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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the paper is to investigate the relationship between leadership styles and Socio Economic Organization Position (SEOP) variables in LIC of India, Andhra Pradesh. This relationship examined in three levels like top management, middle management and low level management in LIC of India.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Leadership means many things to many people. This is due to the changing environment of leaders in different roles in different functions in different settings starting 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 different perceptions of leadership. Further, even these attributes cannot provide a totally satisfactory guidance for the success of leadership. Hence, theoreticians and practitioners of leadership have gone to the extent of developing the ‘contingency approach’, which emphasizes that there is ‘No single best way’. The functions, roles, variables, power, influence, success and effectiveness of leaders, leadership theories and leadership in general discussed by different writers, researchers and practitioners are discussed.

II. DEFINITION OF LEADERSHIP

The word ‘leader’ stems from the root leden meaning ‘to travel’ or ‘show the way’. It has been derived from the verb “to lead.” This also implies “to advance,” “to expel,” “to stand out,” to guide and govern the actions of others. A leader is a person who leads a group of followers.

Hodge and Johnson are of the opinion that “Leadership is fundamentally the ability to form and mould the attitudes and behaviour of other individuals, whether informal or formal situation and that management relates to the formal task of decision and command.”

Ivancevich, Szilagyi and Wallace, defines Leadership as “the relationship between two or more people in which one attempts to influence the other toward the accomplishment of some goal or goals.”

III. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The understanding of leadership has ever been very difficult due to the complexities involved in it. As such the concept of leadership creates more puzzles than solutions. This is due to the fact that the theory and practice of leadership are associated with many fields of knowledge like economics, sociology, anthropology, psychology, political science, public administration, ethics and so on. Further it is closely related to different management and organisational behaviour subjects like motivation, communication, personality, group dynamics, team building and organisational development.

IV. NEED OF THE STUDY

The principal purpose of the current study is to find a the relationship between socio economic and organizational position variables in public sector enterprise with respect to LIC.

V. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
To examine the relationship of Leadership Styles in LIC of India, with certain Socio Economic and Organization Position (SEOP) variables of the employees.

HYPOTHESES
H1: There is no significant inter-relationship among the SEOP variables of employees in LIC.
H2: There is no significant relationship between Leadership Styles and the SEOP variables of employees in LIC.

VI. METHODOLOGY

(i) Source of Data:

The study is mainly based on primary data collected in three phases. In the first phase the purpose and objectives of the schedule are explained to the respondents who are requested to go through the schedule thoroughly. In the second phase doubts of the respondents about the contents of the schedule, if any, are clarified. In the third phase the schedules are collected from the respondents and further discussions were held with them to elicit additional information from them. The present study confines itself to Higher, Middle and lower hierarchical levels in LIC.

(ii) Sampling

The number of samples drawn from LIC of India in each cadre is given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Total Number of Employees</th>
<th>Sample Drawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Manager, Marketing Manager, Managers, D.T.C., Principle. (Top Management)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Managers, Assistant Branch Managers, Administrative Officers, (Middle Management)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist Administrative Officers, Supervisors, and Development Officers. (Jr. Management)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Grade Assistants, Lower Grade Assistants, Record Clerks/Typists.</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(iii) Tools for Data Collection

The schedules supplied to each category of officers are as follows:

SEOP variables were applied to study the leader’s self-perception about their styles with reference to Higher, Middle and Low Level Managers and Superior, Subordinates of LIC of India.

(iv) Field Study

Field investigation was conducted by adopting the personal interview method. During the investigation considerable help was received from Officers in different Grades of LIC.

VII. INTER-CORRELATION OF SEOP VARIABLES OF EMPLOYEES OF LIC

A. Top Management of LIC

For the inter-correlation, the degree of freedom (df) is N-2. Top Management of LIC stood 9, where N=9, the df=9-2=7. For 7 df the entries at 0.01 and 0.05 by linear interpolation are 0.798 and 0.666 respectively (for 3 decimals). The correlation values with two stars are significant at 0.01 level and those with one star is significant at 0.05 level.

Table 1.1 presents the inter-correlations among socio-economic and organizational position variables viz., designation, age, experience, education, and economic status in Top Management. The variable ‘age’ was
significantly but negatively correlated with ‘education’ ($r = -0.762, P<0.05$) indicating that higher the age, lower the ‘education’. The variable ‘experience’ was significantly but negatively correlated with ‘education’ ($r = -0.742, P<0.05$) indicating that higher the experience, lower the ‘education’. None of the other socio-economic and organizational position variables, however, were found not to be significantly inter-correlated. They are rather, independent of each other.

**B. Middle Management of LIC**

For the inter-correlation, the degree of freedom (df) is N=2. Middle Management of LIC stood 9, where N=49, the df=49-2=47. For 47 df the entries at 0.01 and 0.05 by linear interpolation are 0.365 and 0.282 respectively (for 3 decimals). The correlation values with two stars are significant at 0.01 level and those with one star is significant at 0.05 level.

### Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl. No.</th>
<th>SEOP Variables</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>-0.204</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td><strong>-0.868</strong></td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.318</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from field survey

The above table no. 1.2 represents the inter-correlations among socio-economic and organizational position variables viz., designation, age, experience, education, and economic status for Middle Management of LIC.

The variable ‘age’ was significantly and positively correlated with ‘experience’ ($r=0.327, P<0.05$) indicating that higher the age, greater the ‘experience. ‘age’ was also significantly but negatively correlated with ‘education’ ($r = -0.868, P<0.01$) indicating that higher the age, lower the ‘education’. ‘age’ was also significantly but negatively correlated with ‘economic status’ ($r = -0.322, P<0.01$) indicating that higher the age, lower the ‘economic status’. The variable ‘experience’ was significantly but negatively correlated with ‘education’ ($r = -0.318, P<0.05$) indicating that the persons who are at higher experience are with lower education. None of the other socio-economic and organizational position variables, however, were found not to be significantly inter-correlated. They are rather, independent of each other.

**C. Junior Management of LIC**

For the inter-correlation, the degree of freedom (df) is N=2. Junior Management of LIC stood 40, where N=40, the df=40-2=38. For 38 df the entries at 0.01 and 0.05 by linear interpolation are 0.434 and 0.315 respectively (for 3 decimals). The correlation values with two stars are significant at 0.01 level and those with one star is significant at 0.05 level.

### Table 1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SEOP Variables</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td><strong>0.465</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.447</strong></td>
<td>*0.373</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.194</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from field survey

Table 1.3 presents the inter-correlations among socio-economic and organizational position variables viz., designation, age, experience, education, and economic status for Junior Management of LIC.
The variable ‘designation’ was significantly and positively correlated with ‘economic status’ (r=0.465, P<0.01) indicating that higher the ‘designation’, greater the ‘economic status’. The variable ‘age’ was significantly and positively correlated with ‘experience’ (r=0.447, P<0.01) indicating that higher the age, greater the ‘experience’. ‘age’ was also significantly but negatively correlated with ‘education’ (r= -0.373, P<0.05) indicating that higher the age, lower the ‘education’. The variable ‘experience’ was significantly and positively correlated with ‘economic status’ (r= 0.423, P<0.05) indicating that the persons who are at higher experience are with higher ‘economic status’.

None of the other socio-economic and organizational position variables, however, were found not to be significantly inter-correlated. They are rather, independent of each other.

**D. Clerks of LIC**

For the inter-correlation, the degree of freedom (df) is N-2. clerks of LIC stood 202, where N=202, the df=202-2=200. For 200 df the entries at 0.01 and 0.05 by linear interpolation are 0.181 and 0.138 respectively (for 3 decimals). The correlation values with two stars are significant at 0.01 level and those with one star is significant at 0.05 level.

### Table 1.4

Inter-correlations among SEOP Variables for clerks of LIC (N=202)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SEOP Variables</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Economic Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>-0.053</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.545</strong></td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.204</strong></td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from field survey

Table 1.4 presents the inter-correlations among socio-economic and organizational position variables viz., designation, age, experience, education, and economic status for clerks of LIC.

The variable ‘age’ was significantly and positively correlated with ‘experience’ (r=0.545, P<0.01) indicating that higher the age, greater the ‘experience’. The variable ‘experience’ was significantly and positively correlated with ‘education’ (r= 0.204, P<0.05) indicating that the persons who are at higher experience are with higher ‘education’.

VIII. RELATIONSHIP OF SEOP VARIABLES WITH LEADERSHIP STYLES OF EMPLOYEES OF LIC VIZ., TOP MANAGEMENT, MIDDLE MANAGEMENT AND JUNIOR MANAGEMENT

### Table 1.5

Inter-correlation between SEOP variables and Leadership Styles for Top Management of LIC (N=9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N o</th>
<th>SEOP Variables</th>
<th>Authoritarian</th>
<th>Participative</th>
<th>Bureaucratic</th>
<th>Task-orention</th>
<th>Nurturant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>-0.192</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>-0.590</td>
<td>-0.070</td>
<td>-.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td>-0.575</td>
<td><strong>-0.787</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.806</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.904</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.405</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td><strong>0.767</strong></td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td><strong>0.926</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Status</td>
<td><em>0.766</em></td>
<td>-0.397</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.5 presents the inter-correlation between socio-economic and organizational position variables and five leadership styles viz., authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant for Top
Management of LIC. ‘Age’ was correlated significantly but negatively with ‘nurturant’ style (r = -0.660, P<0.05) indicating that ‘nurturant’ style decreases with the increase of ‘age’. ‘Experience’ was correlated significantly but negatively with ‘bureaucratic’ style (r = -0.787, P<0.05), ‘task-orientation’ style (r = -0.806, P<0.01), and ‘nurturant’ style (r = -0.904, P<0.01) indicating that ‘bureaucratic’, ‘task-orientation’ and ‘nurturant’ styles decreases with the increase of ‘experience’. ‘Education’ was correlated significantly and positively with ‘bureaucratic’ style (r = -0.767, P<0.05), and ‘nurturant’ style (r = -0.926, P<0.01) indicating that ‘bureaucratic’ and ‘nurturant’ styles increases with the increase of ‘education’. ‘Economic status’ was correlated significantly and positively with ‘authoritarian’ style (r = 0.766, P<0.05) indicating that authoritarian style increases with the increase of ‘economic status’.

None of the other socio-economic and organizational position variables, however, were found not to be significantly correlated with leadership styles.

Table 1.6 presents the inter-correlation between socio-economic and organizational position variables and five leadership styles viz., authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant for Middle Management of LIC. ‘Age’ was correlated significantly and positively with ‘bureaucratic’ style (r = 0.359, P<0.05) indicating that ‘bureaucratic’ style increases with the increase of ‘age’. ‘Education’ was correlated significantly and positively with ‘nurturant’ style (r = 0.284, P<0.05) indicating that ‘bureaucratic’ and ‘nurturant’ styles increases with the increase of ‘education’.

None of the other socio-economic and organizational position variables, however, were found not to be significantly correlated with leadership styles.

Table 1.7 presents the inter-correlation between socio-economic and organizational position variables and five leadership styles viz., authoritarian, participative, bureaucratic, task-orientation and nurturant for Junior Management of LIC. ‘Experience’ was correlated significantly but negatively with ‘task-orientation’ style (r = -0.580, P<0.01), indicating that ‘task-orientation’ style decreases with the increase of ‘experience’. ‘Education’ was correlated significantly and positively with ‘participative’ style (r = 0.327, P<0.05), indicating that participative style increases with the increase of ‘education’. ‘Economic status’ was correlated significantly but negatively with ‘bureaucratic’ style (r = -0.387, P<0.05), indicating that ‘bureaucratic’ style decreases with the increase of ‘education’. ‘Economic status’ was correlated significantly but negatively with ‘task-orientation’ style.
None of the other socio-economic and organizational position variables, however, were found not to be significantly correlated with leadership styles.

**IX. FINDINGS**

1. No significant inter relationship among socio-economic and organizational position variables of employees of LIC is rejected in the case of age vs education and experience vs education, and is accepted in all other cases.
2. No significant inter relationship among socio-economic and organizational position variables of employees of LIC is rejected in the case of age vs experience, age vs education, age vs economic status and experience vs education, and is accepted in all other cases.
3. No significant inter relationship among socio-economic and organizational position variables of employees of LIC is rejected in the case of designation vs economic status, age vs experience, age vs education, and experience vs economic status, and is accepted in all other cases.
4. No significant inter relationship among socio-economic and organizational position variables of employees of LIC is rejected in the case of age vs experience, and experience vs education, and is accepted in all other cases.
5. No significant relationship between socio-economic and organizational position variables and leadership styles of employees of LIC is rejected in the case of ‘age’ vs ‘bureaucratic’, and ‘education’ vs ‘nurturant’ and is accepted in all other cases.
6. No significant relationship between socio-economic and organizational position variables and leadership styles of employees of LIC is rejected in the case of ‘experience’ vs ‘task-orientation’, ‘education’ vs ‘participative’, ‘education’ vs ‘bureaucratic’ ‘economic status’ vs ‘task-orientation’ ‘economic status’ vs ‘nurturant’ and is accepted in all other cases.
7. No significant relationship between socio-economic and organizational position variables and leadership styles of employees of LIC is rejected in the case of ‘age’ vs ‘nurturant’, ‘experience’ vs ‘bureaucratic’, ‘experience’ vs ‘task-orientation’, ‘experience’ vs ‘authoritarian’, ‘education’ vs ‘bureaucratic’ and ‘education’ vs ‘authoritarian’ ‘economic status’ vs ‘authoritarian’ and is accepted in all other cases.

**X. CONCLUSION**

This study has investigated the relationship of leadership styles and Socio Economic Organization Variables in a public sector enterprise LIC. The results of this study revealed that there is no relationship between leadership styles and SEOP variables. On the basis of the study, it can be concluded that leadership styles have no effect on SEOP variables.
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