CHAPTER II
MANAGERIAL BEHAVIOUR AND EFFECTIVENESS

What do managers do? The question has evoked mixed responses. The earliest authentic description of managerial work can be traced to Fayol (1949). Based on personal experiences he suggested that managers are actively engaged in planning, organizing, commanding and controlling on their jobs.

Planning. By planning Fayol referred to the long-term plans for operation made by managers. These are to be based on forecasts envisaged to affect the future of the organizations. Plans also enable the managers to make appropriate decisions so as to streamline the functioning of the organization.

Organizing. Ensures the judicious combination of machine, material and men for successful task accomplishment.

Commanding. Involves directing subordinate activity towards accomplishment of organizational goals.

Controlling. Emphasizes periodical assessment of the organization structure as also the subordinates, besides highlighting the importance of replacing faulty
structure or incompetent subordinates to ensure organizational performance. The controlling function ensures that actual performance conforms to plans made.

Changing environments, expectations and the complex nature of organizations have questioned Fayol's observations. Significant among these are Drucker's, Adizes' and Mintzberg's descriptions of managerial work.

Drucker's Description of the Managerial Job

According to Drucker (1974) a manager must be capable of monitoring the various functions such that outcomes exceed the inputs. The performance of each unit of the organization should be viewed as complementary to each other. As such, adequate and equal attention to each aspect is necessitated. Moreover, decisions pertaining to the present are as important as those of long term nature. Hence each of these decisions must be taken with due care so that the viable continuance of the organization is not jeopardized.

According to Drucker a manager performs five distinct roles. He sets objectives, organizes, motivates and communicates, measures, and develops subordinate performance. By engaging in each of these activities, the
Manager ensures that his organization performs as best as it can.

Setting objectives. The manager determines the objectives of the organization. The goals to be attained and the modus operandi are decided. These are then communicated to the subordinates so that they may direct their efforts towards accomplishment of these objectives.

Organizing. Through organization the manager first divides the work into 'manageable activities'. These are then converted into 'manageable jobs'. They are then grouped appropriately to constitute the organizational structure.

Motivation and communication. The people engaged in the various activities are motivated to perform through the manager's decisions pertaining to pay, placement and promotion. Upward, downward and lateral communication is resorted to to disseminate required information.

Measuring. Each individual is intimated about the performance requirements of his job. These in turn are related to the overall performance of the organization. The manager evaluates the performance of subordinates.
Such evaluation is communicated so that performance short of expectations is rectified.

Developing. Lastly, since the manager works with people, he must take interest in their development. The task requires analytical ability, integrity and social skills.

Managerial jobs must be derived from organizational objectives. They must have adequate scope, authority and responsibility to make a visible niche in the organization's success. As Drucker observes, "since a manager is someone who takes responsibility for, and contributes to, the final results of the enterprise, the job should always embody the maximum challenge, carry the maximum responsibility, and make the maximum contribution."  

Drucker suggests that managerial jobs should be so designed as to ensure permanance. The manager must be capable of making significant contributions to the jobs.

Effective performance must be credited with recognition. Personal development of the individual is

perhaps by far the most rewarding experience in the organization. Since a manager works with a number of subordinates he must be capable of passing on some of the enthusiasm to work to his subordinates too. Relationships with superiors and with peers are equally crucial to a manager. For effective performance these "managerial relationships" should preferably be as wide as possible. Some restriction should however be imposed on lateral relationships as otherwise they may prove to be cumbersome, time consuming, and of superficial importance only.

Jobs should be large enough to facilitate the personal growth of the incumbents. Since hierarchical structure in organizations generally have very few top level jobs, organizations should ensure that the managers learn, develop and move up the hierarchy steadily over the years. Organizations which facilitate meteoric rise face imminent destruction through frustration and resistance to change by the managers. Managerial jobs should essentially provide satisfaction so as to sustain long term interests of the job occupant.

Jobs must also ensure smooth transition of managerial functions from older to younger managers. This can be made possible only through proper planning. Care
should be taken to see that well experienced, efficient managers are nurtured so as to take over key positions when the need arises, without creating imbalances or hindrances in the functioning of the organization.

Managerial jobs should be capable of retaining the best talent on the jobs. Jobs which prove otherwise should be redesigned so that the incumbent can derive satisfaction through performance and achievement, operating in the way that best suits him.

Further, jobs should be compact units such that each manager is able to work independently without having to engage in too many meetings or requiring constant cooperation or coordination from others.

Since managerial jobs are key positions it is inevitable that they are designed appropriately so that efforts are directed towards achievement of organizational objectives. Drucker believes that the best way is to entrust the design of their jobs to the managers themselves. It may be approved by the superior if they satisfy him about the results that are likely to ensue, the contribution that the manager is to be held accountable for, and the contributions to be made by the managers. Based on suggestions made by the superiors the job description may be made authentic.
Mintzberg’s Dimensional Analysis of Managerial Roles

A conceptually different treatise on managerial jobs has been provided by Mintzberg (1975). Observations such as the manager spends most of his time in planning and delegating rather than on social interaction, is more reflective and systematic while planning, derives all required information from the formal information set up, and that management is evolving gradually into a science and a profession have been dismissed as mere folklore.

Mintzberg found that managers perform numerous functions on their jobs. Each activity lasted most often only for a few minutes. Planning, if resorted to, is only for activities requiring immediate attention rather than of long term duration. In spite of the variety of tasks that managers are required to perform they are unable to delegate because of excessive reliance on the verbal media as opposed to written communication. As such they are often overburdened and face acute time pressures.

Effective managers engage constantly in verbal communication. The concept of a strong management information system that provides all information required by the managers is obsolete. Most information is processed and stored in the manager's brain. As Mintzberg observes,
"the strategic data bank of the organization is not in the memory of its computers but in the minds of its managers."²

Besides performing regular managerial duties, managers also actively engage in, "a number of regular duties, including ritual, and ceremony, negotiation, and processing of "soft" information, that links the organisation with its environment."³ "Soft" information "especially gossip, hearsay, and speculation⁴ are cherished by managers for its "timeliness".

Mintzberg has identified ten managerial roles classified into three categories viz., interpersonal, informational, and decisional roles. Though different in nature, these ten roles are interdependent and contribute substantially to effective performance.

The figurehead, leader and liaison roles originate from the manager's formal authority and involve interpersonal relationships. The figurehead role refers to the ceremonial duties that managers have to perform because of the position held by them. Such duties have to


³Ibid., p.24.

⁴Ibid., p.28.
be performed, as a matter of routine for the smooth functioning of the organization. As the organization unit's head the manager performs leadership roles. Formal authority gives him power to influence the work of subordinates. The liaison role arises out of the managers' necessity to interact with peers and others outside their chain of command. The role derives its importance as it aids the manager to develop an effective external information system for his own use.

Informational Roles. Through interpersonal contacts with subordinates and others, the manager becomes a repository of information. Acquiring, processing and disseminating information is a crucial part of managerial work. The monitor, disseminator and spokesman roles fall under this category. Through contacts, the manager is able to collect information for performing the monitor role. Most of the information is in the nature of gossip, speculation and hearsay. However, such information has its utility for the managers. As disseminator, the manager passes on such of those informations as are required within his organization to his subordinates. As spokesperson, he is the unit's representative.

Decisional Roles. Entrepreneur, disturbance handler, resource allocator and negotiator roles arise out
of the decision making function. As entrepreneur, the manager is responsible for adapting the organization to environmental changes. He develops new projects, and expends efforts to make them viable units. As disturbance handler, the manager takes correctional steps to rectify unexpected but serious disturbances in the functioning of the organization arising out of changes initiated by him. As resource allocator the manager is concerned with making important decisions about allocation of resources, designing the structure of the unit, pattern of formal relationships, division, and coordination of work. Lastly, as negotiator, the manager represents the organization at negotiations.

Mintzberg's description of managerial work thus emphasizes on these ten roles which are inseparable from each other. Two observations have been stressed in this context. First, since time management is the essence of all managerial work, managers should manage it systematically. Moreover, the manager should be capable of discharging obligations to his advantage. Next, as manager's effectiveness is affected by his understanding of his own work, it is plausible that through introspection a manager will be able to improve his effectiveness.
Managerial Roles in a Social System

Adizes (1976, 1980) has identified four roles that managers must perform to ensure effective functioning of the organization. The four roles viz., producing, implementing, innovating, and integrating are related to one of the four subsystems viz., administrative/structural, economic/technological, informational/decision-making, and human/social.

Producing. The role emphasizes achievement of results superior to those of competitors. Activities in the economic/technological subsystem are the focus of the role. As implementers managers schedule, coordinate, control and ensure discipline. Emphasis is on the administrative/structural subsystem.

Implementing. Technical skills alone are not sufficient to help managers to perform effectively. They must be capable of directing subordinates to achieve organizational goals. While performing this role managers are engaged in scheduling, coordinating, controlling and disciplining subordinates' performance. The role emphasizes the administrative/structural sub-system.

Innovating. Changing environments necessitates quick decisions by managers. Often it entails changing
goals or systems to meet outside pressures. Hence they act as innovators or entrepreneurs. The innovating role focuses on informational/decision-making subsystem.

Integrating. It implies combining individual strategies into a group strategy. The role stresses the human/social system. As Adizes observes:

"When a group can operate on its own with a clear direction in mind and can choose its own direction over time without depending on any one individual for a successful operation, then we know that the integrating role has been performed adequately. It requires an individual who is sensitive to people's needs. Such an individual unifies the whole organization behind goals and strategies".

Although all four roles have to be performed well for managing the organization effectively, the most crucial role is that of integration. As such, managers must be capable of performing this role appropriately.

Conclusions about managerial job behaviour have thus undergone significant modifications over the years having regard to the challenges, environment and emerging new trends in management. The process is likely to continue as long as the managerial myth remains.

Managerial Job Dimensions

Managerial job behaviours are difficult to define as they are subject to time, person, and situation determined changes. In order to evaluate accurately it is imperative that it should be possible to distinguish between productive and unproductive behaviour. This is possible only if the evaluator knows accurately what functions the evaluatee has to perform on the job. Job analyses must encompass all core responsibilities of the jobs being studied. Campbell et al., suggest some methods for developing valid constructs of managerial job behaviours. They are:

First, systematic observations, reports, or records of many managers' job behaviours must be accumulated. Second, these records of job behavior must be analyzed either rationally or statistically to discover broader behavioral content categories to define relatively similar groupings of behavioral components. Third, the categories and the behavioral elements defining them should be tried out as a means of observing managerial behaviour and describing the major dimensions making up another sample of managerial jobs. Fourth, the categories may need to be modified as indicated, by these new observations; only then will the generality and broad usefulness of the categories (dimensions) for defining the major behavioral requirements of different managerial jobs have been shown.

---

A significant number of studies have used some of these techniques to arrive at logical conclusions about managerial behaviour in the organizational setting (Carlson, 1951; Burns, 1957; Dubin, 1962; Dubin and Spray, 1964; Stewart, 1967; Campbell et al., 1970; Mintzberg, 1973). Observations by these theorists have dispelled much of the misconceptions about managerial jobs.

Carlson (1951) obtained information about job actions of ten executives. The executives were found to work for a number of hours. One third of the working time was often spent outside the firm. Executive functions like inspecting, overseeing, reading and contemplation were seldom resorted to due to time pressures and constant interruptions.

On the basis of critical incidents method, Flanagan (1954) identified six categories of jobs viz., handling administrative details, supervising personnel, planning and direct action, acceptance of organizational responsibility, acceptance of personal responsibility, and proficiency in military occupational speciality, as important to officer-executives of the Air Force.

Williams (1956) arrived at six critical areas of managerial jobs. These are planning, organization
and execution of policy, relations with associates, technical competence, coordination and integration of activities, work habits, and adjustments to the job.

Burns (1957) studied communication patterns of seventy-six British managers working in eight middle-sized companies. Top level managers in firms committed to large scale expansion spent about 80% of their working time in discussions. Since most of the information obtained was closely guarded by the top management, information flow across the hierarchical levels was restricted.

Hemphill (1959, 1960) developed the Executive Position Description Questionnaire (EPDQ) based on the responses of ninety-three executives. The instrument facilitates the prediction of managerial effectiveness as it gives an advanced indication of those performances that are emphasized by a particular executive position. It also provides appropriate procedures for understanding managerial jobs and job behaviours. Personal and organizational qualities leading to effective performance on the job have also been identified.

The EPDQ consists of ten clusters of jobs obtained through factor analysis of five hundred and seventy-five job elements. The clusters are - providing staff service in nonoperational areas, supervision of work, internal
business control, technical aspects with products and market, human community and social affairs, long range planning, exercise of broad power and authority, business reputation, personal demands, and preservation of assets.

Dubin and Spray (1964) found that face to face discussion was the most frequently used form of interaction. Higher level executives interacted more with people outside the organization. Moreover, most of these discussions were initiated by the executives rather than others. Lower level executives on the other hand interacted more with persons within the organization.

Kelly (1964) adopted the activity sampling technique to analyze managerial behaviour. Results showed that managers spent two-thirds of their time with other persons. One third of which was spent with peers, and one half with subordinates. Further, one half of the activities pertained to planning or programming while about a quarter involved technical matters and machine maintenance. Just over ten percent of the time was spent on personnel administration. The study supported the view that personal style is not as important to effective management as is utilization of resources and techniques for completing a job.
According to Horne and Lupton (1965) the "typical" middle managers spent a considerable portion of their time in giving and taking information directly at their own offices. Informal discussions were confined to a few outsiders. Behavioural patterns were also found to be similar across organizations differing in size and technology.

Stewart (1967) obtained a record of all job behaviour incidents exceeding five minutes duration of 160 managers. The study showed that managers differed in the way they spent their time. The managerial job was often confined to the manager's own office. Information was transmitted through direct discussions. Stewart found that jobs could be clustered into five categories, depending on time spent and similarities to other jobs in the cluster. Jobs in each cluster differed from those in other clusters. Managers in each cluster differed in their use of time as compared to those in other clusters. The study also showed that they interact differently to develop different "styles" of time expenditure.

Of the studies mentioned hitherto Stewart's and Hemphill's studies are considered important as they reveal level and function differences in managerial jobs. Top level management is more concerned with
personal requirements, planning, and power. On the other hand, middle management is concerned with products, markets, and supervision. Sales, marketing and general managers spent relatively more time outside their offices as compared to production and financial services.

One of the more recent studies on managerial behavior job description is that by Luthans et al., (1988). They studied four hundred and fifty seven managers at work. Based on the study, they categorized managerial activities as communication, networking, human resource management, and traditional managerial work such as planning, organizing, controlling etc.

Yuki (1989) attempted to integrate the numerous concepts of leadership developed hitherto with managerial work and behavior. The approach is largely based on decision making, exchanging information, influencing others and developing relationships within the organization.

According to Fondas (1992) managerial jobs should be thought of in nontraditional terms i.e. not on the basis of functions and levels. The suggestion is in the light of changes that have been noticed in recent years in the work place. The behavioural job description emphasizes on
different types of interpersonal contacts (i.e. with peers, subordinates or external people), and the need to influence people through different techniques.

Discussions were based on 6 years of research on the behaviour and working strategies of managers. The sample included twenty five heads of functional areas, eleven general managers, three group executives and twenty nine chief business officers. The research compared managers in the same or similar jobs. The aim was to study how these different managers differed considering such aspects of managerial behaviour as influence tactics, interpersonal contacts, and strategic initiatives.

A Behavioural Job Description (BJD) was developed for use in the study. Behavioural dimensions used by researchers in earlier studies to differentiate among managers in similar jobs was used as the basis for the development of the BJD. The BJD classifies job behavioural demands into 3 broad areas viz., impact of the managers' activities, their interpersonal contacts, and approaches to accomplishing work.

The study found that the vice presidents of finance and marketing have similar profiles. Both are engaged in maintenance and operations. Both jobs require
the incumbents to maintain good contact with people at least for some time. However, contacts are usually initiated by others. The first position necessitates less contact with others. Moreover, it requires more contact with members of other companies and with the superior. The first manager also delegates more than the second. Both use rewards and legitimate authority. However, the purpose for which they use the two differs. Moreover, they differ in the way they accomplish their work. The marketing manager does work without enlisting much help from others. Fodas recommends the use of the BJD in organizations. It is contended that the BJD will be useful for practising managers for making assessments about areas of work requiring attention. Professional development personnel would find it useful for individualizing management training programmes.

Evaluating Managerial Performance

Job descriptions give evaluatees a clear understanding of what is expected of them. Appraisals play a vital part in ensuring that performance is commensurate with these organizational expectations. As Porter et al. observe:

Evaluation is an inevitable consequence of the way organizations are structured and jobs are designed. The assignment of responsibility to
particular individuals for the performance of certain tasks makes the assessment of how an individual performs both possible and necessary. It makes it possible because it identifies the results for which the person is responsible. It makes it necessary because in order to operate, complex, differentiated organisations need information on how well jobs are being performed.

The process of evaluation is generally continuous. Information derived from formal appraisals is usually used to determine organizational rewards. It also acts as a control measure, by infusing disciplinary actions, and can be regarded as the first step in correcting behaviour (Robbins, 1982).

Performance appraisals pose severe problems because of divergent viewpoints held by evaluatees about the criteria to be evaluated. To avoid such discrepancies, behavioural scientists have suggested that output measures should include behavioural traits and job requirements that are essential for proper job performance. Such measures should preferably be objective in nature and capable of influencing behaviour. Goals for future performance should be jointly set and they should be moderately difficult. Evaluations must be done at regular intervals, giving the concerned

---

managers a chance to participate in the process. Reward schemes should adequately reflect the appraisal report.

Appraisal measures are seldom capable of meeting the foregoing requirements as the process is cumbersome and the organizational climate is not conducive. More importantly, constant conflicts are noticeable between individual and organizational objectives. Superior and subordinate perceptions differ so widely that resolution becomes impossible at times.

Such dysfunctional consequences can be overcome through clearer definition of the managerial job, the process for accomplishing objectives, and constructive feedback through interaction. The critical question then is what constitutes effectiveness?

Managerial Effectiveness Defined

Perhaps the first definition of managerial success could be traced to that provided by Guion:

The success of an executive lies largely in meeting major organization goals through the coordinated efforts of his organization; in part, at least, these efforts depend upon the kind of influence the executive has upon those whose work his own behavior touches. The executive's own behavior contributes to the achievement of organizational goals only by its influence on the perceptions, attitudes, and motives of other
people in the organization and on their subsequent behavior.

Guion, in his definition of effectiveness, stresses on the attainment of organizational goals. Goals affect task performance by focussing on a particular aspect for accomplishment. It may take the form of profit maximization, organizational efficiency, stability, high employee morale, organizational commitment etc. Efforts are then directed towards achieving these goals, through appropriate performance strategies. Motivation of the employees is a crucial factor for goal accomplishment. Since jobs are interlinked organizational goals can be attained only through the coordinated efforts of all people engaged in it. As such, it is imperative that the successful executive must necessarily be capable of manoeuvring subsequent behaviour, attitudes, motives and perceptions of others in the organization.

Campbell et al., have defined effective managerial job behaviour as:

Any set of managerial actions believed to be optimal for identifying, assimilating, and utilizing both internal and external resources

---

toward sustaining, over the long term, the functioning of the organizational unit for which a manager has some degree of responsibility.9

According to Campbell et al., the effective manager is engaged in optimizing the use of all resources for the successful functioning and continuance of the organization for a long term. Optimization of resources requires the performance of a number of activities. Different managers may use different techniques to accomplish similar levels of performance.

Evaluation of managerial behaviour should reflect the extent to which the individual manager performs on the job to ensure optimization. Most often the individual's performance is dependent on a number of causal variables like the manager's qualities, human, financial and material resources at his and the organization's disposal. In addition, effectiveness of other managers will also affect the perceived effectiveness of a manager. Finally, if the manager's responsibility spreads over a number of organizational units, then his actions will affect all of them. Consequently, his performance evaluations should take account of this aspect too.

Reddin defines managerial effectiveness as:

The extent to which managers achieve the output requirements of their positions.

The definition makes the concept of managerial effectiveness the central focal point in management, emphasizing performance rather than personality.

The various models of managerial effectiveness are discussed in the following section.

Managerial Effectiveness Models

The heroic and post heroic models of managerial effectiveness are discussed below.

**Heroic models of the manager.** The traditional role of the manager centered around the three distinct tasks of assigning, monitoring and coordinating. Subordinate's tasks were designed and allocated according to superior's perception. Seldom was participative decision making resorted to. As such, all activity came to be centered around the manager. Success was evidenced by the capacity to control the unit under the manager. This unitary concept of the heroic model

---

evolved into two distinct models - manager as technician and manager as conductor models as a result of specific organizational needs and managerial rethinking. The basic assumption underlying these models is that the manager is a problem solver replete with technical competence, wisdom, and deft at articulating subordinate performance (Bradford and Cohen 1987).

Manager as master technician. The model derives its credence from its emphasis on knowledge of technical aspects for success in the organization. Bradford and Cohen opine that:

In this style of leadership the relationship between the leader and subordinates tends to be personal and particularistic, governed less by rules and procedures and more by the particular relationship between the manager and each subordinate.11

The style works best when the manager has wide indepth knowledge, where interpersonal relations are minimal, or in cases where differences of opinion in decision making. It is also useful where subordinates are uncommitted, not cooperative or highly dependent. The style works best during times of emergency.

Problems arise when objective solutions are ignored thereby undermining subordinate's confidence and when organizational systems and procedures are overlooked.

Manager as Conductor. The primafacie motive of the model is resolution of conflicts between managerial and subordinate thinking through involvement of subordinates at each stage of task performance. Control over subordinates is exercised, but acceptance by the subordinates precedes it. This is achieved by using the Critical Path Analysis, Performance Appraisals, Management Information Systems etc. (Bradford and Cohen 1987). Involvement aids good human relations and helps gain acceptance, but may not make good use of human resources to achieve quality solutions (Miles and Ritchie, 1971).

Coordination is achieved by minimizing concern for subordinates, suppressing subordinate development and exercising excessive control. These models are effective performance as subordinate potential is underutilized. If effective performance is to result, it is imperative that subordinates are induced to expend the requisite efforts. This could be achieved through appropriate motivation. Job Challenge needs to be infused to stimulate desired action (Bradford and Cohen, 1987).
Changes in organizational structures and attitudes of people necessitated changes in the perspectives of heroic managers. This change in outlook gave birth to the new 'developer' image of the manager.

The manager as developer. This model is an appropriate alternate to the heroic models dealt with so far.

Developer-managers learn to have impact without exerting total control, to be helpful without having all the answers, to get involved without demanding centrality, to be powerful without needing to dominate and to act responsible without squeezing others out.12

Subordinates are oriented to share both managerial and task responsibilities thus ensuring higher quality. Identification of new opportunities uncovers inherent problems at the initial stage itself thereby preventing its manifestation into a crisis. Shared knowledge and expertise coupled with commitment improves task performance through job challenge, personal learning influence, and new opportunities (Bradford and Cohen, 1987).

The model consists of three interacting components. The first is concerned with developing a team which values sharing responsibilities. The second

12 Ibid., p. 62.
emphasizes continuous development of individual skills through work assignments, discussions and technical training. The developer perspective aids the manager in balancing organization's needs with individual's interests through subordinate learning, involvement and growth. The third aspect determines a common goal which will enable expending of efforts of the whole team in that direction. The goal must be unique and difficult to achieve so as to engage the interest of the members, besides serving the role of a guideline for decision making. The thrust of the post heroic model is its orientation towards the future (Bradford and Cohen, 1987).

The manager as developer is more active than the heroic manager, gives greater autonomy to subordinates inspite of greater controls, and derives power through disbursement of power to subordinates. The manager emphasizes team building ensuring retention of individuality, instills optimism in subordinate capabilities without sacrificing on work, and improves managerial performance through emphasis on other's needs (Bradford and Cohen, 1987).

A more comprehensive model of managerial behaviour has been proposed by Campbell et al.
Model of Managerial Behaviour

Campbell et al. (1970) relate the complex concepts of "person" (individual manager's traits and abilities), "process" (organizational results) and "product" (manager's on the job behaviour and activities), to the heuristic model of managerial behaviour.

The model is a schematic representation of managerial behaviour to be reckoned with in predicting managerial effectiveness. The manager's job behaviour is discerned as a function of ability, motivation and opportunity in the organizational environment. The model is similar to that of Maier's (1955). Maier contended that the multiplicative relationship between ability and motivation appropriately explains the subjective proposition that either of the two variables by itself cannot positively influence behaviour. As such, both motivation and ability in reasonable measure are prerequisites for effective performance. The present model assumes that:

Executive behaviour - or more importantly, effective executive behaviour - is a function of complex interactions between individual or personal characteristics; the demand and expectations placed upon persons by the physical, administrative, and social environments of their organization; and the nature of the feedback, incentive, and reward systems developed by organizational policies and practices.

The individual is conditioned by innate differences, skills, aptitudes, intelligence and personality, all of which influence role behaviour. Borrowing from motivation literature they posit that the three variables - expectancy 1, expectancy 2 and valence act in unison to result in productive behaviour. Expectancy 1, is the subjective probability estimate that a person will accomplish a particular task goal. Expectancy 2, refers to the perception that accomplishment of the task goal will be followed by certain rewards. Valence indicates the strength of preferences among competing rewards.

The individual's perception of abilities influences task options, goals and effort expended. Individual differences apart, task demands including situation constraints represent objective realities that a manager has to reckon with. Availability and preference for rewards also influence job behaviour and performance. Rewards may be categorized into extrinsic and intrinsic. Extrinsic rewards are given by the organization and include such things as pay, promotions status etc. Intrinsic rewards are self given. Included in it are feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction. Mere existence of rewards does not ensure performance. It is
important that the individual knows of its availability as well as the means to secure it. Besides these, the reward has to be positively valued by the individual if it is to induce performance.

Training and development improve performance by moderating task behaviour in the desired direction. The assumption underlying training and development is that individual behaviour can be modified according to organizational requirements. Hence selection programmes must include plans for developing managers. Jennings (1959) had observed that industrial group distinguish and hence prefer either the "life process" i.e., managers are born or the "skill development" i.e., managers are made theories. Campbell et al., do not make any such assumption in their theory. They opine that:

To assure optimally effective managers, it is necessary to obtain as much information as possible on what training can accomplish and to design jobs, organizational environments, and selection programs according to the conditions specified by training research results.

Managerial behaviour is difficult to predict because of constant changes in the organizational environment. Task demands too change frequently as a result

\[14\text{Ibid., p.13.}\]
of environmental changes and feedback. In turn, feedback affects individual expectancies about task accomplishment, reward contingencies and preferences for specific rewards and perceptions of the organizational climate. Often, feedback from performance and feedback from organizational outcomes differ widely because individual perceptions and organizational perspectives are divergent.

The end result is the output of the managerial role, as determined by the collective action of experience, individual differences, training and development, organizational circumstances, and procedures. Managerial effectiveness is posited to be:

... a function of complex interactions between ability, motivation, and opportunity variables and the nature of feedback, incentive, and reward systems developed by organizational policies and practices.\textsuperscript{15}

The Managerial Grid

The managerial grid is a significant contribution by Blake and Mouton (1985) in identifying leadership styles of managers. In the grid concern for people is denoted along the vertical axis and concern for production along the horizontal axis. Concern for production refers to

\textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p.12.
the key executives' initiative for growth and development of the organization. "Since managers exercise leadership with and through people, the assumptions they make about people are important in determining managerial effectiveness."16 Both these dimensions are represented by a scale running from 1 to 9. 1, represents minimum concern, 5, average and 9, maximum concern. The intervening numbers from 2 to 4 and 6 to 8 denote intermediate degrees of concern. The five basic styles represent varying combinations of concern for people and production.

The 1,1 manager (impoverished style), has minimum concern for production and people while the 9,9 manager (team approach), has maximum concern for both dimensions. The 5,5 manager is at the "middle of the road". While the 1,9 manager has least concern for production and a maximum concern for people. The 9,1 manager has great concern for production with a minimum concern for people. The former is referred to as the "country club" manager while the latter "task" manager.

Each manager shows a greater tendency towards one of these styles. The dominant managerial style of a

---

manager is influenced by several conditions such as the organization, situation, values, personality and chance. Blake and Mouton opine that the most effective leadership style is that of the 9,9 team builder (Blake and Mouton, 1978). Further, empirical evidence provided by them substantiates their view that:

The interactive notion of leadership style (that is, concern for people interacting with concern for production) has more predictive validity than additive situational approaches.17

The Three Dimensional Managerial Effectiveness Model

The 3-D model propounded by Reddin (1987) makes significant contribution to managerial effectiveness. In this model, Reddin has included the effectiveness dimension to the concern for task and concern for relationship dimensions. The conceptual framework developed was envisaged to help managers derive meaningful explanations of managerial attitudes and performance. Research has identified two key elements in managerial behaviour concurrent with tasks to be performed and relationships with relevant others. Reddin observes:

Often, managers tend to emphasize either of the

two behavioural elements, or a combination of the two in varying proportions. Also, both behaviours could be used together (the 3-D term is integrated style), task could be used alone (dedicated style) relationship, could be used alone (related style) or each could be used to only a small degree (separated style). 18

Inclusion of the effectiveness dimension to each of the four basic managerial styles yields corresponding less effective styles, viz., Compromiser, Autocrat, Missionary and Deserter. The corresponding more effective styles are termed Executive, Benevolent Autocrat, Developer and Bureaucrat.

Effectiveness is dependent on the situation. Further, research has established that each style in itself yields results in certain situations, though not in yet others. Inspite of the fact that no clear demarcation of behaviours into either of the four basic styles is possible, the utility of the theory cannot be underrated. Preference for a particular style of operation is dependent on its utility in achieving higher outputs in the prevalent conditions. The model coupled with Management by Objectives, channelises efforts towards meeting output requirements.

Two methods may be adopted in the context.

---

They are style flexibility and style drift. While "style flexibility" meets situational requirements, "style drift" implies maintaining balance within oneself and with respect to others, through style modification. The latter does not indicate effective behaviour. Reddin also refers to "style resilience" and "style rigidity". The former is a positive quality aimed at maintaining appropriate style under conditions of stress, while the latter indicates continuance of inappropriate style.

In the theory, emphasis is laid on "the situation", which is considered a composite of five elements viz., the organization, technology, superior, coworkers and subordinates.

The organization's operating mechanisms, promotions and systems design, are external to the manager's work itself but influence his behaviour directly. Technological aspects determine the nature of performance, and is vital to effective execution of work.

Superior, coworkers and subordinate styles are other major influences on effectiveness. Superior's style is influential at the higher levels where the number of subordinates is less, and inter level interactions are more. Subordinate styles are influential where there are few
subordinates and they interact frequently with the manager. Usually subordinates are represented through groups. In cases where jobs are interdependent, interaction with co-workers is inevitable. Hence in all three cases flexibility in expectations and operating styles is an important factors to be reckoned with.

The use of the model enables the manager to identify the situation as it is, and the changes likely to be encountered with in future. It is thus possible to take appropriate actions at the precise time. The use of the grid has been found to stimulate thinking, direct action and ensure compliance (Reddin, 1987).

Theoretical models have induced researchers to explore the myth of the managerial job. Several propositions have been put forth and empirically tested. Significant studies in this area have been documented in the following chapter, under five classifications viz., global ratings, predictive studies, objective personality and interest inventories, leadership ability tests and rater perceptions. Some overlap within these classifications is unavoidable. However, a modest attempt is made to retain the distinctiveness of each category.