

How to Develop a Winning Approach to Delegation in Public and Private Sectors?

Dr Shivi Srivastava¹

I. INTRODUCTION

Authority delegation is a crucial part of the management process. It is one of the methods used to create the network of official role relationships. It is also the process by which a manager grants his subordinates the authority to take initiative, work with others to take initiative, and use organisational resources to accomplish established goals. Here, we attempt to study the development of winning approach to delegation of authority in public and private sector organisation of Uttar Pradesh. The idea of delegation of authority is fundamental to the literature on management. Researchers need to give delegation fair consideration given its importance to managerial success. Public-sector organisations and private-sector organisations both exist in India. Profit-making is typically the primary objective of private sector organisations. The primary objectives of public sector entities are infrastructure growth and development and surplus production. There are also numerous other objectives. It is necessary to delegate authority in order to accomplish these objectives. In organisations operating in the public sector, improper delegation of responsibility may make it more difficult to accomplish objectives. So, an effort is being made to research these elements. The ability of a person to command others and direct their behaviour is more accurately described by the word authority. According to Henri Fayol, authority is "the right to give orders and the power to exact obedience. The process of organising is not complete without delegation. Since the manager is accountable for carrying out a vast array of tasks, activities, and functions because he cannot complete them all by himself, he delegated a portion of his tasks to his assistants to command and the authority to demand submission. It is "the total of the powers and rights entrusted to enable the performance of the work delegated," according to Allen. Giving away power gives a manager the ability to multiply himself. It is an art form to delegate authority to subordinates in order to achieve organisational goals. In order to address different organisational issues, delegation enhances empowerment. He no longer must worry about making decisions that others can make effectively. This enables him to concentrate on important management-related concerns.

II. MATERIAL AND METHODS

According to Simon (1960), the sort of decision being made and its context are the primary factors in determining the number of delegates. He thinks about whether the Whether a decision is programmed or not. Thompson, in his studies of organisation in action (1967), came to a similar conclusion. According to Burns and Stalker (1961), organisations with non-routine technology and organic structures exhibit higher levels of delegation than other types of organisations with customary tools and mechanical constructions. In his article, Harman (1963) discovered that interactions between environmental influences and the organisational system can have an impact on delegation. The level of delegation may be influenced by factors in the external environment, such as social, cultural, legal, political, and economic factors. For instance, when an organisation is faced with a crisis due to an abrupt shift in its environment, it tends to tighten control and delegating. According to Woodward's research from 1965, the nature of the company and the senior management's guiding principles both moderate the

¹ Guest Faculty, Institute of Professional Studies, University of Allahabad, Prayagraj 211002. Email id:monirba2007.bcom@gmail.com

delegation. Some top management promote delegation throughout the company because they think it is an effective technique to complete tasks. This suggests that technology has an impact on delegating.

Lawrence and Lorsch point out in their study (1967) that "The delegation also considers the cost factors in the decisions relative to the company's prestige, competitive strength, employee morale and performance". They reported that production departments, characterised by high certainty of tasks, established routines and tighter controls, are more prone to formalising of the structure. Sales departments are next. Chandrakant Lotia (1967) observed that, in India, delegation of authority not always for whole job. In most of the state enterprises, due to bureaucratic or semigovernmental nature, delegation is not enough to enable a manager to execute his duties with confidence and convenience. Fear and frustration are an environment a rule in almost all the state enterprises in India. A manager in an Indian enterprise has no feeling of confidence (which is so necessary for the efficient running of a business). In Some of the Indian state enterprises, powers are delegated to undesirable men due to political obligation or social pressure. Maier and Thurber (1969) repeated the experiment with undergraduate arts students. Again, the result showed no difference for the two experimental conditions. It was suggested that only the granting for delegation was not enough. If subordinates are to respond and to solve problems, training must accompany the delegation process. These studies illustrate that the delegation must have the requisite attitudes, abilities, knowledge, and skills to use the delegated authority for problem solving. These are developed over a period. The consequences of delegation are thus contingent on other factors. Kakar (1972) opines that there is a high degree of control of subordinate's task performance by the superior in India organisations. This is complimented by the close supervision and non-participation in policy formulation and planning by substantial number of subordinates. It is the parental type in general and authoritarian which usually dominates superior subordinate relationship in Indian firms. Dr. R.D. Agrawal (1985) concludes that delegation is a function of variables related to the superior, the subordinate and other contextual factors. A manager has available to him several delegation choices. His perception of delegated authority is influenced by decision type and its context as well as his perception of his subordinate's characteristics. This perceived need of delegation is moderated by several situational variables including delegant's unit size, functions, span, tasks, his own leadership style, as well as his perception of his superior's leadership style. Macro-organisational and environmental variables also have impact on delegation. The subordinate also has his views of delegation needed by his job performance is influenced by his perception of decision type and context, his own characteristics and his referent others. The "fit" between emergent delegation and subordinate's perceived need for delegation has correlated consequences. Feedback on these consequences provide the due for modification of emergent delegation as well as subordinate's perception of needed delegation, resulting in better "fit".

III. RESEARCH GAP

This study compares how authority is delegated in Uttar Pradesh State's public and private sector organisations. Investigation is its main preoccupation. The factors to be considered when delegating authority include the level of delegation, the need for additional authority, the adequacy of the delegation, the informal use of authority resting with the boss (implied authority), its cause, and its effects.

IV. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The study's main goal is to examine how much authority is delegated in organisations in the public and commercial sectors. Major objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To establish the elements to be considered while distributing authority throughout the structure.
2. To determine the authority needed for various executives from various organisations.
3. To determine the extent of authority delegation considering the situation.
4. To examine the appropriateness or inadequacy of authority delegation based on business needs and actual delegation.

V. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The explanation of the process used to conduct the study is covered in this section of the chapter. It includes research issues, are a part of the study, and the sample, data gathering techniques, statistical tools utilised for analysis, and the interpretation of statistical data, as well as the type of the discovery.

A. Research Hypotheses

The hypothesis is crucial in directing research in an objective manner and in keeping it going. Following hypotheses are framed based on comprehensive review of literature.

H₀: The delegation of authority and capacity is positively correlated with the delegant's view of his subordinate.

H₀₁: The top level of management delegate the most authority, followed by middle and lower levels of management.

H₀₂: Delegation is to a greater extent in matters involving administrative authority and to a lesser extent in matters involving financial authority.

H₀₃: Shortly after, the subordinate who has the employer's trust exercises his authority informally, and the supervisor is unconcerned.

B. Coverage of The Study

Since the issue is broad, it is impractical for a researcher to cover all area of the study, especially if rigour is to be upheld. Consequently, the following restrictions on coverage apply to the current study:

1. Only six public sector entities and six commercial sector organisations operating in Uttar Pradesh State are covered by the study.
2. In such a department, the delegation of authority to the division/department head and his next subordinate has been covered.
3. In such an organisation, it covers primarily eight departments comprising of delegation of authority.
4. The official assignment of jobs, the corresponding authority, and the informal use of the implied delegation were the main points of attention.

C. Sources of Data Information

Based on the well specified research problem and associated hypothesis, a questionnaire was created. Before its use, the questionnaire instruments' validity was evaluated. administration. Two organisations participated in the schedule testing as responses. The goal of the study was stated to the responders. The phrasing of the questions and statements was revised and altered based on the experience gathered to create the schedule's final format. Information was gathered from some of the respondents in the organisation via a questionnaire and through chats. Executives were given questionnaires to complete at their discretion. Questionnaires for the following conference were gathered. All the questions were developed using a rational construct criterion, i.e., using the body of information already available in the fields of management theory and organisational conduct and theory. With the intention of gathering information to test hypotheses in the study's predetermined regions, the objectives of the study were translated into questions.

D. Research Instruments and Tools

The following types of questions were included in the questionnaire:

- a) Choosing inquiries pertaining to the tasks of the respondent and responsibility, age, experience, etc.
- (b) Multiple-choice questions, in which the respondent is presented with several options and asked to select the set that most closely matches the operating conditions. Such inquiries were made in order to identify policies, tactics, and behaviours as well as the causes, relationships, and effects of each.
- (c) A question was created using a Likert-type summarised scale to collect data on attitudes, perceptions, and other topics that might be measured in terms of degree, such as the degree of delegation or the demand for more authority.
- (c) Questions with a 'Yes' or 'no' response option were used to gauge the respondent's leadership style.

VI. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Editing and codification were done on the filled questions. The qualitative elements were put into numbers. The data was then processed and added to a master table. Various tables used in this study were created using the master table as a base. In order to make conclusions, the information in these tables was investigated using appropriate statistical methods, such as the T test and X test to test the statistical significance. For the analysis purpose the following details were presented of respondents working in selected public and private organisations of Uttar Pradesh:

1. General information of the respondents.
2. Delegation of authority.
 - 2.1 Considerations in delegation of authority.
 - 2.2 Authority relating the distribution of job.
 - 2.3 Superior's expectation to consult him before making decisions.
 - 2.4 Degree of authority.
 - 2.5 Lack of adequate delegation of authority.
 - 2.6 Informally use of authority.

General information of the respondents: age, level of education, number of years of service, current position, management development programme involvement is regarded as crucial elements in the authority-delegation process. **Delegation of authority:** The following subsections make up this part: the expectation that the superior will consult him before making decision, factors should be considered when delegating authority, authority level, insufficient authority delegation, inadvertent use of authority. The analysis shows that out of 192 responses from both sector executives/ in public sector organisation 43.75% (42 responses) and private sector organisations 46.75% (45 responses) given as much authority to their subordinates as their (subordinates) can exercise effectively (Rank-1). This follows the consideration of requirement of the subordinates needs to decide the extent of degree of delegation (Rank-2). The third rank gets the complying with their (executives) superior's policy about delegation, while in private sector organisations this factor compliance with executive's superior's policy is considered by 18.25% of respondent (Rank-2). The executives' subordinates need to do subordinates job is considered by 14.58% and gets Rank-3, The feeling of part with minimum of respondent's authority and retain enough authority for control finds Rank-4 and Rank-5 respectively. Significance of differences in detailed instructions by the superior to the subordinates has been shown below in the table 1:

**Table- I:
Significance of differences in detailed instructions by the superior to the subordinates**

Kind of activities	Difference in mean values $x_1 - x_2$	Std.Er of differences	$X_1 \cdot X_2$	Significance at 95%
Major Activities	0.08	0.094	0.085	Not Significant
Secondary Activities	0.99	0.314	3.152	Significant
Routine Activities	0.12	0.346	0.346	Significant

Table I represents to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in detailed instructions given by superiors to subordinates in public and private sector organisations. Significant differences between the two-sample means were evaluated using the standard deviation of the difference. It appears from this that variations in the level of detail with which the superior instructs the subordinates in public and private sector organisations are statistically significant at 95% of the time.

Significance of Differences in Authority Relating the Distribution of Jobs Among Subordinates has been shown below in the table 2:

**Table- II:
Significance of Differences in Authority Relating the Distribution of Jobs Among Subordinates**

Kind of authorities	$X_1 - X_2$	Std.Er of differences	$X_1 - X_2 / \text{Std.Er of differences}$	Significance at 95%
Financial	0.57	0.75	0.76	Significant
Personnel	0.61	0.78	0.78	Significant
Administrative	0.31	0.556	0.557	Not significant
Production	0.48	0.692	0.693	Significant
Marketing	0.26	0.509	4.406	Not significant
Purchase	0.30	.547	0.548	Not significant
Technical	0.33	.574	0.574	Not significant
Other	0.47	.685	0.686	Significant

Table II shows the significance of differences in authority relating the distribution of jobs among subordinates. Different authorities have been shown, their difference of sample mean, standard error, and significance at 95 percent.

Superior's Expectation in Approval Before Finalising Decisions in Respondents Jurisdiction of Authority has been shown below in the Table 3:

**Table-III:
Superior's Expectation in Approval Before Finalising Decisions in Respondents Jurisdiction of Authority**

	Public Sector			Private Sector		
	YES	NO	TOTAL	YES	NO	TOTAL
RESPONSES	36	80	116	46	70	116
PERCENTAGE	37.08	62.92	100	47.50	52.50	100

The null hypothesis, which states that "the two sectors do not differ with respect to the superior expectation in approval before finalising decisions in respondent jurisdiction of authority," has been put to the test using the χ^2 test. It has the null hypothesis has been accepted because the value of the test statistic, has been determined to be negligible for 3 degrees of frequency up to the level of significance.

Before making final decisions in the respondent jurisdiction of authority, the superior expects approval. The analysis has shown that in both sectors public as well as private sector organisation, there are

superiors who expect of approval before finalising decisions in respondent jurisdiction of authority only in policy and other important matters.

Significant differences exist in the levels of decision-making authority that relate to respondent responsibilities. The analysis has shown that there are discrepancies in the amount of decision-making power in topics pertaining to respondent obligations at a 95% level of trust, both organisations place importance on both persons and production.

Inadequacy of Authority in both the sectors has been shown below in the table 4.

**Table- IV:
Inadequacy of Authority**

SECTOR	WEIGHTED MEAN
PUBLIC	4.90
PRIVATE	5.34

The table IV shows that there is a greater lack of authority in private sector organisations than in public sector ones.

Significant of Difference in Degree of inadequate Delegation of Authority has been shown below in the table V.

**Table- V:
Significant of Difference in Degree of inadequate Delegation of Authority**

Kind of authorities	X ₁ - X ₂	Std.Er of differences	X ₁ - X ₂ / Std.Er of differences	Significance at 95%
Financial	0.55	.741	.74	Significant
Personnel	1.35	1.16	1.1	Significant
Administrative	0.50	.707	0.70	Not significant
Production	0.34	.583	0.58	Significant
Marketing	0.44	.663	0.66	Not significant
Purchase	0.35	.591	0.59	Not significant
Technical	0.62	.787	0.78	Not significant
Other	0.72	.848	0.84	Significant

We used the 't' test to determine whether variations in the level of insufficient delegation of authority in organisations from the public and private sectors are statistically significant. The pertinent information is provided in Table V. It demonstrates how disparities in the improper delegation of authority affect financial, personnel, administrative, technological, and other matters in organisations in the public and private sectors.

Informal Use the Authority has been shown below in the table VI.

**Table- VI:
Informal Use the Authority**

	Sectors			
	Public		Private	
	Response	%	Responses	%
Almost	04	.40	03	.30
Mostly	09	.90	07	.70
Generally	25	.25	22	.22
Rarely	50	.50	60	.60
Almost Never	42	.42	52	.52

VII. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Executives in both the public and private sectors of organisations examined how far authority should be delegated based on compliance with superior policy, but the public sector had more executives. Both sectors typically provide their employees with thorough instructions regarding daily tasks. Executives in the public sector are more aware of secondary and executives in the private sector are more aware of significant and secondary operations than routine ones. A comparison of the level of authority in the public sector and the distribution of jobs among subordinates reveals that it is higher in the finance, production, and marketing sectors and procurement problems.

It suggests that public sector CEOs have more discretion when making decisions than their counterparts in the private sector. The expectation of superiors in private sector firms while in public sector organisations, superiors want you to consult him before making decisions in just policy-related subjects. to consult him before making decisions in policy and other critical matters.

Comparing the level of decision-making authority in matters pertaining to respondents' obligations in both public and private sector entities are superior in other areas. In private sector enterprises, it is lower in people matters whereas it is lower in financial matters in the public sector. Public sector entities have greater overall authority to decide on issues relating to respondents' obligations than do private sector organisations.

Comparing the two sectors reveals that the highest percentages in the public sector are for almost fully adequate responses, while in the private sector, it is for almost wholly inadequate significantly insufficient. If we look at that level of virtually entirely and considerably deficient, it shows that the private sector has a higher level of insufficiency than the public sector.

When comparing organisations in the public and private sectors, the degree of improper delegation of authority is highest in the area of marketing.

It is high in public organisation whereas in private sector organisations, production issues are the most pressing. Inadequate authority delegation is more prevalent overall in private sector organisations than in public sector organisations.

A comparison of two industries reveals that neither industry frequently uses informal authority. However, when compared to two other sectors, this casual use was high when compared to the private sector.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Authority delegation is a crucial part of the management process. It is one of the methods used to create a network of official role relationships. It is also the process by which a manager grants his subordinates the authority to take initiative, work with others to take initiative, and use organisational resources to accomplish established goals. Management theorists have unconsciously paid little attention to the idea of delegation of authority, even though it is fundamental to management literature and essential to practitioners' daily lives. Researchers need to give delegating their fair consideration given its importance to managerial success. There are two different sorts of organisations in India: public sector and private sector organisations. Profit-making is typically the primary objective of private sector organisations. The primary objectives of public sector entities are infrastructure growth and development and surplus production. There are also numerous other objectives. It is necessary to delegate authority in order to accomplish these objectives.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agarwal, R.D. "On Delegation of Authority Indian Management Vol. 24, April, 1985.
- [2] Agarwal, R.D. Organisation and Management, Tata Mc-Graw Hill Publishing Company Limited, New Delhi, 1993.
- [3] Ahuja, K.K, Organisation Growth & Development, Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi, 1979.
- [4] Albers, Henry H., Principles of Management: A Modern Approach, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.
- [5] Allen, Louis A., Management & Organisation, Mc-Graw-Hill Kogakusha Ltd., pp. 114-115.
- [6] Banard, C.I. The Functions of Executive, Chambrige Mass. Harward University Press, 1938
- [7] Blake, R.R. and Jane S.M. Corporate Excecence Through Grid Development Gulf Publication Co. Houston 1968, p.4.
- [8] Burns, T. and G.J. Stalker, The Management Innovation (London: Tavistock Publications, 1961).
- [9] Carlon, 8., Executive Behaviour Stockhelm: Shombergs, 1951.
- [10] Chandrakant, Lotia, Management Problems of the Public Sector in India Manaktalas Bombay, 1967.
- [11] Chester, Barnard I., The Functions of the Executive, Cambridge: Hardward University Press. Chowdhry, Kamla, Change-in-Organisations, Lalvani Publishing House Bombay 1970.
- [12] Dadar, R.S., The Principles of Management Progressive Corporation Private Limited, Bombay, 1980. Dubin, Robert, Human Relations in Administration, Practice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi, 1977.
- [13] Fleishman, E.A., The measurement of leadership attitudes in Industry, Journal of applied psychology. Vol. 37, pp. 153- 158.
- [14] Ganguli, S., "Leadership Crisis in Indian Management", Indian Management, Vol. 24, No. 9, September, 1985, pp. 3-8.
- Gupta, Jauharilal, Leadership Styles and Power Sharing in Business Enterprises, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1985.
- [16] Heller, Frank A. and Gary Yulk, "Participation, Managerial Decision Making and Situational Variables "Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance Vol. 4 (1969) pp. 227-241.
- [16] Herbert, M. Engel. How to Delegate, Jaico Publishing House, Bombay, 1985.
- [17] Kayyum, Ali Bohra, "Delegation: The process of making the Job Bigger than yourself", Indian Management, Vol. 25, No. 3, March, 1986, pp. 31-34.
- [18] Keith, Davis, Human Behaviour at Work, Tata-Mc-Graw Hill publishing Company Ltd. New Delhi. Kelly, J., Organisational Behaviour, Richard D. Irwin Ic. Homewood, Illinois, 1974.
- [19] Khandelwal, A.K., "A case study-The managerial style of a Chief Executive", Indian Management, Vol. 22, No. 2, February 1983, pp. 9-13.

- [20] Koontz, Harold and O'Donnel Cyril, Management: A Systems and Contingency Analysis of Managerial Functions, Mc-Graw Hill Kogakusha Ltd., Kshirsagar, S.S., "Delegation of Powers in Indian Banks", Prajnan Vol. VI No. 4 October-December 1997.
- [21] Lawrence, P.R. and Loarsch J.W.: Organisation and Environment (Boston: Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1967.
- [22] Likert, R. The Human Organisation (N.Y.: Mc-Graw-Hill Book Co., 1967) and Likert, R. New X?lttexns...._ciL_.M2nja5:en^ (N.W. Mc-Graw-Hill book CO., 1960.
- [23] McConkey, Dale, O., No Nonsense Delegation, Taraporevala Publishing Industries Private Limited, Bombay, 1974.
- [24] Micheal, V.P. Industrial Relations in India and Worker's Involvement in Management Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1979.
- [25] Moddie, A.D, Indian Manager in his Environments, ASCI Journal of Management September, 1971, p. 197.
- [26] Padhy, K.C., "Managing Productivity of Banks" Indian Management Vol. 21, No. 11 November-1982.
- [27] Padhy, K.C. "Organisational Development and productivity of Banks in India", Indian Management Vol. 22, No. 2, February 1983.
- [28] Prasad, L.M., Organisation Theory and Behaviour, Sultan chand St Sons, New Delhi, 1984.
- [29] Simon, Herbat A. The New Science of Managements Decision (N.Y. Harper & Row Publishers) 1960. Singh, P., "Chief Executives Role and Profile", Indian Management, Vol. 23, No. 3 March 1985, pp. 3-12.
- [30] Stogdill, R.M. & A.E. Loons, Leader Behaviour: Its Description and measurement. Research Monograph No. 88 (Bureau of Research) Ohio state University, 1957.
- [31] Taylor, H.L., "Delegation: The Banker Vol. XXXIII, March, 1986, pp. 31-32.
- [32] Thompson, J.D. Organisation in Action (N.Y. MC-Graw-Hill Book CO. 1967)
- [33] VJoodward, Joan, Industrial Organisation; Theory and Practice (London: Oxford Uni. Press, 1965).