

## **A Study of Managerial Performance as a Function of Burnout, Stressful Work Environment, Leadership Styles and Motivation**

**Ran Singh Dhaliwal\***

*\* School of Management Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala*

---

### **INTRODUCTION**

Managers are the kingpins to achieve the objectives of an organization, but they cannot be treated as machines, whereas achievement of planned targets is high depends on managerial performance simultaneously dignity of individual is also a matter of importance. If a manager having feeling that his dignity was not honored by his organization, it reflects in individual performance behavior. To understand the complex behavior of a person, he must be considered as a whole person, not just separate and distinct characteristics such as knowledge, attitude, skills, and personality traits. Large number of factors influence individual behavior and performance and most of them having inter-related to each other in a web and create high degree complexity in understanding. This complexity always has remained an important issue for researchers.

In case of changed dynamics of economic and business growth the situations have made managerial workforce more and more demanding both economically vis-a-vis psychologically. Because of various types of pressures from powerful multinational corporations and in the name of LPG (liberalization, privatization and globalization) of business and trade, governments have reduced trade barriers that were providing protection to local industry especially were helping to lower down the cost. As a result of high competition, the focus of organizations instead of providing a foundation for long term growth, they are cashing in their assets for short-term stock performance. Due to this enormous and constant pressure these organizations' first priority became to generate cash flow,

instead of creating quality workforce or building a stronger community. All this, in a way has made the work place more cold and hostile where work has become obligation rather than resources of growth. Instead of organizations as existing to enhance the ability and capability of workforce to earn a quality of living and make significant accomplishments, managers serving in organizations are sacrificing their aspirations for good of their employers' benefit. The value of what determines the quality of organizational set-ups is not those cohesiveness among work groups attempting to provide excellent products and services, but managerial workforce is an entirety that is desperate for showing results in terms of increase in performance and output. Peter F. Drucker (1993) has rightly pointed out that capability of adding value through development, improvement and innovation are more important as compared to traditional economic factor (such as monetary capital, physical labor and raw materials). As a result managerial workforce feel highly contained and strained.

Traditionally it was conceptualized that productivity or performance implies 'How much and How well.' It has been defined as quantity of volume of the major product and service that an organization provides to customer (Robbins, 1983). But it must be kept in mind that performance is actually output from all the resources, economy as a whole plays certainly an important role but the way an individual leader/manager plans, organize, and integrates various factors across the whole organization like technology, materials, facilities, product innovations and methods as well as human skills and knowledge, human care and human efforts to increase the overall productive efficiency. Setting and meeting the goal and targets and their successful accomplishment are also an integral part of performance in organizational set-ups. As organizations are now competing for advantage in a volatile business environment it becomes more pertinent to deliberately, consistently, strategically and innovatively develop, optimize and utilize their major value adding resource, i.e. human resource" (Akinyemi, 2011).

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

From time immemorial it was felt concerned to efficiency and effectiveness researchers are trying to find new methods and ways in all the related spheres of operation like financial, mechanical, technical and behavioral, to get the maximum results especially in organizational and managerial (individual) performance. In order to effectively and efficiently completing the tasks and giving philip to overall performance, new technologies and high competitive pressure brought about new crisis in the recent context.

## **BURNOUT AND PERFORMANCE**

Increased complexity of workplace situation needs the analysis of individual's stress experience to be done in terms of multi-dimensional concept. Burnout is one such construct that conceptualizes individual stress experience embedded in a context of complex social relationship and it involves the personal conceptions of both self and others (Maslach, 1998). Burnout does not take place overnight. It is a manifestation of stress. It occurs as a result of continuous high work-stress when it remains unrelieved on performer. So persistence of stress on individuals and failure to manage it effectively are major responsible conditions of it. Maslach and Leiter (1997) expressed that burnout is largely a product of organizational context, even if it is expressed on an individual level. So work climate, work environment and degree variance in burnout, are considered significant areas of study in relation to individual and organizational performance. Burnout has become a focus of systematic study in organizational set-ups, which has attracted the attention of researchers (Maslach and Schaufeli, 1993). Disruptive changes occurred in work environment in Indian industrial set-ups during the recent past decades because of global competition, worldwide recession ringing a bell that its workforce especially managerial staff is largely at the risk of burnout.

## **WORK ENVIRONMENT AND PERFORMANCE**

Review of empirical studies reveals that managerial performance and workplace, organizational performance and learning and the 'learning and performing organization' is now taking a central stage in the organizational context. The view of organizations as open systems, requires us to pay attention to work environment; (i) factors and forces that may affect performance directly, (ii) factors affecting and contributing to performance indirectly. Daft (1998) studied organizational work environment and organizational work culture. The study identified three aspects of work environment's complexity dimension, namely, the number of factors, their complexity and their heterogeneity, whereas stability dimension of work environment reflects the extent to which various factors in the work environment change frequently over the period of time. According to Daft, organizational work culture consists of a set of values, guiding beliefs, understandings and way of thinking, that is shared by and acceptable to members of an organization.

Knuckey et al., (2002) investigated link between organizational employee practices, employee development programme and organizational performance. It was found that employee practices, including employee development, are underdeveloped in low performing organizations. Evans & Rainbird (2002) revealed

that the discourses of Human Resource Management, the learning and performing organization and knowledge management suggest that learning and performance are the central concern in the workplace. They found the effects of managers on salient elements of the organization's work environment that influence performance as highly important. Hosie et al. (2006) presented to specify which aspects of managers' affective well-being and intrinsic job satisfaction predict dimensions of their contextual and task performance, for a detailed account of the development of the managers' performance measurement model refer to.

Huselid (1995), Harel & Tzafrir (1999), and Fey & Bjorkman (2000) investigated the effect of Human Resource Management (HRM) system on organizational performance. They attempted to analyze the relationship between HRM system and organizational performance statistically. However, the relationships were not searched using non-linear approaches. These studies considered that is a critical input in enhancing the business performance results. The HRM system covers; planning, managing and improving the human resources; identifying, developing and sustaining employees' knowledge, talent, and competencies; involving and empowering workforce. It was found that all these factors have a positive effect on organizational performance results and HRM practices prevailing in a specific work environment have a significant impact on organizational performance.

#### **MANAGEMENT ORIENTATION / LEADERSHIP AND PERFORMANCE**

Bowers and Seashore (1966) raised another viewpoint on the principal conclusion of early studies which appears to be that leaders who adopt democratic or participative styles are more successful. In this sense, these early studies are focused on identifying the 'the one best way of leading'. Mullins (1999) highlighted that in the trait theories, the major weakness of style and behavioural theories is that they ignore the important role which situational factors play in determining the effectiveness of individual leaders. Fiedler (1967), House (1971), and Vroom & Yetton (1974) considered this as a limitation that gives rise to the 'situational' and 'contingency' theories of leadership, which shift the emphasis away from 'the one best way to lead' to context-sensitive leadership. Although each study emphasizes the importance of different factors, the general tenet of the situational and contingency perspectives is that leadership effectiveness is dependent on the leader's diagnosis and understanding of situational factors, followed by the adoption of appropriate style to deal with each circumstance. Bass and Avolio (1993) suggested in context of one 'best way of leadership' out of 'transactional' and 'transformational' leadership styles, that transactional leaders were said to be



'instrumental' and frequently focus on exchange relationship with their subordinates. Bycio et al. (1995), opined opposite view, in contrast to transactional leadership, transformational leaders were argued to be visionary and enthusiastic, with an inherent ability to motivate subordinates even in unfavourable situations. Fiedler (1996), one of the most respected researchers on leadership, commented upon role of leadership and its significance by arguing that the effectiveness of a leader is a major determinant of the success or failure of an individual or group, or even an entire organization. Darcy & Kleiner (1991), Hennessey (1998), and Saari et al. (1988) reveal that in the conditions in which organizations have sought to cope with the increasing volatility and turbulence of the external environment and challenges arose by motivating and influencing subordinates, leaders provide training, and developing and equipping them with the skills required to cope with the situation emerged. empirical studies into the links between leadership and performance have been lacking. Thorlindsson (1987) suggested that variations in the performance of different fishing ships, under identical conditions, can be accounted for by the leadership skills of captains. Over a three-year period, it was further revealed that the leadership qualities of the ship captains accounted for 35 to 49 per cent of variation in the catch of different crews. Bass and Avolio (1993) examined that the links between leadership and performance coincide with the re-emergence of the 'the one best way to lead' debate. Of particular relevance is the resurgence of interest into charismatic leadership, which is frequently referred to as transformational leadership. Bycio et al. (1995), and Howell & Avolio (1993) theorized that transformational leadership is linked to organizational performance. Nicholls (1988), and Quick (1992) conceptualized that the visionary and inspirational skills of transformational leaders motivate followers to deliver superior performance at work place.

## **MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE**

Butkus and Green (1999), defined that motivation is derived from the word "motivate", means to move, push or influence to proceed for fulfilling a want. Bartol and Martin (1998) expressed that motivation is a powerful tool which strengthens behavior, provides a path to behavior, and triggers the tendency to continue (Farhad et al., 2011) in right direction in order to attain pre-determined targets; individuals must be satisfactorily energetic, enthusiastic and be clear about their end goals. Bedeian, (1993) emphasized that motivation is an internal drives to satisfy an unsatisfied need and the will to accomplish, that initiates through a physiological or psychological want that stimulates a performance. Chowdhury.M.S, (2007) considered motivation as a progression of moving and

supporting goal-directed behavior.

Individual performance depends on so many factors like performance appraisals, employee motivation, employee satisfaction, compensation, training and development, job security, organizational structure etc., but the motivation itself a significant that factor highly influences the performance of employees. Individual motivation is one of the policies of management enhance effectual job management amongst workforce in organizations (Shadare et al., 2009). A motivated manager is responsive of the definite goals and objectives he/she must achieve, therefore he/she directs its efforts in that direction. Rutherford et al., (1990) observed that motivation an important factor responsible for organizational successful. A motivated manager is constantly looking for improved practices to achieve the task, so motivation it an essential feature for performing organizations.

In addition to the above discussed factors the other variables which seem to be of great importance, i.e. 'financial and non financial incentives' have not been taken for investigation in present study. Role of these factors need careful attention to facilitate occurrence of their positive effect and neutralize negative impact and thereby improve individual performance. Not only performance is affected by burnout, stressful environment, organizational leadership and motivation, it is also being influenced by structural relationships of number of factors in the organizational set-ups which needs also high attention of researchers.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The sample comprised of 100 male marketing managers, falling between 30 to 56 years of the age who were working at the middle level managerial positions in the manufacturing sector. Careful attention was given to the process of selection of subjects so that only those managers are taken who have a minimum experience of 8 years are placed almost at the same level. This was done to ensure homogeneity of the sample so that reliable and generalized results could be obtained. In the manufacturing sector, only consumer goods industry was covered which deals with consumer durable goods and consumable goods. The category-wise distribution of the selected sample is as follows in Table-1.

The following tests and inventories were used to obtain the required data from the selected subjects:

### **1. SELF-PERFORMANCE APPRAISAL INVENTORY**

In order to obtain the information about a manager's performance in the job with regard to various parameters relevant from the point of view of his role,

the total twelve parameters (Organizing Ability, Job Knowledge and Clarity, Communication Skills, Decision-making, Judgmental Skills, Sociability, Leadership Skills, Integrity and Dependability, Commitment and Loyalty, Creativity and Innovation, Attitude and Target Achievement) were selected for in-depth probing. 45 items pertaining to the above twelve parameters were prepared following the Likert scale.

**Table 1****Sample Distribution According to Different Demographic Factors (N = 100)**

Age Mean = 40.47	30-40 yrs. 31%	41-45 yrs. 33%	46-50 yrs. 27%	51-56 yrs. 9%
Children out of married	Single 33%	Double 38%	More than 2 6%	No child 2%
Experience as Manager Mean = 13.14	Upto 8-10 yrs. 43%	Upto 11-15 yrs. 34%	Upto 16-20 yrs. 12%	Above 20 yrs. 11%
Area of operation	Only Pb. 50%	Hry. Pb. U.T. 10%	J&K and Pb 6%	HP, Hry, UT, Pb. 29%
Goods deal with	Consumables 16%		Durables 52%	FMCGs 32%
Marital Status	Married 79%		Unmarried 21%	
Educational Qualification	Graduate 40% 17% B.Com. 18 %B.Tech. 2% BBA, 2% LLB, 1% B.A.		Postgraduate 60% 9% M.Com. 46% MBA. 5% others, ME, CA & PG Dip.	

**Note :** 5% managers were having experience all over India.

### **WORK ENVIRONMENT SCALE (Moos, 1986)**

To assess the human as well as the system aspects of work environment of organizational set-ups the work environment scale was used to obtain the information which is considered influential towards the functioning of an organizational set-up in which individuals are supposed to perform. The scale consists of ten subscales. 90 items pertaining to the following ten parameters were prepared using the scale. The respondents were required to respond to each item as true or false. These ten sub-scales are as follows : Involvement, Peer Cohesion,

Management Support, Autonomy, Task Orientation, Work Pressure, Clarity, Control, Innovation and Physical Comfort.

### **MASLACH BURNOUT INVENTORY (Maslach & Jackson, 1986)**

The Maslach burnout inventory was designed to measure the psychological condition which is the result of chronic interpersonal stressors on job during performance. The scale assesses three dimensions of the burnout syndrome : (i) Emotional Exhaustion, (ii) Depersonalization and (iii) Lack of Personal Accomplishment.

Maslach Burnout Inventory consists of twenty-two statements in total. The subjects are required to respond the frequency "How often", the experiences; feelings related to each subscale are measured using a seven-point scale (0-6).

### **WORK MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRE (Agarwal, 1988)**

WMQ consists of 26 items covering all the major variants with regard to job and overall job satisfaction, extrinsic and intrinsic factors and work environment. Each item has to be rated on 5 points/ alternatives. Weight of 5 is assigned to the most positive response and 1 to extreme negative response. Data obtained from WMQ yielded dimensions of motivation as; (i) Dependence, (ii) Organizational Orientation, (iii) Work Group Relations, (iv) Intrinsic Motivation / Psychological Incentives, (v) Material Incentives and (vi) Job Situation to assess their work motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

### **MANAGEMENT ORIENTATION / LEADERSHIP STYLE INVENTORY**

Management Orientation/Leadership Style assessment scale consists of 35 items. This scale was constructed following Pfeiffer & Jones (1974) Task-Person (T-P) leadership questionnaire. The statements in the scale tend to assess Task Orientation and Person Orientation management style of top level management.

### **ADMINISTRATION OF TESTS USED IN THE STUDY**

Selected subjects from their respective organizations were personally approached, either individually or in the form of a group, which depended on availability of selected managers at one place or otherwise. At the same time, different questionnaire proformas were given to them to elicit their response.

In the first session, the respondents were given performance appraisal, Management orientation/leadership style and PGI mental health questionnaire.

Ten minutes interval was given between administrations of the next tests. On the second or third day that was second session of the testing schedule work motivation questionnaire, work environment scale and burn out inventory were administered.

Number of subjects in group for testing session depended on the number of subjects available from given organizations. In case of observation of some subjects in the first and second sessions of the test administration conducted for that session were given to them along with detailed instructions to be followed. These subjects submitted their response sheets as per instructions. The subjects who failed to submit the record in time or submitted incomplete forms were rejected. All the response-sheets of subjects for different tests were scored as per the instructions given in the respective manuals of test developed by the researcher/author for the test. Inventories were constructed for this investigation only; the standard procedures of taking responses and serving them were followed.

### STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The data obtained from these subjects on 6 variables was subjected to analysis in selected variables and Step-wise Regression Analysis was applied to analyze the predictive value of each of the taken independent variables for explaining job performance of marketing managers.

### ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

In order to find out the percentage of contribution and predictive value of chosen independent variables, viz. burnout, stressful work environment, management orientation styles and work motivation in the performance of marketing managers, step-wise regression was applied to the data obtained from managers using relevant questionnaires which yielded quantitative index of each independent variable.

Table-2 shows  $R^2$  Beta coefficients and Standard Error (SE) of performance (criterion variable) in the analysis of causation of performance ( $x^1$ ) by burnout ( $x^2$ ), stressful work environment ( $x^3$ ), person centered ( $x^4$ ) and task centered ( $x^5$ ) management orientation styles, and work motivation ( $x^6$ ) (Predictor variables). From the said table it can be observed that in Model-I level variable of burnout was taken to find out its contribution in managers' performance. The constant value of variable of performance, which is index of standing performance, is 225.96. At present level of job performance as yielded by the marketing managers and

given their level of burnout, the value of  $R^2$  comes out to be 0.0423, with Beta value of -0.223 which is significant. This implies that presence of a given level of burnout or any increase in the index of burnout is likely to influence the performance in a negative way. 4.23 per cent variance in performance can be predicted from burnout alone and burnout ( $x^2$ ) has emerged as a negative predictor. Though the contribution of variable of burnout in performance appears to be low, however, the effect of burnout on performance in Model- I level has been significant whatsoever.

### STEP-WISE REGRESSION MODEL

Performance = f (Burnout, Stressful Work Environment, Person-Oriented Management Orientation/Leadership style, Task-Oriented Management Orientation/Leadership style and Motivation).

Whereas these variables are denoted as follows :

#### List of Variables

1.  $x^1$  — Performance (dependent variable)
2.  $x^2$  — Burnout
3.  $x^3$  — Stressful Work Environment
4.  $x^4$  — Person Centered Management Orientation/Leadership style
5.  $x^5$  — Task Centered Management Orientation/Leadership style
6.  $x^6$  — Motivation

The research literature available on work performance and job satisfaction is replete with evidence that burnout of employees tend to capacitate the individuals through their experience of emotional exhaustion, chronic fatigue and frustration brought about by these. The factors are likely to reduce the personal accomplishments level, hence, affecting their work performance adversely, and consequently, leading to decline in productivity (Smith & Marjorie, 1980; Gentile and Merna, 1980; Pines and Aronson, 1981; Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980; Kahn, 1980; McGhee, 1990; and Schaufeli & Buunk, 1996).

Burnout is a chronic negative psychological process resulting from negative conditions of work which can be found in all kinds of professionals. Perlman & Hartman (1982) found the managerial personnel affected by it. This occupational stress reaction is considered as the main occupational hazard (Maslach, 1982b), the collection of cognitive (e.g. negative attitudes, concentration difficulties), behavioural (e.g. absenteeism, decreased work performance), affective symptoms (e.g. emotional exhaustion, irritability), (McElroy, 1982; and Seuntjens, 1982) accompanied somatic complaints (Belcastro, 1982; Belcastro and Hays, 1984)

**Table 2**

**Analysis of Percentage of Contribution of Burnout, Stressful Work Environment, Person and Task Centered Orientation Styles and Motivation in Job Performance- Step-wise Regression Analysis**

	Model I	Model II	Model III	Model IV	Model V
Constant	225.96	186.46	185.21	184.29	179.49
$x^2$	-0.223* (0.107)	-0.066 (0.110)	-0.013 (0.118)	0.013 (0.118)	0.507 (0.118)
$x^3$		0.338* (0.094)	0.282* (0.105)	0.256* (0.109)	0.132 (0.118)
$x^4$			0.785 (0.643)	0.708 (0.65)	0.633 (0.634)
$x^5$				0.327 (0.394)	0.392 (0.385)
$x^6$					0.501* (0.201)
Df	98	97	96	95	94
R <sup>2</sup>	0.042	0.154	0.167	0.173	0.224

**Note :** The values given in parentheses denote standard error (SE).

\* indicates significant values.

would trigger chronic stress reactions to the work situation ( Maslach and Jackson, 1981a; Freudenberger & North, 1985; and Gillespie,1991), which is bound to reduce the overall productivity and lower the job performance in the marketing managers. In Model-II, the variable of stressful work environment ( $x^3$ ) was added to the regression equation to check the contribution of these in performance and their predictive value as well. The constant value of performance index has been 186.46. As far as contribution of burnout ( $x^2$ ) and stressful work environment ( $x^3$ ) is concerned, R<sup>2</sup> comes out to be 0.154, i.e., 15.4 per cent variance of the total variance in dependent variable (Performance) is due to burnout ( $x^2$ ) and stressful work environment ( $x^3$ ). Burnout and stressful work environment in combination emerged as negative predictors with Beta value of -0.0657 which is statistically non-significant. But stressful work environment alone came out to be significant positive predictor of performance with Beta value of 0.338. Comparing it with the effect of only burnout that was 4.23 , the R<sup>2</sup> value implies that effect of stressful

work environment goes up to 11.17 per cent is quite significant causing changes in performance.

Stressful work environment tends to disturb the transaction between job environment and personal characteristics of the individual (Handy, 1988). When people in the job start perceiving difficulty in coping with work demands, it has detrimental effects on the behaviour, work motivation, attitude toward work and physical and psychological well being of employer which cost serious consequences to the organization in the terms of reduced productivity of the employees and then increased medical assistance. In the present study stressful work environment has emerged as a major factor in lagging productivity and performance of individuals and organizations. A number of empirical studies conducted in this regard also pointed to the same trend (John & Michael, 1980; Lipowski, 1977; Friedman & Rosenman, 1974; Trendall, 1984). In stressful work environment, occupational/ job stress studies, the factors which came under investigation were role erosion, workload, inter-role distance, role stagnation and role-conflict associated with a particular job. Mishra, 1987; Mishra, et al., 1989; Helode, 1989; Gangopadhaaya, 1991; Thakaran, 1992; Sekhar & Chandra, 1996; Pradhan & Mishra, 1995; and Singh & Mohanty, 1995) studied a number of organizational variables and consistently reported negative effects of job stress on organization in terms of financial loss due to decreased productivity and increased health cost of employees. Substantial negative contribution of stressful work environment as compared to all other chosen variables in the present investigation verify the position that stressful work environment tends to affect the performance of managerial work-force.

In Model-III, when another variable of Person-centered Management Orientation style was added to the already taken two variables of burnout and stressful work environment, it did not much, the constant value of performance that is 185.21. The value of  $R^2$  which is 0.167 shows that 16.7 per cent variation in performance can be attributed to the addition effect of burnout ( $x^2$ ), stressful work environment ( $x^3$ ), and person-oriented management style ( $x^4$ ). These do not vary much from the combined contribution of burnout ( $x^2$ ) and stressful work environment ( $x^3$ ). Burnout ( $x^2$ ), stressful work environment ( $x^3$ ) and person-centered management orientation style ( $x^4$ ) came out to be a negative predictor with Beta value of  $-0.0127$  which is found to be non-significant, whereas burnout ( $x^2$ ) and stressful work environment came out to be positive and significant predictor of performance with Beta value of 0.282, and person-oriented management style ( $x^4$ ) taken alone is also a positive predictor with Beta value of 0.785, but it could not attain the level of significance. Addition of variable of person oriented management style caused increment of just 1.27 per cent in the total effect jointly caused by



the variables of burnout and stressful work environment.

In Model-IV of regression analysis, variable of Task-oriented management style ( $x_5$ ) was added to existing three variables, namely, burnout ( $x_2$ ), stressful work environment ( $x_3$ ), and person oriented management style ( $x_4$ ) in the regression equation. The constant value of performance came out to be 184.29. The value of  $R^2$  at this level of analysis is 0.173 which is also not significant, but greater than what it was in Model-III of analysis that was 0.167, though the additive effect of task-oriented management style ( $x_5$ ) variable is there with  $R^2$  value of 0.173. This 17.3 per cent variation in performance can be attributed to the conjoint effect of burnout ( $x_2$ ), stressful work environment ( $x_3$ ) person-oriented management style ( $x_4$ ) and task-oriented management style ( $x_5$ ). These variables  $x_2$ ,  $x_3$ ,  $x_4$  and  $x_5$  came out to be positive predictor with Beta value of 0.0125 which is found to be non-significant. The same is the case with combined effect of  $x_4$  and  $x_5$  as well as effect of only  $x_5$  i.e. task oriented management style. At this level of analysis stressful work environment ( $x_3$ ) and person oriented management style ( $x_4$ ) and task oriented management style ( $x_5$ ) came out to be positive predictors of performance with Beta value of 0.256 which is significant. Comparison of  $R^2$  for three variables Model-III and Model-IV reveals that change or increment in effect caused by task-oriented management was 0.63 per cent only. If the contribution of person and task-oriented management styles of management in causing change in performance is compared it is in favour of person oriented style of management. It is contributing 1.27 percent for person-oriented management style and 0.63 for task-oriented management style which was found low. Though in both the cases of management styles the total amount of contribution is not much high but still the person-oriented style of management seems to be favoured style in influencing the performance of marketing managers.

Managerial orientation styles tend to contribute to the morale of the employees and affect their work motivation, hence, work involvement. Person-oriented style of management which is more participative and tends to act as buffer against the discontent of employees in many situations. In person-oriented management style, the concern of management for workers' well-being, talent, motivation, reward even in terms of reorganization and positive and encouraging, attitude are likely to lead overall better job satisfaction, hence, better performance by employing at all levels. In contrast non-participative and no-question asked style of top management invites little participation in decisions and goal setting of the organization, and it might trigger acute form of performance stress. At the initial stage it might not affect so adversely but with the passage of time cumulative effect of all this would affect the job performance of marketing managers. In the

present study, there is relatively higher percentage contribution by person-oriented management style than task-oriented management style, though magnitude of contribution is low but points to the same condition as stated above. The kind of effect of management style was evident in studies conducted by Institute for Social Research (1982), on walkout behaviour of Air Traffic Controllers which was spurred by more than just economic grievances. Some studies conducted by Toyota Motors Corporation (1982) on plant workers regarding their job satisfaction in terms of task accomplishment, having contribution recognized, from improving skills and achieving personal growth reflected the same results. Company's quality control evaluations emphasized workers' enthusiasm, project success and how well everyone was participating. These two group studies gave significant credence to the fact that person-oriented management style of top management is likely to contribute towards satisfaction of employees both in individuals as well as team members working to create cheerful and rewarding work environment and contributing to overall increased profits of the organization through their increased involvement and motivation as a result their enhanced job performance.

These findings lend support to the hypothesis, that is, person-centered orientation of high ranking management enhances self-initiative, involvement and work motivation which are clearly reflected in overall job performance of marketing managers.

In Model-V of regression analysis variable of work motivation ( $x_6$ ) was added to already taken four variables, i.e., burnout ( $x^2$ ), stressful work environment ( $x^3$ ), person-oriented ( $x^4$ ) and task-oriented ( $x^5$ ) management styles. The value of  $R^2$  at this level is 0.224 which implies that all the five predictor variables when taken together tend to predict 22.4 per cent of variance in job performance of marketing managers. Beta values for joint effect of  $x^2$ ,  $x^3$ ,  $x^4$ ,  $x^5$ , and  $x^6$ ,  $x^3$ ,  $x^4$ ,  $x^5$ , and  $x^6$ ,  $x^4$ ,  $x^5$ , and  $x^6$ ,  $x^5$ , and  $x^6$  were 0.507, 0.132, 0.633 and 0.392 respectively and all were non-significant. The variable ( $x^6$ ), i.e., work motivation yields Beta value of 0.501 which is significant. All the variables of seem to be positive predictors of performance though with varying levels in terms of level of significance. The notable increment in the value of  $R^2$  at this level is clearly due to the significant effect caused by the variable of work motivation. As compared to earlier joint effect of burnout, stressful work environment, person and task-oriented management style that was 17.3 per cent the addition of the variable of work motivation has enhanced it to 22.4 per cent. This implies that work motivation has caused a change of 5.1 per cent influencing job performance of marketing managers.

Overall changes caused by addition of independent variables of burnout,

stressful work environment, person and task-oriented management styles and work motivation at step-wise level reveal that these selected variables explain 22.4 per cent variance in effects of job performance of marketing managers. While the contribution of burnout comes out to be 4.23 per cent, the stressful work environment causes 11.17 per cent variation in performance. The role of management style of top management is not that effective, however, 1.27 per cent contribution by person-oriented style of management as compared to 0.63 per cent contribution by task-oriented management style seems quite valuable in winning confidence of work-force and inspiring them to perform better. The present contribution of work motivation was 5.1 per cent which is, again, very decisive in effecting positive changes in job performance of marketing managers. If hierarchy of independent variables chosen for the study is to be drawn in terms of their importance, this analysis has made it clear that work environment is the most vital factor in determining the job performance followed by work motivation level of employees and burnout factor operative marketing managers in a given set-up. Then comes the factor of management orientation styles of top management, person-oriented style favoured over the task-oriented management style in terms of positive effects of management style on performance of marketing managers.

The role of work motivation in performance has also been a focus of some empirical researches but the context and reference of studies were different and restricted. Performance of any organization covers both efficiency and effectiveness. When output of any given organization is high and achieves its intended goals, organization is considered highly efficient and effective. In this regard, it is important to recognize that attempts at both efficiency and effectiveness stem from motivation. It is motivation which energizes, diverts and sustains behaviour. The context within which motivation and behaviour occurs is sometime too complex involving listed of obvious and hidden conditions. However, guidelines provided by work organizations in terms of policies, procedures and rules provide straight context may be explicit or implicit. Though Murray's (1938) analysis of motivation was centered on viscerogenic and psychogenic states which induce specific behaviours and Maslow's (1943) alternative viewing of motivation as science of relatively separate and distinct stress hierarchy with certain higher needs becoming achieved to the extent certain lower needs become satisfied in terms of hierarchy of potency. McClelland (1961) went to extent of rating groups, organizations and societies according to the degree of achievement related motivation evident in the total system. Economic growth, corporate profits and individual remuneration are seen as indication of good performance and achievement which is the sole outcome of work motivation. Those business managers who show relatively higher level of

achievement work motivation are inclined to task moderate risks rather than gamble on situation with high potential failure. This tends to maintain consistent string of successes. The level of difficulty of goals for participants induces effort and channels it in appropriate direction (Locke, 1978; Latham and Locke, 1979) which tends to enhance the job performance of marketing managers and overall productivity of the organization. In the present study, the contribution of the work motivation variable comes out to be important next to the factor of work environment. It is also important to recognize that work environment and work motivation of employees are intimately related with each other as conditions available of work environment and values, norms and policies set by the organization for its employees to adhere to effect intrinsic as well as extrinsic levels of motivation of marketing managers which in turn will influence their performance and achievements of the organization.

In sum, results of step-wise regression analysis done to find out predictive value of burnout, stressful work environment, management orientation styles and work motivation in performance reveal that burnout is a negative predictor of job performance of marketing managers with 04.23 per cent of variance in performance. Addition of work environment variable showed that stressful work environment is a positive predictor of performance. While both burnout and stressful work environment explain 15.4 per cent of variance on performance, work environment alone explains 11.17 per cent which is quite significant. In Model-III, when another variable of person centered style of management was added, the joint predictive value of these variables for performance became 16.7 per cent. However, the main contribution in this remained that of stressful work environment. Person centered management orientation style caused 1.27 per cent of variation in predictive power of independent variables. In Model-IV, the variable of task oriented-management style was added; with this the percentage of predictive power of these four variables became 17.3 per cent. Comparative look at the contribution of each individual variable suggests that task-oriented management style contributed only 0.63 per cent in percentage of variance for performance. In Model-V, the factor of work motivation was added, with this the predictive power for performance of marketing managers went up to 22.4 per cent. The sole contribution of work motivation came out to be 5 per cent.

All these results imply that there is a hierarchical order among chosen independent variables in the context of job performance of marketing managers. In this regard, stressful work environment appears at number one. Next comes the variable of work motivation. Afterwards burnout has a significant influence though it is negative. Person-oriented and task-oriented management styles appear at in

the end in the hierarchy of influence of these variables in influencing performance of marketing managers. These results have given a clear picture of underlying dynamics of interactions among these variables while influencing the job performance in any organization.

## AN OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

Work motivation level of marketing managers was found to be facilitated by person-oriented management style as compared to task-oriented approach of the management as perceived by managers.

Burnout appeared as significant predictor of job performance of marketing managers. When burnout and stressful work environment were taken together stressful work environment emerged as a significant predictor of job performance explaining the maximum amount of variance in performance in relation to total variation in job performance explained by all the independent variables.

When person-oriented and task-oriented management styles of top level management were added at each of the next two levels, burnout, stressful work environment and person-oriented management style came out as positive and significant predictors of performance ( $R^2 = 16.67$ ). Burnout, stressful work environment and person-oriented management style and task-oriented management style in consideration also appeared as significant predictors ( $R^2 = 17.3$ ).

Variable of motivation appeared as major predictor of job performance of marketing managers; and it comes after the stressful work environment. At third place came the burnout influence in causing variation in job performance of marketing managers.

## References

- Agarwal, N. G. (1988), Manual of Work Motivation Questionnaire, National Psychological Corporation, Agra.
- Akinyemi, Benjamin (2011), An Assessment of Human resource Development climate in Rwanda Private Sector organizations, *International Bulletin of Business Administration*, 12, pp 56-68.
- Bartol, K. M.; and Martin, D. C. (1998), *Management*, McGraw Hill, New York.
- Bass, B. M.; and Avolio, B. J. (1993), Transformational Leadership and Organizational Culture, *Public Administration Quarterly*, 17(1) : 112-17.
- Bedeian, A. G. (1993), *Management*, 3rd.ed. New York: Dryden Press.
- Bowers, D. G.; and Seashore, S. E. (1966), Predicting Organizational Effectiveness with

- a Four Factor Theory of leadership, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11 : 238-263.
- Butkus, R. T.; and Green, T. B. (1999), Motivation, Beliefs and Organizational Transformation, Organizational Quorum Books.
- Bycio, P.; Hackett, R. D.; and Allen, J. S. (1995), Further Assessments of Bass's (1985) Conceptualization of Transactional and Transformational Leadership, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4) : 468-478.
- Chowdhury, M. S. (2007), Enhancing Motivation and Work Performance of the Salespeople : The Impact of Supervisors' Behavior, *African Journal of Business Management*, 1 (9), 238-243.
- Daft, R. L. (1998), *Organizational Theory and Design*, sixth Edition, Cincinnati, OH : South Western College Publishing.
- Darcy, T.; and Kleiner, B. H. (1991), Leadership for Change in a Turbulent Environment, *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 12(5) : 12-16.
- Edelwich, J.; and Brodsky, A. (1980), Burn-out : Stage of Disillusionment in the Helping Professions, New York, Human Science Press, p. 225.
- Evans, K.; and Rainbird, H. (2002), The Significance of Workplace Learning for a Learning Society, In Working to Learn : Transforming Learning in the Workplace, in K. Evans, P. Hodkinson and L. Unwin, (Eds.), Kogan Page Limited, London, pp. 7-28.
- Farhad, E.; Abadi, Ohammad R.; Jalivand, Mostafa Sharif; Ghorban, A. Salimi; and Somayeh, A. Khanzadeh (2011), "A Study of Influencial Factors on Employees' Motivation for participating in the In-Service Training Courses Based on Modified Expectancy Theory," *International Business and Management*, Vol. 2, pp. 157-69.
- Fey, C. F.; and Bjorkman, I. (2000), The Effect of Human Resource Management Practices on MNC Subsidiary Performance in Russia, Working paper, Stockholm School of Economics in St. Petersburg, *SSE/EFI Working Paper Series in Business Administration*, No. 2000 : 6.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1996), Research on Leadership and Training : One View of the Future, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41 : 241-250.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967), *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness*, New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Freudenberger, Herbert J.; and North, G. (1985), Women's Burnout, New York : Penguin Books.
- Friedman, M.; and Rosenman, R. (1974), Type of Behavior and Your Heart, Knopf, New York, NY.
- Gangopadhaaya, A. (1991), The Impact of Job Content as Occupational Stress and Mental Health, Paper Presented in First International Seminar of Indian Academy of Health Psychology, Cuttack, February 24-25.
- Gentile, Lance M.; and Merna M. Mcmilla,(1980), Combating Burnout : A Must for

- Secondary Urban Reading Teachers, *Reading World*, May, pp. 332-338.
- Gillespie, D. R. (1991), Burnout Among Health Service Providers, *Admin. Policy in Mental Health*, 18 : 161-171.
- Harel, G. H.; and Tzafrir, S. S. (1999), The Effect of HRM Practices on the Perceptions of Organizational and Market Performance of the Firm, *Human Resource Management, Fall*, 38, (3): 185-199.
- Helode, R. D. (1989), "Industrial Supervisors-Their Mental Ability, Occupational Stress, Life Satisfaction and the Need for Developing a Mental Health-oriented New Approach to Personnel Management in India," Paper presented in the First International Seminar, Bhubaneshwar, February 25-27.
- Hennessey, J. T. (1998), Reinventing Government: Does Leadership Make the Difference?, *Public Administration Review*, 58 (6) : 522-532.
- Hosie, P.; Sevastos, P.; Cooper, C. L. (2006), Happy-Performing Managers : Impact of Affective Wellbeing and Intrinsic Job Satisfaction in the Workplace, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar Publishing.
- House, R. (1971), A Path-Goal Theory of Leadership, *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 3 : 81-97.
- Howell, J. M.; and Avolio, B. J. (1993), Transformational Leadership, Transactional Leadership Locus of Control and Support for Innovation : Key Predictors of Consolidated-Business-Unit Performance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78 : 891-902.
- Huselid, M. A. (1995), The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Turnover, Productivity and Corporate Financial Performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38 (3) : 635-673.
- John, M. I.; and Michael, T. M. (1980), Stress and Work, Scott, Foreman and Co.
- Kahn, R. L. (1980), Work, Stress, and Health, Paper delivered at Industrial Relations Research Association, Denver, Colorado.
- Knuckey, S.; Johnston, H.; Campbell-Hunt, C.; Carlaw, K.; Corbett, L.; and Massey, C. (2002), Firm Foundations : A Study of New Zealand Business Practices & Performance, Ministry of Economic Development, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Latham, Garry P., Locke, Edwin A. (1979), Goal Setting- A Motivational Technique That Works, *Organizational Dynamics*, 8(2), Autumn : 68-80.
- Lipowski, Z. J. (1977), Psychomatic Medicine in the Seventies, An Overview, *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 134 : 233-244.
- Locke, Edwin A. (1978), The Ubiquity of the Technique of Goal Setting in Theories and Approaches to Employee Motivation, *Academy of Management Review*, July, pp. 594-601.
- Maslach, C. (1998), A Multidimensional Theory of Burnout, In C.L. Cooper (Ed.),

- Theories of Organizational Stress, New York : Oxford University Press, Inc, pp. 68-85.
- Maslach, C.; and Jackson, S. (1981), The Measurement of Experienced Burnout, *Journal of Occupational Behaviour*, 2 : 99-113.
- Maslach, C.; and Jackson, S. E. (1986), Maslach Burnout Inventory Manual, (3rd Ed.) Palo Alto, CA : Consulting Psychologists.
- Maslach, C.; and Leiter, M. P. (1997), The Truth About Burnout, How Organizations Cause Personal Stress And What to do About it, San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.
- Maslach, C.; and Schaufeli, W. B. (1993), Historical and Conceptual Development of Burnout, In W. B. Schaufeli, C. Maslach and T. Marek (Eds.) Professional Burnout: Recent Developments in Theory and Research, London : Taylor and Francis.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943), A Theory of Human Motivation, *Psychological Review*, 50 July, pp. 370-396.
- McClelland, David C. (1961), The Achieving Society, Princeton, NJ, Van Nostrand.
- McElroy, A. M. (1982), Burnout : A Review to the Literature with Application to Cancer Nursing, *International Review of Nursing Studies*, 40 (5) : 555-565.
- McGehee, D. C. (1990), Stress Among Independent School Teachers : An Analysis of Relationship Between Stress Factors, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 50(8), 2334-A.
- Mishra, P. K. (1987), Life Events and Social Support : Mediation Process, *Doctoral Dissertation Centre of Advanced Study in Psychology*, Utkal University, Bhubaneswar.
- Mishra, P. K.; Pattnayak, B.; and Das, R. (1989), Public Sector a Challenge to Social Science, Paper presented in First International Seminar organized by CGI, Bhubaneswar, February 25-27.
- Moos, R. (1986), Work Environment Scale manual, 2nd Edition, Palo Alto, CA : Consulting Psychologist Press.
- Mullins, L. J. (1999), Management and Organizational Behaviour, 5th Edition, London : Financial Times/Pitman Publishing.
- Murray, Henry A. (1938), Exploration in Personality, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Nicholls, J. (1988), The Transforming Autocrat, *Management Today*, March, pp. 114-118.
- Perlman, B.; and Hartman, E. ( 1982), Burnout : Summary and Future Research, *Human Relations*, 35 : 283-305.
- Peter, F. Drucker (1999), Management Challenges for the 21st Century, Harper Business.
- Pfeiffer, J. W.; and Jones, J. E. (Eds.) (1974), A Handbook of Structured Experience for Relations Training, Lajolla CA : University Associates Publishers.
- Pines, A.; and Aronson, E. (1981), Burnout : From Tedium to Personal Growth, New York : Free Press.



- Pradhan, M.; and Mishra, N. (1995), Life Stress and Burnout Among Couples in Medical Professionals, *Indian Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 22 (2) : 17-22.
- Quick, J. C. (1992), Crafting an Organizational Culture : Herb's Hand at Southwest Airlines, *Organizational Dynamics*, 21 (2): 45-56.
- Rutherford, F. J.; and Ahlgren, A. (1990), Science for all Americans, Oxford : Oxford University Press.
- Saari, L.; Johnson, T. R.; McLaughlin, S. D.; and Zimmerly, D. M. (1988), A Survey of Management Education Practices in the U. S. Companies, *Personnel Psychology*, 41 : 731-743.
- Schaufeli, W. B.; and Buunk, B. P. (1996), Professional Burnout, In M. J. Schabrac, J. A. M. Winnubst and C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of Work and Health Psychology*, New York : Wiley, pp. 311-346,
- Sekhar, S. F.; and Chandra (1996), Job Stress and Burnout Experience Among Nurses from Different Hospitals, *Management and Labour Studies*, 2 : 114-124.
- Seuntjens, A. D. (1982), Burnout in Nursing : What it is and How to Prevent it, *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 7 (1) : 12-19.
- Shadare Oluseyi, A.; and Hammed, T. Ayo (2009), "Influence of Work Motivation, Leadership Effectiveness and Time Management on Employees, Performance in Some Selected Industries in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria," *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 16, pp. 7-17
- Singh, P.; and Mohanty, M. (1995), Role Efficacy in Relation to Job Anxiety and Job Status, *Psycho Lingua*, 26 (1) : 25-28.
- Thakaran, P. N. O. (1992), Organizational Stress and Job Satisfaction Among Working Women, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 38 (1) : 17-19.
- Thorlindsson, T. (1987), The Skipper Effect in the Icelandic Herring Industry, Reykjavik : University of Iceland.
- Toyota Motor Corporation, (1982), The Wheel Extended, *Toyota Quarterly Review*, Special Supplement No. 11, July-Sep, 1982, p-11.
- Trendall, C. J. (1984), Stress and Effectiveness : A Study of Teachers and Schools within one Local Education Authority, Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, University of Reading.
- Vroom, V.; and Yetton, P. (1974), *Leadership and Decision-Making*, Pittsburg, PA : University of Pittsburg Press.