

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN COMMERCE, IT & MANAGEMENT

ijrcm



A Monthly Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International e-Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories

Indexed & Listed at:

Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, ProQuest, U.S.A., EBSCO Publishing, U.S.A., Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A.

as well as in Open J-Gate, India [link of the same is duly available at infibnet of University Grants Commission (U.G.C.)]

Registered & Listed at: Index Copernicus Publishers Panel, Poland

Circulated all over the world & Google has verified that scholars of more than 1388 Cities in 138 countries/territories are visiting our journal on regular basis.

Ground Floor, Building No. 1041-C-1, Devi Bhawan Bazar, JAGADHRI – 135 003, Yamunanagar, Haryana, INDIA

www.ijrcm.org.in

CONTENTS

| Sr. No. | TITLE & NAME OF THE AUTHOR (S) | Page No. |
|---------|--|----------|
| 1. | CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT: A CASE STUDY OF BRITISH TELECOM BROADBAND CUSTOMERS HYDER KAMRAN & NITIN RAJ SRIVASTAVA | 1 |
| 2. | INFLUENCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE, SOCIAL INTERACTION AND DEMOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT: AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT OF TWO LEVELS OF EMPLOYEES OF SAUDI ARABIA DR. NASSER S. AL-KAHTANI | 7 |
| 3. | FINANCIAL DEREGULATIONS AND PRODUCTIVITY CHANGE IN PAKISTAN BANKING INDUSTRY RAFAQET ALI & MUHAMMAD AFZAL | 12 |
| 4. | BRILLIANT INTELLIGENCE AND INTERNAL MARKETING EFFECT ON ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR- STUDY OF EMPLOYEE IN HIGH TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY FENG-LI LIN, JUI-YING HUNG & KUO-SONG LU | 17 |
| 5. | AN IDENTIFICATION OF CRITICAL STRATEGIC SUCCESS FACTORS THAT MAKES ETHIOPIA ONE OF THE MOST ATTRACTIVE TOURIST DESTINATION DR. GETIE ANDUALEM IMIRU | 25 |
| 6. | BARRIERS TO KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT IMPLEMENTATION IN UNIVERSITIES ROYA DARABI & AHMAD GHASEMI | 32 |
| 7. | AN ASSESSMENT OF BANGLADESHI COMMERCIAL BANKS TREND TOWARDS UNIVERSAL BANKING MD. AL MAMUN | 37 |
| 8. | COMPARISON OF IMAGE ENHANCEMENT TECHNIQUES ABDUL RASAK ZUBAIR | 44 |
| 9. | STATIONARY DEMAND CURVE MODEL UNDER JUST IN TIME INVENTORY SYSTEM DR. KAVITA DAVE & DR. NITIN D. SHAH | 53 |
| 10. | A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP STYLES IN PUBLIC-SECTOR ENTERPRISES (A CASE STUDY OF BHARATH EARTH MOVERS LIMITED) K. V. GEETHA DEVI, DR. G. RAMA KRISHNA REDDY & DR. G. HARANATH | 55 |
| 11. | A STUDY ON CONSUMER AWARENESS, USAGE PENETRATION AND ADOPTION OF 3G MOBILE SERVICES IN INDIA SARIKA KHANNA & DR. NISHA AGARWAL | 64 |
| 12. | THE IMPACT OF WORKPLACE STRESS ON HEALTH: THE MEDIATING ROLE OF SPIRITUALITY IN THE WORKPLACE NAGALAKSHMI. P & DR. K. JAWAHAR RANI | 69 |
| 13. | EMPLOYMENT TO WOMEN IN INDIAN BEEDI INDUSTRY AN OPPORTUNITY OR THREAT: A CASE STUDY OF NIZAMABAD DISTRICT GIRISH KUMAR PAINOLI | 72 |
| 14. | CELEBRITY ADVERTISEMENT AND ITS IMPACT ON BUYING BEHAVIOUR DR. S. BANUMATHY & DR. M. SUBASINI | 76 |
| 15. | INFLUENCE OF PERSONALITY ON QUALITY OF WORK LIFE OF TEACHERS J. PARAMESWARI & DR. S. KADHIRAVAN | 79 |
| 16. | LEADERSHIP ENHANCEMENT THROUGH ASSESSMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (LEAD) AT ALPHA PHARMACEUTICALS INDIA PRIVATE LTD. DR. GOWRI JOSHI & DR. BHARATI DESHPANDE | 83 |
| 17. | ANALYSIS OF CUSTOMERS' PERCEPTION IN INDIAN BANKING SECTOR DR. ROSY KALRA | 86 |
| 18. | DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF EMPLOYEES IN INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY IN INDIA DR. DEEPAKSHI GUPTA | 93 |
| 19. | IMPACT OF ANIMATION ON CHILDREN J. J. SOUNDARARAJ & DR. D. V. S. JANAKIDAS | 98 |
| 20. | A CASE STUDY ON TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT WITH REFERENCE TO NUTRINE CONFECTIONERY COMPANY LTD., CHITTOOR (A.P) C. RAJANIKANTH | 109 |
| 21. | SHIFTING PARADIGMS IN TEACHING PEDAGOGY OF B-SCHOOLS PRITAM P. KOTHARI, AVINASH A. DHAVAN & SHIVGANGA C. MINDARGI | 116 |
| 22. | IMPERATIVES FOR GLOBAL RETAILERS EYEING INDIAN RETAIL MARKET- A STUDY OF WAL MART DR. SIDDHARATHA S BHARDWAJ & DR. MAMTA RANI | 122 |
| 23. | CUSTOMERS' PERCEPTION TOWARDS E-BANKING SERVICES OF THE COMMERCIAL BANKS IN CUDDALORE DISTRICT RAVICHANDRAN & DR. A. MURUGARATHINAM | 125 |
| 24. | CUSTOMER RETENTION CHALLENGES IN THE HYPERCOMPETITIVE INDIAN INDUSTRIES NIDHI KHURANA & AJEET KUMAR PATHAK | 128 |
| 25. | SERVICES INNOVATION INSIDE AND OUTSIDE OF THE ORGANIZATION WITH THE HELP OF ICT DR. RAJESH N. PAHURKAR | 133 |
| 26. | CREATING A SYSTEMATIC TRADING PLAN WITH AT THE MONEY CALENDAR CALL SPREAD IN NIFTY PRIYANKA VASHISHT | 137 |
| 27. | GENDER EMPOWERMENT IN PRACTICE: A CASE STUDY OF BHARAT COKING COAL LIMITED, DHANBAD DR. N. C. PAHARIYA & ABHINAV KUMAR SHRIVASTAVA | 143 |
| 28. | RETAIL STORE SELECTION CRITERIA USED BY CUSTOMERS IN DELHI-NCR: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE RETAILERS ANOOP KUMAR GUPTA | 147 |
| 29. | CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT IN TELECOM INDUSTRY – WITH REFERENCE TO BHARTI AIRTEL, ANDHRA PRADESH DR. K. RAJI REDDY, DR. D. THIRUVENGALA CHARY & SHATHABOINA. RAJU | 152 |
| 30. | INITIATIVE TAKEN TOWARDS RETAIL MARKETING IN INDIA WITH REFERENCE TO LUCKNOW CITY (U.P.), INDIA SMRITI SRIVASTAVA & RAJEEV GUPTA | 156 |
| | REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK | 161 |

CHIEF PATRON

PROF. K. K. AGGARWAL

Chancellor, Lingaya's University, Delhi
Founder Vice-Chancellor, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University, Delhi
Ex. Pro Vice-Chancellor, Guru Jambheshwar University, Hisar

PATRON

SH. RAM BHAJAN AGGARWAL

Ex. State Minister for Home & Tourism, Government of Haryana
Vice-President, Dadri Education Society, Charkhi Dadri
President, Chinar Syntex Ltd. (Textile Mills), Bhiwani

CO-ORDINATOR

AMITA

Faculty, Government M. S., Mohali

ADVISORS

DR. PRIYA RANJAN TRIVEDI

Chancellor, The Global Open University, Nagaland

PROF. M. S. SENAM RAJU

Director A. C. D., School of Management Studies, I.G.N.O.U., New Delhi

PROF. M. N. SHARMA

Chairman, M.B.A., Haryana College of Technology & Management, Kaithal

PROF. S. L. MAHANDRU

Principal (Retd.), Maharaja Agrasen College, Jagadhri

EDITOR

PROF. R. K. SHARMA

Professor, Bharti Vidyapeeth University Institute of Management & Research, New Delhi

CO-EDITOR

DR. BHAVET

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

DR. RAJESH MODI

Faculty, Yanbu Industrial College, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

PROF. SANJIV MITTAL

University School of Management Studies, Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

PROF. ANIL K. SAINI

Chairperson (CRC), Guru Gobind Singh I. P. University, Delhi

DR. SAMBHAVNA

Faculty, I.I.T.M., Delhi

DR. MOHENDER KUMAR GUPTA

Associate Professor, P. J. L. N. Government College, Faridabad

DR. SHIVAKUMAR DEENE

Asst. Professor, Dept. of Commerce, School of Business Studies, Central University of Karnataka, Gulbarga

MOHITA

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

PROF. NAWAB ALI KHAN

Department of Commerce, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, U.P.

PROF. ABHAY BANSAL

Head, Department of Information Technology, Amity School of Engineering & Technology, Amity University, Noida

PROF. A. SURYANARAYANA

Department of Business Management, Osmania University, Hyderabad

DR. ASHOK KUMAR

Head, Department of Electronics, D. A. V. College (Lahore), Ambala City

DR. SAMBHAV GARG

Faculty, M. M. Institute of Management, Maharishi Markandeshwar University, Mullana, Ambala, Haryana

PROF. V. SELVAM

SSL, VIT University, Vellore

DR. PARDEEP AHLAWAT

Reader, Institute of Management Studies & Research, Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak

S. TABASSUM SULTANA

Associate Professor, Department of Business Management, Matrusr Institute of P.G. Studies, Hyderabad

SURJEET SINGH

Asst. Professor, Department of Computer Science, G. M. N. (P.G.) College, Ambala Cantt.

TECHNICAL ADVISOR

AMITA

Faculty, Government H. S., Mohali

MOHITA

Faculty, Yamuna Institute of Engineering & Technology, Village Gadholi, P. O. Gadholi, Yamunanagar

FINANCIAL ADVISORS

DICKIN GOYAL

Advocate & Tax Adviser, Panchkula

NEENA

Investment Consultant, Chambaghat, Solan, Himachal Pradesh

LEGAL ADVISORS

JITENDER S. CHAHAL

Advocate, Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh U.T.

CHANDER BHUSHAN SHARMA

Advocate & Consultant, District Courts, Yamunanagar at Jagadhri

SUPERINTENDENT

SURENDER KUMAR POONIA

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We invite unpublished novel, original, empirical and high quality research work pertaining to recent developments & practices in the area of Computer, Business, Finance, Marketing, Human Resource Management, General Management, Banking, Insurance, Corporate Governance and emerging paradigms in allied subjects like Accounting Education; Accounting Information Systems; Accounting Theory & Practice; Auditing; Behavioral Accounting; Behavioral Economics; Corporate Finance; Cost Accounting; Econometrics; Economic Development; Economic History; Financial Institutions & Markets; Financial Services; Fiscal Policy; Government & Non Profit Accounting; Industrial Organization; International Economics & Trade; International Finance; Macro Economics; Micro Economics; Monetary Policy; Portfolio & Security Analysis; Public Policy Economics; Real Estate; Regional Economics; Tax Accounting; Advertising & Promotion Management; Business Education; Management Information Systems (MIS); Business Law, Public Responsibility & Ethics; Communication; Direct Marketing; E-Commerce; Global Business; Health Care Administration; Labor Relations & Human Resource Management; Marketing Research; Marketing Theory & Applications; Non-Profit Organizations; Office Administration/Management; Operations Research/Statistics; Organizational Behavior & Theory; Organizational Development; Production/Operations; Public Administration; Purchasing/Materials Management; Retailing; Sales/Selling; Services; Small Business Entrepreneurship; Strategic Management Policy; Technology/Innovation; Tourism, Hospitality & Leisure; Transportation/Physical Distribution; Algorithms; Artificial Intelligence; Compilers & Translation; Computer Aided Design (CAD); Computer Aided Manufacturing; Computer Graphics; Computer Organization & Architecture; Database Structures & Systems; Digital Logic; Discrete Structures; Internet; Management Information Systems; Modeling & Simulation; Multimedia; Neural Systems/Neural Networks; Numerical Analysis/Scientific Computing; Object Oriented Programming; Operating Systems; Programming Languages; Robotics; Symbolic & Formal Logic and Web Design. The above mentioned tracks are only indicative, and not exhaustive.

Anybody can submit the soft copy of his/her manuscript **anytime** in M.S. Word format after preparing the same as per our submission guidelines duly available on our website under the heading guidelines for submission, at the email addresses: infoijrcm@gmail.com or info@ijrcm.org.in.

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT

1. COVERING LETTER FOR SUBMISSION:

DATED: _____

THE EDITOR
IJRCM

Subject: SUBMISSION OF MANUSCRIPT IN THE AREA OF _____.

(e.g. Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/Economics/Psychology/Law/Computer/IT/Engineering/Mathematics/other. **please specify**)

DEAR SIR/MADAM

Please find my submission of manuscript entitled ' _____ ' for possible publication in your journals.

I hereby affirm that the contents of this manuscript are original. Furthermore, it has neither been published elsewhere in any language fully or partly, nor is it under review for publication elsewhere.

I affirm that all the author (s) have seen and agreed to the submitted version of the manuscript and their inclusion of name (s) as co-author (s).

Also, if my/our manuscript is accepted, I/We agree to comply with the formalities as given on the website of the journal & you are free to publish our contribution in any of your journals.

NAME OF CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Designation:

Affiliation with full address, contact numbers & Pin Code:

Residential address with Pin Code:

Mobile Number (s):

Landline Number (s):

E-mail Address:

Alternate E-mail Address:

NOTES:

- a) The whole manuscript is required to be in **ONE MS WORD FILE** only (pdf. version is liable to be rejected without any consideration), which will start from the covering letter, inside the manuscript.
- b) The sender is required to mention the following in the **SUBJECT COLUMN** of the mail:
New Manuscript for Review in the area of (Finance/Marketing/HRM/General Management/Economics/Psychology/Law/Computer/IT/Engineering/Mathematics/other, please specify)
- c) There is no need to give any text in the body of mail, except the cases where the author wishes to give any specific message w.r.t. to the manuscript.
- d) The total size of the file containing the manuscript is required to be below **500 KB**.
- e) Abstract alone will not be considered for review, and the author is required to submit the complete manuscript in the first instance.
- f) The journal gives acknowledgement w.r.t. the receipt of every email and in case of non-receipt of acknowledgment from the journal, w.r.t. the submission of manuscript, within two days of submission, the corresponding author is required to demand for the same by sending separate mail to the journal.

2. **MANUSCRIPT TITLE:** The title of the paper should be in a 12 point Calibri Font. It should be bold typed, centered and fully capitalised.

3. **AUTHOR NAME (S) & AFFILIATIONS:** The author (s) **full name, designation, affiliation (s), address, mobile/landline numbers**, and **email/alternate email address** should be in italic & 11-point Calibri Font. It must be centered underneath the title.

4. **ABSTRACT:** Abstract should be in fully italicized text, not exceeding 250 words. The abstract must be informative and explain the background, aims, methods, results & conclusion in a single para. Abbreviations must be mentioned in full.

5. **KEYWORDS:** Abstract must be followed by a list of keywords, subject to the maximum of five. These should be arranged in alphabetic order separated by commas and full stops at the end.
6. **MANUSCRIPT:** Manuscript must be in **BRITISH ENGLISH** prepared on a standard A4 size **PORTRAIT SETTING PAPER**. It must be prepared on a single space and single column with 1" margin set for top, bottom, left and right. It should be typed in 8 point Calibri Font with page numbers at the bottom and centre of every page. It should be free from grammatical, spelling and punctuation errors and must be thoroughly edited.
7. **HEADINGS:** All the headings should be in a 10 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised. Leave a blank line before each heading.
8. **SUB-HEADINGS:** All the sub-headings should be in a 8 point Calibri Font. These must be bold-faced, aligned left and fully capitalised.
9. **MAIN TEXT:** The main text should follow the following sequence:

INTRODUCTION

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

NEED/IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

OBJECTIVES

HYPOTHESES

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

FINDINGS

RECOMMENDATIONS/SUGGESTIONS

CONCLUSIONS

SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

APPENDIX/ANNEXURE

It should be in a 8 point Calibri Font, single spaced and justified. The manuscript should preferably not exceed **5000 WORDS**.

10. **FIGURES & TABLES:** These should be simple, crystal clear, centered, separately numbered & self explained, and **titles must be above the table/figure**. **Sources of data should be mentioned below the table/figure**. It should be ensured that the tables/figures are referred to from the main text.
11. **EQUATIONS:** These should be consecutively numbered in parentheses, horizontally centered with equation number placed at the right.
12. **REFERENCES:** The list of all references should be alphabetically arranged. The author (s) should mention only the actually utilised references in the preparation of manuscript and they are supposed to follow **Harvard Style of Referencing**. The author (s) are supposed to follow the references as per the following:
 - All works cited in the text (including sources for tables and figures) should be listed alphabetically.
 - Use (ed.) for one editor, and (ed.s) for multiple editors.
 - When listing two or more works by one author, use --- (20xx), such as after Kohl (1997), use --- (2001), etc, in chronologically ascending order.
 - Indicate (opening and closing) page numbers for articles in journals and for chapters in books.
 - The title of books and journals should be in italics. Double quotation marks are used for titles of journal articles, book chapters, dissertations, reports, working papers, unpublished material, etc.
 - For titles in a language other than English, provide an English translation in parentheses.
 - The location of endnotes within the text should be indicated by superscript numbers.

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING FOR STYLE AND PUNCTUATION IN REFERENCES:

BOOKS

- Bowersox, Donald J., Closs, David J., (1996), "Logistical Management." Tata McGraw, Hill, New Delhi.
- Hunker, H.L. and A.J. Wright (1963), "Factors of Industrial Location in Ohio" Ohio State University, Nigeria.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOOKS

- Sharma T., Kwatra, G. (2008) Effectiveness of Social Advertising: A Study of Selected Campaigns, Corporate Social Responsibility, Edited by David Crowther & Nicholas Capaldi, Ashgate Research Companion to Corporate Social Responsibility, Chapter 15, pp 287-303.

JOURNAL AND OTHER ARTICLES

- Schemenner, R.W., Huber, J.C. and Cook, R.L. (1987), "Geographic Differences and the Location of New Manufacturing Facilities," Journal of Urban Economics, Vol. 21, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

CONFERENCE PAPERS

- Garg, Sambhav (2011): "Business Ethics" Paper presented at the Annual International Conference for the All India Management Association, New Delhi, India, 19–22 June.

UNPUBLISHED DISSERTATIONS AND THESES

- Kumar S. (2011): "Customer Value: A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Customers," Thesis, Kurukshetra University, Kurukshetra.

ONLINE RESOURCES

- Always indicate the date that the source was accessed, as online resources are frequently updated or removed.

WEBSITE

- Garg, Bhavet (2011): Towards a New Natural Gas Policy, Political Weekly, Viewed on January 01, 2012 <http://epw.in/user/viewabstract.jsp>

A STUDY OF LEADERSHIP STYLES IN PUBLIC-SECTOR ENTERPRISES (A CASE STUDY OF BHARATH EARTH MOVERS LIMITED)

K. V. GEETHA DEVI
ASST. PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE & MANAGEMENT
SRKPG COLLEGE
NANDYAL

DR. G. RAMA KRISHNA REDDY
PRINCIPAL
SRKPG COLLEGE
NANDYAL

DR. G. HARANATH
ASST. PROFESSOR
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
YOGI VEMANA UNIVERSITY
KADAPA

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to study the differences in the leadership styles as perceived by the leaders and sub-ordinates in a public-sector enterprise. The study has revealed that differences do exist in the five leadership styles viz., authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant, as perceived by the leader himself and perceived by the subordinates in Bharath Earth Movers Limited (BEML).

KEYWORDS

Authoritarian leadership style, Participative leadership style, Bureaucratic leadership style, Task-oriented leadership style, Nurturing leadership styles.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership means many things to many people, which is due to the changing role of leaders in different environment and in different settings ranging from leadership of the family to the top positions in multinational organizations. However, the essentials of leadership are the same to all leaders in all positions. Nevertheless, due to the variation in the skills required, roles played, functions performed, issues tackled and the relationships promoted, different leaders have varying perceptions of leadership. Theoreticians and practitioners of leadership have gone to the extent of developing the 'contingency approach', which emphasizes that there is 'no single best way' to lead people.

CONCEPT OF LEADERSHIP

There are as many definitions of leadership as there are scholars, who have attempted to analyze and understand the concept, but there is no universally accepted definition of it, despite the fact that there are about 33,000 articles and books have been written about it in the 20th century. Leadership is a process of influencing the behaviour, beliefs and feelings of the members of a group. The functions of leadership however, cover wide range of activities like coordinating, decision-making, policymaking, group representing, controlling and arbitrating. Leadership, not being a single phenomenon, is affected by many variables and requires several skills like technical, human, conceptual, designing, creative, communicative and decision making. The main aspect of influencing people by a leader is the power, which has many sources. The leadership effectiveness covers the personality of the leader, his past experience, expectations of superiors, characteristics of subordinates, requirements of the task, and the organisational climate and policies. A common characteristic that can be found in many of the definitions is the 'influence', exerted by the leader. That is, he tries to influence the behaviour of others in a specific direction. The trait theory has been put to rigorous research by Byrd et.al., and has resulted in the development of behavioral theory. Likert's system 4 theory, McGregor X and Y theory and Continuum theory of Tannenbaum and Schmidt has opened new vistas on the behavioral dimensions of leadership. The confusion and controversy of trait and behavioral theories have given way to the contingency models of leadership like Fiedler's contingency model, Vroom and Yetton's contingency model, path goal theory, life cycle theory, tri-dimensional model, learning model.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Before discuss the leadership styles in the select organization, some of the important studies conducted by the researchers are presented hereunder: Mullen (1965) compared the leadership styles of managers in three divisions of a large automobile insurance company, and its relationship to each division's efficiency and effectiveness. Each manager showed a distinct leadership style: one was democratic, another laissez faire, and the third was authoritarian. It was concluded that all three divisions were operating at an equally high rate of efficiency and therefore measures of effectiveness did not show any difference between divisions.

Rensis Likert (1967) and his associates of the University of Michigan have developed four leadership systems of management: exploitative autocratic (system 1) benevolent autocratic (system 2), participative (system 3), and democratic (system 4). On the basis of intensive research, Likert has concluded that high producing departments in several organizations were followed by system 4 (democratic) leadership form of management.

Sinha and Chowdhary (1969) have studied 165 male executives in the State of Bihar, to test the effectiveness of leadership style. They have concluded that for less prepared subordinates, nurturant task leadership style is expected to be used more often and with greater effectiveness. Whereas, in case of better prepared subordinates, participative leadership style is anticipated to be effectively employed and an authoritarian leader is considered to be ineffective.

Sinha (1976) in his study hypothesized that before an organization achieves moderate degree of productivity, it requires nurturant-task style of leadership which can move employees towards harder efforts and work commitment. Once moderate level of productivity is achieved and the normative structure of the organization is interjected in the employees, then the organization is ready for the participative style of management.

Based on the study of 280 managers from two public-sector and four private-sector units, Singh and Das (1977) found that "bureaucratic" style was the most predominant, followed by the style 'benevolent autocrat', 'developer', and 'democratic' styles of leadership. They highlighted that leadership style was

associated with the type of organization, executives' age group, their level in the organization and their exposure to management programmes. In the public sector, leadership style was in the order of 'compromiser', 'developer', and 'autocratic' style. Whereas, in case of private sector organizations 'benevolent autocracy' was followed by the 'bureaucratic', 'democratic' and 'developer' styles. Hierarchy-wise, top-level managers were more 'benevolent autocrats' followed by 'democratic' and 'developer' in behaviour. At the organization level, the middle and lower level managers are more towards 'bureaucratic' followed by the 'benevolent autocrat' category. In case of age factor consideration, aged managers are more 'benevolent autocratic', followed by 'developer', 'bureaucratic' and 'democratic' leaders; whereas, the young executives are more democratic followed by 'benevolent autocratic' and 'bureaucratic'. The executives who are exposed to formal management education are more democratic as compared to those who do not have such exposure.

Sinha and Sinha (1977) noted in their study that the nurturing leaders were close to the authoritarian leaders is being strict, in pushing their ideas through, and in controlling other ideas and activities. The nurturing leaders were close to the participative ones in encouraging the members, giving due consideration to their ideas, and yet maintaining control over them.

Through a study of 120 managers, Jaggi (1978) observed in his analysis that prevailing leadership styles were between 'benevolent autocracy' and 'consultative' type, and the leadership style was associated with various factors such as the age of the executives, their position, functions and size of the organization. Younger managers and managers in larger-sized companies were less authoritarian than the managers in production and technical areas.

Singh (1979) studied 100 managers of public sector enterprises and concluded that 3 per cent of the managers adapted democratic style, 7 per cent autocratic style, 23 percent compromiser style, 31 percent bureaucratic style and 21 percent developer style. He found that differences in the leadership styles were due to the procedural rigidity in the public sector enterprises.

Muthayya and Vijaya Kumar (1985), by taking a sample of 68 scientific personnel belonging to different research institutions, identified five styles, viz., directive, negotiate, consultative, participative and delegate styles. The study indicated that the predominant style is 'directive' followed by 'delegate' and participative.

Singh and Pandey (1986) conducted a study to explain the pattern of relationship among three leadership styles (participative, authoritarian and authoritative) with different strategies of control, need-satisfaction and commitment with the organization. The study concluded that the participative style leads to greater need-satisfaction and organisational commitment, and authoritative style is closer to participative leadership but it does not lead to commitment. The study also brought out that participative and authoritative are positive styles of leadership.

Omer Bin Sayeed (1990) attempted in his study to examine the conflict-handling strategies, leadership behaviour and style in a common framework. The study was conducted on 79 middle level managers who were undergoing various training programmes at National Institute for Training in Industrial Engineering, Bombay. It was found that conflict management strategies represented two main conflict management styles, viz., Reciprocal Problem Solving Style and Authoritative System Supported Style, which tended to relate selectively with five leadership dimensions. Reciprocal conflict management style significantly related with Participative, Nurturant, and Task-oriented leadership behavior, while Authoritative Conflict Management Style had significant relationship with authoritarian and bureaucratic leadership style.

Panchanatham et. al. (1993) attempted to explore the leadership and problem solving styles of executives of public sector organizations. They opined that the executives dominantly used democratic, authoritative and coaching styles of leadership. There were no significant relationships between leadership styles and problem solving styles. The study suggested that the organization should design separate training programmes on problem solving and leadership styles and the executives of different branches should be considered equally for developmental programmes.

Syed Vazith Hussain (2002) sought to analyze the different leadership styles in small scale industries at micro level. He identified five styles, viz., benevolent, autocrat, consultative, democratic and delegation. He collected data from 98 owner-managers of small scale industries and concluded that owner-managers are adopting different styles depending upon the situation even though they are free from adopting any style. The results of the study strongly confirm the view that leadership is situational and effective leader should be flexible enough to adopt at different situations.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

From the foregoing studies it can be said that the success and failure of any organization is attributed to the effectiveness of leadership. Thus, the leadership has become indispensable and managers are to be replaced by leaders, despite the argument that leadership is dispensable by another school of thought. As such, the topic of leadership has occasioned research studies without limit, and new dimensions are added to leadership theory and practice. The present study attempts to analyze different styles of leadership and its perceptions by their subordinates.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Against this backdrop, the specific objectives of the study are:

- (i) To identify the differences in leadership styles as perceived by the leaders in BEML.
- (ii) To find out the differences in leadership styles as perceived by the subordinates.
- (iii) To find out the differences in leadership styles as perceived by the leaders and the subordinates in the company.

HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses formulated for the study are as follows:

1. There is no significant difference in the leadership styles at the inter levels.
2. There is no significant difference in the leadership styles in the inter levels as perceived by their subordinates.
3. There is no significant difference in the leadership styles as perceived by the leader himself and those perceived by his subordinates.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

(i) SELECTION OF THE SAMPLE

The study is based on the primary data collected from the employees of BEML. The data was collected from seven hierarchical levels of officers' viz., Deputy General Manager, Assistant General Manager, Senior Manager, Managers, Assistant Managers, Engineers and Assistant Engineers from different departments of the selected organization. By adopting simple random sampling, from each level of officers 50 per cent were drawn as the sample and the total respondents for the study consisted of 399 out of 784 officers of BEML as follows.

| Designation | Grade | Number of Officers | Samples drawn |
|---------------------------|-------|--------------------|---------------|
| Deputy General Manager | VII | 16 | 8 |
| Assistant General Manager | VI | 31 | 16 |
| Senior Manager | V | 47 | 24 |
| Manager | IV | 95 | 48 |
| Assistant Manager | III | 173 | 88 |
| Engineers | II | 232 | 118 |
| Assistant Engineers | I | 190 | 97 |
| Total | | 784 | 399 |

(ii) COLLECTION OF DATA

In the present study, three questionnaires were used to collect the data. Questionnaire I was designed to elicit the information relating to the socio-economic and organizational position variables viz., name, age, designation, experience and educational qualifications. Questionnaire II, leader satisfaction score (Sinha

1980) which was administered to officers with a view to judging their own leadership styles, and Questionnaire III was designed to measure the leader's style as perceived by his subordinates (Leader Behaviour Score) among officers. Both II and III questionnaires consisted of 50 items each to measure five leadership styles, viz., authoritative, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturing and each of these categories consisted of 10 items. The collected responses were solicited on a 5-point scale, ranging from Quite True (5), True (4), Doubtful (3), False (2), Quite False (1).

The leadership styles were measured in two ways i.e., as perceived by the leader himself (Leader's Self Perception) and as perceived by his immediate subordinates (Subordinate's Perception of Superior Styles). For the analyses of leadership styles of the DGM, AGM, SM, M, AM and E level officers, the leader's self perception (Questionnaire-II) was used and in analyzing the styles of AGM, SM, M, AM, E and AE level employees, the subordinate's perception of the superior styles (Questionnaire-III) was used.

The Questionnaires supplied to each category of officers are: for AGM, SM, M, AM, M, AM and E level officers the questionnaires used are Questionnaire I, Questionnaire II, Questionnaire III; for DGM level officers Questionnaire I, Questionnaire II; and for AE level officers the Questionnaire I, Questionnaire III served.

TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS

The data collected through the questionnaires were processed and the hypotheses were tested through appropriate statistical tools, viz., mean, standard deviation and 't' test.

ANALYSIS ON LEADERSHIP STYLES IN BEML

The presentation and discussion of the data on leadership styles pertains to the different groups in the select organization is presented as under:

GROUP I

The difference between the leadership styles at inter levels of officers viz., Deputy General Managers and Assistant General Managers; Assistant General Managers and Senior Managers; Senior Managers and Managers; Managers and Assistant Managers; Assistant Managers and Engineers is discussed in group I category.

GROUP II

The difference between the leadership styles at inter-levels of officers as perceived by their subordinates is presented in group II category.

GROUP III

The difference between the leadership styles as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by his immediate subordinates is explained in group III category. With a view to finding out the differences among the five levels of managers viz., (1) Deputy General Managers and Assistant General Managers; (2) Assistant General Managers and Senior Managers; (3) Senior Managers and Managers; (4) Managers and Assistant Managers; and (5) Assistant Managers and Engineers of BEML in self-perception about their leadership styles and as perceived by subordinates, mean and standard deviations were computed. Further, with an intent to find out significant difference between the five levels 't' test was computed.

GROUP I. LEADERSHIP STYLES OF OFFICERS IN SELF PERCEPTION ABOUT THEIR STYLES

A. The difference between leadership styles of Deputy General Managers and Assistant General Managers self perception, is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGERS AND ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGERS

| Sl. No. | Leadership Styles | Deputy General Managers | | | Assistant General Managers | | | 't' value |
|---------|-------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 30.3 | 8 | 6.9 | 31.0 | 16 | 7.2 | 0.1 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 44.0 | 8 | 4.8 | 42.6 | 16 | 5.5 | 0.6 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 37.4 | 8 | 9.9 | 38.8 | 16 | 4.1 | 0.4 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 44.3 | 8 | 4.1 | 40.5 | 16 | 5.7 | 1.9 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 47.0 | 8 | 2.1 | 43.9 | 16 | 5.6 | 2.0 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of participative, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Deputy General Managers than Assistant General Managers, whereas mean values of authoritarian and bureaucratic styles are higher for Assistant General Managers than Deputy General Managers. In the authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles, the Deputy General Managers and the Assistant General Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.080, $P < 0.05$; P0.631, $P < 0.05$; B0.374, $P < 0.05$; T1.850, $P < 0.05$ and N1.969, $P < 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in leadership styles at inter levels self perception" is accepted.

B. The Leadership Styles of Assistant General Managers and Senior Managers in self perception about their styles, is shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGERS AND SENIOR MANAGERS

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Assistant General Managers | | | Senior Managers | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|----------------------------|----|--------------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 31.0 | 16 | 7.2 | 33.0 | 24 | 6.9 | 0.9 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 42.6 | 16 | 5.5 | 40.0 | 24 | 3.8 | 1.1 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 38.8 | 16 | 4.1 | 33.6 | 24 | 9.0 | 2.5 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 40.5 | 16 | 5.7 | 38.9 | 24 | 3.9 | 1.0 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 43.8 | 16 | 5.6 | 40.8 | 24 | 4.5 | 1.8 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Assistant General Managers than Senior Managers, whereas mean values of authoritarian style is higher for Senior Managers than Assistant General Managers. In authoritarian, participative, task-oriented and nurturant styles, the Assistant General Managers and the Senior Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.869, $P < 0.05$; P1.056, $P < 0.05$; T0.966, $P < 0.05$ and N1.827, $P < 0.05$). In bureaucratic style, the Assistant General Managers and the Senior Managers differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical value (B2.462, $P > 0.05$). Hence, there is significant difference in different leadership styles of Assistant General Managers and Senior Managers.

C. The Leadership Styles of Senior Managers and Managers, is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SENIOR MANAGERS AND MANAGERS

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Senior Managers | | | Managers | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|----------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritative (A) | 33.0 | 24 | 6.9 | 31.6 | 48 | 8.9 | 0.7 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 40.0 | 24 | 3.8 | 40.9 | 48 | 4.9 | 0.9 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 33.6 | 24 | 9.0 | 36.0 | 48 | 7.6 | 1.2 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 38.9 | 24 | 3.9 | 40.5 | 48 | 4.1 | 1.6 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 40.8 | 24 | 4.5 | 41.6 | 48 | 3.5 | 0.8 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of authoritative style is higher for Senior Managers than Managers, whereas mean values of participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Managers than Senior Managers. In authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles, the Senior Managers and the Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.740, $P<0.05$; P0.873, $P<0.05$; B1.149, $P<0.05$; T1.550, $P<0.05$ and N0.764, $P<0.05$). Therefore, there is no significant difference among different leadership styles in the inter levels of Senior Managers and Managers.

D. The Leadership Styles of Managers and Assistant Managers, is shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF MANAGERS AND ASSISTANT MANAGERS

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Managers | | | Assistant Managers | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|----------|----|--------------------|--------------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritative (A) | 31.6 | 48 | 8.9 | 32.2 | 88 | 6.6 | 0.4 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 40.9 | 48 | 4.9 | 40.6 | 88 | 5.1 | 0.4 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 36.0 | 48 | 7.6 | 38.2 | 88 | 6.4 | 1.7 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 40.5 | 48 | 4.1 | 41.3 | 88 | 3.4 | 1.2 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 41.6 | 48 | 3.5 | 41.2 | 88 | 2.9 | 0.7 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of participative and nurturant styles are higher for Managers than Assistant Managers, whereas mean values of authoritative, bureaucratic and task-oriented styles are higher for Assistant Managers than Managers. In authoritative, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles, the Managers and the Assistant Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.443, $P<0.05$; P0.432, $P<0.05$; B1.696, $P<0.05$; T1.158, $P<0.05$ and N0.685, $P<0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference among different leadership styles in the inter levels of Managers and Assistant Managers" is accepted.

E. The Leadership Styles of Assistant Managers and Engineers is shown in Table 5.

TABLE 5: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ASSISTANT MANAGERS AND ENGINEERS

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Assistant Managers | | | Engineers | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|--------------------|----|--------------------|-----------|-----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 32.2 | 88 | 6.6 | 34.8 | 118 | 6.6 | 2.7 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 40.5 | 88 | 5.1 | 39.3 | 118 | 6.3 | 1.6 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 38.2 | 88 | 6.4 | 39.6 | 118 | 5.8 | 1.6 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 41.3 | 88 | 3.4 | 40.4 | 118 | 4.6 | 1.6 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 41.2 | 88 | 2.9 | 42.1 | 118 | 3.7 | 1.9 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of participative and task-oriented styles are higher for Assistant Managers than Engineers, whereas mean values of authoritative, bureaucratic and nurturant styles are higher for Engineers than Assistant Managers. In authoritative, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles, the Managers and the Assistant Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A2.737, $P<0.05$; P1.608, $P<0.05$; B1.638, $P<0.05$; T1.594, $P<0.05$ and N1.861, $P<0.05$). In authoritative style, the Managers and Assistant Managers differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical value (A2.737, $P>0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference among different leadership styles in the inter levels of Assistant Managers and Engineers" is rejected.

GROUP II. THE LEADERSHIP STYLES OF OFFICERS AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

A. Leadership Styles of Deputy General Managers and Assistant General Managers as perceived by their subordinates, is shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGERS AND ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGERS AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Deputy General Managers | | | Assistant General Managers | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|-------------------------|----|--------------------|----------------------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 24.1 | 16 | 6.5 | 32.5 | 24 | 7.7 | 3.7 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 40.6 | 16 | 6.6 | 33.8 | 24 | 6.3 | 3.3 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 38.4 | 16 | 4.9 | 35.7 | 24 | 4.7 | 1.7 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 39.8 | 16 | 6.4 | 36.4 | 24 | 4.6 | 1.8 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 42.0 | 16 | 4.4 | 38.7 | 24 | 3.8 | 2.5 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Deputy General Managers than Assistant General Managers, whereas mean value of authoritative style is higher for Assistant General Managers than Deputy General Managers. In bureaucratic and task-oriented styles, the Deputy General Managers and Assistant General Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (B1.743, $P<0.05$ and T1.792, $P<0.05$). In authoritative, participative and nurturant styles, the Deputy General Managers and Assistant General Managers differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical value (A3.709, $P<0.05$; P3.247, $P<0.05$ and N2.460, $P<0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference among different leadership styles in the inter levels as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

B. Leadership Styles of Assistant General Managers and Senior Managers as perceived by their subordinates, is given in Table 7.

TABLE 7: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGERS AND SENIOR MANAGERS AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Assistant General Managers | | | Senior Managers | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|----------------------------|----|--------------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritative (A) | 32.5 | 24 | 7.7 | 31.4 | 48 | 7.6 | 0.6 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 33.8 | 24 | 6.3 | 37.3 | 48 | 6.4 | 2.2 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 35.7 | 24 | 4.7 | 35.5 | 48 | 6.4 | 0.2 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 36.5 | 24 | 4.6 | 37.0 | 48 | 6.1 | 0.5 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 38.7 | 24 | 3.8 | 38.7 | 48 | 5.8 | 1.0 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of authoritative and bureaucratic styles are higher for Assistant General Managers than Senior Managers, whereas mean values of participative and task-oriented styles are higher for Senior Managers than Assistant General Managers. The mean value of nurturant style is equal in Assistant General Managers and Senior Managers. In authoritative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles, the Assistant General Managers and the Senior Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.563, $P<0.05$; B0.157, $P<0.05$; T0.485, $P<0.05$ and N1.00, $P<0.05$). In participative style, the Assistant General Managers and the Senior Managers differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (P2.157, $P>0.05$).

Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference among different leadership styles in the inter levels of officers as perceived by their subordinates" is accepted.

C. Leadership Styles of Senior Managers and Managers as perceived by their subordinates, is shown in Table 8.

TABLE 8: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SENIOR MANAGERS AND MANAGERS AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Senior Managers | | | Managers | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|-----------------|----|--------------------|----------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritative (A) | 31.4 | 48 | 7.6 | 32.4 | 88 | 7.9 | 0.7 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 37.3 | 48 | 6.4 | 35.8 | 88 | 8.5 | 1.1 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 35.5 | 48 | 6.4 | 36.6 | 88 | 5.4 | 1.1 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 37.0 | 48 | 6.0 | 36.7 | 88 | 7.4 | 0.3 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 38.7 | 48 | 5.8 | 36.9 | 88 | 7.7 | 1.5 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of participative, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Senior Managers than Managers, whereas mean values of authoritative and bureaucratic styles are higher for Managers than Senior Managers. In authoritative, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles, the Senior Managers and Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.686, $P < 0.05$; P1.143, $P < 0.05$; B1.066, $P < 0.05$; T0.28, $P < 0.05$ and N1.54, $P < 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference among different leadership styles in the inter levels of officers as perceived by their subordinates" is accepted.

C. Leadership Styles of Managers and Assistant Managers as perceived by their subordinates, is shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF MANAGERS AND ASSISTANT MANAGERS AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl. No. | Leadership Styles | Managers | | | Assistant Managers | | | 't' value |
|---------|-------------------|----------|----|--------------------|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 32.4 | 88 | 7.9 | 31.6 | 118 | 8.3 | 0.7 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 35.8 | 88 | 8.5 | 35.1 | 118 | 6.9 | 0.6 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 36.6 | 88 | 5.4 | 37.1 | 118 | 4.7 | 0.6 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 36.7 | 88 | 7.4 | 37.6 | 118 | 5.4 | 0.9 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 36.9 | 88 | 7.6 | 39.5 | 118 | 5.5 | 2.8 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of authoritative and participative styles are higher for Managers than Assistant Managers, whereas mean values of task-oriented, nurturant and bureaucratic styles are higher for Assistant Managers than Managers. In authoritative, participative, bureaucratic, and task-oriented styles, the Managers and Assistant Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.667, $P < 0.05$; P0.602, $P < 0.05$; B0.622, $P < 0.05$ and T0.91, $P < 0.05$). In nurturant style, the Managers and Assistant Managers differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical value (N2.764, $P > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference among different leadership styles in the inter levels of officers as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

D. Leadership Styles of Assistant Managers and Engineers as perceived by their subordinates, is shown in Table 10.

TABLE 10: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ASSISTANT MANAGERS AND ENGINEERS AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Assistant Managers | | | Engineers | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|--------------------|-----|--------------------|-----------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 31.6 | 118 | 8.3 | 31.9 | 97 | 8.8 | 0.3 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 35.1 | 118 | 6.9 | 35.6 | 97 | 7.3 | 0.5 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 37.1 | 118 | 4.7 | 34.5 | 97 | 6.5 | 3.3 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 37.6 | 118 | 5.4 | 38.3 | 97 | 6.0 | 0.9 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 39.5 | 118 | 5.5 | 37.9 | 97 | 7.1 | 1.8 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Mean values of bureaucratic and nurturant styles are higher for Assistant Managers than Engineers, whereas mean values of task-oriented, authoritative and participative styles are higher for Engineers than Assistant Managers. In authoritative, participative, task-oriented and nurturant styles, the Managers and Assistant Managers do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.297, $P < 0.05$; P0.457, $P < 0.05$; T0.921, $P < 0.05$ and N1.778, $P < 0.05$). In bureaucratic style, the Managers and Assistant Managers differ significantly as the 't' value of these styles are greater than the critical value (B3.311, $P > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference among different leadership styles in the inter levels of officers as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

GROUP III. LEADERSHIP STYLES AS JUDGED BY THE LEADER HIMSELF AND AS PERCEIVED BY HIS SUBORDINATES

With a view to find out difference between leadership style of a superior, as judged by the superior himself and as judged by his immediate subordinates, the analysis was done at six levels viz., Deputy General Manager, Assistant General Manager, Senior Manager, Manager, Assistant Manager and Engineer. Self reported scores were juxtaposed with the scores on leader behavior scores for each level. First, for the Deputy General Manager level, the leader's self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Assistant General Managers) perception on superior style. Second, for the Assistant General Manager level, the leader's self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Senior Managers) perception on superior style. Third, for the Senior Manager level, the leader's self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Managers) perception on superior style. Fourth, for the Manager level, the leader's self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Assistant Managers) perception on superior style. Fifth, for the Assistant Manager level, the leader's self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Engineers) perception on superior style. Sixth, for the Engineer level, the leader's self perception scores were juxtaposed with the average score on subordinates (Assistant Engineers) perception on superior style. To compute this 't' test was used to find out the significant difference between the leader's self perception and as perceived by their subordinates.

A. Leadership Styles of Deputy General Managers self reported and as perceived by their Subordinates, is shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGERS AND AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Self judgment | | | Judged by their subordinates | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|---------------|---|--------------------|------------------------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 30.3 | 8 | 6.9 | 24.1 | 16 | 6.5 | 2.1 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 44.0 | 8 | 4.8 | 40.6 | 16 | 6.6 | 1.4 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 37.4 | 8 | 9.9 | 38.4 | 16 | 4.9 | 0.3 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 44.3 | 8 | 4.1 | 39.8 | 16 | 6.4 | 2.1 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 47.0 | 8 | 2.1 | 42.0 | 16 | 4.4 | 3.7 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

The mean values of authoritative, participative, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Deputy General Managers than judged by his subordinates, whereas mean values of bureaucratic style is higher for Deputy General Managers subordinates than self judgment. The Participative and bureaucratic styles of the Deputy General Managers' as perceived by their immediate subordinates do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical values (P1.429, $P < 0.05$ and B0.268, $P < 0.05$). The authoritative, task-oriented and nurturant styles of the Deputy General Managers' self judgment as perceived by their immediate subordinates differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical value (A2.079, $P < 0.05$; T2.093, $P < 0.05$ and N3.723, $P < 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the leadership styles of Deputy General Managers as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

B. Leadership Styles of Assistant General Managers self reported and as perceived by their Subordinates, is shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGERS AND AS PERCEIVED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Self judgment | | | Judged by their subordinates | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|---------------|----|--------------------|------------------------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 31.0 | 16 | 7.2 | 32.5 | 24 | 7.7 | 0.6 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 42.6 | 16 | 5.5 | 33.8 | 24 | 6.3 | 4.7 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 38.8 | 16 | 4.1 | 35.7 | 24 | 4.7 | 2.2 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 40.5 | 16 | 5.7 | 36.4 | 24 | 4.6 | 2.4 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 43.9 | 16 | 5.6 | 38.7 | 24 | 3.8 | 3.6 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

The mean values of participative, bureaucratic task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Assistant General Managers than judged by their subordinates, whereas mean values of authoritative styles by Assistant General Managers' subordinates than self judgment. The authoritative style of the Assistant General Managers' and as perceived by their immediate subordinates do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.626, $P < 0.05$). The participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles of the Assistant General Managers' self judgment and as perceived by their immediate subordinates differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are higher than the critical value (P4.672, $P > 0.05$; B2.215, $P > 0.05$; T2.378, $P > 0.05$ and N3.257, $P > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in leadership styles of assistant general managers as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

C. Leadership Styles of Senior Managers and as perceived by their Subordinates, is shown in Table 13.

TABLE 13: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF SENIOR MANAGERS AND AS JUDGED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl.No. | Leadership Styles | Self judgment | | | Judged by their subordinates | | | 't' value |
|--------|-------------------|---------------|----|--------------------|------------------------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 33.0 | 24 | 6.9 | 31.4 | 48 | 7.7 | 0.9 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 40.0 | 24 | 3.8 | 37.6 | 48 | 6.4 | 2.3 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 33.6 | 24 | 9.0 | 35.5 | 48 | 6.4 | 0.9 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 38.9 | 24 | 3.9 | 37.1 | 48 | 6.1 | 1.6 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 40.8 | 24 | 4.5 | 38.7 | 48 | 5.8 | 1.6 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

The mean values of authoritative, participative, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Senior Managers than perceived by their subordinates, whereas mean values of bureaucratic style is higher as perceived by subordinates than self judgment. There is no significant difference in authoritative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles of the Senior Managers' and as perceived by their immediate subordinates as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical values (A0.879, $P < 0.05$; B0.911, $P < 0.05$; T1.585, $P < 0.05$ and N1.758, $P < 0.05$). The participative style of the Senior Managers' self judgment and as perceived by their immediate subordinates differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical value (P2.282, $P < 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in leadership styles of senior managers as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

D. Leadership Styles of Managers and as perceived by their subordinates, is shown in Table 14.

TABLE 14: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF MANAGERS AND AS JUDGED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl. No. | Leadership Styles | Self judgment | | | Judged by their subordinates | | | 't' value |
|---------|----------------------|---------------|----|--------------------|------------------------------|----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 31.6 | 48 | 8.9 | 32.4 | 88 | 7.9 | 0.5 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 40.9 | 48 | 4.9 | 35.8 | 88 | 8.5 | 4.5 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 36.0 | 48 | 7.6 | 36.6 | 88 | 5.4 | 0.5 |
| 4 | Task-orientation (T) | 40.5 | 48 | 4.1 | 36.7 | 88 | 7.4 | 3.8 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 41.6 | 48 | 3.5 | 36.9 | 88 | 7.6 | 5.0 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

Managers judged themselves to be participative, task-oriented and nurturant than judged by their subordinates, whereas mean values of authoritative and bureaucratic styles are higher in case of subordinates than judged by the Managers. The perceived authoritative and bureaucratic styles of the Managers' and as perceived by their immediate subordinates do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.512, $P < 0.05$ and B0.467, $P < 0.05$). The participative, task-oriented and nurturant styles of the managers' self judgment and as perceived by their immediate subordinates differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical value (P4.464, $P > 0.05$; T3.802, $P > 0.05$ and N4.97, $P > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in leadership styles of Managers as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

E. Leadership Styles of Assistant Managers and as Perceived by their subordinates, is shown in Table 15

TABLE 15: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ASSISTANT MANAGERS AND AS JUDGED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl. No. | Leadership Styles | Self judgment | | | Judged by their subordinates | | | 't' value |
|---------|----------------------|---------------|----|--------------------|------------------------------|-----|--------------------|-----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritarian (A) | 32.2 | 88 | 6.6 | 31.6 | 118 | 8.3 | 0.6 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 40.5 | 88 | 5.1 | 35.1 | 118 | 7.0 | 6.4 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 38.2 | 88 | 6.4 | 37.1 | 118 | 4.7 | 1.5 |
| 4 | Task-orientation (T) | 41.3 | 88 | 3.4 | 37.6 | 118 | 5.4 | 6.0 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 41.2 | 88 | 3.0 | 39.5 | 118 | 5.5 | 2.8 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

The mean values of authoritative participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Assistant Managers than judged by their subordinates. The authoritative and bureaucratic styles of the Assistant Managers' and as perceived by their immediate subordinates do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A0.6, $P < 0.05$ and B1.445, $P < 0.05$). The participative, task-oriented and nurturant styles of the Assistant Managers' self judgment and as perceived by their immediate subordinates differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical values (P6.430, $P > 0.05$; T6.015, $P > 0.05$ and N2.826, $P > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in leadership styles of Assistant Managers as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

F. Leadership Styles of Engineers and as perceived by their subordinates, is shown in Table 16.

TABLE 16: LEADERSHIP STYLES OF ENGINEERS AND AS JUDGED BY THEIR SUBORDINATES

| Sl. No. | Leadership Styles | Self judgment | | | Judged by their subordinates | | | t' value |
|---------|-------------------|---------------|-----|--------------------|------------------------------|----|--------------------|----------|
| | | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | Mean | N | Standard Deviation | |
| 1 | Authoritative (A) | 34.8 | 118 | 6.6 | 31.9 | 97 | 8.8 | 1.9 |
| 2 | Participative (P) | 39.3 | 118 | 6.3 | 35.5 | 97 | 7.3 | 3.9 |
| 3 | Bureaucratic (B) | 39.6 | 118 | 5.8 | 34.5 | 97 | 6.5 | 5.9 |
| 4 | Task-oriented (T) | 40.4 | 118 | 4.6 | 38.3 | 97 | 6.0 | 2.8 |
| 5 | Nurturant (N) | 42.1 | 118 | 3.7 | 37.9 | 97 | 7.1 | 5.2 |

Source: Compiled from field survey

The mean values of authoritative, participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles are higher for Engineers than judged by their subordinates. The authoritative style of Engineers' and as perceived by their immediate subordinates do not differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are less than the critical value (A1.848, $P < 0.05$). The participative, bureaucratic, task-oriented and nurturant styles of Engineers' and as perceived by their immediate subordinates differ significantly as the 't' values of these styles are greater than the critical values (P3.939, $P > 0.05$; B5.924, $P > 0.05$; T2.798, $P > 0.05$ and N5.177, $P > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in leadership styles of Engineers as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by their subordinates" is rejected.

FINDINGS

The issues investigated in this analysis are: whether there are any differences among leadership styles at inter-levels of managers and also to find out the difference among leadership styles as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by his immediate subordinates. The following are the major findings of the analysis.

- In BEML, no significant difference is found among different leadership styles at various levels and its self-perception by Deputy General Managers, Assistant General Managers, Senior Managers, Managers and Assistant Managers.
- Leadership styles of Assistant Managers, Engineers, Assistant General Managers, Senior Managers differ significantly.
- A significant difference is found among different leadership styles as perceived by their subordinates of Deputy General Managers, Assistant General Managers, Managers, Assistant Managers and Engineers.
- No significant difference is found among different leadership styles as perceived by their subordinates at Senior Managers as well as Managers.
- A significant difference is found in leadership styles at Deputy General Managers, Assistant General Managers, Senior Managers, Managers, Assistant Managers and Engineers as judged by the leader himself and as judged by their immediate subordinates.

CONCLUSIONS

- The analysis of self perception in BEML revealed that at officers' level, the dominant style is nurturant, followed by task-oriented, participative, bureaucratic and authoritative styles.
- The analysis of subordinates' perception on superior styles, observed that at officers' level, the dominant style is 'nurturant', followed by 'task-oriented', 'bureaucratic', 'participative' and 'authoritative' styles.
- At officers' level, a significant difference is noticed in leadership styles as judged by the leader himself and as perceived by their subordinates.

SUGGESTIONS

Leadership is the most pervasive activity touching every facet of human existence. However, leadership is affected by innumerable variables creating an incomprehensive picture. Thus, it had become very difficult to adopt a particular concept, construct, and style. Nevertheless, ineffective leadership to the organisational context would definitely create an environment of poor relationships and lower turnover. Owing to these complexities, the major suggestion that can be made is that the knowledge and practice of leadership is to be taught preferably from lower levels of education. Irrespective of the sector, activity and operation, the leadership is to be strengthened, so as to achieve the desired results. However, there cannot be a uniform package of leadership that can be suggested to deal with all the organisational situations due to their wide variance. Therefore, the organizations should also create congenial environment, wherein the leader realizes his/her role and discharge responsibility to fulfill the individual as well as organisational goals.

REFERENCES

- Argyris C. (1976) "Theories in Action that Inhibit Individual Learning", American Psychologist, Vol.31. pp.638-654.
- Bennis, W. G. (1959), "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behaviour: The Problem of Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol.4, pp. 259-269.
- Chester I. Barnard, (1946), The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), p.260.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1964) "A Contingency Model of Leadership Effectiveness," Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, (New York: Academic Press).
- Gheselli, E.E.(1963) 'Management Talent', American Psychologist, Vol.18 (October), pp.631-642.
- Henri Fayol (1949), General and Industrial Management (London: Pitman and Sons).
- House R.J. (1971) "A Path-Goal Theory of Leadership Effectiveness", Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol.16, (September), pp.321-338.
- Jaggi B.L. (1978) "Management Leadership Styles in Indian Work Organizations," Indian Manager, (April-June).
- Jennings, E.E. (1961) "The Anatomy of Leadership", Management of Personnel Quarterly, Vol.1. Autumn, p.2.
- Keith Davis, (1972), Human Behaviour at Work, (New Delhi: McGraw Hill), pp.102-104.
- McGregor, D. (1960), The Human Side of Enterprise, (New York: McGraw-Hill), pp.33-57.
- Mullen, J.H.(1965), "Differential Leadership Modes and Productivity in a Large Organization", Academy of Management Journal, Vol.3, pp.107-126.
- Muthayya, B.C. and Vijaya Kumar, S.(1985), "Leadership Styles, Perceived Need Satisfaction and Subjective Job Characteristics among Scientific Personnel", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.21, No.2 (October), pp.173-182.
- Omer Bin Sayeed (1990), "Conflict Management Styles: Relationship with Leadership Styles and Moderating Effect of Esteem for Coworker", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.26, No.1 (July), pp.28-52.
- Ordway, Tead (1953), The Art of Leadership (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company), p.83.

16. Panchanatham, N., Rajendran, K. and Karuppiyah K. K. (1993), "A Study of Executive Leadership Styles and Problem Solving Behaviour", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.29, No.1. July.
17. Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard (1979), Management of Organisational Behaviour, (New Jersey: Engle Wood Cliffs, Prentice Hall).
18. Prabhakar Singh (1987), "Nurturant Task and Participative Task Leaderships: The Effective Leader Behaviors for Indian Industries", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.23, No.2, (October), pp.197-204.
19. Reddin J. William (1967) "The 3-D Management Style Theory" Training and Development Journal (April), pp.8-17.
20. Rensis Likert (1961), New Pattern of Management, (New York: McGraw-Hill), pp.5-25.
21. Rensis Likert (1967), The Human Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill), p.47.
22. Shaw, M.E., and J.M. Blum (1966), "Effects of Leadership Style upon Group Performance as a Function of Task Structure", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, pp.238-242.
23. Singh R.P. and Pandey J (1986), "Leadership Styles, Control Strategies and Personal Consequences", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.22, No.1 (July), pp.41-51.
24. Singh, A.P. and G.S. Das (1977), "Management Styles of Indian Managers: A Profile," ASCI Journal of Management, (September).
25. Singh, P. (1979), "Leadership Process and its Impact on Productivity, Satisfaction and Work Commitment", Decision, Vol.6, pp.259-269.
26. Sinha J.B.P. (1976), "The Authoritative Leadership: A Style of Effective Management", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.11, pp.381-389.
27. Sinha, J.B.P. and Chowdhary, G.P. (1979), "Perception of Subordinates as a Moderator of Leadership Effectiveness" (mimeograph) A.N.S. Institute of Social Studies, Patna.
28. Sinha, T.N. and Sinha, J.B.P. (1977), "Styles of Leadership and their effects on Group Productivity," (mimeographed) A.N.S. Institute of Social Studies, Patna.
29. Stogdill R. M. (1948), "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature", Journal of Psychology (January), pp.35-71.
30. Syed Vazith Hussain (2002), "Leadership Styles in Small Scale Industries", The Indian Journal of Commerce, Vol.55, No.3 (July-September), pp.45-54.
31. Tannenbaum, R. and Schmidt, W.H. (1973) "How to Choose a Leadership Pattern," Harvard Business Review (May-June) pp.162-175, 178-180.
32. Varma, Neelam (1986), "A Test of Implicit Personality Theories of Leadership", Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, Vol.22, No.2 (October), pp.189-198.
33. Vroom V.H. and Yetton P.W. (1973) "Leadership and Decision Making," (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press).
34. Yukl, Gary (1981), Leadership in Organizations (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey).

QUESTIONNAIRES

QUESTIONNAIRE I: SOCIO ECONOMIC AND ORGANISATIONAL POSITION VARIABLES

This schedule is designed to know about Socio Economic and Organisational Position variables of Leaders. Your responses will be kept confidential and individual identity will not be revealed.

1. IDENTIFICATION

- 1.1. Name: No compulsion to mention
- 1.2. Age :
- 1.3. Designation :
- 1.4. Experience (in years) : Present : Past : TOTAL
- 1.5. Educational qualifications:

QUESTIONNAIRE II: LEADER'S SELF PERCEPTION

Below are given some statements regarding the behaviour of a leader. Please judge to what extent they are true or false for you when you are in the leading role. Put a circle around one of the five responses against each statement.

QT – Quite True, T – True, D – Doubtful, F – False, QF – Quite False

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. I maintain partnership in the group. | QT T D F QF |
| 2. I help my subordinates in their career planning. | QT T D F QF |
| 3. I keep crucial information to myself. | QT T D F QF |
| 4. I help my subordinates to grow up and assume responsibility. | QT T D F QF |
| 5. I explain to my subordinates what I expect from them and what they can expect from me. | QT T D F QF |
| 6. I make my subordinates feel free even to disagree with me. | QT T D F QF |
| 7. I believe that top boss makes major decisions & implements them. | QT T D F QF |
| 8. I provide all information to my subordinates and let them jointly find the solution of a problem. | QT T D F QF |
| 9. I behave as if power and prestige are necessary for getting compliance from the subordinates. | QT T D F QF |
| 10. I help my subordinates even in their family matters. | QT T D F QF |
| 11. I interact with my subordinates as if they are equal. | QT T D F QF |
| 12. I maintain fair but impersonal relationship in the group | QT T D F QF |
| 13. I go by the joint decisions of the group | QT T D F QF |
| 14. I take special care to get the work done with top priority. | QT T D F QF |
| 15. I treat all group members as my equals. | QT T D F QF |
| 16. I believe that most of the interpersonal troubles start because people try to be over friendly and informal on the job. | QT T D F QF |
| 17. I maintain high standard of performance. | QT T D F QF |
| 18. I believe that subordinates acquire sense of responsibility under the care and guidance of a good leader. | QT T D F QF |
| 19. I think that if clear-cut job descriptions are available, there will be less conflict in an organization. | QT T D F QF |
| 20. I expect my subordinates to increase their knowledge on the job. | QT T D F QF |
| 21. I believe that not all employees are capable of becoming officers openly show affection to those subordinates who work hard. | QT T D F QF |
| 22. I openly show affection to those subordinates who work hard. | QT T D F QF |
| 23. I take the decision quickly and I am confident of being right. | QT T D F QF |
| 24. I give as much responsibility as my subordinates can handle. | QT T D F QF |
| 25. I believe that one can really grow up by learning to do a job well. | QT T D F QF |
| 26. I consider seniority as a time-tested criterion for promotion. | QT T D F QF |
| 27. I see that subordinates work to their capacity. | QT T D F QF |
| 28. I always follow standard rules and regulations. | QT T D F QF |
| 29. I grant full freedom and autonomy to my subordinates so that they can work hard. | QT T D F QF |
| 30. I rule with an iron hand to get the work done. | QT T D F QF |
| 31. I want to have full power and control over my subordinates. | QT T D F QF |
| 32. I create a climate where members respect each other's individuality | QT T D F QF |
| 33. I believe that all of us have more or less equal potentialities. | QT T D F QF |
| 34. I drive myself very hard. | QT T D F QF |
| 35. I categorise my subordinates as good and bad. | QT T D F QF |

| | |
|--|-------------|
| 36. I help the subordinates in their needs as much as I can. | QT T D F QF |
| 37. I give directions to my subordinates when it is necessary. | QT T D F QF |
| 38. I favour that the area of responsibility should be clearly demarcated according to rank and positions. | QT T D F QF |
| 39. I always keep track of the progress of the work. | QT T D F QF |
| 40. I confine myself to my own jurisdiction. | QT T D F QF |
| 41. I inform my subordinates how well they are doing their job. | QT T D F QF |
| 42. I feel responsible for the well being of my subordinates. | QT T D F QF |
| 43. I make it clear that personal loyalty is an important virtue. | QT T D F QF |
| 44. I am a friendly type. | QT T D F QF |
| 45. I never question the well established ways of doing things in this organization. | QT T D F QF |
| 46. I try to have strict division of labour even in my own group. | QT T D F QF |
| 47. I find time to listen to the personal problems of the subordinates. | QT T D F QF |
| 48. I do not tolerate any interference from my subordinates. | QT T D F QF |
| 49. I have affection for my subordinates. | QT T D F QF |
| 50. I believe that if I am not alert all the time there are many people who may pull me down. | QT T D F QF |

QUESTIONNAIRE III: SUBORDINATE'S PERCEPTION ON SUPERIOR STYLES

Below are given some statements regarding the behaviour of a leader. Please judge to what extent they are true or false. Put a circle around one of the five responses against each statement.

QT – Quite True, T – True, D – Doubtful, F – False, QF – Quite False

| | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. He maintains partnership in the group. | QT T D F QF |
| 2. He helps us in our career planning. | QT T D F QF |
| 3. He keeps crucial information to himself alone. | QT T D F QF |
| 4. He helps us to grow up and assume responsibility. | QT T D F QF |
| 5. He explains to us what he expects from us and what we can expect from him. | QT T D F QF |
| 6. He makes us feel free even to disagree with him. | QT T D F QF |
| 7. He believes that the top boss makes major decisions & implements them. | QT T D F QF |
| 8. He provides all information to us and let us jointly find the solution of a problem. | QT T D F QF |
| 9. He behaves as if power and prestige are necessary for getting compliance from us. | QT T D F QF |
| 10. He helps us even in our family matters. | QT T D F QF |
| 11. He interacts with us as if we are equal. | QT T D F QF |
| 12. He maintains fair but impersonal relationship in the group | QT T D F QF |
| 13. He goes by the joint decisions of the group | QT T D F QF |
| 14. He takes special care to get the work done with top priority. | QT T D F QF |
| 15. He treats all group members as his equals. | QT T D F QF |
| 16. He believes that most of the interpersonal troubles start because people try to be over friendly and informal on the job. | QT T D F QF |
| 17. He maintains high standard of performance. | QT T D F QF |
| 18. He believes that we acquire sense of responsibility under the care and guidance of a good leader. | QT T D F QF |
| 19. He thinks that if clear-cut job descriptions are available, there will be less conflict in an organization. | QT T D F QF |
| 20. He expects from us to increase our knowledge on the job. | QT T D F QF |
| 21. He believes that not all employees capable of becoming officers. | QT T D F QF |
| 22. He openly show affection to those subordinates who work hard. | QT T D F QF |
| 23. He take the decision quickly and he is confident of being right. | QT T D F QF |
| 24. He gives as much responsibility as we can handle. | QT T D F QF |
| 25. He believes that one can really grow up by learning to do a job well. | QT T D F QF |
| 26. He considers seniority as a time-tested criterion for promotion. | QT T D F QF |
| 27. He sees that we work to our capacity. | QT T D F QF |
| 28. He always follows standard rules and regulations. | QT T D F QF |
| 29. He grants full freedom & autonomy to us so that we can work hard. | QT T D F QF |
| 30. He rules with an iron hand to get the work done. | QT T D F QF |
| 31. He wants to have full power and control over us. | QT T D F QF |
| 32. He creates a climate where members respect each other's individuality. | QT T D F QF |
| 33. He believes that all of us have more or less equal potentialities. | QT T D F QF |
| 34. He drives himself very hard. | QT T D F QF |
| 35. He categorises us as good and bad. | QT T D F QF |
| 36. He helps us in need as much as he can. | QT T D F QF |
| 37. He gives directions to us when it is necessary. | QT T D F QF |
| 38. He favours that the area of responsibility should be clearly demarcated according to rank and positions. | QT T D F QF |
| 39. He always keep track of the progress of the work. | QT T D F QF |
| 40. He confines himself to his own jurisdiction. | QT T D F QF |
| 41. He informs us how well we are doing our job. | QT T D F QF |
| 42. He feels responsible for the well being of us. | QT T D F QF |
| 43. He makes it clear that personal loyalty is an important virtue. | QT T D F QF |
| 44. He is a friendly type. | QT T D F QF |
| 45. He never questions the well established ways of doing things in this organization. | QT T D F QF |
| 46. He tries to have strict division of labour even in his own group. | QT T D F QF |
| 47. He finds time to listen to our personal problems. | QT T D F QF |
| 48. He does not tolerate any interference from us. | QT T D F QF |
| 49. He has affection for us. | QT T D F QF |
| 50. He believes that if he is not alert all the time there are many people who may pull me down. | QT T D F QF |

REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

Dear Readers

At the very outset, International Journal of Research in Commerce, IT and Management (IJRCM) acknowledges & appreciates your efforts in showing interest in our present issue under your kind perusal.

I would like to request you to supply your critical comments and suggestions about the material published in this issue as well as on the journal as a whole, on our E-mails i.e. **infoijrcm@gmail.com** or **info@ijrcm.org.in** for further improvements in the interest of research.

If you have any queries please feel free to contact us on our E-mail infoijrcm@gmail.com.

I am sure that your feedback and deliberations would make future issues better – a result of our joint effort.

Looking forward an appropriate consideration.

With sincere regards

Thanking you profoundly

Academically yours

Sd/-

Co-ordinator

ABOUT THE JOURNAL

In this age of Commerce, Economics, Computer, I.T. & Management and cut throat competition, a group of intellectuals felt the need to have some platform, where young and budding managers and academicians could express their views and discuss the problems among their peers. This journal was conceived with this noble intention in view. This journal has been introduced to give an opportunity for expressing refined and innovative ideas in this field. It is our humble endeavour to provide a springboard to the upcoming specialists and give a chance to know about the latest in the sphere of research and knowledge. We have taken a small step and we hope that with the active co-operation of like-minded scholars, we shall be able to serve the society with our humble efforts.

Our Other Journals

