

## ADMINISTRATIVE EFFECTIVENESS AMONG MEN AND WOMEN EXECUTIVES<sup>#</sup>

**Asad Bano**

*NWFP Public Service Commission*

*Peshawar, Pakistan*

*The study was designed to appraise administrative and executive effectiveness among men and women executives. A sample of 70 executives (35 men and 35 women) were randomly selected from health, education, industrial, and organizational departments. Performance of these executives were rated by five of their same sex subordinates (705=350) on Purdue Rating Scale (PRS, Remmers & Hobson, 1951). The findings indicate that the women Administrators were significantly better than the men administrators on Social Responsibility Scale while there was negligible differences between men and women administrators on the other two scales of PRS, namely, Administrative Achievement and Democratic Orientation Scales.*

Any executive or junior executive such as department head, division manager, director, or president of an organization is an administrator (Remmers & Hobson, 1951). In the past couple of decades, there has been considerable interest, both in research and in practice, in the comparative study of leadership role among men and women. These efforts have yielded following three distinct point of views (Powell, 1990):

1. *No difference*: Women who pursue the non-traditional career of manager reject the feminine stereotype and have needs, values, and leadership styles similar to those of who pursue managerial career.
2. *Stereotypical differences*: Women and men managers differ in ways predicted by stereotypes, as a result of early socialization experiences that reinforce masculinity in men and femininity in women.
3. *Non-stereotypical differences*: Women and men managers differ in ways opposite to stereotypes because women managers have to be exceptional to compensate for early socialization experiences that are different from those of men.

---

<sup>#</sup> Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Asad Bano, NWFP Public Service Commission, Peshawar, Pakistan.

Powell (1990) conducted a comprehensive review of the research literature on gender differences regarding administrative styles to determine the level of support for each of the following variables: Behavior, motivation, commitment, and subordinates responses. Powell concluded that: There is little reason to believe that either women or men make superior managers, or that women and men are different types of managers. Instead, there are likely to be excellent, average, and poor managerial performers within each sex. Success in today's highly competitive market place calls for organizations to make best use of the talent available to them. To do this, they need to identify, develop, encourage, and promote the most effective managers, regardless of sex. Administrative and executive effectiveness is the product of working relationship between the administrator and the group he/she directs (Remmers & Hobson, 1951).

Although there is no formula that teaches one how to be an effective supervisor, research evidence accumulated over many years has uncovered many useful insights. Employees like to work for supervisors who show consideration for them, who are supportive, and who are fair and just in their treatment (Kotter, 1982). For effective management, supervisor creates an atmosphere of approval in relations with subordinates. Employees perception of their quality of working life is affected heavily by the treatment they receive from their supervisors (Likert, 1967). This attitude of the supervisor is termed as "Social responsibility" or "Fairness to subordinates". Supportive supervisory behavior has quite consistently correlated positively and highly with the satisfaction of subordinates (Yukl, 1971). In a highly acclaimed multi-volume work titled as "Lee's Lieutenants: A study in Command", Douglas Southall Freeman made perceptive observations about those officers (colonels and generals) who served under General Robert E. Lee in the confederate Army during the Civil War. Freeman noted that those commanders who were most effective in prolonged field operations (and not in just one battle) looked out for the well-being of their soldiers in terms of sanitation, food, clothing, and shelter (Freeman, 1944). Although the specific concerns facing the modern supervisor are somewhat different from those of a military leader, the message is same: A successful supervisor is concerned about the well being of his or her people.

Another aspect of effective supervision is to provide adequate tools, equipment, and materials so that employees can do their jobs properly. He or she also provides proper job information, production plans, and schedules. The supervisor gives help in diagnosing technical

problems when requested. This dimension has been variously labeled as "Facilitation and goal emphasis" "Administrative achievement", and the like (Beach, 1985). Livingston (1969) suggested that those managers who display confidence in themselves and in their subordinates' skills and who communicate their expectation of high performance, tend to manage work units that consistently outperform units run by managers who show little confidence in their employees capacity to produce.

Another important dimension of effective leadership and supervision is the development of team work among employees. Research evidences (Likert, 1967; Marrow, Bowers, & Stanly, 1967; Ritchie, 1974) show that best supervisors build up group pride and loyalty. They involve the group as a whole in the problems of the department. The effective supervisor also engenders a feeling of group responsibility for the success of the whole section of department, and also generates an appropriate degree of employees participation in day to day decisions. This characteristic of the administrator is called "Democratic orientation".

The present study was undertaken to investigate the characteristics of men and women executives in relation to effective management, and also to see whether there is any relationship between education of the executives and the ratings they got from their subordinates.

## METHOD

### Sample 1

Sample 1 consisted of randomly selected 70 executives (35 men and 35 women). Out of the 70 administrators, 22 (31.4%) were senior doctors from the hospitals of Peshawar (Lady Reading Hospital; and Hayat Abad Medical Complex ); 26 (37.2%) were educationists who were Principals of different colleges and departments head and the remaining 22 (31.4%) were either directors or managers of various organizations at Hayat Abad Industrial Area, Peshawar. Education wise there were 23(32.83%) graduates; 23(32.83) post graduates, and 24 (32.48%) highly educated (M.Phil, Ph.D, M.R.C.Ps, etc.) executives. Age range of the sample was 35 to 55 years with a mean age of 45.14 years for men and 42.42 years for women executives.

## Sample 2

It included a randomly selected group of 350 subjects who were subordinates of the executives comprising Sample 1. Criteria of their selection was as follows:

- 1) Age range: 39-50 years.
- 2) Minimum education: Bachelors degree.
- 3) Work experience under present administrator: At least one year.
- 4) Immediate subordinates of the executives: Either junior doctors/lecturers/associate or assistant professors, and sub managers, etc.

## Instruments

### *Personal Datasheet*

It was designed to collect information, i.e., age, occupation, basic pay scale, academic qualification of the administrators.

### *Purdue Rating Scale*

The scale was originally developed by Remmers and Hobson (1951) for a means to appraise administrative and executive effectiveness. The scale is composed of 36 items. The responses to the items are measured on a 5-point scale ranging from 'always' to 'never'.

Three factors or general characteristics of good administration in this rating scale are: (1) Social responsibility for subordinates and society: It measures how much he/she is public-spirited and considerate to his employees, (2) Administrative achievement: It is used to measure the abilities of an administrator related to his/her job or duties, and (3) Democratic orientation: It is used to measure the attitude of an administrator towards his/her subordinates based on the concept of equality and absence of class feelings.

## Procedure

Each administrator was individually asked to fill up a personal data sheet and with their help and support staff meetings of their subordinates were arranged. The staff members/subordinates were motivated in a group form to rate their bosses honestly on PRS (Remmers & Hobson, 1951). Each executive was rated by five of their

same sex subordinates ( $70 \times 5 = 350$ ). Executives being rated were not present in the meetings.

### Scoring

Following the scoring procedure given in the manual of PRS, each administrator ratings of the raters on each item of the scale was individually summed and averaged to obtain a single score.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The reliability of PRS was determined by computing alpha coefficient. Alpha coefficient for all the three factors, *viz*, social responsibility, administrative achievement, and democratic orientation, ranged from .87 to .97 with a median of .92. The overall internal consistency of the scale is .98. Item sum correlation method was used for determining the validity of the scale. The correlation ranged from .66 to .86 and are statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ) for all items of the scale.

Means and standard deviations ratings for men and women executives by the subordinates on PRS are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

*Means, Standard Deviations and t-values for the Rating of Men and Women Executives on PRS*

Variables	Men ( $n = 35$ )		Women ( $n = 35$ )		<i>t</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Social Responsibility	43.30	3.49	47.49	4.06	2.43*
Achievement	71.91	3.75	72.88	3.65	1.09
Administrative					
Democratic Orientation	13.69	1.31	14.16	0.93	1.72

\* $p < .05$ ;  $df = 68$

*t*-test was used to check the significance of difference between the two groups under study. Results show that there is a negligible difference between the mean scores of ratings for administrative achievement and democratic orientation of both sexes. However, women administrators are rated significantly higher than men administrators on social responsibility factor of PRS.

Table 2

*Means, Standard Deviations, t-values and ANOVA on the Scores of PRS for Men and Women Executives with Varying Educational Qualifications*

Variables	Highly Educated*			Post Graduates			Graduates			ANOVA	
	Men (n=15) M	Women (n=15) M	t	Men (n=15) M	Women (n=15) M	t	Men (n=15) M	Women (n=15) M	t	Men (n=15) F	Women (n=15) F
Social Responsibility	44.4 (3.34)**	47.29 (3.15)	.18	45.29 (3.79)	48.31 (4.02)	.15	45.80 (3.34)	46.5 (5.23)	.03		.41
Administrative Achievement	71.48 (2.80)	76.64 (3.87)	.16	71.96 (4.00)	73.41 (4.37)	.06	72.10 (3.75)	70.97 (3.86)	.03		.09
Democratic Orientation	13.4 (1.27)	14.29 (.85)	.17	13.85 (1.61)	14.26 (.87)	.07	13.76 (1.04)	13.75 (1.23)	.001		.30

\* Ph.D/M.Phil., & M.R.C.P., etc.

\*\*Values within parenthesis represent Standard Deviations.

*t*-test and ANOVA was used on the rating scores of men and women executive belonging to highly educated, post-graduate, and graduate academic qualifications. Statistical analysis clearly depicts that the educational qualification of both men and women executives yielded insignificant differences on the rating.

Findings of the present study suggests that men and women are apt to be more similar than different in relation to professional and social skills required in their work place (Table1). The only notable difference is that women administrators are higher than men administrators on Social Responsibility scale. Possible explanation for the findings is as follow: The biological difference between men and women is in itself not a basis of judgment for poor/good management in the world of work. There are excellent and poor managers among each sex and there is little reason to believe that either women or men make superior managers (Powell, 1990). In a study, Gillmar (1982) questioned men and women managers to explore the potential gender differences in management styles. She concluded that both have different methods or accomplishing similar goals. One of the difference, she noted, is that men managers tend to let employees struggle on their own while women managers typically show more concern and guide their subordinates to the final clearance of the problem. Similar view has been expressed by Gray (1990). He related that men generally see the world from a "focused" perspective while women see the world from a more "expanded" perspective. Focused perception tends to go from 'parts' to the 'whole'— it is like relating one thing to another in a sequential way. Expanded or open perception is opposite to focused perception— it goes from 'whole' to the 'parts'. In the decision making process, e.g., women tend to be aware of so many possibilities that they can not focus on one and make a decision. They may spend days in making a decision and as they are more relationship oriented they also include others in their decision. A man, on the other hand, would concentrate on final conclusion and get it done quickly without taking time to explore at least some of the options. Similarly, men and women form and express opinions differently. Women take additional time and care to consider various points of view and together all available information before forming opinion and are equally careful in expressing it to let others know that they do not claim to be absolutely right. Unlike women, men quickly form opinion or conclusion based on what he already knows and appears more definite if others agrees, otherwise weigh the merits of others disagreement against their own opinion and is ready to change accordingly. This difference in orientation greatly affect values, priorities, and interests. Women

naturally take greater interest in love, relationships communication, sharing, and cooperation; men have greater interest in producing results, achieving goals, competition, and efficiency. A considerable number of studies (Chodorow, 1978, 1989; Giligan, 1982, Gilligan, Lyons, Hammer, 1990; Lever, 1978; Maccoby, 1990; Miller, 1986; Roberts, 1991) supports Gray's (1990) explanation of differences in style or approach of men and women perspective.

Findings of Table 2 suggest that there is no relationship between educational qualification of the executives and the variables measuring administrative effectiveness of the executives. McClelland (1961) demonstrated that an increasingly large percentage of American managers are college educated, but because performance is important to effectiveness in workplace, there is no guarantee that a certain limit of education will lead to success. Although graduates of Ivy League Schools and other prestigious institutions may have an advantage, many American managers from all types and sizes of colleges have made it into the upper ranks.

## REFERENCES

- Beach, S. D. (1985). *Personnel: The management of people at work*. (5th ed) NY: Mcmillan Publishing Co.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering: Psycho analysis and sociology of gender*. Berdeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Chodorow, N. J. (1989). *Feminism and psychoanalytic theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Freeman, D. S. (1944). *Lee's Lieutenants: A study in command (Vol. 3)*. NY: Charles Scriner's Sons.
- Giligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, C., Lyons, N. P., & Hammer, T. J. (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard School*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gillmer, B. V. (1982). *Applied psychology: Adjustment in living and work*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.



- Gray, J. (1990). *Men, women, and relationships: Making peace with the opposite sex*. NY: Arcata Graphics.
- Kotter, J. (1982). *What do effective managers really do?* *Harvard Business Review*, Nov-Dec., 156-167.
- Lever, J. (1978). Sex differences in the complexity of children's play and games. *American Sociological Review*, 43, 471-483.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The human organization: Its management and value* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Livingston, S. J. (1969). Pygmalion in management. *Harvard Business Review*, 47(4), 81-89.
- Maccoby, E. E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist*, 45, 513-520.
- Marrow, D. Bowers, G., & Stanly, R. S. (1967). *Management by participation*. NY: Harper and Row Publication.
- McClelland, C. D. (1961). *The achieving society* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). N J: Prentice-Hall Publication.
- Miller, J. B. (1986). *Toward a new psychology of women* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Powell, I. (1990). Gender and leadership styles: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 93, 74-75.
- Remmers, H. H., & Hobson, R. L. (1951). *Manual for Purdue Rating Scale for administrators and executives*. Indian University Book Store.
- Ritchie, B. J. (1974). *Organizational behaviour: Research and issues*. Madison Research Association.
- Roberts, T. A. (1991). Gender and the influence of evaluations on self assessments in achievement settings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 110, 108-119.
- Yukl, G. (1971). *Organizational behavior and human performance* (Vol. 6) NY: McGraw Hill.