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PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

- how to approach measuring CEO’s non-conscious motives

- to get know Winter’s scoring method and analyze it results for recognition and evaluation of non-conscious motives (power, affiliation, achievement, and moral responsibility) in the running text
BACKGROUND

- McClelland’s theory: four non-conscious motives and their combinations

- If the leader’s behavior increases his employees’ inner motivation, this is indirectly due to his own internal motives

- **Motivational leadership profile** theory defines a generic combination of motives predicting the leader’s effectiveness.
Measuring motives

- The motives are best measured through associations

- The power of motivation can also be measured through behavior responses (McClelland, 1987)

- Winter (1991a, 1991b) set up a scoring system for measuring motives and responsibilities in running text
Advantages of the Winter’s method

- Indirect method of measuring personality
- “Long-distance” use
- Non-reactivity (enables periodic measurements and adaptability because it can be used for various personality characteristics)
How to find non-conscious motives?

**AFFILIATION-motivated people**: establish, maintain, and restore close personal, emotional relationships with others

**POWER-motivated people**: energetic, seek impact on others, concerned about prestige, great interest in its own right

**ACHIVEMENT-motivated people**: concern for long-term involvement, competition against some standard of excellence, unique accomplishment
+ RESPONSIBILITY

= a complex group of cognitions (convictions and values) that channels, leads, or even obstructs pathways used for expressing motives.

☐ The inclination towards responsibility or the need for social accountability is manifested in five ways:
  - moral and legal behavior
  - internal commitment
  - concern for others
  - concern for consequences
  - self-judgment
Leader motivational profile

- Power motive > median of all power motives,
- Power motive > affiliative motive,
- Inclination towards responsibility > median of all values of inclination towards responsibility
METHOD

Participants
- 59 executives employed in Slovenian
- 47 men and 12 women
- 59.3% ($N = 35$) directors that are not company owners and 40.7% director entrepreneurs (also company founders)
- Average age: 41 and 50 years (Min = 30, Max = 70)

Tools and procedure
- A one-hour structured interview
- Winter’s motive scoring system (Winter, 1992, 1993)

Je še kaj takega, kar bi bilo potrebno upoštevati, da bi lažje razumeli vašo vlogo na tem položaju...

Example of appraisal accordance between the expert and the student (for manager No. 48)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Expert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power motive</td>
<td>Affiliative motive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power motive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative motive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement motive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and legal behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal obligation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for consequences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS – ABOUT THE APPLIED METHOD

- *t*-test indicates important differences by measuring the following motives and responsibility between both groups – social motive ($t = -4.31; p < 0.01$), achievement motive ($t = -9.19; p < 0.01$), and responsibility ($t = 2.79; p < 0.01$) – which may indicate poor calibration of one or another group, or poor recognition of a motive in the texts.

- The average reliability in recognizing motives was 0.40, and 0.37 in recognizing responsibility. The maximum measurement reliability was 0.80, which is still lower than 0.85.
RESULTS – ABOUT THE UNCONSCIOUS MOTIVES

The motives most frequently present:

☐ the achievement motive \((Me = 8.18)\)
☐ the power motive \((Me = 6.12)\)
☐ the affiliative motive \((Me = 2.79)\)
The leader motivational profile

14%

Directors; 33%

Entrepreneurs; 25%
Motives and responsibility regarding the position in the company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power motive</th>
<th>Affiliative motive</th>
<th>Achievement motive</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Moral and legal behavior</th>
<th>Internal obligation</th>
<th>Concern for others</th>
<th>Concern for consequences</th>
<th>Self-judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Directors</strong></td>
<td>5,95</td>
<td>3,49</td>
<td>7,04</td>
<td>4,07</td>
<td>1,03</td>
<td>1,30</td>
<td>0,38</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>1,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,41</td>
<td>2,62</td>
<td>2,33</td>
<td>2,26</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>1,23</td>
<td>0,49</td>
<td>0,40</td>
<td>1,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entrepreneurs</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,41</strong></td>
<td>2,88</td>
<td><strong>9,17</strong></td>
<td>3,55</td>
<td>9,70</td>
<td>1,10</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>1,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,80</td>
<td>1,72</td>
<td>3,54</td>
<td>2,26</td>
<td>0,73</td>
<td>1,39</td>
<td>0,48</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td>0,85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Correlation coefficient between motives and type of responsibility

### Table 3. Correlation coefficients between motives and types of responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power motive</th>
<th>Affiliative motive</th>
<th>Achievement motive</th>
<th>Moral and legal behavior</th>
<th>Internal obligation</th>
<th>Concern for others</th>
<th>Concern for consequences</th>
<th>Self-judgment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliative motive</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement motive</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral and legal behavior</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal obligation</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for others</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for consequences</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-judgment</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility (altogether)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.73*</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < 0.05, ** *p < 0.01

Pearson’s correlation coefficient shows a link between the achievement and social motive (r = 0.28), which indicates a link between pleasant, warm interpersonal relationships and expresses a wish for perfection and high goals.

At the 5% risk level, the connection between the power motive and moral and legal behavior (r = 0.35) is statistically significant. This means that the higher the moral, legal behavior of leaders, the higher their aspiration for power and vice-versa.
Factors that should be better monitored in future studies

- Large number of students

- The inter-rater reliability level between two scorers was also higher for leaders that expressed themselves more clearly during the interview, did not use metaphors, and answered in the first-person singular and not in the first-person plural.

- Reliability was also higher if interviewees divided their thoughts into short statements.
CONCLUSIONS

- Winter’s motive scoring system proved not to be sufficiently reliable

- The achievement and power motivation are prevailing in entrepreneurs, whereas in directors the leader motive profile is more often (33%) noticed

- The leader’s non-conscious need for power is in positive correlation with subordinate’s commitment, satisfaction and motivation
Limitations of the study

- A sample of leaders is always very specific
- The sample studied included no more than 60 directors
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