



Perceived Managerial Effectiveness within SJVN, A Mini Ratna Public Sector Undertaking in Shimla, Himachal Pradesh

Dr. Vinod Negi¹ & Dr. Pyare Lal²

¹Associate Professor, HPUBS, Himachal Pradesh University, Summer Hill, Shimla (H.P.)-171005

²Assistant Professor, Government College Kandaghat, Dist. Solan (H.P)

Date of Submission: 03-07-2022

Date of Acceptance: 16-07-2022

Abstract

This present paper aims to identify the demographic factors that influence the perception of employees regarding managerial effectiveness. The study uses The Organizational Effectiveness Questionnaire (Mott, 1972) to find out the managerial effectiveness in SJVN and statistical relevance was checked by Chi Square test. Mott (1971) grouped eight items into three factors namely productivity (three items, production output, optimum utilisation of resources, and adoption of new method of production), adaptability (three items; quality, problem anticipation, and acceptance of changes and flexibility (it includes two items; adjustment to the new situations and copes with emergencies readily and successfully). 150 employees were surveyed and their responses were analysed with the help of chi-square test. It was found income, designation, education and tenure were significantly related with managerial effectiveness and designation of employees was found significant in case of flexibility. the limitation of the study is that it has not considered the effects of other possible factors that might also affect the perception of employees regarding the managerial effectiveness.

Keywords: Managerial Effectiveness, Employees, Managers, Dimensions of Managerial Effectiveness

I. INTRODUCTION

Managerial effectiveness is a leader's ability to accomplish the desired results. How well a manager uses his skills and competencies in guiding and directing others determines whether he can achieve those results effectively or not. If he can, his accomplishments can help the organization gain a competitive edge against rival organizations heading into the future. Generally, the views surrounding the issue of managerial effectiveness have tended to be largely based on the assumption about what

managers do, and what they should do to be successful. According to Robotham and Jubb (1996), these assumptions are challenged (Luthans, Rosenkrantz, & Hennessey, 1985) in that rather than relying on an appraising of managers' performance that is based on the activities usually set for managerial success, a focus on the activities managers actually perform has emerged. Effectiveness is something more than a quality which a manager brings to a situation, to see it this way it is nothing more than a chance to discard trait theory of leadership which has argued more effective leaders has special qualities not possessed by less effective leaders. Managerial effectiveness is not an aspect of personality.

Managerial effectiveness varies usually from organization to organization and from job to job and hence the criteria of effectiveness needs to be carefully and defined. Effectiveness is best defined as, what a manager produces from a situation by managing it properly. In the present time, it represents turnover and not output. The manager must think of performance, not personality. It is not about what managers do, but what they can achieve in terms of results. Present study is focused on how managerial effectiveness is perceived by employees of SJVN irrespective of their designation and how effectively work is done in SJVN.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Management performance is the extent and quality of managers' role in realizing their objectives (Shirazi and Mortazavi, 2009). It has been found that highly skilled or competent managers a greater role in the of an organization. Competencies are a part of the theories that explain leadership effectiveness (Hogan and Kaiser, 2005). Burgoyne (1976) was of the view that there is a need to clearly outline functions of a manager before managerial effectiveness could be defined. A manager's major



objective is to achieve organizational goals. In other words, there is a strong emphasis on performance.

Although Thorndike (1949) was the first to make note of the trend to measure effectiveness by defining the statement of some ultimate criterion, Campbell (1974) identified nineteen different variables used to measure effectiveness. The most commonly used univariate measures include: (a) overall performance (measured by employee or supervisory ratings); (b) productivity (actual output data); (c) employee satisfaction (self-report questionnaires); (d) profit (accounting data); and (e) withdrawal (turnover or absenteeism data).

Georgopoulos and Tannenbaum (1957) were the first to use a multivariate model of effectiveness, and since their study multivariate models have proliferated. Steers (1975) summarized 17 representative models and found little overlap across the various approaches. Adaptability- flexibility was the criterion mentioned most often, whereas productivity followed close behind. A Scale of Organizational Effectiveness developed by Mott (1972) defined effectiveness along these lines— adaptability, flexibility, and productivity. This study uses the Mott questionnaire.

In recent years many concerns and criticisms have been expressed about the nature of most management and leadership research. Hamlin and Sawyer (2007) classify the criticisms into four categories. Firstly; in last fifty years many research has been done on the work and what managers do, few studies have attempted to distinguish between what Hales (1986) refers to as good management and bad management, or have been focused on managerial or leadership effectiveness (Barker, 2000). As a result, there is still little agreement in the literature about what is managerial effectiveness and what is leadership effectiveness. (Hamlin and Sawyer, 2007). The second criticism is regarding the lack of generalizability of managerial effectiveness across various organizational settings, sectors and cultures. Axelsson (1998) claims there are very few studies which have empirical results that can be generalized beyond particular organizational settings. A same kind of situation exists in the field of leadership research (Kim and Yukl, 1995). As per Avolio, Bass and Jung (1999) reason for this is weak research design. Third criticism is that most management and leadership research continues to be far away from the real world of practice (Adler, Shani and Styhere, 2004). The fourth criticism is about the evidence based approaches to management practice, especially in the healthcare management, (Axelsson, 1998).

In the present study, The Organizational Effectiveness Questionnaire (Mott, 1972) was used to measure the perceived effectiveness of managers. Mott (1972) defined managerial effectiveness as perceptions of competence encompassing technical knowledge, human relations skills, administrative expertise, as well as issues such as mutual trust and confidence. To measure the managerial effectiveness in SJVN, the scale which was developed by Mott (1971), was used. Mott (1971) grouped eight items in three factors: productivity (three items, production output, optimum utilization of resources, and adoption of new method of production), adaptability (three items; quality, problem anticipation, and acceptance of changes and flexibility (it includes two items; adjustment to the new situations and copes with emergencies readily and successfully).

Objective of Study

The present study was aimed at to measure the managerial effectiveness in SJVN a *Mini Ratna* public sector enterprise situated at Shimla the capital of Himachal Pradesh. For the fulfillment of the study following objectives were framed:-

1. To study the relationship between socio-economic factors and managerial effectiveness
2. To measure the Managerial Effectiveness of managers in SJVN

III. Methodology

The present study was conducted in SJVN a *Mini Ratna* PSU in Shimla the capital of Himachal Pradesh. The study was based on primary data and secondary data. A structured and close-ended questionnaire was used to collect data from respondents, in which demographical questions such as age, gender, income, education and marital status were covered, and to fulfill above mentioned objectives appropriate mathematical and statistical tools were used. For the fulfillment above stated objectives, The Organizational Effectiveness Questionnaire (Mott, 1972) was used to find out the managerial effectiveness in SJVN and statistical relevance was checked by Chi Square test. To measure the managerial effectiveness in SJVN, the scale which was adapted from Mott (1971), was used. Mott (1971) grouped eight items in three factors productivity (three items, production output, optimum utilisation of resources, and adoption of new method of production), adaptability (three items; quality, problem anticipation, and acceptance of changes and flexibility (it includes two items;



adjustment to the new situations and copes with emergencies readily and successfully).

Sampling

The study focuses on measuring the managerial effectiveness in SJVN. A diverse sample of 150 employees from all levels of management was selected by using simple random sampling method. These 150 employees consist of executives, Deputy Managers, Sr. Managers, DGM & other staff members etc.

Data Collection

To fulfill the study objectives both primary and secondary data was collected. Primary data was collected from each employee with the help of pre-tested questionnaire. The secondary data was collected with the help of various books, journals, web sites and census data.

Analysis and Interpretation

In this section analysis of data collected through questionnaires is presented. Following table 1 shows the relationship between socio economic factors and managerial effectiveness.

In order to check the statistical significance between socio-economic factors and managerial

effectiveness the following Null and Alternate Hypothesis were framed and tested by the chi-square test:-

H_0 : Socio-economic factors has no significant relationship with managerial effectiveness

H_A : Social economic factors has significant relationship with managerial effectiveness

In the following table chi-square values are, (pearson and p-values) tabulated. It can be seen from the table that computed p values were less than .05 ($p < .05$) at 5 per cent of significance level for income in case of production output, Designation, Income and Education for Acceptance of Changes, Education in case of adjustment t new situations, Tenure , Designation and Location in case of Copes with Emergencies Readily and Successfully. Hence a inference can be drawn the manager perceive that the employees productivity is related to income i.e. employees work harder for monetary gains. When it comes to coping or accepting change managers think designation, income and education of employees plays a key role. Tenure, Designation and Location of employees were perceived to play a significant role in coping with emergencies by the managers of SJVN.

Table 1 Socio economic Factors and Managerial Effectiveness

	Age	Gender	Tenure	Designation	Income	Education	Location
Production Output	6.541 (0.886)	2.831 (0.587)	9.484 (0.661)	4.055 (0.852)	21.584 (0.042)	10.345 (0.242)	5.487 (0.241)
Quality	4.073 (0.907)	6.256 (0.100)	6.592 (0.680)	2.476 (0.871)	1.719 (0.995)	5.886 (0.436)	1.109 (0.775)
Optimum Utilisation of Resources	8.689 (0.466)	3.523 (0.318)	7.454 (0.590)	3.596 (0.731)	6.147 (0.725)	6.420 (0.378)	3.302 (0.347)
Problem Anticipation	15.487 (0.216)	5.194 (0.268)	17.922 (0.118)	8.211 (0.413)	9.846 (0.629)	9.349 (0.314)	5.728 (0.220)
Adoption of New Method of Production	15.485 (0.216)	1.626 (0.804)	8.247 (0.766)	12.630 (0.125)	11.567 (0.481)	9.549 (0.298)	5.871 (0.209)
Acceptance of Changes	5.138 (0.953)	1.480 (0.830)	11.398 (0.495)	16.083** (0.041)	22.315** (0.034)	21.913** (0.005)	1.913 (0.752)
Adjustment to the New Situations	8.749 (0.461)	6.542* (0.088)	4.926 (0.841)	3.536 (0.739)	7.428 (0.593)	16.272** (0.012)	3.227 (0.358)
Copes with Emergencies Readily and Successfully	5.784 (0.927)	1.757 (0.780)	19.069* (0.087)	16.107** (0.041)	13.932 (0.305)	6.981 (0.539)	7.974* (0.093)

Source: Calculated by researchers

Mott (1971) grouped eight items in three factors productivity (three items, production output, optimum utilisation of resources, and adoption of

new method of production), adaptability (three items; quality, problem anticipation, and acceptance of changes and flexibility (it includes two items;



adjustment to the new situations and copes with emergencies readily and successfully). Following table 2 shows the chi-square results between socio-economic factors and three grouped factors of managerial effectiveness. It can be seen from the following table that the computed p-value was less

than .05 ($p < .05$) at 5 per cent of significance level for designation in case of flexibility. Employees of SJVN perceive that employees with their designation learn to be more flexible and they learn to accept changes, adjust to new situation and cope with emergencies.

Table 2 Socio Economic Factors and Three Major Factors of Managerial Effectiveness

	Age	Gender	Tenure	Designation	Income	Education	Location
Productivity	26.57 (0.646)	8.333 (0.596)	16.734 (0.976)	17.669 (0.609)	30.943 (0.418)	24.964 (0.203)	3.812 (0.955)
Adaptability	15.504 (0.962)	2.877 (0.969)	10.446 (0.998)	20.119 (0.326)	22.238 (0.725)	25.890 (0.102)	7.546 (0.580)
Flexibility	22.291 (0.383)	7.828 (0.348)	15.251 (0.810)	23.257* (0.056)	15.227 (0.811)	8.392 (0.868)	10.056 (0.185)

Source: Calculated by researchers

IV. CONCLUSION

This study was carried out in SJVN a *Mini Ratna* PSU in Shimla the capital of Himachal Pradesh. The study used The Organizational Effectiveness Questionnaire (Mott, 1972) in order to find the effect of socio-economic factors on the managerial effectiveness in SJVN and statistical relevance was checked by chi square test. 150 respondents from different offices of SJVN participated in the study. In this paper it has been found the employees perceive that the employees productivity is related to income i.e. employees work harder for monetary gains. In dealing with change or accepting change employees think designation, income and education of employees plays a key role. Tenure, Designation and Location of employees were perceived to play a significant role in coping with emergencies by the employees of SJVN. Out of three grouped factors of managerial effectiveness i.e. productivity, adaptability and flexibility it was found that employees

perceive that designation of employees plays a key role in employees becoming more flexible. With their designation employees learn to accept changes, adjust to new situation and cope with emergencies. The limitation of the study is that it has not considered the effects of other possible factors that might also affect the perception of employees regarding the managerial effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adler, N., Shani, A.B. & Styhre, A. (2004). Collaborative Research in Organizations: Foundations for Learning, Change and Theoretical Development. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- [2]. Avolio, B.J., Bass, B.M. & Jung, D.L. (1999) Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(4), 441-463.
- [3]. Axelsson, R. (1998). Towards evidence based health care management. *International Journal of Health Planning and Management*, 13(4), 307-317.
- [4]. Campbell, J. P. (1974). The measurement of organizational effectiveness: A review of relevant research and opinion. Minneapolis: Personnel Decisions.
- [5]. Georgopoulos, B. S., & Tannenbaum, A. S. (1957). The study of organizational effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 22, 534-540.
- [6]. Hales, C.P. (1986), What do managers do? A critical review of the evidence. *Journal of Management Studies*, 23(1), 88-115.
- [7]. Hamlin, B. & Cooper, D. (2007). Developing effective managers and leaders within health and social care contexts: An evidence-based approach. In S. Sambrook and J. Stewart (Eds.), *Human resource development in the public sector: The case of health and social care*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 187-212.
- [8]. Hogan, R., Kaiser, R.B. 2005. What We Know About Leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9(2), 169-180
- [9]. Kim, H. & Yukl, G. (1995). Relationships of managerial effectiveness and advancement to self-reported and subordinate-reported leadership behaviors from the multiple-linkage model, *Leadership Quarterly*, 6(3), 361-377.



- [10]. Luthans, F., Rosenkrantz, S. A., & Hennessey, H. W. (1985). What do successful managers really do? An observation study of managerial activities. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 21(3), 255-270
- [11]. Managerial Effectiveness - A Critical Analysis Fonceca Clayton Michael , Raj S. Paul 2 & Anandan C.R. Christi (2021). Managerial Effectiveness - A Critical Analysis. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* e-ISSN: 2278-487X, p-ISSN: 2319-7668. Volume 19, Issue 8. Ver. II. (August 2017), PP 47-52
- [12]. Mott, P. E. (1972). *The characteristics of effective organizations*. New York: Harper & Row.
- [13]. Robotham, D., & Jubb, R. (1996). *Competences: Measuring the unmeasurable*. *Management Development Review*, 9(5), 25-29.
- [14]. Shirazi, A., Mortazvi, S. 2009. Effective management performance a competency based perspective. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 5(1), 1-10.
- [15]. Steers, R. M. (1975). Problems in the measurement of organizational-effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 546-558.
- [16]. Thorndike, R. L. (1949). *Personnel selection: Test and measurement techniques*. New York: John Wiley
- [17]. Yozgat Ugur and Sahin Safiye (2013). Perceived Managerial and Leadership Effectiveness Within Turkish Public Sector Hospitals. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 99 (2013) 216 – 221.