CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The proactive social nature of man makes the study of work behaviour instrumental to the prediction and understanding of effectiveness. Theorists have stressed the need to identify behaviour contributing to productivity at work. Research so initiated has delved into the intricacies of behaviour and the behavioural process individuals engage in. Such studies have revealed that the traditional approach of evaluating organizational effectiveness on the basis of its financial performance alone does not give as clear a picture as is desirable. Consequently, several new measures came into use in keeping with the expanse in criteria identified. Correspondingly, there has been a growing volume of research on the psychological nature, the practices, and the outcomes used in estimating the quality of a manager's work.

Prominent among these are the works of expectancy theorists (Vroom, 1967; Porter and Lawler, 1968; Campbell et al., 1970). They posited that managerial job behaviour is a product of ability, motivation and opportunity in the organizational environment. Personal characteristics,
physical and social environments, policies and practices, together with rewards and feedback, influence behaviour to yield positive or negative outcomes. The capacity to moderate outcomes largely rests with the individual manager. Positive outcomes will accrue provided the manager adjusts behaviour to situational requirements. It implies that the manager must be adept at situation sensitivity, flexibility, and situational management skills (Reddin, 1987). Situation sensitivity refers to the manager's ability to assess the situation. By situation flexibility, Reddin refers to the manager's capacity to match skills to the requirements of the situation. Situation management skill indicates the ability of the manager to change the situation if the need arises. Effectiveness when measured on the basis of these outcomes highlights performance as opposed to personality.

Beginning with Lewin (1938) several successive researchers have enumerated various combinations of factors as contributing in differing magnitude to performance effectiveness. However, none of these suggestions has proved to be all conclusive. Mixed results have been obtained when the effect of any combination of these factors has been studied in an altogether new sample. Further, emphasis on the importance of traits has lessened considerably, and behaviour on the managerial job has been
increasingly identified as contributing to managerial effectiveness.

Keeping in line with this general change in outlook, newer insights about the managerial job have been provided by theorists from time to time. Each of these job behaviour descriptions differs almost entirely from each other. It is quite natural, as these observations most often take into account the peculiarities of the organization's structure, differences in perceptions of managers and situational constraints imposed. Such factors are bound to change constantly in a world where fast changing organizational structures have become essential norms. This is especially true in the present day organizational philosophy of "change or perish".

One of the earliest authentic treatises on managerial job behaviour, which has been well acclaimed, is that of Fayol's (1949). A protagonist of the classical organization theory, Fayol contended that managers are constantly engaged in planning, organizing, commanding and controlling on their jobs. This description was based on Fayol's own personal experiences on the job. The observation was of historic importance as no systematic attempt had been made in this direction by anyone else prior
to Fayol. Moreover, he seemed to have a genuine and earnest interest in the simplification and clear definition of managerial activity.

However, with the passage of time, Fayol's observations were rendered outdated. This was the result of an increase in the complexity of organizations. As such, Fayol's theory was dismissed as only an over-simplified, broad description of work engaged in by managers, at a time when industrialization was just being ushered in. Whatever may be the shortcomings of Fayol's observations, there can be no denying of the virtual importance it has played in shaping research done thereafter, on the manager's job.

Drucker (1975) identified five distinct roles performed by managers on their jobs. These are setting objectives, organizing, motivating and communicating, measuring, and developing subordinate performance. He posited that these activities enable the manager to maximize the performance of his organization. Organizational objectives determine managerial jobs. Managerial jobs, in turn, must have sufficient authority and responsibility, so that individual managers are able to contribute their best towards accomplishment of organizational objectives.

Moreover, Drucker suggests that managerial jobs
should be of a permanent nature. It implies that the manager should have adequate opportunity to continue on the job for a sufficiently long period so that he is able to make significant contributions. Similarly, these jobs should be large enough to ensure growth and development of the incumbent besides sustaining the long-term interests of the manager concerned.

The extreme importance attached to managerial jobs make the design of these jobs crucial to any organization, which desires excellence. One way of doing so, as suggested by Drucker, is to let the managers design their own jobs. Some control in this regard must be exercised by the manager's superior so as to ensure that the jobs are in line with organizational requirements. By resorting to this, it is contended that managers will experience a greater sense of enthusiasm to work, thereby improving organizational performance.

Mintzberg (1973) has given a conceptually different exposition on managerial jobs. He dismissed most of the observations made hitherto by other theorists as "folklore" rather than representing facts about actual managerial jobs. He identified three types of roles that present day managers engage in. Though widely different
from each other, these roles are interdependent and influence managerial performance. The three roles identified are interpersonal, informational, and decisional roles.

Interpersonal roles arise out of the formal authority vested with the manager. It refers to the manager's relationship with others in the organization. It includes the figurehead, leader, and liaison roles. The first arises out of the formal position occupied by the manager in the organizational structure. The duties attached to this role are more of ceremonial nature. The second refers to roles which require the manager to influence and motivate subordinates to meet organizational objectives. The third role highlights manager's involvement in interaction and negotiation within and outside the organization.

Informational roles are constituted by the monitor, disseminator, and spokesperson roles. The manager constantly acquires information, processes it, and distributes it to persons requiring it in the organization. He also acts as the unit's representative when performing the spokesperson role.

The decisional role consists of entrepreneurial,
disturbance handler, resource allocator, and negotiator roles. Entrepreneurial role emphasizes development of new projects. As disturbance handler, he rectifies disturbances in the organization to ensure smooth functioning. Resources are appropriately allocated by the managers so as to ensure its optimal use. Lastly, as negotiator the manager engages in negotiations with subordinates, superiors, and outsiders.

Mintzberg's description of the managerial job has gained substantial research interest, as it provides a clearer and closer image of the present day managerial job.

Adizes (1976, 1980) identified that managers engage in four roles viz., producing, implementing, innovating, and integrating for performing effectively on their jobs. In turn, each of these roles is related to one of the four subsystems in the organization viz., administrative/structural, economic/technological, informational/decision-making, and human/social.

Thus descriptions of managerial jobs have undergone significant changes in the past few decades. The process is likely to continue in future too, keeping in view the emerging new trends in management. Closely related to elucidation of managerial jobs has been the search for identifying productive managerial behaviour. It has proved
to be a major problem confronting organizations. Though several propositions have been made, none can be considered conclusive, precisely because of the magnitude of the problem at hand.

Inspite of this, these propositions are ideal starting points to determine what exactly leads to effectiveness. Besides they have a prominent role to play in evaluating managerial performance. Evaluations are inevitable to any organization as they provide the evaluatees an idea of what is expected of them. It thus enables them to channelize their efforts to meet organizational expectations. Further, it also acts as a control measure by correcting inconsistent behaviour.

Performance appraisals pose severe problems because of divergent viewpoints held by the evaluator and evaluatee of the criteria to be evaluated. Research on appraisal measures have consistently emphasized the need to obtain ratings from different raters within the organization, with whom the ratee manager frequently interacts. The reason behind the suggestion is that no single measure of performance can give an accurate, actual evaluation of effectiveness. Combining evaluations from different raters will at best give a better assessment if
not a totally correct one. Research using self, peer, subordinate, and superior's assessments have yielded promising results. Using assessments of any one rating source in isolation often results in errors in evaluations. Composite assessment by different raters at different levels have the capacity to minimize such errors, thereby enhancing accuracy in evaluations.

Working on the basis of suggestions mentioned above, the present study makes a modest attempt at studying interrater perceptions about certain criteria, identified as influential in determining effectiveness. Superior's ratings being the most common evaluation measure, the study has obtained evaluations from the immediate superior of each subject. The general trend of eliciting ratee managers self assessments has of late been observed in most organizations. The purpose for which these self assessments are obtained in these cases is still unclear. However, considering the new practice and the potential of self assessments, they have also been obtained. Interrater perception of managerial behaviour, and effectiveness is the focus of the study.

A total of one hundred and twenty managerial level executives from six diverse organizations were selected as sample for the study, using quota sampling method. Seventy
six superiors also participated in the study by rating the manager(s) working directly under them. Information was collected through questionnaires, to determine ratee and superior managers' perceptions about effectiveness.

Reliability tests yielded encouraging evidence. The split half reliability was 0.78. Correlations in the multitrait-multirater matrix showed some significant cases to support discriminant and convergent validities.

Results and Discussion

For the purpose of clarity, the study can be divided into three distinct parts. The first is concerned with identifying the extent to which superiors and ratee managers view the different criteria as influential in determining managerial effectiveness. The criteria are broadly classified into six categories viz., experience variables (managerial tenure, company tenure, and managerial level), person centred factors (work quality, ability, effort, and interpersonal competence), motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic), contextual factors, role behaviours (organization and coordination, resource allocation, strategic problem solving, decision making, information handling and growth and development), and role stress (role
conflict, role ambiguity and role overload). The criterion weight was obtained to study consensus in the perception of superiors and the managers in the three levels of the organizational hierarchy.

The regression equation with the nineteen variables was capable of accounting for a significant portion of the variance. Models based on self ratings and superiors' ratings were found to be different. The two models emphasized different criteria as more/less important to others. Differences in case of person centred variables were found to be significant. Positional expectations and contextual factors were also found to be significant. Higher, middle, and junior level managers were observed to differ in their perception of the weights to be assigned to the criteria of effectiveness. Agreement as regards criterion weight was found to be low. It was observed that the closer the hierarchical levels of the raters greater is the similarity in perceptions of criterion weight.

Concurrence in some cases in the view points of ratee managers and their superiors indicates some similarity in perceptions. Certain factors tend to be considered important by the two sets of raters. Such factors are found to be situation specific, and hence instrumental for
effective performance. Disagreement observed in some cases indicate that the two groups of managers have different perceptions of the same criteria.

Such discrepancies expressed by the two sets of raters does not indicate that either of the two viewpoints is right or wrong in toto. In fact, these discrepancies should be scrutinized to determine their nature. If these are mere error variances, steps should be taken to at least minimize their effect in case it is not possible to remove them entirely, so as to increase the accuracy of evaluations. In contrast, variances otherwise arising must be properly analyzed as they may prove to be useful in providing fresh insight into managerial effectiveness.

Differences in viewpoints may arise due to a number of reasons. Perhaps one reason for such difference in perception is probably that at the earlier stages of an individual's career, it is the superior's view that bears weight as regards effectiveness. However, the same undergoes change in favour of ratee's views at later stages of his career. This is directly the result of greater freedom and interest that the ratees exercise on the job as they move up the hierarchical level. Consequently, ratee managers tend to rate the influence of the factors on the
basis of what they presume their superiors consider important for effective performance. Superiors on the other hand may evaluate the factors on the basis of what has helped them to attain their current status. Perhaps this is also the reason for similarity in perceptions of raters in the same hierarchical level.

Each individual's perception of organizational factors and role behaviour differ according to views already held by them. These are usually based on preconceived notions or other information in possession of the rater. Judgemental errors, bias, and nature of feedback also influence evaluations.

Raters at different hierarchical levels are also influenced by the climate and organizational factors to which they are exposed. Their perception will quite naturally reflect the influence of these factors. In turn, these factors affect their perceptions of the constituents and the importance of the variables contributing to effectiveness. Hence different raters tend to consider some of these factors as more/less important to effectiveness.

Evidence from research on performance appraisals have repeatedly shown that evaluation based on the perceptions of a single evaluator does not do an adequate
justice to the evaluatee's performance. Hence, it is vital that any performance appraisal measure should consider opinions of different raters (superiors, peers, subordinates, and ratees themselves) if evaluation is to be accurate.

In the second part the influence of personality attributes (the need for power, achievement and affiliation) on effectiveness was studied. The differences in effectiveness of these three groups of managers and their profile characteristics were also studied.

The regression model using the person centred variables and personality attributes (power, achievement and affiliation) as independent variables and overall effectiveness as the dependent variable accounted for a sizeable portion of the variance. Person centred variables were found to affect effectiveness. Effort expended was considered to be an important factor but not as important as work quality. Probably this is because ratees feel that efforts by themselves will not ensure effectiveness. It requires something more - the willingness to perform as best as possible on the job. Thus work quality becomes a more important factor. Ability has a negating effect in the model. Interpersonal competence is not viewed as important
probably because ratees feel that performance is what actually matters in evaluation rather than good relations with others in the organization.

The need for affiliation is closely related to interpersonal competence. This factor has a negative effect in the model probably because managers feel that emphasis on good relationships has a detrimental effect on performance. The need for achievement has a positive effect on effectiveness, as it induces the person to work towards excellence. However, it is not found to be as influential as the need for power. Since managerial jobs are so designed as to get work done out of others, the power aspect is crucial to good management. The capacity to influence other's performance towards organizational goals is thus vital to a manager. Effective performance of the manager's work unit reflects on the manager's own effectiveness. This is probably the reason why managers perceive that the motive contributes to effectiveness.

Personality attributes of managers were found to be significant factors influencing effectiveness. The power, achievement, and affiliation oriented managers tended to differ in their effectiveness. The power oriented manager seemed to be more effective.
Comparison between the mean effectiveness of managers based on self ratings and on the basis of the discriminant analysis showed significant difference. The discriminant function could be considered to be a more reliable estimate for classifying managers according to effectiveness based on their personality orientations. The observation is significant as it enables organizations to impartially measure the degree of effectiveness of managers on the basis of power, achievement and affiliation. The test could be used at different stages of career development to determine the more effective category of managers within the organization. The profiles of the three groups of managers also tend to be significantly different. The power oriented managers were observed to score high on organization and coordination, resource allocation, and decision making. While the achievement oriented managers were found to score high on work quality, effort expended, strategic problem solving and information handling; the affiliation oriented managers were found to score high on interpersonal competence and growth and development. The profile of the successful manager as determined by the study is a facilitating one in the context. For it can be compared with profiles of job applicants to arrive at selection decisions. To some extent personality
orientations could be changed in the direction desired by the organization through training and positive feedback.

As motivation is crucial to performance, the role of fifteen extrinsic and intrinsic rewards in influencing effectiveness has been studied in the third part. The expected utility theory has been used in the context as it employs the dual categorization (target vs performance orientation) method for classifying performance thereby simplifying analysis. More important is the fact that the use of the theory ensures reasonable accuracy as it does not rely entirely on the views expressed by ratee managers.

Ratee managers viewed their individual performances as determinants of utilities. If it is perceived that rewards are contingent on efforts, greater is the effort expended. High effort oriented subjects differed in their perception of increase in probability of rewards if target accomplishment is rewarded. Managers attaining targets do not differ in their perception of increase in probability of rewards if performance is likely to be rewarded. Perception of the reward path was considered to be instrumental for better performance and reward probability enhancement is dependent on perception of high effort expenditure or target orientation as probable positive influences in reward enhancement.
Perceived intrinsic probability was observed to increase as managers move up the hierarchy. Increase in subjective probabilities of intrinsic factors were reported by higher level followed by middle and lastly the junior level managers. Increase in subjective probability of extrinsic reward for target attainment was found to be independent of the nature of the organization. Subjects in the private and public sectors expressed similarity in increase in subjective probability of extrinsic rewards when targets were accomplished.

A stronger relationship between performance orientation and managerial effectiveness, and a weaker one between target orientation and managerial effectiveness was established by the data.

The importance of performance orientation as against target orientation in ensuring effectiveness has been established. It indicates that appropriate motivation in the former case would ensure better performance and effectiveness. Managerial efforts can be guided in the right direction through manipulation of reward structure. Perception of increase in intrinsic rewards reported by higher level managers indicate that they attribute greater importance to job factors as compared to lower level
managers. It implies that organizations should be capable of creating the appropriate kind of interest on the job, so that individuals become intrinsically disposed towards effectiveness.

Results of the study in totality reemphasize that effectiveness is a function of the interaction between the individual and the organizational factors. In sum, these findings give fresh insight into managerial effectiveness. To that extent the study may be considered an appropriate sequel to past researches in this vast and nebulous area.

Implications for Future Research and Practice

There is vast scope for further research in this area. A more comprehensive study with a larger and more diverse sample is desirable to arrive at more concrete conclusions.

Preferably, the number of variables entering the managerial effectiveness model should be reduced without sacrificing its capacity to predict effectiveness. This could be achieved through factor analysis.

Methodological refinements need to be made in eliciting self assessments. Preferably, at least on an
experimental basis, these should be used in combination with superiors' assessment for purposes of evaluation of performance. The effect of self assessment on the future performance of the ratee should be assessed through appropriate feedback. In turn, the role of feedback in improving self assessments and assessments by superiors need to be studied.

Self assessments are often viewed with distrust as they are considered to be extremely exaggerated evaluations of performance. Research must direct attention on the type of managers (power, achievement, affiliation) who rate themselves high in self assessments. The factors which are generally overrated also need to be studied.

Equally important are under-raters. The reasons behind such assessments and the type and hierarchical levels of such raters should be determined. Necessary steps could then be designed to induce underraters to make accurate ratings.

The profile of the accurate-raters should be mapped so that organizations may instill these characteristics through adequate training, in both the under- and over-raters.
The observation that assessments by managers closer to each other in the hierarchical structure bear some degree of similarity needs to be analyzed more rigorously. Since self-assessments and assessments by superiors display significantly different perceptions, ratings by peers and subordinates could also be included for a more accurate evaluation. The moderating effect of these evaluations could also be focused on. However, care should be exercised, while making selections of the various multiple raters, so as to ensure that they have adequate knowledge about the ratee being evaluated. In the absence of this precaution, evaluations will be misleading.

The use of multiple assessments must be resorted to after giving due training to the various raters on the need for, and the basis on which, correct decisions about evaluations could be made. The effect of such training is yet another aspect which has to be explored. The time-frame within which positive changes in attitudes towards accurate evaluations arise need to be determined. Organizations can then incorporate multiple assessments at the earliest possible time period.

Preferably, greater observational techniques should be employed to determine the reason behind the
greater success of the power oriented manager. Since individual behaviour can be moderated according to organizational preferences, through proper training, organizations could take steps to reinforce such of those attitudes that positively influence performance.

Attention must be focussed on determining whether any of the personality orientations (power, achievement, and affiliation) is more dominant at any particular stage in the manager's career. If so, it is desirable to determine which orientation is dominant at each stage. The finding is bound to have practical managerial implications.

Literature on organizational psychology is replete with theories on motivation. However, most of these theories cannot be considered to be adequately useful in the context of managerial motivation. Exception being the expectancy theories of motivation. The role of these theories in answering vital questions about managerial motivation are rather dubious. Hence research efforts must be guided towards determining a simplified yet useful theory of managerial motivation. Since managerial motivation is reported to be caused more by intrinsic factors, efforts must be directed towards determining which intrinsic factors affect managers' performance the most. A plan of action for
infusing intrinsic motivation should also be chalked out. Further, it is desirable to know the nature of rewards that motivate each group of managers, i.e. those high on power, high on achievement and high on affiliation.

The importance of a manager's values in ensuring effective performance is yet another promising area of research.