



EXPLAINING ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS—LEADERSHIP STYLES VS. MOTIVATION PROFILES VS. DECISION-MAKING STYLES: SUPPORTING OR COMPETING DIMENSIONS?

Jon Aarum Andersen

School of Business and Economics, Linneaus University, Sweden
jon.andersen@lnu.se

Abstract

This paper assessed if and to what degree leadership styles, motivation profiles and decision-making styles explain organizational goal attainment (effectiveness). Leadership behaviors of 209 Swedish corporate managers were collected using established instruments, and effectiveness data were collected from the companies in which these managers were employed. It is concluded that managers' leadership styles, motivation profiles, and decision-making styles support each other because they give a more comprehensive description of leadership behaviors. On the other hand, leadership styles, motivation profiles, and decision-making styles compete in presenting empirical support for and explanations of organizational effectiveness. Managers who were power-motivated appeared to be more effective than other managers, regardless of their leadership styles and decision-making styles. Leadership scholarship needs to focus more on the consequences of managers' behaviors and how they relate to organizational goal-attainment.

Keywords: management, leadership, attitudes, motivation, decision-making, effectiveness

1 INTRODUCTION

Leadership scholarship includes a number of descriptions of managers' behaviors, with different *reasons* for the behaviors as well as the organizational *consequences* of behavioral types. This paper assessed to what degree leadership styles, motivation styles, and decision-making styles support or are at odds with each other in explaining organizational effectiveness with reference to empirical studies.

Several hundred definitions of leadership have been presented over the years (Bass, 1990; Yukl, 2010). What properties must be present for leadership to exist and to be what it is? What makes formal leadership possible? Organizational-effectiveness studies argue that a formal leader, subordinates, and tasks are the properties that must exist for managerial leadership to exist. Formal organizations (corporations or public agencies) employ both managers and subordinates, which have legal and contractual implications. A formal leader (manager) is a person

who is responsible both for the subordinates and for the results. Leadership is a process, but management is a position (Hughes et al., 1999). Managers lead business enterprises or public agencies.

Organizational psychology addresses the *reasons* for behaviors or behavioral patterns of individuals at work, such as personality traits, attitudes, needs (motivation), and intuition. Management studies address the behaviors of managers rather than the reasons for their behaviors. The aim is to assess the consequences of managerial actions related to organizational effectiveness. Again, managerial psychology seeks to explain the actions and behaviors of managers. Explaining the organizational consequences (goal-attainment) of managerial behaviors is the aim of management scholarship.

Three types of managerial behaviors have dominated leadership scholarship: leadership styles (e.g., Blake and Mouton, 1964), motivation profiles (e.g., McClelland, 1990), and decision-making styles

(e.g., Keegan, 1984). The *universal* theorists claim that there is one best way to lead, whereas the *contingency* theorists claim that leadership effectiveness is dependent on the situation (Blake and Mouton, 1978).

McClelland and Burnham (1976, p. 105) wrote “After all, management is an influence game.” It is only by acting or refraining from taking action that subordinates, superiors, owners, financiers, customers, and other parties can be influenced. Leadership research addresses the reasons for actions as well as different kinds of actions. Again, what is central in managerial leadership research is not the reasons for leaders’ behavior, but rather the organizational consequences of the behaviors. Table 1 presents the causes, study objects, and the presumed consequences of attitudes, motivations, and decision-making styles on organizational effectiveness.

Table 1: Causes, study objects (phenomena), and consequences

Cause	Study object	Consequence (presumed)
Attitudes	Leadership styles: Separated, dedicated, related, integrated.	Organizational effectiveness
Motivations	Motivation profiles: Achievement, affiliation, power motivation.	Organizational effectiveness
Personality, intuition	Decision-making styles: Sensing, intuition, thinking, feeling.	Organizational effectiveness

2 ORGANIZATIONAL TYPES AND EFFECTIVENESS (GOAL-ATTAINMENT)

Blau and Scott (1962) presented a typology based on the prime beneficiaries of organizations. Some organizations are established in which the owners are the prime beneficiaries, namely business enterprises. Goal-attainment is the key issue and the basic definition of effectiveness in managerial theory. The main goal of a specific business enterprise is a description of a desired permanent state in the future with respect to the degree of profitability (i.e., the dividend on shares) and the risk level expected by the owners based on their in-

vestment time horizon. The ultimate goal of a company is profitability (Shetty, 1979; Hambrick, 1983; Nash, 1983; Walton and Dawson, 2001). The prime beneficiaries in public organizations are the citizens. In private schools the *goal* is profitability, and the *means* is education. The goal of public schools is to increase the level of *knowledge* in society, and the means is *education*.

Organizational effectiveness is an objective variable. It is measured by the degree of goal-attainment in which the owners, board of directors, and managers on different levels specify the goals that their subordinate departments need to achieve. The people, who constitute the majority of the working population, work in private or public organizations in order to achieve the goals of the prime beneficiaries. Leadership is a process, but management is a position (Hughes et al., 1999).

3 EMPIRICAL STUDIES OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS AND EFFECTIVENESS

Studies of the behaviors of managers traditionally have used masked instruments, in which managers have responded to a number of questionnaires without knowing what is being measured. The questionnaires are returned directly to the researchers, who score them, and the managers who responded are not informed of which leadership behaviors they have. Only the researchers know the identity of the respondents.

Empirical data on the degree of effectiveness (what goals to achieve and what actually has been achieved by each manager) come from the senior managers of the individual managers who responded to the instruments that measure behaviors. This procedure enables researchers to link specific leadership behaviors and the degree of effectiveness of each manager who takes part in an investigation.

It is imperative to stress this procedure because some studies have deviated from these requirements and these data-collection procedures when studying managerial leadership. Managerial effectiveness was a key concept in the study by Yukl et al. (2019). However, it was neither defined nor measured as the degree of goal-attainment. Yukl et al.’s

empirical study of leadership behaviors was not based on subordinates and managers, but on responses from students at two universities regarding their supervisors (university employees). The managerial effectiveness was measured according to the students' subjective ratings of how their supervisors carried out their duties. In other words, the dependent and independent variables were subjective and originated from the same respondents.

4 ATTITUDES AND LEADERSHIP STYLE THEORIES

4.1 Style Theories

The seminal works of Likert (1961), Halpin and Winer (1957), and Fleishman and Harris (1962) were concerned with the relationship between behavior and organizational performance. It was assumed that a particular leadership style was a consequence of the leader's attitudes, values, and assumptions. Likert (1961), Halpin and Winer (1957), and Fleishman and Harris (1962) developed the notion of "one best way to lead," or universal theories: employee-centeredness (i.e., more concern for the employees than tasks), "high-high" leadership style (i.e., high concern for employees and for tasks), and, with Blake and Mouton (1964), the team-leadership style (i.e., high concern for employees and for outcomes). However, the empirical support for the universal theories has not impressed other researchers.

Blake and Mouton (1985, p. 198) defined leadership as follows: "Processes of leadership are involved in achieving results with and through others." They stressed that goal-attainment can be achieved only with or through other people inside as well as outside the organization. Blake and Mouton pinpointed what may be seen as the dilemma of leadership. The formal leader (manager) is responsible for results in accordance with organizational goals, yet no leader or manager can achieve the goals of the organization by his or her own efforts alone. If that were possible, neither an organization nor a leader would be needed. Although the logical arguments for the "9.9-team leadership" that Blake and Mouton (1982) presented were strong, the empirical support was not.

Leadership research experienced an upheaval when Fiedler (1967) argued for a theory of contingency, which was founded on 15 years of research. To Fiedler it was illogical to argue for one best way to lead. He claimed that effective leadership depended on the leader adjusting his or her behavior according to the degree of internal situational control. Strube and Garcia (1981) performed a meta-analytic review of 170 studies based on Fiedler's theory. They reached a favorable conclusion about the validity of Fiedler's model. However, Fiedler and Garcia (1987) argued that it was time to leave the contingency model behind and move on. Additionally, Yukl (1989) concluded that Fiedler's theory could not explain leader effectiveness after all. However, the managerial style theory is one of the most influential leadership theories, and has influenced managers around the world (Andersen, 2013).

4.2 Measurements of Leadership Styles

Blake and Mouton (1985, p. 13) suggested five leadership styles which measured managers' concern for production and concern for subordinates. Fiedler (1967) developed the LPC instrument with three leadership styles, adding a situational variable in addition to the concern for people and tasks. The concept of leadership style proposed by Reddin (1970) consists of task-orientation and relationship-orientation with two main styles: task-oriented style and relationship-oriented style. This leads to four leadership styles: separated style, related style, dedicated style, and integrated style. These styles were measured by a forced-choice instrument, the Management Style Diagnosis Test (MSDT), consisting of 56 statement (Reddin, 1987).

5 MOTIVATION AND MANAGERS' MOTIVATION PROFILES

5.1 Motivation Theories

The works of McClelland (1961, 1990) on motivation were based on the proposition that needs are the reason for motivation. The focus was on the motivation and motivation-based behaviors of managers (motivation profiles) and the impact of their behavior on organizational outcomes. McClelland (1990) claimed that every individual has three

needs: *achievement*, which is the desire to do better than other people or be more effective, to solve problems, or to master difficult tasks; *power*, which is the desire to control other people, to influence their behavior, or to be responsible for other people and their work; and *affiliation*, which is the desire to establish and maintain friendly and close relationships with other people. According to McClelland (1990) the needs for achievement, power, and affiliation are acquired, and are not based on personality. These needs are expressed in varying degrees and are results of individual life experiences.

McClelland (1990) performed extensive research on managers' motivation-related behavior. It is a theoretical assumption that most individuals have a distinct or predominant motivation profile. McClelland (1990) claimed that one specific motivation profile enhances organizational effectiveness: strong power motivation, stronger than the needs for affiliation and achievement. This claim does *not* imply that the higher the power motivation, the greater is the effectiveness. The main claim is only that managers' power motivation must be stronger than the other needs.

5.2 Measurements of Motivation Profiles

McClelland had a strong conviction that the Thematic Apperception Test was a superior method for the study of motivations. McClelland and Steele (1972) described this instrument. To promote leadership research on managers' motivation, an instrument was developed and applied which (1) measures achievement, affiliation, and power motivation; (2) measures the relative strengths of these factors; (3) rests explicitly on the definitions of McClelland (1990); and (4) measures managers' work motivation. It was tested for reliability and validity with responses from 580 managers (Andersen, 1994, 2018). The application of this instrument in four studies with responses from 565 managers supported McClelland's theoretical claims that (1) managers have motivation profiles; (2) there are differences in motivation profiles between managers across organizational types; (3) there are no significant differences in motivation profiles between female and male managers; and (4) managers who are motivated predominantly by power enhance organizational effectiveness (Andersen 2018).

6 PERSONALITY, INTUITION, AND MANAGERS' DECISION-MAKING STYLES

6.1 Personality Types

In psychology, intuition often is regarded as a personality trait. The most influential contribution to the subject of intuition is Jung's work on psychological types (Jung, 1921/1971). Quinn and Hall (1983) turned to Jung's typology as a social scientific meta-theoretical framework. Jung's typology (a classification of personality traits) has proven to be useful in defining and predicting behavior (Keegan, 1984). Morgan (1986) showed how Jung's theories have influenced organizational thinking. Jung's typology has been reviewed in recent years, especially in the field of management (e.g., Akinci and Sadler-Smith, 2012).

Jung (1971) pointed out that in real life the types are not found in pure form. The typology rests on two elements, namely attitudes and functions, and often is presented using three dimensions of the human psyche: (1) attitudes (extrovert and introvert); (2) perception functions (sensing and intuition); and (3) judgment functions (thinking and feeling).

Jung (1933/1992, p. 103) used the term "decisions" in only one place ("important decisions") when referring to the functions. Carlyn (1977, p. 461) argued that "thinking/feeling has to do with the decision-making style which is preferred by a person." Myers and McCaulley (1985) also described the functions in terms of decisions. Jung applied the concept of function to designate specific forms of psychic activity and behavior in people generally, and these remain the same regardless of circumstances (Benfari, 1991).

Everyone has a preference for one of the four functions. The preferred function is called the "dominant" or "superior" function. The opposite of the dominant function (i.e., that person's strength) is called the "inferior" function (i.e., that person's weakness). For example, if the dominant function is thinking, the weakest function will be feeling. If the dominant function is sensing, the inferior function will be intuition.

The personality-type theory distinguishes between the types with respect to temporal orientations, in which the intuitive ones have the longest time horizons. According to Jaques (1990) the hierarchical levels in organizations are reflections of the

managers' and supervisors' planning time span. The level of responsibility in any organizational position—whether a manager's or a foreman's responsibility—can be measured objectively as the targeted time of completion of the longest task, project, or program assigned to that role (*ibid.*). The more distant the targeted date of completion of the longest task or program, the higher the position the individual ought to have. Bass (1990) also referred to research on the planning time span of managers that supports this argument.

People solve problems and make decisions in a variety of ways because humans apply different functions. Problems can be solved and decisions made using intuition, sensing, thinking, and feeling. The functions that are dominant and preferred depend on the personality of the individual. Problems are solved effectively and effective decisions are made when the person in question applies the function most appropriate to the problem, situation, or task at hand. Isabel Myers must be credited with bringing Jung's typology to life (Keirseey and Bates, 1978). Jung's work on personality and intuition still stimulates researchers today (Liebowitz, 2020). However, the prevalence of inconsistencies in Jung's works regarding descriptions and explanations of types has created problems for contemporary researchers.

6.2 Leadership and Personality

Several reviews of the research on leadership and personality have been performed. Stogdill (1948) performed a comparative review of 124 published studies and concluded that persons who are leaders in some situations may not necessarily be leaders in others. Although there were positive correlations between a number of traits and emergent leadership, these correlations were weak.

Gibb (1969) stated that (1) it is not possible to find one specific personality trait that characterized leaders, and (2) it is not possible to isolate a number of traits that, when combined, explain leadership. Research failed to find a relationship—even a modest one—between personality and leadership. Gibb (1969, p. 227) concluded that “research showed no scientific basis for a relationship between traits and leading positions.” However, he pointed out that per-

sonality traits could not be excluded in leadership because they probably were not completely without consequences. Stogdill (1974) concluded that personality research had limited value when predicting an individual's leadership potential. However, there were indications that traits work with other factors for those in formal leadership positions.

When it comes to decision-making styles, including intuition, some theories are not based on personality theory (e.g., Rowe et al., 1986; Driver et al., 1990). The scholarship on the reasons for regarding intuition as a cognitive factor (e.g. Cristofaro, 2019) rather than as a personality trait was reviewed by Akinci and Sadler-Smith (2012).

6.3 Intuition in Decision-Making

In the Western world, great emphasis is placed on the analytical way of solving problems (Fordham, 1964). By and large, Western culture overestimates the thinkers and underestimates the intuitive, feeling, and sensing types. Too many managerial techniques overemphasize thinking, whereas individual values, commitments, and motivations often are ignored (Keegan, 1984). However, only one-fourth of what managers do requires logical capabilities. Other aspects of managerial work, such as the supervision of daily activities, motivating subordinates, and being creative, require considerably different ways of acting (*ibid.*). Thinking refers to only one of the steps of the managerial problem-solving process, namely the evaluation of alternatives and the selection of solutions.

6.4 The Measurement of Intuition and Decision-Making: Myers–Briggs Type Indicator

Jung (1971) discussed the problem of measurement in psychology and claimed that there are facts that can be measured quantitatively. Relatively complicated aspects could also be available by following the following measuring methods. The Myers–Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) (Briggs Myers, 1962) is one of the most applied psychological instruments in the world, and its scientific qualities are well documented (Samuels, 1985). The chief obstacle to using the MBTI is that it is very extensive. The standard form of the MBTI in use is Form G, which has 126 items, of which 94 are scored for type.

The Myers–Briggs instrument measures 16 types (eight combinations of function and two attitudes) (Briggs Myers and McCaulley, 1985). It is a questionnaire developed to make it possible to test Jung’s theory and put it to practical use (McCaulley, 1990). Jung’s typology and Myers’ contribution are not identical theories. As Stoknes (1992, p. 103) observed, “The MBTI has become so widespread that it has almost lost its roots in the Jungian theory.” However, it is hard to find empirical studies of managers’ decision-making based on the MBTI instrument (Liebowitz, 2020).

6.5 Keegan’s Type Indicator (KTI)

To measure the functions, the KTI instrument contains 32 items (compared with 94 items in the MBTI). The KTI collects only variables that are relevant for management studies. The instrument has acceptable face and content validity, and is based explicitly on Jung’s typology. This instrument links Jungian functions to managerial decision-making (Keegan, 1984). The BMTI is a general test of the Jungian typology, whereas the KTI is a test for managers and measures decision-making styles. The Keegan Type Indicator is less verified in terms of reliability and validity, and no documentation of test results exists.

Keegan (1984) focused on decisions, implying that attitudes are less relevant. This is based on the four functions. Jung claimed that there is one dominant, one auxiliary, one underdeveloped, and one unconscious function for all humans. Keegan (1984, p. 34) presented eight decision-making styles: (1) intuition with thinking (as the auxiliary function), (2) intuition with feeling, (3) thinking with intuition, (4) thinking with sensing, (5) sensing with thinking, (6) sensing with feeling, (7) feeling with sensing, and (8) sensing with intuition.

Sensing and intuition are denoted perception functions. Thinking and feeling are called judgment or decision-making functions (Keegan, 1984). The fact that all humans must judge and choose by thinking and feeling in addition to perceiving a problem (by sense and intuition) makes Jung’s typology a genuinely individual decision-making theory.

Based on the concepts established here regarding problem-solving and decision-making, we return

to the problem-solving process. The first four steps in the process now can be linked directly to these concepts. To find and define the problem, the perceiving functions of sensing and intuition are needed. To generate alternative solutions and to evaluate alternatives and select solution, the judging functions of thinking and feeling are used. Finally, to conduct an ethics double check, the feeling function is needed. Jung’s functions cover all the four steps of the problem-solving and decision-making process (Keegan, 1984). The Keegan Type Indicator Form B measures the variables extroversion and introversion as well as sensation, intuition, thinking, and feeling with 44 statements and questions (Keegan, 1982). Twelve items concern the attitudes, 16 items refer to the functions sensing and intuition, and 16 items refer to the functions thinking and feeling. The items concerning the attitudes are bipolar. Of the 32 items that measure the functions, 24 are bipolar statements, and eight items are ranked on a scale from 1 to 4.

Keegan (1980) described the instrument and guidelines for scoring. The instrument is open, and its merits are not reduced if the respondents have knowledge of Jung’s theory. The reliability has not been tested separately. The face validity can be established easily because Jung’s typology describes the concepts and terms applied, thus enabling the formulation of valid statements and questions. The content validity has been tested, and the correlation between the scores and the assessment of the respondents was found to be high (Keegan, 1980).

A review of the plethora of planning and decision-making models that currently are available indicates that although each has value, each is incomplete. Jung’s typology is almost complete because it touches on the two functions of perception (i.e., sensing and intuition) and the two functions of judgment (i.e., thinking and feeling), and their relationship to each other (Keegan, 1984). Keegan’s ambition was to make the theory applicable to more professionals, especially to managers. In the field of managerial development, the typology presented by Jung (1921/1971) gives genuine insight into the questions of why persons succeed or fail in decision-making and how they do so (Keegan, 1984). Keegan (ibid.) based his work on the works of Jung, and developed the theory further and adapted it to the field of management.

The main contribution of Keegan (1980, 1982, 1984) is the description of decision-making behavior, that is, how managers perceive when becoming aware of a problem or possibility and how they solve the problem or utilize the possibility. A personality theory thus has become a basis for a behavioral theory of leadership.

6.6 Are Managers Intuitive Types?

The purpose of Jung's typology is not to label people in terms of their personality type, but to *understand* their behavior. However, the theory does not predict any relationship between type-based behavior and specific consequences of the behavior. In managerial leadership, the focus is on the relationship between leadership behavior or behavioral patterns and organizational outcomes.

A hypothesis states that managers with a decision-making behavior based on intuition and supported by the thinking function would be found more frequently than those with other combinations. Andersen (1994) collected data on the decision-making styles of 209 managers in eight Swedish corporations by using the Keegan Type Indicator, and found that the majority of the managers (32%) were intuitive types.

6.7 Managers' Intuition and Organizational Effectiveness

The burning issue in leadership theory on decision-making is whether there is one best way for managers to make decisions. In this case, the problem is whether intuitive managers are more effective than other managers when the relationship between intuitive managers and the degree of organizational goal-attainment is tested empirically.

The research on decision-making behavior basically is descriptive. In the field of managerial research, this descriptive research is less relevant, because the outcome factors are weakly developed. It is hard to find research that contains a hypothesis regarding a relationship between specific decision-making styles and effectiveness. These putative relationships have not been fully tested empirically.

Many theories can be described by the terms "phenomenon," "cause," and "effect." The phe-

nomenon is behavior, that is, the decision-making behavior of managers. It is specific behavioral patterns that Jung described using the four functions. The cause of distinct type (i.e., the dominant function) is the personality of the individual. Jung's theory describes types and type-related behavior, and holds that type is a personality trait.

Effectiveness embraces two entities. In the field of management, it is defined as the degree of goal-attainment. There is only a weak basis for assuming a direct relationship between decision functions (decision-making styles) and effectiveness. Keegan (1984) argued that the four functions are effective in different situations, that is, in relation to different types of problems and tasks to be addressed. These arguments are not precise regarding the concepts of situation, problem, and task.

McCaulley (1990) took another path in seeking an answer to this question. She claimed that the intuitive and thinking types are those who most likely are successful. Eccles and Nohria (1992) introduced the concept of *robust action*. Robust actions are characterized by moves that managers make that preserve their flexibility in circumstances of uncertainty. Eccles and Nohria (ibid.) suggested some principles of robust actions, including "judging the situation at hand." Making decisions and acting at the right time depends on the ability to judge the situation. The ability to see opportunities and threats when one is in a managerial position is crucial. This may well be a characteristic of intuitive managers.

Andersen (2000, 2006) suggested that intuition as a decision-making style might be related to organizational goal-attainment. The concept of intuition and the other decision functions was based on Jung's typology. Andersen (1994) found that the majority of the managers were intuitive, but the majority had feeling as the auxiliary function, rather than thinking. Whether intuitive managers are more effective remains to be seen (ibid.). The primary issue in decision-making is not the decision per se, but the execution and implementation of the decision, which is the task of the subordinates. This leads to a number of important questions. Are they capable and competent, and will they execute the decision as intended and at the right time or within the time span? How will competitors and suppliers act or react when they observe the consequences of the decision?

7 INTUITION IN DECISIONS-MAKING VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES VS. MOTIVATION PROFILES: SUPPORTING DIMENSIONS?

Andersen (1994) presented data on leadership styles, motivation profiles, and decision-making styles of 209 Swedish managers. That study reported that of the 48 theoretical general profiles, four profiles with two or more managers in each group were isolated (Table 2). Two leadership style and all three motivation profiles were present, whereas intuition as decision-making style was found in three combinations (Andersen, 1994, p. 276). Thus, leadership styles, motivation, profiles, and intuition in decision-making are *supporting* dimensions in describing leadership behavior.

Table 2. Combinations of leadership styles, motivation profiles, and decision-making styles in managers (N = 209)

Leadership styles	Motivation profiles	Decision-making styles	Combinations
Integrated style	Achievement motivated	Intuition	7%
Integrated style	Power motivated	Intuition	7%
Integrated style	Affiliation motivated	Intuition	5%
Related style	Power motivated	Feeling	2%

8 LEADERSHIP BEHAVIORS IN MANAGERS ACROSS ORGANIZATIONS AND GENDER

8.1 The Public–Private Distinction

The public–private distinction research tradition (Rainey et al., 1976) contains arguments for differences between public and private managers in many areas, including personality and behavior. Wittmer (1991) stated that previous research indicated that public managers are different from their private-sector counterparts in terms of work-related values, reward preferences, needs, and personality types. Hanbury et al. (2004) found that leadership style and decision-making style (personality) were correlated strongly with years of service for public managers in the United States.

Andersen (2010) determined whether there were behavioral differences between public- and private-sector managers according to the public–private distinction argument. An analysis of data from 343 managers in two public organizations and one private company in Sweden revealed significant differences in behavior (namely leadership styles, motivation profiles, and decision-making styles) between public and private managers (ibid.). However, one similarity in behavior was reported: most public and private managers were intuitive types. However, the public managers scored higher on intuition than the private managers.

8.2 Leadership and Gender

Do female managers have different leadership styles than male managers? Andersen (2011) eliminated the effect of organizational differences (i.e., private versus public) by studying only public organizations. Of the 30 pairwise comparisons of means for samples consisting of 38 managers in three different organizations (Andersen, 2011), only five comparisons (17%) yielded significant differences in leadership behavior between women and men as managers ($p < 0.05$). In only one case was the significance at the level of 1%. Anderson concluded that there were no or only small and inconsistent differences in leadership behavior between women and men.

Trinidad and Normore (2005, p. 574) claimed that “Women leadership styles are presented as alternative to traditional leadership models.” However, because there are no differences between women’s and men’s leadership behaviors, this alternative does not exist. Virtually no significant differences in behavior between female and male public managers were found.

9 INTUITION IN DECISION-MAKING VS. LEADERSHIP STYLES VS. MOTIVATION PROFILES: COMPETING DIMENSIONS?

9.1 Comparative Study of Leadership Behaviors and Effectiveness

Regarding competing behavioral dimensions, only one empirical study has measured leadership styles, motivation profiles, and decision-making styles (including intuition), as well as the effective-

ness of the same managers (Andersen 1994). Leadership styles were measured using a forced-choice instrument (the MSDT) developed by Reddin (1987), and the motivation profiles were measured using a different forced-choice instrument, the Andersen Motivation Profile Indicator (AMPI) by Andersen (1994). The decision-making styles were measured using a forced-choice instrument (the MSDT) developed by Keegan (1982). The effectiveness of 53 managers in two different companies was measured according to the degree of financial goal-attainment. Power-motivated managers appeared to be more effective than those motivated by any of the other behavioral dimensions investigated by Andersen (1994). However, the chi-squared test showed that the relationship between power motivation in managers and effectiveness was not significant at the 90% level.

Those who managed departments in private companies and achieved or surpassed the profit-margin goal were regarded as effective, whereas those who did not were regarded as less effective or inefficient (Andersen, 1994). On the basis of data from these managers' scores on decision-making style and the degree of effectiveness of their departments, the analysis assessed the degree, if any, of the relationship between intuition in managers and their effectiveness.

Andersen (1994) reported that the covariance between effective and less-effective managers for intuitive managers was 1.5 (6:4). The covariance for the other managers was 0.5 (8:15). These results imply that the intuitive factor in managers is 3 times more strongly related to effectiveness than are other dominant functions of the managers. Intuitive management with thinking function was 6.7 times more strongly related to organizational effectiveness than was management with other decision-making styles. Because the expected value in one of the cells was less than 5, the chi-squared test result was not presented. Moreover, the Fisher exact two-tailed *p*-value was 0.26, indicating that the difference was *not* significant.

Several managers were intuitive and had an innovative and creative decision-making style. Andersen (1994) found no statistical support for intuition in managers being the cause of organizational effectiveness (i.e., goal-attainment). However, managers who were predominantly power motivated according to a McClelland-based instrument (Andersen, 1999)

were more effective than managers with the other two motivation profiles. In terms of the three leadership behaviors, the aforementioned studies suggest that decision-making styles, motivation profiles, and leadership styles *compete* to explain managers' behavior related to organizational effectiveness. Andersen (1994) showed that power-motivated managers were more effective than managers with any other leadership behavioral pattern. There was no strong statistical basis for determining the winner. However, power motivation in managers is a strong contender.

10 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Scholarship on managerial leadership addresses the consequences of managers' behaviors related to organizational goal-attainment (effectiveness). Managerial decision-making—stressing the *making of* decisions—is about actions. The main focus in managerial research on decision-making is the consequences of the decisions on goal-attainment. It is evident that both internal contingency variables (i.e., the execution of the decisions) and external contingency variables (i.e., the reactions of other organizations on these decisions) are needed in order to understand fully why some decisions lead to effectiveness and others do not.

This paper assessed the relevance to managerial leadership of theories of intuition in decision-making versus leadership theories based on managers' attitudes (leadership styles) versus motivation (motivation profiles) when the end variable is organizational effectiveness. The conclusion is that scholarship on leadership styles, motivation profiles, and decision-making style, including intuition, support each other by providing a broader perspective of managers' behaviors.

The three types of behavior in managers applied here may be competing in presenting one type which is related more strongly to organizational effectiveness than others. The main research question is this: What is the strength in explaining organizational effectiveness of the leadership-style theories versus the motivation-profile theories versus the scholarship on intuition and decision-making? Table 3 presents the relationships among the four leadership styles, the three motivation profiles, and the four decision-making styles.

An empirical study (Andersen, 1994) with data from the same managers in different companies found that managers who were motivated by power appeared to be more effective than other managers, regardless of leadership style and decision-making style. It is evident that the personality approach to leadership has been contested, and has become more so over the years. What makes personality still a part of leadership research is the fact that the focus has changed from personality traits per se to decision-making and the behavioral consequences of specific decision-making-styles.

Studies of how personality traits, including intuition, relate to leadership have produced inconsistent answers. Previous and current research has found no statistical support for the assumption that intuition in decision-making—whether as a personality trait or as a cognitive variable—explains organizational effectiveness. Managerial leadership is about acting and achieving organizational goals. Managerial research on leadership styles, motivation profiles, and decision-making styles linked to organizational effectiveness needs to continue, as both supporting *and* competing dimensions of leadership behaviors.

Table 3: Effect of leadership behaviors on organizational effectiveness

Leadership behaviors (cause)	Organizational effectiveness (outcome)
Separated leadership style	Not empirically supported (Reddin 1983, p. 59). Insignificant (Andersen 1994, p. 278) (<i>N</i> = 53).
Dedicated leadership style	
Related leadership style	
Integrated leadership style	
Achievement-motivated profile	Not empirically supported (McClelland & Burnham 1976; McClelland 1990, p. 582). Insignificant (Andersen 1994, p. 280). (<i>N</i> = 53).
Affiliated-motivated profile	
Power-motivated profile	Significant, but not significant on the 90% level. (Andersen 1994, p. 281). (<i>N</i> = 53).
Sensing as decision-making style	No definition of effectiveness (Keegan 1984). Insignificant (Andersen 1994, p. 283). (<i>N</i> = 53).
Intuition as decision-making style	
Thinking as decision-making style	
Feeling as decision-making style	

EXTENDED SUMMARY/IZVLEČEK

Ta članek je razpravljal ali in v kolikšni meri stili vodenja, motivacijski profili ter slogi odločanja pojasnjujejo doseganje (učinkovitost) organizacijskih ciljev. Vodstveno vedenje 209 švedskih managerjev je bilo zbranih s pomočjo uveljavljenih instrumentov, podatki o uspešnosti pa so bili zbrani od samih podjetij, v katerih so bili ti managerji zaposleni. Ugotavljamo, da se stili vodenja, motivacijski profili in stili odločanja managerjev medsebojno podpirajo, ker rezultira v celovitejšem opisu vodstvenega vedenja. Po drugi strani stili vodenja, motivacijski profili in slogi odločanja tekmujejo v predstavitvi empirične podpore in razlag organizacijske uspešnosti. Managerji, ki gradijo svoje vodenje na podlagi moči, so se izkazali za učinkovitejše od drugih managerjev, ne glede na njihov stil vodenja in slog odločanja. Področje vodenja se mora bolj osredotočiti na posledice vedenja managerjev in na njihov odnos do doseganja organizacijskih ciljev.

REFERENCES

- Akinci, C. & Sadler-Smith, E. (2012). Intuition in management research: A historical review. *International Journal of Management Research*, 14(1), 104-122.
- Andersen, J.A. (1994). *Leadership and Effectiveness. Dissertation* (in Norwegian - summary in English). Lund University Press, Lund.
- Andersen, J.A. (1999). Are power motivated leaders more effective? A review of McClelland's theory. *Current Topics in Management*, 4(4), 41-59.
- Andersen, J.A. (2000). Intuition in managers. Are intuitive managers more effective? *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15(1), 46-67.
- Andersen, J.A. (2006). Leadership, personality and effectiveness. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 35(6), 1078-1091.
- Andersen, J.A. (2010). Public vs. private managers. How public and private managers differ in leadership behavior. *Public Administration Review*, 17(1), 131-141.
- Andersen, J.A. (2011). At the end of the road. On differences between men and women in leadership behavior. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(5), 428-441.
- Andersen, J.A. (2013). *Managerial Grid*. In Kessler, E.H. (Ed.) (2013). *Encyclopedia of Management Theory*, 1, 474-477.
- Andersen, J.A. (2018). *Managers Motivation Profiles. Measurement and application*. Sage Open, April 27.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). *Bass & Stogdill's handbook of leadership*. Free Press, New York, NY.
- Benfari, R. (1991). *Understanding Your Management Style. Beyond the Myers-Briggs Type Indicators*. Lexington Books, Lexington, MA.
- Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Gulf Publishing, Houston.
- Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1978). *The New Managerial Grid*. Gulf Publishing, Houston.
- Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1982). A comparative analysis of situationism and 9,9 management by principle. *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(4), 20-43.
- Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1985). *The Managerial Grid III*. Gulf Publishing, Houston, TX.
- Blau, P.M. & Scott, R.W. (1962). *Formal organizations*. Chandler, San Francisco, CA.
- Briggs Myers, I.B. (1962). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Briggs Myers, I.B. & McCaulley, M.H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the Development and Use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA.
- Carlyn, M. (1977). An assessment of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 41(5), 461-472.
- Cristofaro, M. (2019). I feel and think, therefore I am: An affect-cognitive theory of management decisions. *European Management Journal*, 38(2), 344-355.
- Driver, M. J., Brousseau, K.R. & Hunsaker, P.L. (1990). *The dynamic decision-maker. Five decision styles for executive and business success*. Harper & Row, New York.
- Eccles, R. G. & Nohria, N. (1992). *Beyond the Hype. Re-discovering the Essence of Management*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1967). *A theory of leadership effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Fiedler, F.E. & Garcia, J.E. (1987). *New approaches to effective leadership: Cognitive resources and organizational performance*. John Wiley & Sons. New York.
- Fleishman, E.A. & Harris, F.E. (1962). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. *Personal Psychology*, 15(2), 43-56.
- Fordham, F. (1964). *Introduction to Jung's Psychology*. Harmondsworth Penguin Books, London.
- Gibb, C.A. (1969). *Leadership*. In: L. Gardner and E. Aronson (Eds), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. IV (pp. 205-281). Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Halpin, A.W. & Wiener, B.J. (1957). *The leadership behavior and effectiveness of the airplane commander*. In: Stogdill, R.M. and Coons, A.D. (Eds.), *Leader behavior: Its description and measurement*. Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, Columbus.
- Hambrick, D.C. 1983. Some tests of the effectiveness and functional attributes of Miles and Snow's strategic types. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26(1), 5-26.
- Hanbury, G.L., Sapat, A. & Washington, C.W. 2004. Know yourself and take charge of your own destiny: The "fit model" of leadership. *Public Administration Review*, 64(5), 566-576.
- Hughes, L. R., Ginnett, R.C. & Curphy, G.J. (1999). *Leadership. Enhancing the lessons of experience*. Irwin McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Jaques, E. (1990). *In praise of hierarchy*. Harvard Business Review, 68, 127-33.
- Jung, C.G. (1921/1971). *Psychological Types*. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Vol. 6. Bollingen Series XX, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Jung, C.G. (1933/1992). *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. Ark Paperbacks, Routledge, London.
- Jung, C.G. (1964). *Man and his symbols*. Aldus Books, London.
- Jung, C.G. (1971). *Psychological types*. In: H. G. Haynes (trans.) and revised by R. F. Hall. The collected works of C. G. Jung (Vol. 6). Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Keegan, W.J. (1980). *How to Use the Keegan Type Indicator (KTI) and the Keegan Information Processing Indicator (KIPI)*. Warren Keegan Associates Press, New York.

- Keegan, W.J. (1982). *Keegan Type Indicator Form B*. Warren Keegan Associates Press, New York.
- Keegan, W.J. (1984). *Judgements, Choices and Decisions*. Wiley, New York, NY.
- Keirsey, D. & Bates, M. (1978). *Please Understand Me. Character and Temperament Types*. Prometheus Nemesis Books, Del Mar, CA.
- Liebowitz, J., (Ed.) (2020). *Developing informed intuition for decision-making*. CRC Press, Boca Raton.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D.C. (1990). *Human Motivation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McClelland, D.C. and Steele, R.S. (1972). *Motivation Workshops*. Morristown: General Learning Press.
- McClelland, D.C. & Burnham, D.H. (1976). *Power is the great motivator*. Harvard Business Review, 54, 100-110.
- McCaulley, M.H. (1990). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and leadership*. In: Clark, K. E. and Clark, M.B. (Eds). Measures of Leadership. Leadership Library of America, West Orange, NJ, pp. 381-418.
- Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organization*. Sage Publications, San Francisco, CA.
- Myers, I.B. & McCaulley, M.H. (1985). *A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto.
- Nash M. (1983). *Managing Organizational Performance*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.
- Quinn, R.E. & Hall, R.H. (1983). *Environments, organizations, and policymakers. Toward an integrative framework*. In: Quinn, R.E. and Hall, R.H (Eds), *Organizational Theory and Public Policy*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA.
- Rainey, H.G., Backoff, R.W. & Levine, C.H. (1976). Comparing public and private organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 36(2), 233-44.
- Reddin, W.J. (1970). *Managerial effectiveness*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Reddin, W.J. (1983). *Management Effectiveness & Style – Individual or Situational?* S.A. Tamarisk, UK.
- Reddin, W.J. (1987). *How to make your leadership style more effective*. McGraw-Hill (UK), London.
- Rowe, A. J., Mason, R.O. & Dickel, K.E. (1986). *Strategic management & business policy. A methodological approach*. Addison-Wesley Publishing, Reading.
- Samuels, A. (1985). *Jung and the Post-Jungians*. Routledge, London.
- Shetty, Y.K. (1979). *A new look at corporate goals*. California Management Review, 16(2), 71-79.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *Journal of Psychology*, 25(1), 35-71.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1969). Validity of leader behavior descriptions. *Personnel Psychology*, 22(2), 153-58.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research*. New York: Free Press.
- Stoknes, P.E. (1992). *What is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator?* In: Sharp, D. (Ed.), *Personality types: Jung's Model of Typology*, pp. 103-316., Moxnes Publishing, Oslo.
- Strube, M.J. & Garcia, J.E. (1981). A meta-analytic investigation of Fiedler's contingency model of leadership effectiveness. *Psychological Bulletin*, 90(2), 307-321.
- Trinidad, C. & Normore, A.H. (2005). Leadership and gender: a dangerous liaison? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(7), 574-590.
- Walton E.J. & Dawson, S. (2001). Managers' perception of criteria of organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(2), 173-199.
- Wittmer, D. (1991). Serving for people or serving for pay: Reward preferences amongst government and business managers. *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 14(4), 369-383.
- Yukl, G.A. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 251-289.
- Yukl, G.A. (2010). *Leadership in organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Yukl, G.A., Mahsud, R., Prussia, G. & Hassan, S. (2019). Effectiveness of broad and specific leadership behaviors. *Personnel Review*, 48(3), 774-83.