to put on a pleasant and socially appealing facade, and hence, the results of this section of the present study.

OVERVIEW

Looking at the overall results of this section, on a macro level, would it be correct to say that leadership styles are by and large partially related to motivational patterns? Two definite trends seem to emerge clearly. The first of these is that n.Dom is negatively related to Participative style and positively to the Authoritarian style. Sinha (1980) has conceived of these two styles as being on opposite ends of a continuum of leadership behaviour. The trend of manifestation of n.Dom seems to be higher in the Authoritarian leader and lower in the Participative leader. In a boss-subordinate situation, the boss is in a position of formal authority and superiority over the subordinate. If his desire to dominate by coercion, force,
overruling his subordinate’s wishes, is high, he would adopt an Authoritarian style. If his need for domination is less, he will encourage a Participative style and share information, invite suggestions, delegate decision making etc. Such a trend has been foreseen by Sinha (1980) where he expected that the factor of 'control over subordinates' would be high in the Authoritarian leader who rules with an iron hand and wants to have full power and control over his subordinates (high dominance). The Participative leader, on the other hand grants full freedom and autonomy to his subordinates so that they can work hard (low dominance).

The second trend that emerges is that n.Ach, n.Aff and n.Nur seem to relate only to the task orientation of the leader as shown in the correlations with Style 1 and Task oriented style. Higher amounts of n.Ach seem to go with higher Task-oriented leadership behaviour (desire to get the job done, meeting objectives etc.). Higher amounts of n.Aff and n.Nur seem to interfere with task accomplishment and thus lead to lower amounts of task-oriented leadership behaviour.

**C) Subordinate’s Interpersonal Perception Of Leadership Style, Need Deficiency And Importance**

Subordinates relate to their bosses in many ways. Some look up to them with respect some revere and emulate them, some hold them in awe, some resort to servility and sycophancy, some simmer with discontent, some rebel, and some simply suffer in the agony of frustration over the years.

Two critical aspects of the subordinate’s relations with his superiors considered in the present study are (a) how he perceives his (the bosses) leadership style and (b) what his patterns of need satisfaction/deprivation are, and how important are these needs to him as related to the boss’s style of functioning.
In the present work an attempt was made to ascertain whether a person’s perception of a boss’s style was in any way related to his feelings of need satisfaction/deprivation and need importance. Hypotheses #10 through #14 postulated various kinds of relationships between these two aspects of boss-subordinate relationships.

The findings in Table 3 indicate the following significant correlations.

- **Style 2** is positively related to importance of Autonomy need \( (r = 0.14) \).
- **Style 3** is positively related to importance of security need \( (r = 0.20) \).
- **Style 4** is negatively related to importance of esteem need \( (r = -0.14) \) positively related and to deficiency of self-actualisation need \( (r = 0.15) \).
- **Nurturant style** is positively related to importance of item NS.2 \( (r = 0.15) \).
- **Bureaucratic orientation** is positively related to deficiency of Autonomy need \( (r = 0.30) \).

Each one of these trends will be discussed in the context of the present study in the ensuing section.

1) **Style 2 and Autonomy need**

Style 2 has been described by Hersey and Blanchard (1971) as a ‘selling’ style where most of the direction is provided by the leader. He attempts two way communication and socio-emotional support to ultimately have a ‘group consensus’ style of decision making. This is similar to the Blake and Mouton (1964) 9,9 style of functioning where ‘work accomplishment is from committed people; interdependence through a ‘common stake’ in organisation purpose leading to relationships of trust and respect. According to Tannen-
banm & Schmidt (1958) “leaders whose behavior appears to be at the democratic end tend to be group oriented and thus give their followers considerable freedom in their work.

Thus, Style 2 is reflected in leader behavior that permits subordinates to function within limits defined by the superior. Such a subordinate would find that, due to a democratic climate his need for group activity and self prestige are fairly satisfied. In other words there is low deficiency of social and esteem needs, since he freely interacts with his boss and peer group and his contributions are adequately recognised. Now, according to Maslow’s (1954) Gratification/Activation Proposition, once a given need has been satisfied, the need in the next higher category gets activated and assumes importance (see Chapter One for details). The autonomy need category has been inserted by Porter (1961) in his work on job attitudes, in the hierarchical order between the esteem and self-actualisation categories of Maslow’s categorisation (1954). Therefore, once the social and esteem needs are satisfied, according to the Gratification/Activation Proposition, the Autonomy need which is the next higher need will be activated and will be perceived by the subordinate as important.

If the sample profiles in Table 5 are to be examined, it will be found that the need deficiency of the Autonomy need is quite high (\( \bar{x} = 1.72 \)) and ranks second only to the deficiency of the Actualisation need (\( \bar{x} = 1.82 \)). Therefore, it is quite possible that in addition to the Gratification/Activation Proposition as discussed earlier, the Deprivation/Domination Proposition is also operating within the framework of the Maslow (1954) Model. According to the Deprivation/Domination Proposition, the need that is deprived will also dominate in the individuals personality. It is, therefore, possible that the average subordinate yearns for a more participative or delegating style wherein he can have more ‘elbow room’ and freedom of action. However, the large proportion of bosses are perceived as being high on S2 (mean subordinate rating = 5.32) and not on the Participative Style 3 or
the delegating Style 4 where the Autonomy need would be more satisfied. Consequently, there is a perception of a higher deficiency and hence a higher importance (dominance) of the Autonomy need. This is also consonant with the Herzeberg (1959) Motivation/Hygeine Theory where autonomy, scope and independence in work have been recognised as important intrinsic motivators and job content factors. The importance of the Autonomy need in motivation of the average employee has been recognised by the corporate world as well, and many steps have been taken by industries to motivate their employees through satisfaction of this need. Such steps include measures to undertake job redesign, job enlargement, job enrichment, participative management etc. The Government too, does recognise the importance of the autonomy need and has provided in the labour legislation (Factories Act, 1948; and Trade Unions Act, 1926) for constitution of Joint Working Committees etc. to ensure greater worker participation in decision making hence satisfying the need for independence and autonomy.

2) Style 3 and Security Need

As was discussed in the review preceding Hypothesis #14, a review of the literature has shown that, in the Indian context, the security need has been shown to be unique in the average working adult. Even though it was the most satisfied need it was ranked the most important.

If the sample profile in Table 5 is to be studied, it will be found that in the present study, the mean deficiency reported in the satisfaction of this need is indeed the lowest ($\bar{x} = 1.31$) amongst the need categories considered here. In importance however, this need has ranked only fourth out of the five needs studied.

In the present case, a positive correlation has been obtained between Style 3 and importance of Security need. In a developing nation like India, there has always been a perpetual scarcity of resources and basic necessities like food, clothing and shelter. This
scarcity makes the average Indian feel insecure and this leads to a fixation of the security need in his mind. This experience carries over to the psyche of the industrial employee. Till today, in the unorganised sector of the urban economy, wages are low, employment is scarce and where available, jobs do not guarantee security (Dholakia, 1983). Permanent and secure jobs in the organised sectors are very difficult to get. As a result, when an individual does get a permanent, secure job, he clings on to it. Even though his need for security is now satisfied, the importance of that need does not decrease. On the contrary the importance might increase because now he has tasted the luxury of security and does not want to get back to the stage where he was needy and insecure.

The subordinate who has been guaranteed food, clothing and shelter now craves social need satisfaction according to the Gratification/Activation proposition of Maslow (1954). He seeks out and prefers situation where nurturance, love, affection and affiliation is provided. Such a situation is available in the S3 style leader who is present to satisfy the social needs of the employee. Hence, in the present study, the importance of the security need and the subordinate perceptions of the Style 3 leader are correlated significantly.

3) Style 4, Esteem and Actualisation Needs

According to Hersey and Blanchard (1972) Style 4 is seen as a delegating style when used appropriately in relation to highly mature subordinates. In this mode, the Style 4 manager would provide scope for challenge and autonomy to his subordinate. Thus, when the subordinate perceives his boss to be delegating, he experiences enhanced feelings of self confidence, self esteem and prestige. This means his esteem need would be fairly satisfied and cease to be of importance to him. Therefore, in the present work a negative correlation of Style 4 and importance of esteem needs has been observed.

What is more interesting however, is that this Style 4 associates with a feeling of deficiency in the Self Actualisation need, in other words, the delegating style seems to
activate the Actualisation need of the subordinate. This finding, when taken along with the
discussion regarding Hypothesis #4 in the earlier pages of this chapter makes the case for
adopting a delegating Style 4 even more strong. Earlier it had been discussed how and why
Style 4 is positively associated with P style and negatively with F style. Mohan’s (1989) study
on human relations training and Style 4 had been also cited and the necessity of increasing
the delegating style in the Indian population had been pointed out. Now, when it is also
found that subordinates who perceive their bosses to be delegating, also report on activation
of the self actualisation need, it is all the more evident that these findings could possibly give
support for human relations training to enhance the delegating capacities of managers.

4) Nurturant Style

An examination of Table 3 will show that perception of N style is positively related
to importance of item NS-2. This item in the PNSQ relates to the subordinates ’feeling of’
being-in-the-know 'The Nurturant boss...' cares for his subordinates, shows affection, takes
personal interest in their well-being and is committed to their growth. His personal warmth
helps create a climate of trust and understanding where subordinates grow up and acquire
maturity" (Sinha, 1980). Under such a boss, the subordinate per haps feels that he shares
the complete trust of his boss, and his boss in turn, does not hide information, misinform or
alienate him in the course of discharging his duties. The boss’s nurturance makes him feel
special and important. Thus, he feels in volved in and committed to every aspect of the
functioning of the organisation. This feeling of being a privileged person makes him attach
a great deal of importance to the feeling of 'being-in-the-know' that he derives from his
boss’s nurturance, thus explaining the correlation between N style and the impor tance of
item NS-2 in the present work.

5) Bureaucratic Orientation and Autonomy Need
In the present work, there has been found a positive correlation of the bureaucratic orientation with the deficiency of the autonomy need \( (r = 0.30) \) as is observed in the results presented in Table 3.

Bureaucratic style is often used as a synonym for red-tape, inefficiency and ineptness. Weber’s (1947) concept of bureaucracy includes specialisation of labour, emphasis on rules, procedures and precedents, high degree of centralisation of authority recognition of seniority over merit etc. Thus, a bureaucratic person is one that subscribes to such policies and manifests them in his day-to-day interaction with his subordinate. The subordinate, under a highly bureaucratic boss would feel increasingly bound by rules and regulations, red tape, past precedence, centralisation of authority etc. He would feel his freedom of action has been curtailed, in other words his autonomy need deficiency would be high. This is the probable reason why in this part of the study, bureaucratic orientation has shown a positive correlation with deficiency of the Autonomy need.

**OVERVIEW**

The macro view that emerges from the discussion in this section shows three clear trends. Firstly, for motivation at the higher levels of Maslow’s hierarchy, Style 2 and Style 4 seem to be important. Secondly, people-oriented styles, Style 3 and Nurturant Styles, seem to be associated with reinforcement of the security need in the Indian context. Lastly, Bureaucratic behaviour of the boss deprives the autonomy need and the subordinates become automatic and routine-like in their day to day functioning. They lack independence, innovation and identification with the work targets.

In this section again, the case was made out for greater emphasis on delegation and participation for motivating employees at the higher level needs in the hierarchy.
D) Self Perception Of Leadership Styles And Subordinate Perception Of Leadership Styles

India is the second largest democracy in the world. Democratic values are instilled in the laws, norms and the values that every citizen professes to believe in. Nevertheless, the Indian culture is also one where the elders are respected, revered and looked up to for emotional security, nurturance and support. As Chattopadhyay (1975, 1980) puts it, Indian followers are 'dependency prone'. How does the individual integrate his democratic values with dependency proneness? Historically, it was the benevolent father figure style which was the most respected of all. The head of the family, the head of the village, the head of the corporate world, the boss, all found that it was this leadership style that was accepted, was respected and, in generally produced best results.

It was this style, that was later labeled by Sinha (1980) as the Nurturant Task style and is also the style that in the sample studied here, has been endorsed most strongly and emerges the most popular. Since this style is alien to the American culture and as has been seen earlier, even in the present work no parallel correlate of the NT style has been found in the Situational Leadership Theory, the one that came closest to the values of democracy (Style 2) was the one that was endorsed as the favourite.

Earlier in this Chapter, a comparison of the Situational Leadership Theory and the Nurturant Task Leader Model was undertaken. Later, the focus was shifted to understanding work motivation and managerial leadership in the boss-subordinate situation. The motivational correlate of Leadership Styles in the boss was discussed, followed by an assessment of subordinate perceptions of leadership styles and related patterns of need satisfaction. The attention will now be diverted into studying the nature of the gap between self perceptions of leadership styles of the boss and corresponding subordinate ratings. The
scoring and analysis of self/other rated leadership styles will be discussed in two sections. The first one will pertain to interpretation of LEAD scores, and the second one will pertain to the interpretation of LBS scores LEAD Self/Other differences and correlations.

1) BOSSES LEAD PROFILE

It has been discussed earlier that the most popular among the LEAD(Self) scores was Style 2 ($\bar{x} = 5.37$). This was so because in the Indian context, the social desirability of the democratic style is very high. The second most preferred style was Style 3($\bar{x} = 3.41$) (relationship oriented), followed by Style 1($\bar{x} = 2.88$) and lastly Style 4 ($\bar{x} = 0.21$). This indicates that after the democratic 'selling' style, the Indian managers prefer a relationship oriented style according to their self perceptions. Thus, the mean style profile of the Indian sample according to this study is profile '2-3'. According to Hersey & Blanchard (1972), people with style profile '2-3'... “tend to do well working with people of average levels of maturity but find it difficult handling discipline problems and immature work groups, as well as ‘delegating’ with people to maximise their development. This style profile tends to be the most frequently identified style in the United States and other countries with a high level of education and extensive industrial experience”. Thus, given the Indian industrial climate of rampant union discord and indiscipline in Indian industry, the need of the hour seems to be, according to these results, to develop the potential to enhance the Style 1 capacities of Indian managers. This Style 1 was reported as the third most preferred style of functioning, followed by Style 4.

The mean effectiveness (Style Adaptability) score reported was 21.8 which is above the cut-off point of 18. This indicates that Indian managers exhibit some degree of Style Adaptability and are able to adjust their Style according to the maturity of the followers and the Situation they are in. Earlier studies using the LEAD instrument have used the older system of scoring on style adaptability wherein the range of scores possible was -24 to
+ 24 with negative scores indicating ineffectiveness. Such a study by Mohan (1987) has obtained mean effectiveness of 5.45. In addition, Mohan (1989) has obtained mean effectiveness of 5.82 before training of managers. In her study, after imparting training in human relations, the mean effectiveness score went up to 8.99. This shows that, with training, it is possible to improve one’s Style Adaptability. In the present study, the mean effectiveness score obtained was 21.8 on a scale of 0 to 36. This is just above the cut-off point of 18. The scope for improving the average Indian manager’s effectiveness is quite substantial. When taken together with Mohan’s (1989) study, the implications for management development would be to impart more training aimed at improving the manager’s flexibility.

2) PROFILE OF SUBORDINATE’S PERCEPTION OF LEAD STYLES

The profile of subordinate perceptions of their boss’s leadership style according to the LEAD(Others) instrument shows that they perceive their bosses to be highest in Style 2 followed by Style 1. According to Hersey & Blanchard, people with style profile '2-1'..."tend to be able to raise and lower their socio-emotional support or relationship behavior but often feel uncomfortable unless they are 'calling the shots', that is when they are providing the structure and direction this style profile tends to be characteristic of engineers who have become supervisors of other engineers but tend to be relevant be reluctant to give up their engineering; sales-persons who have become sales managers and yet still love to sell themselves, and teachers who have become administrators but who still want to be directing the activities of children. These leaders often project that "no one can do things as well as I can".

This indicates that according to the perceptions of their subordinates, Indian managers are mostly democratic or task oriented. The relationship orientation comes in mostly in the form of the 'selling' Style 2, and sometimes in the 'participating' Style 3 which
obtained the next highest rating in this analysis. The least most perceived style was Style 4. This was so because as was discussed earlier, in the Indian context the manifestation of the 'delegation' Style 4 is conspicuous by its absence.

3) BOSS-SUBORDINATE INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION ON LEAD

If Table 6 is to be examined, it will be found that for LEAD scores, significant differences were obtained in respect of Style 3 and Style 4. ($t = 5.04$) Bosses have rated themselves higher on Style 3 and lower on Style 4 as compared to the mean subordinate rating. In Table 7, if the correlation of each style's self ratings and other ratings, are to be examined down the diagonal line, it will be observed that only in the case of Style 2 are the subordinate ratings tallying with the self ratings ($r = 0.23$).

Hersey and Blanchard (1972) have used the Johari Window framework (1955 and 1970) for providing feedback to managers regarding differences between their LEAD(Self) and LEAD(Others) score. According to this framework there are some attitudes or behaviors engaged in by leaders that they know about themselves. At the same time, part of the leader's personality is also unknown to self. That is, in some areas leaders are unaware of how they are coming across to others. The Public arena is that area of the personality that is known to both self and others. The Private arena is known only to self. The area that is unknown to self but known to others is referred to as the Blind arena and the last which is not known to either self or others is the unknown arena.

In terms of the LEAD(Self) and LEAD(Others) scores, the Johari Window is represented as:
If this concept of Johari Window is viewed in the light of the results of LEAD(Self) and LEAD(Others) scores being discussed, it will be observed that Style 2 scores (where there is positive correlation) fall in the Public arena. In the Private arena, the leader views himself as higher on Style 3 and lower on Style 4. However, he is Blind as far as the ratings of the subordinates who rate him as lower on Style 3 and higher on Style 4 is concerned. The implications are that through feedback and disclosure, the managers as well as subordinates should work together to develop a shared perspective and thereby reduce the Blind and Private arenas of the leadership personality. This would work towards reduced friction between bosses and subordinates. Rao (et.al.) (1990) have used their Leadership Styles Questionnaire in their human relations training to help managers review
and reflect about their own people management and leadership styles and beliefs thus attempting to reduce the blind arena.

LBS(I) and LBS(II) - Differences and Correlations

4) BOSSES LBS PROFILE

It has been shown earlier how Sinha (1980) has traced the roots of the NT style in the familial system of India. For this reason, it has emerged as the most popularly endorsed style among the styles measured by the LBS(I)(x̄ = 43.3). This is followed by T(x̄ = 41.9), N(x̄ = 39.9), P(x̄ = 39.2), F(x̄ = 32.4) and B(x̄ = 28.5) styles ranked in that order.

The NT style has been conceived by Sinha (1980) as meeting the requirements of organisations to achieve goals of productivity as well as morale and job satisfaction. However, when the NT style is not in use, it is the Task style which emerges as the second alternative. This is probably so, because it is often perceived as being a discipline and productivity oriented style. Given the industrial relations climate of rampant union discord and militancy, the average Indian manager probably feels that if the NT style does not prove effective, he should adopt the T style to enforce discipline and productivity. The next preference would then be for the relationship oriented styles which are the Nurturant and Participative Styles. The Authoritarian and Bureaucratic styles are in today’s context, viewed as undesirable forms of behavior and are hence rated as the least popular.

5) PROFILE OF SUBORDINATES PERCEPTION OF LBS STYLES

It has been seen earlier that bosses have ranked the NT style as the most popular style. However, the subordinates perceptions were found to be different on this account. The highest average rating was obtained for the Task style, followed by the NT, P, N, F, B styles in that order.
The bosses, seem to be perceiving themselves as providing nurturance, but the subordinates have viewed them as being primarily Task oriented. This may be so because Sinha (1980) has conceived of the NT style as providing nurturance only if the task has been accomplished. Thus the emphasis is first on task accomplishment after which the nurturance is provided. Hence, the subordinate views the task accomplishment as primary and the Nurturance as secondary. This would explain why the subordinates have perceived their bosses to be highest on Task orientation, followed by the relationship oriented styles of NT, P and N. The Authoritarian and Bureaucratic styles have also been perceived by subordinates as very low.

6) BOSS-SUBORDINATE INTERPERSONAL PERCEPTION OF LBS STYLES

Upon examination of Table 6, it is found that for LBS scores, significant differences were obtained for all the styles except the Task style. The bosses rated themselves significantly higher than the subordinate ratings on Participative\( (t = 5.80)\), Nurturant Task\( (t = 7.21)\) and Nurturant\( (t = 6.78)\) styles. Only in the case of Authoritarian\( (t = 2.53)\) and Bureaucratic\( (t = 3.93)\) styles was the subordinate rating significantly higher than the self-rating of the boss. In the case of correlations of self-rating of each style with the subordinate rating of each style, down the diagonal line of Table 7, it is found that significant positive correlations are obtained in respect of Participative\( (r = 0.20)\) Nurturant\( (r = 0.22)\) and Bureaucratic\( (r = 0.27)\) styles respectively.

As in the case of the LEAD scores, if the framework of the Johari Window were to be applied, it will be found that the Public arena lies wherever there has been found a significant positive correlation between styles of LBS(I) and LBS(II). These styles are Participative, Nurturant and Bureaucratic. The public arena also lies in the Task style where no significant t-ratio was obtained. However, in the Private arena is the boss’s self percep-
tion that he is more NT, more Nurturant, more Participative and less Authoritarian. The subordinate’s perception that his boss is less Nurturant, less NT, less Participative and more Authoritarian lie in the Blind arena of the boss’s leadership personality. When the boss perceived himself as caring for his subordinate’s well being and providing socio-emotional support, and this love and affection is not perceived by his subordinates, it could lead to misunderstandings and conflict. Such a conflict could be resolved or even avoided altogether, if the boss and subordinate, through the processes of feedback and disclosure, share their perceptions about each other and arrive at a common shared perspective.

**OVERVIEW**

Social desirability, ego defenses and a number of factors may consciously or subconsciously motivate a person to unwittingly distort the presentation of undesirable elements of his behavior. Authoritarian behavior is usually manifested in a number of ‘undesirable’ behavior patterns like rigidity, self centeredness, strict control of subordinates, and democratic or participative behavior usually manifested in ‘desirable’ behavior patterns like considerateness, sharing of power and decision making, understanding the subordinates feelings and so forth. Very often managers are judged by their superiors on how ‘popular’ they are with the rank and file. This makes the managers keep their first responses in check and to put on a ‘democratic front’, and this fact is more true when the manager is called upon to answer a ‘leadership style’ questionnaire like the ones used in this study.

The other side of the coin reveals that most often, subordinates (especially in the Indian context) have an innate desire to please their bosses. A subordinate who has an autocratic boss may suffer from such a feeling of insecurity that he may not speak out about his boss’s negative points and also present a desirable picture. This distorts the picture even further.
Thus, it can be seen that reality is very often not truly reflected and a gap exists between the actual leadership style of a boss, his stated leadership style, and the perceived leadership style by subordinates. Managers' need to be open to feedback and disclosure about their leadership personalities in order that the Blind and Private arenas may be reduced and a shared perspective is arrived at. This will go towards improving the nature of boss-subordinate relations by reducing misunderstandings and conflict.
III SUBGROUP DIMENSIONS

A) Differences in Styles and Needs between Various Industry Sectors

The government by itself is the single largest employer in this country. It creates avenues for employment through its administrative networks, through its law enforcement agencies through hundreds of civic bodies and also through various public sector undertakings. In the organised sector, the next largest employer would be the private sector which consists of various small scale family managed industry and also of large scale corporate giants. A third and significant industry sector is the Multinational corporations, which are basically foreign companies with operations in India. The sample of present research consisted of companies in all these three industry sectors - Public, Private and Multinational.

These three sectors vary widely in the kind of cultural parameters they operate in. Due to these cultural differences, they often attract different kinds of people for employment. Kumar (1981) studied job preferences of MBA students and found that the preference for employment in MNC's was highest, followed by PVT sector and PUB sectors respectively. Verma and Sinha (1983) found that private sector employees professed higher levels of job satisfactions as compared to public sector. Such studies serve to point out that differences between the three industry sectors do exist. The present work attempted to study the nature of these differences in regard to leadership styles and needs of the bosses and subordinates. The results of the analysis arising out of this part of the study were presented in Table 8 and Table 9.

Table 8 shows significant t-ratios between leadership patterns of bosses these three sectors. Bosses in PUB sector scored significantly higher in Authoritarian style,
followed by PVT sector and lastly MNC, where the mean F score was significantly lower. The bosses in MNC sector rated themselves significantly lower in Bureaucratic orientation as compared to PUB and PVT sectors perceive their bosses to be substantially higher in Style 1 than do their counterparts in PUB sector. Also those in PVT sector perceive their bosses lower in Style 3 compared to PUB sector (Table 9).

Through these results it is observed that the managers in MNC’s are lower in F and B styles and higher in S1. Perhaps the MNC companies as a result of the Western influence on their culture tend to recruit managers who may appear to be more ‘professional’ for ‘detached’ in their approach although this is not reflected in correspondingly higher scores in participative style or even Style 2 which are considered ‘democratic’ styles. In fact, even Mascarenhas(1978) as quoted by Pandey(1988) has found that MNC’s tend to be more progressive than the domestic firms. However, subordinates in MNC and PVT perceive their bosses to be substantially higher in Style 1 than do their counterparts in PUB sector. Also, those in PVT sector perceive their bosses lower in Style 3 compared to PUB sector. Thus a general tendency of the PUB sector to be low in task orientation and high in people orientation is clearly emerging.

As far as need parameters under study are concerned, MNC bosses are significantly lower in n.Aff as compared to bosses in PUB and PVT sectors. This confirms with the previous observation of MNC bosses appearing to be more ‘detached’ or ‘professional’ in their dealing. Subordinates in MNC companies perceive a higher need deficiency in the safety and security need categories, as compared to PUB employees. Surprisingly, this higher deficiency is paired with a significantly low importance of the same need as compared with PUB sector subordinates. The fact that there is a higher deficiency is obvious since job security in MNC companies is not taken for granted whereas in PUB sector job security is a hundred percent assured. Earlier researches by Lahiri (1973), Ganguli (1964) and Srivasa-
tava (1984) have shown that in the Indian culture, the security need is most satisfied but yet assumes most importance. This seems to be true only of the PUB sector companies whereas the reverse is true of MNC's. PVT sector executives gave more importance to the social and autonomy needs as compared with PUB sector. So also, importance of esteem needs in private sector was significantly higher than the same in both MNC and PUB sectors. Here a trend seems to be emerging that PVT sector executives, although showing no differences in need deficiencies give a greater importance to social, esteem and autonomy needs.

Non-specific item 1 (NS-1) relates to the deficiency and importance of the 'pay' factor in work. In this grouping, it is found that employees in PVT sector feel a much higher deficiency than those in MNC sector although there is no difference in the importance attached to this factor MNC's are well known to be among the highest pay masters in the country. Their executive salaries and fringe benefits far exceed most other Indian companies. It is therefore not surprising that the MNC managers have perceived a lower deficiency in that area. The same can also be said to be true of PUB sector where as a consequence of the Fourth Pay Commission, large scale upgradation of salaries was undertaken in recent years. It is perhaps due to these reasons that the PVT sector managers perceive a significantly higher deficiency in the 'pay' factor vis-a-vis the MNC and PUB sectors.

OVERVIEW

In the Industry Sector wise comparison of the parameters under study, it has been observed that the MNC bosses are more impersonal than their counterparts in PUB and PVT sectors reflected in lower n.Aff. Similarly, the PUB sector bosses are seen to be high in people and low in task-orientation. The security need of subordinates in PUB sector is more satisfied than the MNC subordinates. The need for 'pay' is better satisfied in the MNC subordinates.
B) Differences Between Groups On The Basis Of Job Function

By and large, no significant differences can be perceived in the leadership styles of the managers of these two groups, with the exception of Bureaucratic orientation. Technical managers are found to be more bureaucratic than non-technical ($t = 2.5$), and this is manifested in - specialisation of labour, well defined hierarchy of authority, clearly defined responsibilities, systems of rules and procedures impersonality of relations, promotions based on technical qualifications and seniority, centralisation of authority etc.

In addition to the above, there were also found significant differences in deprivation of security ($t = 2.16$) and autonomy needs ($t = 1.68$) with non-technical subordinates perceiving higher deficiencies in both these categories vis-a-vis their counterparts in technical groups.

C) Leadership Styles and Needs in Relation to Job Tenure

Not so long ago there was a time when senior managers in corporations were older, wiser and more experienced people. Promotions were slower and the climb up the corporate ladder was slow and painstaking. Recently, however, the trend has changed. The younger people seem to be growing rapidly and lesser and lesser experienced people are reaching the top. This is probably so because the newer generation comes in straight at the level of first line management because of their more professional qualifications (eg. MBA’s, CA’s and Engineers). The older generation has usually grown slower because in many cases they have started at the rank and file levels and then been promoted upwards. These younger generation of managers seem to have different qualities of leadership as compared to the older generation. The nature of such differences between people with longer job tenures
and shorter job tenures was the subject of the next sub-group analysis undertaken in the present work, the results of which were presented in Table 12 and Table 13.

The more experienced managers were found to score more on Authoritarian ($t = 1.9$) and Bureaucratic styles ($t = 1.9$) as compared to the younger generation. With more experience they seem to lose some of their flexibility and become more rigid, authoritarian and bureaucratic in their ways.

On the need parameters under study, the younger boss showed significantly higher achievement drive than the older boss ($t = 1.77$). This is supported by Mohan (1973) who found a positive correlation between n.Ach and academic achievement. This is probably the reason why, as mentioned earlier, the younger generations seem to be climbing the corporate ladder more rapidly than the older stalwarts. There were also striking differences in need importance between these groups. The less experienced subordinates also perceive their bosses to be less authoritarian than their more experienced counterparts. This could be so because the younger, more immature, more dependency-prone subordinate would be in a better position to accept his boss's authority easily. Those subordinates with more years behind them, tend to view any use of authority as autocratic and authoritarian. The less experienced subordinates give less importance to security and social needs though there were no significant differences in deficiencies in these need areas. Thus, for the younger generation job security and social needs do not hold much importance. This reflects upon the changing values of society. Traditionally, job security was considered an important part of an individual's working life. The younger generation is now not concerned with long term security and is impatient in its desire to get ahead regardless of the risk of losing the job, or of social concerns at the work place. This is the probable reason why security and social needs are given less weightage by the younger generation as compared to the older generation.
OVERVIEW

On the whole, the younger generation seems to have more achievement drive, less authoritarianism and bureaucratism than the managers with longer job tenures. With more experience, managers of the older generation seem to lose some of their flexibility and n.Ach and tend to become more authoritarian and bureaucratic in their ways. There could be either of two reasons for thus, and perhaps there could be cases where both these reasons are valid.

The first one of these is that the younger generation has been through much more competition, more 'professionalism' and also a more modern educational process than the older, more experienced managers. This necessarily makes them higher in n.Ach and lower in F and B styles. The second explanation for this phenomenon is that the managers with more experience become more authoritarian and bureaucratic and lose some of the n.Ach they originally came with, as a result of age or even of disillusionment with the establishment.

In either case, the implications for management are clearly two fold. The first being that more experienced bosses need to be exposed to organisation and management development inputs such that their n.Ach may be enhanced and their authoritarian and bureaucratic orientation may be toned down. The second implications of these results is that managements need to encourage the infusion of young blood to vitalise their systems, while at the same time not discounting the wisdom of the experienced managers.

Younger subordinates have been shown to perceive their bosses as less authoritarian. The older ones find it more difficult to accept the leader’s use of authority and perceive them as more authoritarian. The younger subordinates also lay less emphasis on traditional values of job security.
V) Analysis Of Effectiveness (Style Adaptability)

What, from the results of this study is the emerging profile of the ‘high effectiveness’ boss? Before this issue is discussed, it may be appropriate to reiterate that according to Hersey and Blanchard (1972) ‘effectiveness’ of a leadership style refers to the appropriateness of that leadership style in relation to the task-relevant maturity of the group of subordinates. It is not to be mistaken with overall work efficiency or even goal attainment. This limited meaning of the term ‘effectiveness’ is the context in which this analysis has been undertaken.

Thus, the results of this study show that the high or very high effectiveness boss is significantly higher in n.Aff and n.Nur than the low or very low effectiveness bosses. This is reflected in significantly higher manifestations of Style 3, Participative, Nurturant-Task and Nurturant styles and significantly lower scores on Style 1 and Authoritarian Styles in the high and very high effectiveness groups as compared to the low and very low effectiveness groups.

When an individual is open to the socio emotional needs of a group, as a person, it seems to add to his sensitivity and ability to adapt to the demands of the situation. Historically, in the earlier part of this century it was the authoritarian style that was considered the only way to get work out of the employees. Such a boss was rigid, slave driving and single mindedly task oriented and subscribed to McGregor’s Theory X (1957). However, with the dawn of professional management there was gradually perceived an increasing emphasis on the feelings and needs of the workers as individuals and as a group. This new approach was labeled the ‘human relations approach’ or as Theory Y. Managers were increasingly oriented towards changing their attitudes to care for their subordinates and it was such a flexibility that was in general found to produce results. Thus, flexibility, or in
terms of the present work, adaptability of style, was found to go with higher amounts of affiliative and nurturant behavior. This is reflected in the results of the present study. Here, the relationship oriented needs as well as the relationship oriented leadership styles have both been found to the higher in persons with higher amounts of Style Adaptability. The needs are n.Aff and n.Nur, and the leadership styles are Style 3, N, P, and NT.

Conversely, a person who shows a lower amount of Style Adaptability, also shows a higher amount of Authoritarian and Style 2 behavior both of which are high in task orientation. This means that single minded task orientation makes a person rigid and insensitive to the demands of the situation.
III  OVERVIEW OF THE DISCUSSION CHAPTER

The foregoing pages have seen the interpretation of the results of the research undertaken. Broadly speaking, there were five areas in which this study focused.

The comparison of Indian classifications of styles of leadership, with Western thought, indicated that perhaps the concept of Nurturant or Nurturant Task leadership is not found in Western countries. The Need patterns as related to leadership styles suggested that n.Dom is related to Authoritarian behavior and that Task-orientation of managers is related to n.Ach. The analysis and interpretation of perceived leadership styles and need deficiencies in the subordinate indicated some interesting trends. The study of gaps in interpersonal perception indicated that there are large disparities between self ratings and subordinate ratings. Lastly, the subgroup analysis shed light on the nature of differences between different groups within the sample. In the Industry sector analysis, the MNC bosses were found to be more impersonal as compared to PUB bosses who are more affiliative. The technical bosses were found to be more bureaucratic. However, the non-technical subordinates perceive higher deficiency in security and autonomy areas. The differences in younger and older generations of bosses and subordinates served to reflect the changing values of society. In general younger bosses have more achievement drive and less bureaucratism. The younger subordinates find their bosses less authoritarian and also give less importance to security and esteem needs. Finally relationship oriented needs as well as relationship oriented leadership styles have been found to be higher in people with higher Style Adaptability.