CHAPTER V

INFLUENCE OF PERSONALITY ATTRIBUTES ON EFFECTIVENESS

Personality attributes of managers juxtaposed with organizational variables determine behaviour. Consequently, identification of such attributes is essential to any study of managerial behaviour and performance. Beginning with Atkinson (1957), and Hemphill (1959, 1960), several successive researchers have emphasized some personality attributes as more important than others in determining behaviour. Some of these studies have also arrived at logical conclusions about their influence in determining an individual's success.

Significant among these is McClelland's needs theory, which identifies three types of needs - need for power (n/Pow), need for affiliation (n/Aff) and need for achievement (n/Ach). The theory has over the years stimulated substantial research interest, because of the awareness it has created of the desirability of organizations to provide the right atmosphere to enable managers to satisfy those needs which are foremost to them thereby enhancing their performance capabilities.

In his initial treatise McClelland (1961) posited that the need to achieve was one of the most important
factors for economic growth. Though at first it was considered to be applicable to all kinds of managerial work, its scope was later narrowed down to entrepreneurial tasks (Miner, 1980). Further, he opined that the need for achievement is based on a single man’s performance, and had nothing to do with group activity. As such the individual concentrates on improving self performance.

McClelland (1966) observed that the need for achievement induces individuals to set moderately difficult but attainable goals. They are willing to challenge themselves only if they believe that they can influence the outcomes by their individual performance on the job. The driving force thus is personal achievement rather than rewards. Hence achievement oriented persons were observed to seek concrete feedback on their performance. McClelland also opined that the desire for achievement could be ingrained in people through training.

Further studies by McClelland led him to believe that the need for power is a vital aspect in all organizations where tasks are interdependent and supervision is indispensable. The power motive involves influencing others. The power oriented manager engages in goal setting so that groups can work towards achieving them. Moreover,
he must be capable of imparting his leadership skills to subordinates.

The affiliative manager seeks the approval of persons with whom he works (Byrne, 1961). Personal relationships were observed to be overemphasized to the detriment of the organizational unit's performance. Research results on the affiliative motive are confusing and often support the thesis that the motive mars performance.

Mc Clelland has widely used the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) to measure subconscious motivation. However, its use in studying motivation has often been called to question due to low internal consistency as also low test-retest reliability. Inspite of these problems the Thematic Apperception Test has been used by many researchers to assess managerial motivation, often yielding inconsistent results.

Mc Clelland and Boyatzis (1982) found that reanalysis of data from the AT&T study (Bray et al., 1974), using TAT predicts managerial success for non-technical managers. Stahl (1983) observed that achievement motivation combined with power motivation was capable of predicting managerial performance and promotion rate.
Atkinson and Feather (1966) theorized that individuals engage in achievement-oriented tasks if they view that their performance will be evaluated against specified standards of excellence.

Wainer and Rubin (1969) conducted a study to determine the relationship between an entrepreneur's level of n/Ach and his company's performance. Results showed positive relationship between the two. Also, the highest performing companies were usually headed by entrepreneurs having a high n/Ach and a moderate n/Pow. Further, performance of those entrepreneurs who had a high n/Ach coupled with high n/Pow was found to be poorer than those with high n/Ach and moderate n/Pow. In the case of the moderate n/Ach group, better performing companies were found to be headed by entrepreneurs with a high n/Aff.

Matsui et al. (1982) reported positive correlation between need for achievement and self set goals. Goals were posited to relate to performance. No correlation between achievement motivation and performance was observed when the goal level was statistically controlled. Thus the need for achievement was found to affect performance through its effect on goals.
Can each of these variables, which are essentially found in reasonable measure in all managerial personnel, though dormant at times together with various other independent aspects, purely individual centered (such as ability, work quality, effort, and interpersonal competence) provide a more divergent insight into managerial effectiveness? The focus of the chapter is the point in question.

Rating managers' scores on overall effectiveness and person centred variables were used for purposes of analyses in this chapter. Besides these, the questions in parts two (role behaviours) and three (personality attributes) of the questionnaire were used for purposes of testing hypotheses in this chapter. Only self ratings are used in this part of the study.

**Attitude Measures**

The variables used in this section of the study are discussed below:

The need for power. The need to influence people rather than concentrating on self performance. Atkinson defines n/Pow as "that disposition, directing
behaviour towards satisfactions contingent upon the control of the means of influencing another person."

The extent to which the ratee is keen on getting work done through others was assessed. Ratee's preference for competitive jobs and high status was elicited. Questions also determined the ratee's capacity to influence others, employ coercion tactics to ensure compliance and instill a sense of responsibility among subordinates.

The need for achievement. The need to achieve above standard results from accepting greater responsibilities and taking higher risks. McClelland describes it as "the need to do something better than it has been done before."  

Questions were designed to determine the extent to which the ratee considers himself to be committed to his work. Data on the extent to which he is motivated to undertake responsibility and risks, set moderate goals


and achieve above standard results were obtained. Items also assessed the ratee's self confidence, receptivity to feedback and determination to perform rather than rely on chance.

The need for affiliation. Desire to be friendly and to foster mutual understanding through persuasion. "nAff is concerned with the establishment, maintenance, or restoration of positive affective relationships with other people, that is, friendships." It can be considered as the desire for success based on an internalized measure of excellence (Atkinson, 1958). Ratee's value for sound relationships with subordinates, peers, and superiors was determined. The degree to which the ratee is capable of persuading subordinates to perform, foster mutual understanding and encourage co-operative actions was also determined.

The extent to which the need for power, achievement and affiliation enable the ratee manager to perform effectively was also determined.

Person centred variables. The four components of this variable are ability, work quality, effort and interpersonal competence. Evaluations of the ability and work quality of ratee managers were obtained. Since performance is dependent to a large extent, on the effort expended by the individual, perceptions about this variable were also elicited. Interpersonal competence was measured by the degree to which the manager is receptive to the suggestions put forth by others, the responsibility accepted for his own actions, and encouragement to subordinates. The extent to which these factors affect effectiveness was determined.

Overall effectiveness. Represented by a composite of three measures. They are superior's perception of ratee's performance adjusted for the extent to which the superior desires to change ratee's performance, self ratings of performance adjusted for the extent to which the ratee desires to change his performance, and merit promotions as a percentage of experience. The average of self and superior's ratings were added to the score on the third variable.
Results and Discussion

As a preliminary attempt at answering the question, a multiple regression equation was drawn up using overall effectiveness as the dependent variable and the other variables such as person centred variables (ability, work quality, effort, interpersonal competence and need for power, need for achievement and need for affiliation as the independent variables. Interestingly, in the case of the ratee managers self ratings 84% of the variance is accounted for by these variables (see table 4). Need for power (t=-15.60) was found to be the most significant factor, followed by work quality (t=-5.49), need for achievement (t=-4.83), and effort expended (t=-4.01). Need for affiliation was found to affect effectiveness negatively (t=-4.87). The other two factors viz., ability and interpersonal competence were found to be insignificant contributories.

The regression model shows that the need for power, need for achievement and need for affiliation have a bearing on managerial effectiveness. Person centred variables also indicate significant effect on effectiveness. Together, these variables are capable of explaining a large part of the variance in effectiveness. Inclusion of these
TABLE 4
Managerial Effectiveness Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Quality</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>5.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Competence</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(Pow)</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>15.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(Ach)</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>4.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n(Aff)</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-4.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall F</td>
<td>106.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1. * = p < 0.05
variables in the study of effectiveness is relatively justified thus.

Of the personality attributes, the need for power appears to be the most dominant factor, suggesting that the power drive perhaps has a strong influence on effectiveness. The role of achievement motive in determining effectiveness is also supported by the data. However, need for affiliation has been found to negatively influence effectiveness.

The model identified work quality and effort expended as significant person centred variables. Interpersonal competence followed by ability was found to be relatively less significant in determining effectiveness.

Since the regression equation established that the drives are essentially influential in effectiveness, it was considered relevant to recategorize the managers according to their effectiveness based on the drives. As such, managers were classified on the basis of effectiveness as determined by the discriminant function employing scores on the power, achievement and affiliation orientations. Table 5 shows the results of the comparisons between means of the average and high effectiveness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
<th>t-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self Ratings$^a$</td>
<td>Discriminant Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>6.891*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.166</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>4.752*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

1. * - $p < 0.05$
2. Point of separation 1.675
3. $N_a$ - 90 and 30 for high and average groups respectively.
4. $N_b$ - 74 and 36 for high and average groups respectively.
groups based on self ratings and assignment according to the discriminant analysis.

The difference between the mean effectiveness of the two groups is significant, the t-values being 6.891 and 4.752 respectively. Results suggest that the discriminant procedure be adopted, instead of relying entirely on self ratings. Inspite of the caveat that it is not appropriate to test the discriminant model using data from which weights are derived, it has been done, thereby sacrificing some methodological accuracy.

Hypothesis 4

Personality attributes of ratee managers do not influence their effectiveness.

One way analysis of variance was performed to determine whether any significant difference is discernible in the case of the three groups viz., those high on power, high on achievement and high on affiliation. Each ratee's score for the power, achievement and affiliation variables was computed. A ratee was considered to be power oriented if the score for power variables was higher than those for achievement or affiliation. Similarly, if a ratee's score was highest for achievement variables he was considered to
be achievement oriented, and if his score was highest for affiliation variables he was considered to be affiliation oriented. The F-ratio of 3.94 (see table 6), indicated significant differences between the three groups as regards effectiveness. Scheffe's F-test was adopted to determine which differences between the means are significant. The analysis yielded F-statistic of 7.85 in case of the power and achievement groups, 1.47 in case of power and affiliation groups, and 0.74 between the achievement and affiliation groups. Though significant difference is observable among the three groups as regards effectiveness, in effect the difference is more pronounced in case of the power and achievement groups only. The mean differences between the power and affiliation, and achievement and affiliation groups is rather insignificant. Apparently the power oriented group is more effective than the other two groups.

Since significant difference was observable amongst the three groups in the above analysis, further analysis was done to determine whether there is any difference between the three groups as far as person centred variables and role behaviours are concerned.
### TABLE 6

One Way Analysis of Variance Between the Three Groups of Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean squares</th>
<th>F-statistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1713.06</td>
<td>856.53</td>
<td>3.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>25383.77</td>
<td>216.95</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>27096.83</td>
<td>227.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

1. * - p < 0.05
2. N = 48, 42, & 30 for the power, achievement and affiliation groups respectively.
Hypothesis 5

Role behaviours and person-centred variables will be perceived to be identically influential across the power, achievement and affiliation groups of managers.

Except in the case of organization and coordination and resource allocation, all other variables showed significant differences between the groups (see table 7). Tukey's procedure was adopted to determine which differences between the means are significant. Except ability all other variables were found to be emphasized more by any one of the three groups of managers. The q-statistic showed that the power group was high on organization and coordination (4.810), resource allocation (3.967), and decision making (3.481). The achievement group was high on work quality (3.209), effort expended (3.103), strategic problem solving (4.759) and information handling (4.045); the affiliation group was high on interpersonal competence (3.340) and growth and development (3.880). Based on these values it can be inferred that managers seem to have different perceptions about the person-centred and role behaviour variables, depending on their personality orientations.
### Table 7

ANOVA and Tukey's Procedure Results of the Person Centred and Role Centred Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>F-statistic df(2,117)</th>
<th>Q-statistic df (3,117)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>II &amp; III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Centred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work quality</td>
<td>22.680*</td>
<td>1.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>25.010*</td>
<td>0.966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>32.990*</td>
<td>1.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal competence</td>
<td>14.860*</td>
<td>2.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization &amp; coordination</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>4.810**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource allocation</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>3.967*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic problem solving</td>
<td>5.812*</td>
<td>2.793*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>29.400*</td>
<td>3.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information handling</td>
<td>15.380</td>
<td>1.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and development</td>
<td>15.790*</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

1. * - p < 0.05
2. ** - p < 0.01
3. I refers to power oriented managers.
   II refers to achievement oriented managers.
   III refers to affiliation oriented managers.
4. N = 48, 42, and 30 for the power, achievement and affiliation groups respectively.
Results indicate that performance determiners like ability, work quality, effort expended and interpersonal competence have strong influence on the perceived effectiveness of the ratees. The observation is similar to that of earlier studies in this area (Argyris, 1962; Porter and Lawler, 1967; Adizes, 1976). Effort expended was considered a significant factor affecting effectiveness, precisely because most individuals feel that expenditure of adequate efforts will lead to accomplishment of desired performance. However, the importance attached to efforts expended was relatively less than that attributed to work quality. This also lends support to the views expressed hitherto that the quality of the work of the individual ratee is what really matters and not how much of effort is expended. Moreover, expenditure of efforts by itself does not ensure effectiveness. It requires something more the desire to perform the job with the goal of doing it as best as possible. Hence what counts in effectiveness is work quality rather than effort alone. Effort is useful in that it has a mediatory role to play. It transforms casual performance into quality work thus ensuring effectiveness.

The role of ability in the model is rather dubious. Ability is observed to have a negative effect on performance. One probable reason could be that the
individual's perception that he has the requisite ability to perform, may lead to the individual not evincing as much care as is required for good performance. It is quite natural that under the circumstance effectiveness becomes elusive. Thus ability by itself does not ensure effectiveness. Besides confidence in ability alone without emphasizing on the need to expend adequate efforts, and the need to ensure quality standards will have a detrimental effect on effectiveness.

As such, assessments about ability should differentiate appropriately between real and apparent abilities. What really matters is real ability. Real ability facilitates transformation of knowledge into productive performance. It thus complements the role of efforts thereby resulting in commendable performance. Apparent ability on the other hand merely exists in the perceptions of the individuals and has probably no justification for its presence. The 'feeling' is merely illusory. Consequently, it cannot transform itself into fruitful action. On the contrary, its mere presence in the minds of the individual boosts the perception of capacity to perform to such heights, that actual performance falls way short of these projections. It can thus be safely posited that ability and effort should work in unison if it is to
contribute to effective performance. The independent existence of either of these two factors cannot ensure effectiveness. In sum, the presence of both factors, ability and effort, in the individual is, reasonable measure is required for effective performance.

Interpersonal competence is not considered as an important factor in determining effectiveness probably because ratees feel that performance is what actually matters in evaluation of effectiveness, rather than friendly relationships with superiors, peers or subordinates. No doubt that these relationships are important for the smooth functioning of the organizational unit, but their role is only supportive in nature, for good relationship makes working easier. But presence of a congenial working atmosphere need not necessarily induce the individual to perform as best as possible. The decision thus rests with the individual alone. This is probably the reason why this variable does not have a significant part in the model.

Closely related to the interpersonal competence is the need for affiliation. The model has shown that the need for affiliation has a significant negative effect on managerial effectiveness. It is likely that managers feel that overemphasis on good relationships with others in the
workplace lead to a lessening of performance standards. This is probably because managers with strong need for affiliation tend to be more interested in developing and nurturing good relationships. As such, they do not emphasize good performance of subordinates. Similarly, in the case of relationships with superiors, the manager may be more concerned with doing things to catch the superior's attention (Boyatzis, 1972). Collectively these factors will naturally lessen the effectiveness of the affiliative manager.

The need for achievement has a positive, significant effect on effectiveness. This is natural as the achievement oriented person tries to perform to the best of his capacity. As such, this need clearly induces the person to strive for standards of excellence, thereby ensuring effectiveness.

The model has shown the need for power to be the most significant factor in effectiveness. This is probably because managers perceive that the performance of their organizational units can be improved by influencing their subordinates' performance, besides putting in maximum efforts. The power motive thus seems to be a crucial factor in determining effectiveness. The relatively larger weight
assigned to the factor as compared to the other factors suggests that the managers view the motive as the most significant contributory to effectiveness.

The technique of using self ratings to classify managers into the three groups viz., those high on power, achievement or affiliation may not be entirely reliable. Methodological refinements need to be made so as to give a more accurate picture. The use of discriminant analysis may be an appropriate alternative.

Difference in the mean effectiveness is observable when the managers are grouped on the basis of self ratings and on the basis of the discriminant function. As the first method of classifying is based on managers' perceptions of themselves it is possible that they are unclear of their own behaviour. The application of discriminant analysis to the information elicited from managers would provide a better way of distinguishing between the three types of managers. Moreover, it may be possible to identify individuals who are likely to become effective managers at the time of their entry into the organization itself by using the discriminant technique applied in the study. However, some methodological refinements would be necessitated before it is applied to other organizational settings.
Analyses also seem to suggest that the most effective type of manager is the power oriented manager; overall effectiveness scores are relatively higher for these managers. Since power oriented managers are capable of manoeuvring performance of others in the desired direction, organizational performance is likely to be better. Managerial jobs being primarily concerned with ensuring performance compliance of others in the work set up, it is imperative that the manager should have the capacity to ensure that each individual under his supervision performs as best as possible. If managers are able to ensure such performance it is quite plausible that performance standards would be well above normal standards. The good performance of the organizational unit under the manager's supervision would naturally reflect on the manager's own capability and lead to the manager scoring higher on overall effectiveness as compared to achievement or affiliation oriented counterparts.

Significant differences are observable in the case of the three groups of managers as regards the person centred variables and role behaviours. The power oriented manager appears to be more efficient at organization and coordination, and resource allocation. These factors represent two aspects which often require the capacity to
make risky decisions. Hence they score better on decision making too as this requires the manager to influence others into accepting what the manager feels is right. Further, it implies that the manager has to accept responsibility for decisions taken. As the power oriented manager is more often than not a tough task master he is likely to be more successful at these roles.

Achievement oriented managers on the other hand have scored well on work quality, effort expended, strategic problem solving and information handling. These managers are more concerned with their own contribution to organizational performance rather than to those of others. Thus they tend to expend more efforts as well as devote more attention to work quality. Moreover, they tend to weigh all alternatives before arriving at any conclusion. As such, they are capable of solving problems amicably. Since information is a vital ingredient to good management, the achievement oriented manager seems to be efficient at handling it.

The affiliation oriented managers are better than their counterparts in interpersonal competence and growth and development. It is natural that this group of managers give undue weightage to their relationships with others. As
such, they exercise greater interest in the general improvement in performance standards of their subordinates. Affiliation oriented managers also evince greater interest in the personal growth of subordinates. As such, besides fostering compatible relationships they also tend to be more educative.

Hitherto the study has focussed attention on the identification of behaviour contributing to effectiveness, interrater evaluation of the constituents of effectiveness, influence of attributes on effectiveness as also providing distinct characteristic profiles of managers differing in their personality attributes. The next chapter attempts to study the motivational role of rewards in sustaining effective performance.