

ASCI Journal of Management Vol. 4 No. 2 (March 1975)

Work Values of Indian Managers*

S R GANESH

A K MALHOTRA

*The authors are grateful to S S Bhat of the Administrative Staff College of India for developing the computer programme for the research data.

An individual's perceptions and the crucial choices he makes and how he makes them in different situations are greatly influenced by his personal values. The study of personal values, therefore, provides an important and useful means of understanding human behaviour. It is only since the last decade that the social scientists have increasingly come to rely upon the study of values to understand the managerial behaviour. However, there are not many studies on the values of Indian Managers.¹

There are many approaches to the study of values. Most of them, however, can be classified as either preferential or normative, or as emphasising very specific or highly abstract values.² The preferential approaches focus on likings, needs, desires and interests, whereas the normative approaches focus on obligations. The very specific values would be the ones related to the organisational life, while the values related to the ultimate nature of things in a culture are the abstract values. Thus, there is a considerable diversity in the definitions of, and therefore, in the approaches to, the study of values.

The present paper does not focus on values per se but on the personal value system, which could be defined as "a relatively permanent evaluative" framework which shapes and influences the general nature of an individual's behaviour.³ The evaluative framework will have "a strong motivational component as well as cognitive, affective and behavioral components."⁴ The approach adopted in this paper for the study of personal value systems of Indian managers is preferential in nature and focuses specifically on work-values, that is, those which are related to the organisation. The attempt is to develop a profile of values of the Indian manager distributed in different value systems and to determine the influence of various factors on these value systems, particularly, the following:

- (1) Types of organisation — private sector, public sector, and government
- (2) Level in the management hierarchy — junior, middle, or top level
- (3) Age of the respondents — below 35, between 36 and 40, between 41 and 45, and above 45 years

This paper reports some of the initial and significant results of a research study on a sample of Indian managers. Arising out of the findings, we will discuss the possible implications, both direct and indirect, for the individual manager, the performance of the organisation, and for the development of the organisation.

The Framework

The research study is based on the framework developed by Graves,⁵ which is an extension of the work done by Maslow.⁶ Graves conceives of an individual at any given point of time as having a stable set of needs and values which are distributed among different value systems and are hierarchically ordered. As one changes or as conditions of one's existence change, some value systems receive a greater weightage and tend to influence one's behaviour more than other value systems. Graves has postulated eight value systems and has associated a particular level of existence with each, in an ascending order:

- Level 1 "Reactive" value system
- Level 2 "Tribalistic" value system
- Level 3 "Egocentric" value system
- Level 4 "Conformistic" value system
- Level 5 "Manipulative" value system
- Level 6 "Sociocentric" value system
- Level 7 "Existential" value system
- Level 8 "Experientialistic" value system

However, he found that values of most people are distributed between the second and the seventh levels. This study, therefore, is confined to six levels, from level 2 to level 7.

Graves uses the terms, such as "tribalistic", "manipulative", etc, in a very special sense and these terms should not be confused with common usages of the terms. To clarify this, we have paraphrased Graves to highlight the important characteristics of the six value systems relevant to the paper. In the following paragraphs, we will focus on the basic philosophy, the dominant needs and concerns, and the behaviour patterns in each of the six value systems.

Level 2: "Tribalistic" value system

The main characteristic of this level is the individual's need for stability. This need gets focused when he finds himself in his first established way of life—given to him by his family, tribe or society. This way of life is not understood but the individual has a strong tendency to defend it. His understanding is limited to his direct personal experience and he does not possess the ability of critical evaluation. The prime end-value at this level is safety which is achieved through tradition. Thus, the main view at this level is "one shall live according to the ways of one's elders". The individual at this level is strongly influenced by, and he tacitly submits to, authority figures — the boss, the police, the government official, the teacher, the priest, the father, and the elder brother. Since there is a lurking fear of the unknown, he has a low risk-taking ability and a high need for protection. He is also likely to evade personal responsibility, although he can be depended upon for faithfully carrying out instructions.

Level 3: "Egocentric" value system

It is at this level an individual becomes aware of his existence. This awareness is limited to his needs, desires, whims, and fancies. He reacts against the constraints imposed on him by the society and resorts to "might" for asserting his individuality. He may also develop a strong contempt for morality which he views as nothing more than a defence for the weak. His basic philosophy is that of rugged individualism and "might is right" and his attitude is that of "to hell with the rest of the world, I am for myself." Since every one cannot win in this struggle of power, this level of existence also leads to the dichotomies "authority Vs submission" and "'haves' Vs 'have nots.'" At the level, the individual's main need is survival and self-assertion. He has a hostile attitude, a high degree of suspicion and mistrust, a greater need for hitting out, a greater fear of being used by others, and a strong hatred for constraints. Consequently, he is not likely to respond favourably to group techniques emphasising openness, trust, and the like. He may also be selfish, unscrupulous and dishonest. He can be restrained through power, but, in order to bring him out of his egocentricity, it may help to administer small doses of structured participation in management.⁷

Level 4: "Conformistic" value system

At this level, the individual sees that things do not happen the way he wants and life is not under his control. This problem is faced both by the 'haves' and the 'have-nots.' The individual rationalises that the forces which control his life are not merely beyond his control, but, perhaps, beyond this world. He starts attributing his life, his place in the society, his sufferings and happiness to a super-natural power (e.g. the theory of Karma). The central theme at this level is "one shall perform the role ascribed to one with absolute perfection, disregarding the immediate desires in order to come to everlasting peace and happiness later." Consequently, the individual at this level usually subordinates himself to a

philosophy, cause, or religion and has a high need to get others to accept his values. Since his emphasis is on perfect performance of his roles, he has low tolerance for ambiguity and has difficulty in accepting people whose values differ from his own. He tends to evaluate in rigid categories of good and bad. He may fight against his own feelings if his sense of morality tells him that they are undesirable. For him, life is a serious business and the words 'should' and 'ought' play an important role. However, these 'shoulds' and 'oughts' are defined in an absolute sense and not by the whims and fancies of an authority figure as in the case of tribalistic existence. Thus, although he dislikes violence, he may still indulge in it in order to defend his particular cause, religion, or philosophy. In his everyday life, he normally emphasises duty, sacrifice, discipline, and strict adherence to rules and regulations and reacts strongly against corruption, favouritism, etc.

Level 5: "Manipulative" value system

When an individual asks himself why can't one have some enjoyment in this life and why must life be only a time of denial, he also realises that he cannot have enjoyment unless he expresses his independence from the fatalistic attitude of the conformist. He needs to gain mastery over the universe, rather than becoming its servant, and that he can do so only through his "reason." The individual at this level has a high need for achievement and goes to any extent to achieve his goals. He values gamesmanship, competition, the entrepreneurial attitude, efficiency, work simplification, the calculated risk, scientific scheming, and manipulation. For him people are items on the balance sheet to be manipulated as objects, just like supplies and equipment. However, he does not 'hit out' as the egocentric does, nor does he have the 'to hell with others' attitude.

Level 6: "Sociocentric" value system

When an individual has satisfied his material wants, his affiliative needs — to belong, to be accepted, to love and be loved — come to the fore. He realises that in treating people like objects his relationships with people have become akin to his relationship with objects. That he has "got ahead" but has not "got along with"; that beneath his cold rationality there lies a soft, tender, and subjective being which is waiting to find an outlet. At this level, it is the feelings of men, rather than the hidden secrets of the physical universe, which draw the individual's attention. Co-operation is more valued than competition, and social approval takes precedence over individual fame. Consumption and warm social intercourse are for this level rather than production and cold, calculated self-interest. The individual at this level prefers sensitivity over objectivity, taste over wealth, respectability over power, consumer good over organisational profit, and participation over authoritarianism. Sociocentricity is not a return to conformism although there are similarities between the two. Whereas the main theme of the conformistic is 'self-denial', the theme of the socio-centric is 'acceptance of others'. Thus, unlike the conformist, the socio-centric resents the impersonality of rules and regulations. The loyalty of the socio-centric is to his peer group, whereas that of the conformist is to an abstraction, a cause, philosophy, or God. He dislikes violence. He would encounter authoritarianism with passive resistance and may often indulge in self-punitive behaviour, for instance, alcoholism, drug abuse, etc.

Level 7: "Existential" value system

At the earlier levels, the individual is geared towards overcoming certain deficiencies, be it the need for physiological relief, security, material wants, or love and belongingness. At the existential level, the human mind attains freedom and is ready to experience and express. The theme at this level is "to be, to experience and express." The individual at this level has a high tolerance for ambiguity and for people with different values. He is goal-directed but

his time perspective is longer than that of the manipulative individual. Further, he has a better comprehension of the multiplicity of goals in any situation, organisational or otherwise. Like the sociocentric, he is concerned with the dignity of the fellowmen but does not subordinate himself for social approval. He does not share the awe for the absolute with the conformist. He views rules, regulations, systems, procedures and roles as flexible and as means towards an end, not as personal threat or assault as in the case of the egocentric.

Methodology

Questionnaire

Based on Graves' framework, Scott Myers and Susan Myers developed a questionnaire on work-values of managers, in 1973, which was used by them to develop normative data on the work-values of various groups of employees, particularly in the US. Based on this normative data, they constructed typical value profiles for individuals and groups of employees. Flowers and Hughes⁸ used the same framework to determine the relationship between work values and managerial mobility.

In the present study, the questionnaire on "work values" has been used without any substantive changes. The questionnaire contains 18 work-related items, such as attitude towards supervision, systems and procedures, organisational goals, personal expectations, job freedom, etc. Each question has responses reflecting the attitudes and values at the six levels (2 to 7). In every question, each response corresponds to a particular level in the hierarchy of value systems. In the questionnaire, these responses are not in any fixed order but can be translated in terms of the value systems with the help of a key. The key identifies the particular value system which a response reflects.

For each question a respondent is asked to distribute 12 points among the six responses. These scores can be translated into their respective value systems with the help of the key. Thus, by adding the scores of an individual on a given value system for all the 18 questions, a profile can be made for the individual.

Sample

We administered the "values for working" questionnaire developed by Scott Myers and Susan Myers to about 300 Indian managers, and about 219 responded. The sample represents various types of organisations (public sector, private sector and government), various levels in the management hierarchy, and various age groups. Table 1 gives the details of the distribution of managers in the various groups.

As can be seen from Table 1, our sample has a higher proportion of middle level managers and a lower proportion from the government organisations. This is essentially due to the method of sample selection. Further, the managers who are above 40 in age account for a little more than 60 per cent of the total sample. This perhaps is a characteristic of the universe and not just of the sample. Subramaniam⁹ estimated that about 65 per cent of Indian managers are more than 40 years old.

Analysis

The three variables, namely, the type of organisation, the level in the management hierarchy, and the age, have been treated independently in our analysis. For example, in the analysis of different types of organisations, the respondents were classified into three groups. The mean and standard deviation scores were obtained for each group and were compared through a two-tailed t-test. Since we did not hypothesise any direction in which the

Total sample		219
Organisation	1) Private sector	113
	2) Public sector	73
	3) Government	33
Level in Management hierarchy	1) Top level	41
	2) Middle Level	129
	3) Junior level	49
Age group	1) 35 years and less	33
	2) 36-40 years	53
	3) 41-45 years	75
	4) 46 years and above	58

Table 1: Characteristics of the sample

difference would be obtained, a two-tailed test is more appropriate than a single-tailed test.¹⁰

Another set of questions pertains to the differences in response to the different questions in the questionnaire. From the discussion of Graves's framework, it is clear that each value system has various aspects and components. The response to any one question reflects, at best, some aspects only. Therefore, in order to understand what aspects of a given value system are considered more important by the managers, a content analysis of the various statements has been attempted.

Limitations

Before reporting the most significant findings and the differences among the various groups, we would like to mention some of the limitations of the study. The first concerns the bias in the sample. It represents those managers who attended some of the training programmes organised by the Administrative Staff College of India, Hyderabad, during 1974. This method of sample selection may introduce bias since those attending training programmes at the Administrative Staff College of India may have characteristics different from those who do not attend training programmes at all.¹¹

Secondly, treating each of the variables independently limits the interpretation of the results. It is important to determine the interaction among the variables. However, the nature and extent of these interactions can only be determined with a factorial design using a bigger sample than the present one. Further, the statistical significances have to be interpreted carefully. For instance, it is quite possible that the differences in the various age groups found by us were actually determined by the difference in the levels of the respondents or the types of organisations they represent.

Value System \ Score	Tribal-istic	Ego-centric	Confor-mistic	Manipu-lative	Socio-centric	Existen-tial
Mean	13.30	4.00	20.62	19.31	17.21	25.53
SD	4.72	3.17	5.87	6.15	5.71	7.92

Table 2: Percentage scores for the total sample

Another limitation is the longitudinal aspect. We are in no position to say that as a person grows his value systems will reflect these changes. For all we know, these differences might be just in two groups affected by something like a generation gap and have nothing to do with the transitional aspect. Thus, the present study does not seek to explain with confidence why the differences are found although some plausible explanations are advanced.

Findings and Discussion

Only the most significant results are being reported because of the limitations mentioned before. To begin with, the overall trend for the total sample is presented and, subsequently significant differences among the various groups of managers are discussed.

Overall Trends

Table 2 gives the percentage mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) scores for the six value systems.

As can be seen from this table, the Indian managers show greater preference for existential (25.53 per cent), conformistic, manipulative and socio-centric values, and least preference for egocentric (4.00 per cent). There is a high degree of variance around the mean scores of the six value systems. The standard deviations range from 28.5 to 79.25 per cent of the mean scores, suggesting that there are considerable individual differences in the emphases placed on the various value systems.

There are no published research findings either in India or elsewhere with which these scores can be directly compared. Even the research findings of Graves and Myers have not been published. Further, the relatively even distribution of scores among conformistic, manipulative and socio-centric values makes the task of interpretation rather difficult. It, therefore, becomes essential to look at each individual value system and find out the particular aspects for which it has been preferred. The following paragraphs report the results of the content analysis undertaken for each value system. The figures within the brackets represent the mean percentage scores for the particular item.

In the tribalistic values, we find that the highest scores are given to items which emphasised security and stability. For instance, statements like "in my opinion a retirement plan will help me and my family keep going when I am too old to work" (24.07) or "The kind of job I like is the one which has steady work, fair play, and above all, a good boss" (24.05) have received above average scores. On the other hand, items emphasising helplessness, a tendency towards avoiding problems, and an excessive dependency in authority relationships obtained below average scores. These aspects are reflected in such statements

as "company profits are important but there isn't much I can do about it" (3.36), "I do not like to get sick, but when I do, there is very little I can do about it" (6.23), and "to me company loyalty means being on the job as much as I can and do what I am told" (5.22). A question-wise analysis does not seem to be feasible for the egocentric value system because of its very low scores on all the items.

The conformistic value system tends to emphasise duty consciousness, personal responsibility, caution, and security. These aspects are reflected in these statements: "I think it is each person's responsibility to stay healthy by developing clean living habits" (30.52); "Company loyalty means sticking with the company through good and bad years, making sacrifices when necessary to keep the company strong" (28.06); and "For me basic salary is fairly set by management and I carefully plan how I save and spend this money" (30.51).

On the other hand, statements which emphasised "firmness and rigidity", another aspect of the conformistic values, are not liked by the managers. For example, a statement like "It is the duty of every person to follow systems and procedures exactly as they are defined in the manuals or explained by the supervisor: people should not be allowed to bend the rules" has received a score (4.72) significantly below the average for the conformistic level.

In manipulative values, items which have an open admission of personal needs for status and money receive low scores. Only a few of our respondents agree with the statements like "In my opinion a retirement plan provides future financial security, specially if you can get into a high paying job before retirement" (10.74) or "For me basic salary is OK for meeting on-going expenses, but I am always on the lookout for opportunities to make more money" (8.57). The aspects for which manipulative values are liked emphasise independence, initiative, objectivity, assertion of personal responsibility, and a tendency to differentiate between means and ends. For example, statements which have received a high score in the manipulative value system are "For me job freedom means the opportunity to stand on my own legs and to pursue success without too much interference froth- supervision or any thing else" (28.57), "The kind of job I like is one which allows me some flexibility on means, and pays off as along as I get good results" (20.59), and "The kind of person I would like to supervise should take orders well and use imagination and initiative in getting the job done in such a way that we both look good" (37.22).

In the socio-centric values above average scores are given to those statements which emphasise organisational responsibility towards employees: "Retirement plan is an organisation's responsibility and should provide enough for everyone to live comfortably" (24.19); "The information that will be most important to me at work is a policy change that will place as much emphasis on the people in the organisation as it does on profits" (24.34); and "Basic salary should be democratically set with consideration for a person's productivity and needs" (26.32).

Socio-centricity is not liked for its emotionality, subjectivity, and an interest in the psychological aspects of human personality. This is reflected in low [scores on] statements like "Job freedom for me means the opportunity to be friends with any one without worrying about where they fit into the company" (8.03), "Sometimes I think that too much stress is placed on trying to heal physical illness and not enough on maintaining mental health" (10.25), and "Most job descriptions place too much emphasis on the job and not enough on the people who do the job" (11.94).

The existential values are emphasised in such aspects as independence, personal responsibility, creativity, goal directedness, and a long-term perspective. For example, the statement that "Systems and procedures should serve only as guidelines and should permit

people to be flexible and innovative, and even to violate the system, in achieving organisational goals," received the highest score (42.57) of all the questions in all the value systems. Similarly, statements such as "Company profits will be greater in the long run when the needs of the employees and company are both considered" (30.72) and "The kind of boss I like is one who gives me the necessary help I need and lets me do my job in my own way" (35.09) have received significantly high scores. However, the experiential and expressive components of the existential values did not receive much support from our respondents. Statements like "For me, paid time off is an opportunity to be away from the pressure of the organisation and to be oneself" (15.10) and "Money is important to me because it provides freedom and the opportunity to be myself, having money is not as important as what I do with it" (20.65) received below average scores.

While our respondents value independence and flexibility for themselves, they do not like them to be in others. This is reflected in the low scores for the statements "In my opinion company rules are best when they are few, and effective if they succeed in putting the burden of responsibility on the employees" (15.68) and "The kind of person I would like to supervise neither wants nor needs me for anything other than helping identify the job to be done, thus leaving me free to do what I need to do" (15.27). Another highlight of this analysis is that though our respondents do consider the various elements of existential values, they would not like to sacrifice security for these values. The statement that "Retirement plan offers security and freedom for the future, provided it should not make one stick to the organisation because of it" has received a score (16.26) much below the average for the existential values.

Thus, the question-wise analysis of the various value systems indicates that the managers in our sample place high value on duty consciousness, willingness to accept personal responsibility, security and stability, initiative, organisational responsibility to employees, and goal directedness. It is interesting to note that all these values either pertain directly to the conformistic level or at least do not clash with the conformistic values. Thus, when these managers exhibit manipulative, socio centric, and existential values, they do so in a primarily conformistic manner. This is most apparent in the case of manipulative and sociocentric values. The manipulative level emphasises the high need for material gains and higher status. However, the managers in our sample tend to de-emphasise the manipulative values for this very reason alone. They exhibit manipulative values in those areas that overlap with the conformistic level (for instance, willingness to take personal responsibility).

Similarly, the essence of the socio-centric system lies in its emphasis on emotion, warmth in interpersonal relations, and an interest in subjectivity and tenderness. The Indian managers are socio-centric for an entirely different and rather conformistic reason – organisational responsibility to employees. Even in the existential values we observe that these items which are non-conformistic in nature (for instance, encouraging independence, spontaneity, and expressive behaviour, and the need for being one's own self) are not valued by our respondents. Thus, there is a dominant conformistic bias in the values of Indian managers along with a relative indifference towards their own existence. This is reflected in an ambivalent attitude towards personal objectives like material gains, warm inter-personal relations, emotionality, spontaneity, or opportunities for being one's own self. The only exception to this is their need for security and stability for which they are quite prepared to subordinate all other values.

It may be interesting to note here that this dominant conformistic bias in the Indian manager was also observed by England, Dhingra, and Agarwal who identified a high degree of moralistic orientation¹² among Indian managers. England also observed that Indian

managers place lower value on most employee groups.¹³ It may be due to this very reason that our respondents do not quite like to encourage independence, among their subordinates and other employees. England's study showed that personalistic goals and status orientation were valued high, whereas they received a low score in our study. We observed ambivalence towards personalistic goals, particularly those pertaining to money¹⁴ and status. Some of these findings may not be peculiar to the managers, in particular. For instance, Jacob and Singh¹⁵ found that Indians put much more emphasis on "Selflessness" compared to the people in Poland, US and Yugoslavia.

In their comparative study of managers in different countries, Haire, Ghiselli and Porter¹⁶ observe that managers from developing countries, including India, place high importance on all the needs in Maslow's hierarchy. This was interpreted by them as higher and somewhat unrealistic expectations from the organisation. We also find that the Indian managers place high importance on the organisation's responsibility to employees. Nevertheless, it is surprising that the managers who place such a high value on "selflessness" should also have such high expectation from their organisations. The explanation probably lies in the Indian philosophy and outlook towards life that emphasise that one should fulfil one's duties without any regard for gains, benefits, or personal goals. However, there is also the hope that eventually one will be rewarded for the fulfilment of one's duty and the perfect performance of one's role. If the same outlook is projected by these managers into their work lives, it is not surprising that they place high value both on "organisational responsibility towards employees" and "selflessness", for the assumption is that one's personal interest will be taken care of by a higher order, in this case the organisation itself.

Differences among Groups

We observed many similarities and some differences in the values of the different groups of managers. Here we would only highlight some of the major differences in the work-values of the managers from different types of organisations, different (management levels and different age groups).

Types of Organisations

In three out of the six value systems, we found significant differences in the managers from the private sector, the public sector and the government organisations. Table 3 gives the percentage mean and standard deviation scores from these three groups.

As can be seen from this table, the most striking differences are found between the managers from the government organisations and the private sector organisations. In four out of the six value systems, these two groups fall on the two extremes, whereas the managers from the public sector organisations fall in between the two. The differences for which the t-value (two-tailed) equals or exceeds the .05 level of significance are as follows:

1. The managers from the government organisations are significantly more tribalistic, compared to the managers in the private sector. The results are significant at .02 level. The public sector managers fall in between the two groups. However, their difference is not statistically significant with either of the other two groups.
2. The private sector managers are significantly more manipulative, compared to the managers in the public sector and government organisations, this being significant at the .01 level for both the groups.

Value System	Tribalistic		Egocentric		Conformistic		Manipulative		Sociocentric		Existential	
Type of Organisation	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Private Sector	12.73	4.69	3.88	3.29	20.65	6.27	20.73	6.65	15.74	5.27	26.24	9.04
Public Sector	13.47	4.88	3.98	3.07	21.01	5.56	18.08	5.05	18.66	6.04	24.77	6.63
Govt.	14.89	4.03	4.48	2.94	19.67	4.96	17.15	5.28	18.99	5.02	24.79	6.00

Table 3: Organisation-wise analysis

- The private sector managers are significantly less socio-centric, compared to the managers in the public sector and the government organisations. The results are significant at .01 level for the government organisations and .001 level for the public sector managers.

Earlier attempts at finding out the influence of the type of organisation on values dealt with only two types of organisations - the public sector and the private sector. Neither England and his associates¹⁷ nor Dwivedi¹⁸ found any significant differences between the two groups. However, the classification of the respondents into the public sector, the private sector, and the government in our study has enabled us to notice some differences. We do not know whether these differences are due to the culture of these organisations or the types of individuals who join these organisations. However, Subramaniam¹⁹ observes that the private sector as well as the government organisations obtain their managerial class from approximately the same source. Hence, it is more realistic to assume that the differences observed by us are due to the cultures of these organisations. This highlights the important part an organisation plays in shaping individual values. However, there is one area in which our findings are consistent with the earlier findings. Both England and his associates²⁰ as well as Dwivedi²¹ observed that managers from the private sector organisations value aggressiveness more than their counterparts in the public sector. This is confirmed in our study by the higher score of the private sector managers on the manipulative value system.

Management Levels

The level in the management hierarchy has very little influence on the values of managers. The only significant difference found by us is that the managers at the top level are more existential than the managers at the middle levels, the difference being significant at .01 level. The difference between the top and the junior levels is statistically significant. On the whole, there is a greater compatibility between the junior level and the top level. (See Table 4).

In four out of the six value systems, the top level and the middle level fall on the two extremes with the junior level managers falling in between these two extremes. The middle level managers have highest scores on socio-centric values, and the junior level managers have slightly higher scores on the manipulative values, compared to the other two groups. Mason, Haire and his associates²² also observed that the only significant difference between managers at the senior and the junior levels is that the former enjoys a greater degree of

Value System Level	Tribalistic		Egocentric		Conformistic		Manipulative		Sociocentric		Existential	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Top level	12.31	4.45	3.35	2.84	20.74	5.97	19.11	6.55	16.02	5.41	28.43	9.76
Middle level	13.62	4.77	4.25	3.29	20.65	5.77	19.14	5.90	17.79	5.72	24.52	6.92
Junior level	13.31	4.70	3.88	3.04	20.46	5.98	19.91	6.38	16.66	5.72	25.74	8.05

Table 4: Analysis by management levels

need satisfaction. If this be so, it is to be expected that a higher proportion of them would fall into the existential system.

Age groups

As can be seen from Table 5, there are no linear trends of a direct relationship between age and scores on the different value systems except in the case of conformistic values. The statistically significant differences among the four groups are :

1. Tribalistic values are at their maximum during the period 41 to 45 years. The differences between this group and those of 35 years and below is significant at .05 level.
2. The conformistic values tend to increase with age. The differences between the managers who are 46 and above and those who are 40 or below is significant at .05 level. The group of managers falling in between 41 and 45 do not show a statistically significant difference with either of the groups. Thus, it would seem that this is the period of transition in the increase of conformistic values.
3. The manipulative values decrease with age. In this case also the appreciable difference takes place only after the age of 45. The difference between the managers above 46 and below 35 is significant at .01 level. During the age 36 to 40, there is some decline in the manipulative values. But this difference as compared to the scores of managers below 35 years is significant at the .01 level.
4. Socio-centric values also increase with age. Once again, significant transition occurs after the age of 45. We found the difference in the score of socio-centric values of the managers who are between 46 and above and the managers who are between 41 and 45 to be statistically significant at .02 level. On the other hand, the socio-centric

Value System Age Group	Tribalistic		Egocentric		Conformistic		Manipulative		Sociocentric		Existential	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
35 yrs and less	12.01	4.93	3.78	3.12	19.31	5.78	21.31	7.41	16.71	6.30	26.85	8.39
36 yrs to 40 yrs	12.72	4.31	3.92	3.03	19.82	4.36	18.81	5.44	17.41	4.80	27.29	7.20
41 to 45 years	14.11	4.86	3.92	3.27	20.75	6.26	20.07	6.50	16.21	5.62	24.90	8.45
45 years and above	13.53	4.53	4.38	3.19	21.94	6.30	17.64	4.87	18.59	5.93	23.97	6.96

Table 5: Analysis by age groups

scores are higher for the managers below 40, as compared to those in the age group of 41-45, though the difference is not statistically significant. Thus, it would seem reasonable to conclude that no appreciable change in the socio-centric values takes place till the age of 45.

5. The existential values decrease with age. From our data, it seems that during the age of 36-40, the existential values are at their maximum and decline thereafter. The differences in the score of this group of managers, compared to those who were 46 and above, is significant at .02 level.

Haire et al²³ did not find any significant difference between the values of the younger and the older managers. They had classified respondents into two groups of below 40 and above 40, whereas we used a four-fold classification. Since we also observed that significant differences take place only after the age of 45, our findings concur with Haire's.

That we did not find any linear trend in the influence of age on value systems is also confirmed by Veiga's²⁴ observations. He classified the work lives of managers into four categories — up to 32 years, from 33 to 43, from 41-48, and 49 onwards. In the first phase, the individual is seeking a niche for himself and his concern for job security and company loyalty is at a minimum. During the second phase - from 33 to 40 years - he has established a niche for himself and is enjoying his first taste of real management responsibility. This probably explains the decline in the manipulative values during the age of 36-40 as observed by us, and an increase in the existential values. The third phase is accompanied by a period of self appraisal analysis and anxiety. It is this phase which really determines whether the individual would further go up in the organisational hierarchy. Thus, it is not surprising that we observed an increase in the manipulative and tribalistic values and a decrease in the socio-centric values in the age group 41 to 45. During the last phase, the individual's main concern is job security and he has a high stake in the retirement plans of the organisation. He is not so much concerned with his advancement, and would be satisfied with a stable and undisturbed work life. This is supported by the significant decrease in the manipulative values after the age of 46.

Some Perspectives

Even with the limitations of the study, these initial findings have important implications for the individual manager's performance and development of the organisation. In the following paragraphs, we have attempted to look beyond the present study.

Earlier, it was reported that the Indian managers have a high need for stability and security and also a tendency to look towards the organisation for the protection of their personal interests. The important question for the organisation is: how it should respond to this need — should it take up the responsibility of protecting the individual's interests all the time? One argument is that this will be conducive to preserving harmony and ensuring a high degree of morale in the organisation. Arising out of Maslow's hierarchy of needs, this may also imply that the employees will start operating at a higher level in the hierarchy. However, certain points have to be considered for the other side of the argument. Firstly, this may imply higher costs for the company, though Drucker²⁵ has argued that the hidden costs of not doing so are, perhaps, higher. Secondly, some amount of insecurity might be desirable from the point of view of individual and organisational performance. And finally,

an increased dependence in the area of personal needs and goals might lead to increased dependence in other areas, decision-making, initiative in work, etc.

There are a variety of other questions which the present study does not address itself to. The important among these, not mentioned earlier, are those which concern the relationship of the value systems with success, compatibility between members of an organisation with particular work and functions, etc. Another area of interest concerns the relative merits and demerits of the various approaches for the development of the organisation in the Indian context. Although generalisations are quite meaningless, it may be useful to work with some guidelines for further research efforts. In view of the predominance of conformism and the need for security and stability, the Indian managers are likely to respond more favourably to incremental changes compared to radical changes. Further, approaches which are aimed at the organisation (that is, structure, tasks, and systems) and incorporate formal institutionalisation measures would have a greater chance of acceptance. This is not to suggest that the need for approaches which are aimed at people and their attitudes is any less. However, due to the low value placed on self and others, it might be difficult to work on these areas to start with.

NOTES:

1 Some of the recent studies are:

- (a) Dwivedi R S. The relative importance of personality traits among Indian Managers. *Indian Management* 1970, 9(4), pp 30-5.
- (b) England W, Dhingra O P, Agarwal N C. The Manager and the Man. *Organization and Administrative Sciences* 1974, 5(2).
- (c) Haire M, Ghiselli E E, et al. *Managerial Thinking-An International Study*. New York, John Wiley & Sons Inc. 1966.
- (d) Negandhi A R, Prasad S B. *Comparative Management*. New York, Mereclith Corporation, 1971.
- (e) Pathak V K. Organisational setting, values, attitudes and modernisation of management. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations* 1970, 6(1), pp. 41-68.
- (f) (Thiagrajan K M. Mutual perceptions of manager's and worker's values—a cross cultural study. *Indian Management* 1974, 13(12), pp. 21-30.

2 England et al. Op. cit. pp. 2-3.

3 Ibid. p.2. We have substituted "evaluative" for "perceptual" in the definition given by the authors.

4 Rokeach M. *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values-A Theory of Organization and Change*. San Fransisco, Jossey Bass Inc, 1961, p. 157.

5 Graves C W. Levels of existence—an open system theory of values. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*. 1970,10 (2), pp 131-55.

6 Maslow A H. *Motivation and Personality*. New York, Harper, 1954.

7 Scott Myers, Susan Myers S. Towards understanding the changing work ethic. *California Management Review* 1974, 16 (3), pp 7-19.

8 Flowers V S. Hughes C L. 49-60. Why employees stay. *Harvard Business Review* July—August 1973, pp.

9 Subramaniam V. *The managerial class of India*. New Delhi. All India Management Association , 1971.

10 Since the sample sizes are different in the different groups, the "Variance-Ratio" test was used to check for homogeneity before using the t-test.

11 Pathak compared the value attitudes in organisations which send their employees for outside training courses with those organisations which do not use the outside training facilities. He concluded that the "user" organisations tended to be more "rational" whereas the "non-users" tended to be more "emotional". Pathak V K. op cit.

12 England et al define "moralistic orientation as an evaluative framework consisting of ethical considerations influencing behaviour toward actions and decisions which are judged to be 'right' and away from those which are judged to be 'wrong' (op cit p. 8). In contrast to this, the pragmatic mode is guided by success-failure considerations and the affective mode is guided by hedonistic considerations.

13 This may also lead to lack of inter-personal co-operation in Indian organisations. Negandhi and Prasad found a high degree of inter-personal hostility and lack of co-operation in Indian companies as compared to American companies and their subsidiaries in India. Negandhi A L, Prasad S B. Op cit.

14 The ambivalence towards wealth was also observed by Thiagarajan. In his comparative study of mutual perception of managers' and workers' values, he found that both the groups felt that money was more important to the the other group than to them. Another interesting finding relevant to the present discussion, is that the Indian managers place very low importance on "independence" and the workers also felt that independence was least important to the managers. Thiagarajan K M. Op cit.

15 Jacob B M, Singh K K. Measuring values. In Jacob B IV *Values and the Active Community*. New York. The Free Press, 1971, pp. 385-99.

16 Haire et al, op cit. p. 91, 101-6.

17 England G W, et al. op cit. pp. 79-81.

18 Dwivedi R S. op cit. p. 34.

19 Subramaniam V. Op. cit.

20 England G W, et al, Op cit. p. 32.

21 Dwivedi R S. Op. cit. p. 32.

22 Haire M, et al, Op. cit. op. 117-34.

23 Ibid. pp. 155-69.

24 Veiga, John F. The mobile Manager at Mid-career. *Harvard Business Review* 1973, 51 (1)' pp. 115-9.

25 Drucker P F. *Management*. London, Heineman, 1974. p. 285-99.