In the present study, managerial effectiveness will be studied in the light of contextual and task performance and the different styles adopted by managers. The aim is to discover the role of integrative complexity and motives in managerial performance and in the adoption of different managerial styles. How does organizational climate interact with integrative complexity and motives to lead to managerial effectiveness will also be studied.

2.1 Managerial Performance:

Katz and Kahn (1978) gave a 3 dimensional definition for describing job performance:

1) Joining and staying in the organization.

2) Dependably meeting or exceeding standards of performance prescribed by organisational roles.

3) Innovatively and spontaneously going beyond prescribed roles to perform such actions as cooperating with other members, protecting the organisation from harm, offering suggestions for improvement, undertaking self development & representing the organization favorably to outsiders.

The second and third patterns of behaviour stand out because they contrast organizationally essential activities that are prescribed by role requirements with other activities that are purely discretionary and not usually prescribed.
Orr, Sackett and Mercer (1989) in their study showed that there are some supervisors who take both prescribed and discretionary behaviour into account when asked to judge job performance of their subordinations.

Organisational citizenship behaviour (Organ, 1988), prosocial organization behaviour (Brief & Motowidlo, 1986) and organisational spontaneity (George & Brief 1992) all highlight behaviours that involve cooperation & helping others in the organisation. Borman and Motowidlo (1993) merged the above concepts and gave the distinction between task performance and contextual performance.

According to Bateman and Organ (1983) affective variables such as job satisfaction, mood and stress can have important causal affects on contextual performance. Motowidlo and Van Scotter (1994) reported that personality variables were better predictors of contextual performance than of task performance. But, there is lack of empirical evidence to show which other personal factors (e.g. motivation) and organisational factors contribute to contextual and task performance separately. An effort will be made in this study to explore these factors.

2.1.1 Methods of measuring job performance:

a) Written essays - This involves writing a narrative describing an employee’s strengths & weaknesses, his past performance, potential and suggestions for improvement. This procedure does not require any complex forms or any extensive training to complete.

b) Critical incidents – in this method, the appraiser writes down anecdotes that describe what the employee did that was especially effective or ineffective. Only specific behaviours are cited and the list of critical incidents provides a set of examples from which the employee can be shown which behaviours are desirable and which behaviours are undesirable.
c) Graphic Rating Scales – in this method, a set of performance factors, such as quantity and quality of work, depth of knowledge, cooperation, loyalty, attendance, honesty, initiative etc. are listed. The evaluator rates the subordinate on each of the factors. Graphic rating scales are popular because they are less time consuming, easy to administer, and allow for quantitative analysis and comparison.

d) Behaviourally Anchored Rating Scales – These scales combine major elements from the critical incident and graphic rating scale techniques. The appraiser rates the employees on actual behaviour rather than on general traits. These behaviours include future plans of the subordinates, problem solving behaviour of the subordinate, how he handles emergency situations etc.

e) Multi person comparisons – In this, an individual’s performance is measured in comparison with one or more others. The most commonly used comparisons are – group order ranking, individual ranking and paired comparisons.

The group order ranking requires the evaluator to place the subordinate into a particular classification, such as top one fifth or second one fifth and so on.

The individual ranking approach rank orders subordinates from the best to the worst i.e. from the highest performer to the lowest performer. There are no ties on any rank.

The paired comparison approach compares each employee with every other employee and rates each as either the superior or the inferior member of the pair. After all paired comparisons are made; each employee is assigned a summary ranking based on the member of superior scores he or she has achieved. This approach ensures that each employee is compared against every other, but it can become unwieldy when there are many employees to be compared.
The performance of the subordinates should be judged by the immediate superior because of the frequent contact and familiarity. Sometimes peer rating is also done and even more rarely the boss may be rated by his subordinates. Then the organization considers an aggregate of all the ratings.

In the present study, the self rating of the person has been considered on contextual & task performance. Also the person has been rated by his peers and superiors on contextual and task performance respectively.

2.2 Managerial Styles:

The classic leadership studies and various leadership theories tend to describe what managerial styles will be more effective under what conditions.

According to Tannenbaum & Schmidt (1957), the leader selects one of the seven possible leader behaviours depending upon the forces among the leader, follower and the situation. These seven possible leader behaviours are along a continuum of leadership behaviour in which the styles ranged from manager centered to subordinate centered.

In the classic work done by Douglas McGregor (1960), theory X assumes that most people prefer to be directed, are not interested in assuming responsibility, and want safety above all. In this case people are motivated by money, fringe benefits and the threat of punishment, so subordinates need to be controlled and closely supervised. Thus theory X represents the authoritarian style of leadership. Whereas theory Y assumes that people are not lazy and unreliable. It postulates that people can be basically self directed and creative at work if properly motivated. Thus it is an essential task of the manager to tap the potential of the subordinates by being supportive and facilitating. Thus theory Y represents the humanistic style of leadership.
House and Mitchell (1974) in his path goal theory of leadership described the directive, supportive, participative and achievement oriented styles of leadership. The style adopted by the leader depended upon the task structure. If the task was unstructured then, the suitable leadership behaviour should be directive and if the task is highly structured then the leadership behaviour should be supportive for maximum job satisfaction of the subordinates.

2.2.1 Hersey and Blanchard’s lifecycle approach

Hersey and Blanchard’s (1969) life cycle or situational approach also yielded 2 major styles of Leadership

- Task style and Relationship style.

- In the task style the leader organizes & defines roles for members, he explains the tasks the members are to do, when, where and how the task has to be accomplished.

- In the relationship style, the leader has close, personal relations with the members of the group, and there is open communication & psychological and emotional support.

- Hersey and Blanchard incorporated the maturity of the subordinates into their model which is defined by 3 criteria.

  * Degree of achievement motivation.
  * Willingness to take on responsibility.
  * Amount of education and experience.

Deriving from this they gave four basic styles of leadership:
In this study, the theory of Hersey and Blanchard has been put to use. An endeavour will be made in this study to explore which personal and organisational factors affect the style adopted by the manager, and how his style adaptability and style range contribute to his performance. This situational approach is valuable in training and development of managers.

Hersey and Blanchard’s managerial styles can be studied through a questionnaire (leadership effectiveness and adaptability description scale- LEAD) which has 12 situations depicting the various levels of maturity of the group. Each situation has four alternative actions and the subject has to choose one action...
which he is most likely to adopt in the given situation. Then the scoring is done to arrive at the style range and style adaptability of the manager.

2.3 Integrative Complexity:

Conceptual / integrative complexity construct is a descendent of Kelly’s (1955) personal construct theory. The concepts closest to integrative complexity are cognitive complexity Beiri (1971), conceptual complexity (Schroder et al, 1967) and interactive complexity (Streufert & Streufert 1978; Streufert & Swezey, 1987).

It is more of a cognitive personality trait. Those who are low on complexity i.e. low differentiation and absence of integration are characterized by rigidity, all or none judgments and intolerance for divergent view points. Higher complexity levels are marked by increasing differentiation and increasing integration of information. At the higher end, there is considerable flexibility and the ability to synthesize various points of views in arriving at judgments. Integratively complex thinkers have an independent judgment which may stem from the tendency to refrain from jumping to conclusions in response to ambiguous information and the readiness to think flexibly in face of contradictory evidence (Tetlock, 1985). Integrative complexity may also be a way of coping cognitively with disruptive events (Suedfeld and Bluck, 1993).

Various assumptions have held that complexity can be modified over a short run by concurrent experiences and motivation, or in the long run by certain experiences (such as child rearing practices). Further, complexity is seen as changing in response to fatigue, stress, intrapsychic conflict and social factors.

To summarize, integrative complexity is a cognitive process that requires the ability to differentiate dimensions of a situation, and also to integrate those dimensions. High integrative complexity positively affects interpersonal communication and negotiations, while low integrative complexity may be associated with violence. Environmental conditions, such as stress, also influence a person’s integrative complexity levels. In fact, integrative complexity...
and stress follow a curvilinear pattern of the sort that is described by the Yerkes-Dodson law.
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Very low and very high stress levels are associated with low integrative complexity (Schroder et al., 1967). Up to a certain point, stress increases integrative complexity; after an optimum level of arousal, integrative complexity decreases as stress increases: a phenomenon known as "disruptive stress." The disruptive stress hypothesis (Suedfeld & Granastein, 1995) posits that complexity is reduced when demands of the environment overwhelm a person's coping ability or when perceived control over the outcome of a situation is threatened. These studies show that organizational climate will play an important role in fostering complexity. An endeavour will be made in this study to see how integrative complexity interacts with motives and climate to lead to managerial effectiveness.
2.3.1 Measurement of integrative complexity:

Integrative complexity is usually measured by the paragraph completion test where the subject is asked to write paragraphs based on sentence stems. It can also be measured by the semi projective picture story exercise (PSE). Each paragraph is scored on a scale ranging from low differentiation, no integration (1) to high differentiation, high integration (7). Many researchers have analyzed archival materials like old speeches, pieces of literature etc. to get the integrative complexity score of historical personalities during historical events. In the present study the semi projective picture story exercise (PSE) has been used to measure integrative complexity by using six pictures to elicit stories.

2.4 Motives:

The term motivation can be traced to the Latin word ‘movere’, which means ‘to move’. Thus motivation is a process that starts with a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates behaviour or a drive aimed at a goal or incentive.

Motives are primary and secondary i.e. primary motives are biological motives / physiological motives and are basically unlearned e.g. hunger, thirst, avoidance of pain, maternal concern etc. The learned motives are secondary motives and are more important in the context of organizational behavior e.g. achievement motive, power motive and affiliation motive.

Achievement motive is a prominent motive which is defined as need to excel in relation to a competitive or an internalised standard of excellence (McClelland, 1953). It is an important motive in an organisational set up because managerial positions require such drive in order to be successful especially if the task at hand is challenging.

At higher levels of management, power needs, play a more important role in success. McClelland (1976), stated that power motive can take 2 forms among managers – personalised power and socialised power. Managers with
personalised power motive strive for dominance, while managers with socialised power motive are concerned with group goals and provide the necessary support, strength and competence. People high on power motive have a tendency to dominate others but at the same time they have strong inhibition against domineering behaviour which results in eventual avoidance of power. Thus there are two kinds of power, i.e. positive power originating in strength (hope of power) and negative power originating in weakness (fear of power).

The third motive affiliation motive, results in a strong desire for approval and reassurance from others, a tendency to conform to the wishes of those whose friendship is valued and a sincere interest in the feelings of others. Noujaim (1968) found that those managers who are high on affiliation motive are not successful managers because they concentrate more on forming and maintaining relationships and cannot take tough decisions. Mc Adams (1980) decided that a whole new approach was needed to measure the positive aspects of the affiliation motive. He employed more positive arousal conditions to derive a fantasy measure of this positive aspect which he termed as need for intimacy. The intimacy scoring system focuses more on the quality of relationship rather than on the active striving to attain them. Also intimacy motive correlates 0.32 with affiliation motive scores (Mc Adams and Powers, 1981) and appears to predict indexes of relationship quality in a better way (Mc Adams, 1989). Thus, it was hypothesized that intimacy motive will be a better predictor of managerial performance than affiliation motive, so in this study the relation of intimacy motive with managerial performance was studied.

Further it needs to be investigated how the various motives affect contextual and task performance separately and how the various motives affect the adoption of different managerial styles.

2.4.1 Measurement of motives:

The strength of the various motives is best measured by the scores derived from the coding of thought content of imaginative stories. The scores on the various motives are usually obtained from stories written to pictures, but the
scores can also be validly obtained from stories written to stem sentences. The former is known as the semi projective Picture story exercise (PSE) and the latter is the French test of insight which is a sentence completion test. Besides the above mentioned projective and semi projective tests, objective measures in the form of questionnaires can also be used e.g. The Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Edwards, 1954). Cattell, Horn, Sweney and Radcliffe (1964) developed the motivational analysis test which was based on factor analysis and used both the questionnaire and the semi-projective techniques. Mc Clelland (1987) suggested that the coding of associative thoughts is a valid measure of motivation as it satisfies the requirements of functional definition of a motive, i.e. it energises, orients and selects behaviour. In the present study the semi-projective picture story exercise (PSE) has been used to measure motives by using six pictures to elicit stories.

2.5 Organizational Climate:

Organizational climate can be defined as the "relatively enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that
a) is experienced by its members,
b) influences their behavior, and
c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attitudes) of the organization." (Taguiri and Litwin, 1968).

Organisational climate includes employee perceptions and evaluations of leadership practices, decision-making processes, working relationships among employees, appraisal and recognition, as well as roles and goals. Organisational climate reflects the way things are done in a particular work environment. Organisational climate perceptions are viewed as a critical determinant of individual behaviour in organisations, mediating the relationship between objective characteristics of the work environment and individual employee responses.
Theoretical Orientation...

While all researchers agree on the importance of the climate construct, there is no consensus as yet on the core dimensions of climate. Thus, Campbell and colleagues (1970) proposed four primary climate dimensions: individual autonomy, the degree of structure imposed on positions, reward orientation, and consideration, warmth and support. Hellreigel & Slocum (1974) defined organizational climate as a set of attributes which can be perceived about a particular organization and its subsystems and that may be induced from the way that organization and its subsystems deal with their members and environment.

Other researchers have proposed different taxonomies of climate dimensions (Ostroff, 1993). The organisational health model (Hart & Cotton, 2003), incorporates 10 core dimensions of organisational climate: supportive leadership, role clarity, participative decision-making, coworker interaction, appraisal and feedback, employee development, goal alignment, work demands, workgroup morale and workgroup distress. The climate construct has also recently been expanded to include a focus on more specific domains such as the climate for customer service and the climate for safety (e.g., Neal, Griffin & Hart, 2000).

An organization comprises of the top management and the employees or subordinates working under the management. The people working in an organization have their own individual needs apart from the organization's needs. All these psychological components – structure, systems, culture, leader behaviour and psychological needs of employees – interact with one another and create an organizational climate. Organizational climate can be discussed in terms of how it is perceived or felt by organizational members. So a climate may be perceived as hostile or supportive, as conducive to achievement or stifling and so on.

The organizational climate can be measured in terms of trust, morale, conflict, equity in rewards, leader credibility, resistance to change and scapegoating. Most authors have used organizational climate as a descriptive concept e.g. Burns & Stalker (1961) described organizational climate as Organic vs Mechanical. Likert (1967) proposed 4 types of climate exploitative,
benevolent, consultative and participative. The framework proposed by Litwin and Stringer (1968) emphasized the effect of organizational climate on the motivation of its members. Udai Pareek (1989) derived his work and development of MAO-C from motivational framework of organizational climate only and this instrument has been used in the present study to measure organizational climate.

There is lack of empirical evidence to show how organisational climate affects contextual and task performance and how it contributes to the manager’s style range and style adaptability. This area of research will be further explored and an effort will also be made to see how integrative complexity and motives interact with organisational climate to lead to managerial effectiveness.

Thus it can be assumed that integrative complexity, motives and organizational climate besides having their independent effects also interact with each other to influence managerial style and performance. In the work situation, it is the organizational climate, which provides cues for the optimal arousal of personal variables like integrative complexity and motives and thus influences managerial effectiveness. Thus, it is proposed that the independent contribution and interaction effects of integrative complexity, motives and organizational climate need to be investigated with regard to managerial styles and performance.