In the field of organizational behaviour, work performance has been considered as a dependent variable of great interest because the goals and objectives of the organization are measured in terms of performance. Performance is what people actually do and it can be observed. Performance includes all those actions that are relevant to the goals and can be measured in terms of each individual’s proficiency (Campbell et al, 1993). In other words work performance is the degree to which an individual executes his or her role with reference to certain specified standards set by the organization (Nayyar, 1994). As work performance is a complex phenomenon, it depends on numerous factors and numerous research studies have been conducted in which work performance has been found to be associated with a number of factors. The present study is also an effort in the same direction by adding integrative complexity to the picture. The aim of the present research was to study the effect of motives and integrative complexity on managerial performance, both task and contextual, and managerial styles. How integrative complexity and organizational climate moderate the relationship between motives and performance, and also between motives and managerial styles, was studied.

Task and Contextual Performance:

Managerial performance was studied as task and contextual performance. According to Holzbach (1978) self ratings show greater leniency effects than superior or peer ratings, so in this research apart from self ratings of performance, superior and peer ratings were also considered. For task performance, ratings from superiors were considered and for contextual performance, ratings from peers were considered.
Significant and positive correlations were obtained among all the performance scores. For the whole sample the task performance (superior rated) had positive correlations with scores on contextual performance (peer rated). This shows that managers who are high on task performance are also high on contextual performance. Such people not only perform well themselves but help others also to perform well thus leading to overall efficiency of the organization.

A negative correlation was observed between contextual performance (self rated) and intimacy motive in the whole sample as well as in the public sector sample. Here hypothesis 5a which states that intimacy motive is positively related with a manager's contextual performance (self rated) has not been substantiated. According to Prager (1995) those who are high on intimacy motive have a negative view of themselves as tactless, touchy and cowardly. The implication is that they have high standards about their relationship with others and therefore are more likely to regard themselves as having less empathy for others. Thus managers who are high on this motive perceive themselves to be indulging less in prosocial and helping behaviour at their work place. In the same public sector sample, task performance (self rated) had negative correlations with intimacy motive scores. Thus public sector managers who are high on intimacy motive rate themselves poorly on both task and contextual performance.

Also in the public sector sample there is a positive correlation between the task performance (superior rated) and achievement motive scores. Here hypothesis 4b which states that achievement motive is positively related with a manager's task performance (superior rated) has been substantiated for the public sector sample. Thus public sector managers who are high on achievement motive excel in task performance and this is also recognized by their superiors.

In the whole sample, task performance (self rated) scores had a positive correlation with achievement climate scores. Thus in this climate a manager's task performance improves. In the private sector group, there was a positive correlation between contextual performance (self rated) scores and achievement climate scores. Thus private sector managers indulge in contextual performance
Discussion...

i.e. they are not just concerned about their own individualistic pursuits, even though the climate is achievement oriented. Smith, Organ and Near (1983) argue that the category of performance called organizational citizenship behaviour is important in organizations but not easily explained by the same incentives that induce high production. Halbesleben and Bowler (2007) found that motivation mediates the emotional exhaustion – job performance relationship. Emotional exhaustion at work place is associated with communion strivings that were manifest in the form of organization citizenship behaviour targeted at individuals.

Managerial styles and Managerial performance

In the inter-correlation matrix, there is a significant and negative correlation between task performance (superior rated) and delegating leadership style (low task/low relationship). This shows that those managers who delegate more are not rated highly by their superiors in task performance. In the Indian scenario, keeping in mind the dependency proneness of Indians, a style of leadership that blends authoritarian direction with a paternal nurturance – called the nurturant task leadership style is more successful (Sinha 1980). In a study by Singh (1987) in which he collected data from executives belonging to more than 100 organisations, he found that more than 70% of executives showed the nurturant task style of leadership. In a more recent study Mehta and Krishnan (1999) found that the nurturant task oriented and participative styles of leadership showed a positive relationship with a sense of community. But by and large, the nature of task and the maturity of the subordinates decides which leadership style will yield better results.

Integrative Complexity:

Another new area of research was integrative complexity. Integrative complexity is a cognitive process that requires the ability to differentiate different dimensions of a situation and also to integrate those dimensions. High integrative complexity positively affects interpersonal communications and negotiations while low integrative complexity is associated with conflict.
The inter correlation matrix between the scores of all the variables shows that integrative complexity had positive and significant correlations with the all motive scores. This may be because same measure i.e. picture story exercise was used to measure both motives and integrative complexity. Winter (2007) studied the role of motivation, responsibility and integrative complexity in crisis escalation. He analysed diplomatic messages, speeches and official media commentary and found that during war crisis, individuals show higher levels of power motivation and responsibility and during peace crises individuals showed higher integrative complexity and achievement motivation.

Also integrative complexity had a significant and positive correlation with leadership style adaptability. These results have not only substantiated hypothesis 3 which states that integrative complexity is positively related with a manager’s leadership style adaptability but are also coherent with earlier findings. Suedfeld and Rank (1976) studied the long term success in revolutionary leaders and found that a leader was associated with low conceptual complexity during the phase of revolutionary struggle (when it is desirable to have a categorical, single minded approach to problems). The same leader displayed higher complexity during the post struggle consolidation phase (when, as leaders of a government in power, the former revolutionists would need a relatively graduated, flexible and integrated view). Suedfeld (1985) studied APA presidential addresses for integrative complexity. APA presidents who were judged as particularly eminent by senior colleagues gave addresses higher in complexity.

In another study by Tetlock, Bernzweig and Gallant (1985) of Supreme Court decision makers, subjects with moderate voting records exhibited more integratively complex styles of thought in their case opinions than those with conservative voting records. Thus managers who score high on integrative complexity can adapt a leadership style which is more conducive to the situation thus leading to better performance.
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Moderated regression analysis with integrative complexity as the moderating variable shows that integrative complexity has moderated the relationship of

a. Hope of power and telling leadership style;
b. Fear of power and delegating leadership style;
c. Intimacy motive and selling leadership style.

This has been depicted diagrammatically in figure 6.1 below:

![Diagram showing the relationship between integrative complexity, hope of power, telling leadership style, fear of power, delegating leadership style, and selling leadership style.]

Note: solid line shows that in the high integrative complexity group the relationship between the two variables becomes positive. Broken line shows that in the high integrative complexity group the relationship between the two variables becomes negative.

In the low integrative complexity group the correlation between hope of power and telling leadership style is negative. Hope of power is an approach motive and in the low integrative complexity group those who are high on this motive hesitate to adopt high task / low relationship leadership style. This relationship becomes positive in the high integrative complexity group. Thus a manager with high integrative complexity becomes more comfortable with his tendencies and does not shy away from using his position to get more work done.
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In the low integrative complexity group the correlation between fear of power and delegating leadership style is negative. Fear of power is an avoidance motive and in the low integrative complexity group those who are high on this motive hesitate to delegate. They may feel that they will lose grip on their subordinates in doing so. This relationship becomes positive in the high integrative complexity group. Thus a person with high integrative complexity does not shy away from delegation. He loses the fear of losing grip on his subordinates; rather he is comfortable if more power centres are being created. To explain this one working hypothesis is that integrative complexity plays a role much like activity inhibition (McClelland and Boyatzis, 1982) in channeling need for power in socially constructive and adaptive directions (Tetlock, Peterson and Berry, 1993).

In the low integrative complexity group the correlation between intimacy motive and selling leadership style is positive. Thus a person high on intimacy motive adopts more of high task / high relationship style in low integrative complexity group. This relationship becomes negative in high integrative complexity group. Thus a manager with high integrative complexity even though he is high on intimacy motive realizes that it is difficult to maintain good relations all the time if higher targets have to be achieved.

The flattering portrait of integratively complex thinkers as given by Tetlock, Peterson and Berry (1993) also shows that these individuals refrain from jumping to conclusions, in response to ambiguous evidence and are also willing to change their minds in response to contradictory evidence. This relative open mindedness manifests itself in a variety of cognitive tasks and interpersonal settings. Integratively complex thinkers will

- Actively seek out information about the world,
- Be open to new experiences and unusual forms of art,
- Be good listeners even to points of view they find distasteful,
- Identify more creative solutions to problems,
- Tend to hold balanced, nuanced, and moderate positions in political controversies,
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- Appear less predictable and stable in behavior,
- Be cognitively self directed (the mere fact that other people are doing something or that an authoritative person says to do it is not good enough reason for the integratively complex person to do it. As a result they show greater independence of judgment when social pressures toward conformity or groupthink are brought to bear on them (Harvey, Hunt and Schroder, 1961; Schroder, Driver and Streufert, 1967; Streufert and Streufert, 1978; Tetlock, 1979, 1983, 1984; Tetlock and Kim, 1987).

But in the present research the hypothesis 1 and 2 that in managers, integrative complexity is positively related with task and contextual performance has not been substantiated. This may be because unfortunately in Indian scenario such independence in thought and style of functioning is rarely encouraged. In most of the public sector undertakings and in many of the private sector companies rules and procedures are already established and the employees are expected to work within that framework only.

Public and Private Sector – A Comparison

As the data was collected from two different types of companies – private and public sector so a comparison between them using the t-test yielded significant differences on many variables. The managers of private sector scored significantly higher on achievement motive than the managers of public sector. Maybe over a period of time the public sector managers lose the motivation to achieve more as increased efforts don’t yield greater incentives. Also the managers of the private company have scored significantly higher on integrative complexity than the managers of public sector. May be this is because both these groups were significantly different on perceptions of organizational climates in their respective organizations. Managers of public sector have perceived the climate of their organization as more of achievement, extension and affiliation oriented. While the managers of the private sector have perceived the climate of their organizations as more of control and dependence oriented. This finding is relevant as the management and human resource policies of private sector and
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Public sector companies in India are markedly different. Sinha (1990) studied 28 medium sized organizations from public and private sectors in Bihar. In public sector companies, there is a soft work culture; work values are displaced by non-work values thus making the organization ineffective. On the contrary in private organizations, work remains the prime concern of all stakeholders.

Also Managers of the public sector have rated themselves significantly higher than the managers of the private sector company both in task and contextual performance. But the managers of private company have scored significantly higher on selling leadership style. Thus managers of public sector perceive themselves to be not only working harder but also helping others more. Whereas managers of private sector indulge in high task/high relationship leadership style to achieve higher targets.

Factor analysis was done for the scores obtained on all the variables for the two samples of public and private sector separately. For each sample eight factors were obtained. When coefficients of congruence were calculated for all the extracted factors, the results showed high congruence between seven out of eight factors.

The first factors of both public and private sector had a high degree of congruence. This factor had high positive loadings on control and dependency climate and high negative loadings on achievement and extension climate. So this factor was named as **achievement vs control dependency climate**. According to Pareek (1989), in an organization where such a climate is prevalent there are clear cut channels of communication and is controlled by a few people who ultimately take all the decisions.

The second factors of both the private and the public sector had a high degree of congruence. This factor had high positive loadings on fear of power motive, achievement motive, intimacy motive and integrative complexity. So this factor was given the name of **social maturity**.
Motives and integrative complexity have played a major role in the managerial performance and managerial styles adopted by the managers. Motives and integrative complexity interact in crisis situations and lead to effective conflict resolution (Winter, 2007)

The fourth factor of private sector and the third factor of public sector also had high degree of congruence and were labeled overall performance. This factor had high positive loadings on both task (self rated) and contextual performance (self rated). This shows that both task and contextual performance contribute significantly to a persons overall performance.

The third factor of the private sector and the fourth factor of the public sector have a high degree of congruence and was labeled leadership style adaptability factor. This factor had high positive loadings on participating leadership style and leadership style adaptability but high negative loadings on telling leadership style. This shows that those managers who adopt a participating leadership style are also high on leadership style adaptability. But those managers who adopt a telling leadership style are low on leadership style adaptability. Thus a manager, who creates a more cordial atmosphere, is flexible also but a manager who is only concerned about attaining targets is not flexible.

The sixth factor of private sector and the fifth factor of public sector also had high congruence. This factor was labeled as expert achievement vs affiliation climate. This factor had positive loadings on achievement climate and expert influence climate but a high negative loading on affiliation climate. In an organization dominated by achievement climate, affiliative tendencies are less.

The fifth factor of private sector and the sixth factor of public sector had high congruence and was labeled as selling vs participating leadership style. This factor had high negative loadings on selling leadership style but positive loadings on participating leadership style. In the private sector this factor also had a positive loading on delegating leadership style. This shows that a manager who is relationship oriented is more relaxed about targets to be achieved.
Discussion...

The seventh factor of the private sector and the eighth factor of the public sector had a high congruence. This factor was named as contextual performance. In the private sector this factor had high positive loadings on both the contextual performance (peer rated) and task performance (superior rated) but in public sector high factor loading was observed only for contextual performance (peer rated). According to Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994, 1996), contextual performance contributes over and above task performance to an individuals worth in an organization.

The eighth factor of private sector did not have congruence with any factor of public sector. Similarly the seventh factor of public sector did not have high congruence with any factor of private sector. The eighth factor of the private sector shows a high positive loading on hope of power and delegating leadership style. Hope of power is an approach motive and a manager high on this motive is open to the idea of delegation. The seventh factor of the public sector had a positive loading on task performance (superior rated) but a negative loading on delegating leadership style. Thus a public sector manager who indulges in low task/ low relationship leadership style is not rated highly by his superior on task performance. These differences between the public sector and the private sector managers are possibly due to differences in perception of organizational climate which is discussed ahead.

Organizational Climate as Moderator:

Moderated regression analysis showed that achievement climate moderates the relationship between achievement motive and task performance (superior rated). In high achievement climate the correlation between achievement motive and task performance becomes significantly positive (figure 6.2). In various studies by Sen (1982), Surti (1982) and Khanna (1986), achievement climate seems to have contributed to organizational effectiveness and job satisfaction. When a climate is such that it stimulates the achievement motive and provides a vehicle for the satisfaction of a variety of important employee needs, then the contribution of
climate to performance and satisfaction would be expected to be substantial (Downey, Hellriegal and Slocum, 1975; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973, Schneider and Bartlett, 1968; Steers, 1976)

![Achievement climate](image)

Note: solid line shows that in high achievement climate the relationship between variables becomes positive.

These findings can be explained using the conceptualization given by Lewin (1951), who proposed that behaviour is a function of person and environment: \( B = f(PE) \). According to this view person (P) and environment (E) together determine behavior (B). For Lewin the perceived characteristics of environment were more critical in shaping behaviour. Moreover, climate ostensibly serves as a basis for individuals to interpret and understand their surroundings and to determine reward – punishment relationships (Forehand and Gilmer, 1964; Pritchard and Karasick, 1973).

Moderated regression analysis also showed that dependence climate has moderated the relationship between:

- task performance (superior rated) and intimacy motive;
- contextual performance (self rated) and hope of power motive.

This has been depicted diagrammatically in figure 6.3 on the next page:
In high dependence climate the correlation between intimacy motive and task performance (superior rated) becomes significantly positive. Thus we can say that in this climate, individuals high on intimacy motive are rated highly on task performance by their superiors. McAdams and Losoff (1984) found that those school kids who are high on intimacy motive are rated highly by their schoolmates on various dimensions. Also McAdams and Valliant (1982) in a longitudinal study spanning over 17 years determined that subjects high in intimacy motive are strongly associated with later job satisfaction.

Though the dependence climate is associated with autocratic organizations and it increases role stress (Khanna, 1986), but in this study, in high dependence climate the correlation between hope of power motive and contextual performance becomes significantly positive. When dependence climate is high, then a manager high on hope of power indulges in more pro-social behaviour in the organization. This is because in dependence climate the manager high on hope of power knows that he can demonstrate his need for power by indulging in contextual performance.
Affiliation climate is associated with low job satisfaction and feelings of personal inadequacy (Khanna 1986) and in this study affiliation climate has moderated the relationship between

- achievement motivation and contextual performance (self rated);
- between hope of power and contextual performance (peer rated).

This is depicted diagrammatically in figure 6.4 below:

![Diagram](image)

Note: broken line shows that in high affiliation climate the relationship between the variables becomes negative
The solid line shows that in high affiliation climate the relationship between the variables becomes positive

Thus in high affiliation climate the correlation between achievement motivation and contextual performance (self rated) becomes significantly negative. A manager with high achievement motivation indulges less in pro-social and helping behaviour at workplace in high affiliation climate. This maybe because even though the climate is affiliation oriented but a person with high achievement motive is still interested more in his personal goals than in helping others.
In high affiliation climate the correlation between hope of power and contextual performance (peer rated) becomes positive. Thus managers high on hope of power indulge more in pro-social behaviour. Here also the affiliation climate facilitates the manager who is high on hope of power to exert his power over others by helping others. According to Litwin and Stringer (1968) if performance is the desired outcome an achievement oriented climate may be more suitable if job satisfaction were the desired outcome, an affiliation oriented climate may be more suitable.

Moderated regression analysis with leadership styles as predicted variables showed that achievement climate moderates the relationship between

- fear of power motive and participating leadership style;
- fear of power motive and delegating leadership style.

This is depicted diagrammatically in figure 6.5 below:

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 6.5**

Note: broken line shows that in high achievement climate the relationship between the variables becomes negative.

Solid line shows that in high achievement climate the relationship between the variables becomes positive.
In high achievement climate, the correlation between fear of power and participating style becomes negative. This means that achievement climate does not facilitate participating leadership style. In this climate, the correlation between fear of power and delegating leadership style becomes positive. Fear of power is an avoidance motive. In high achievement climate, a manager with high fear of power delegates more and he avoids asserting his position.

Dependence climate has also moderated the relationship between intimacy motivation and leadership style adaptability (figure 6.6).

\[ 
\begin{array}{ccc}
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\text{Intimacy Motive} & \rightarrow & \text{Leadership style adaptability}
\end{array}
\]

Figure 6.6

Note: Solid line shows that in high dependence climate the relationship between the variables becomes positive.

In high dependence climate the correlation between intimacy motivation and leadership style adaptability becomes significantly positive. Thus those with high intimacy motivation have greater style adaptability in dependence climate. This reflects that the managers adapt different styles in dependence climate more so when they are high on intimacy motivation.

McClelland and Boyatzis (1982) studied leadership motive pattern and long-term success in management and found that leadership motive pattern (moderately high power motive, low affiliation motive and high activity inhibition) is significantly associated with managerial success after 8 and 16 years for non-technical managers. Among these subjects achievement motive was also
associated with success but only at lower levels when individual contribution was more important. Importantly none of these measures were associated with success for technical managers with engineering responsibilities. To conclude various studies (Marrow et al 1967; Lawler et al. 1974) have shown that climate serves to mediate the impact of both structure and management style on performance and satisfaction.