

Abstract

The present study examined leadership effectiveness in the Chinese work setting using the behavioral complexity model derived from Quinn's (1988) Competing Value Framework. Four hypotheses were generated for empirical testing. Hypothesis 1 studied the underlying construct of leadership behaviors and organization effectiveness. Hypothesis 2 examined the impact of Behavioral Complexity on effectiveness perceptions. Hypothesis 3 investigated the differential expectations among executives themselves, their subordinates and superiors on leadership effectiveness. Hypothesis 4 studied the personality correlates of Behavioral Complexity, specific leadership behaviors, and leadership effectiveness.

Two pilot studies were first carried out to prepare the survey protocols for the Main Study. In the Main Study, completed survey questionnaires were analyzed on a valid sample of 152 senior executives, their immediate superiors (N=111), and at least two immediate subordinates (N=334). First, confirmatory factor analysis identified a five-factor model for both leadership behaviors and organization effectiveness. The five leadership dimensions were Leading Change, Producing Results, Managing Processes, and Relating to People as in the original complexity model, with the additional dimension of Exhibiting Moral Behavior. The five dimensions of organization effectiveness were Open Systems, Rational Goals, Internal Processes, and Human Relations as in the original complexity model, with the additional dimension of Corporate Reputation. Second, Behavioral Complexity was found to have a direct effect on Leadership Effectiveness and Organization Effectiveness. Third, executives themselves, subordinates, and superiors were found to associate different leadership dimensions with leadership effectiveness. Fourth, results indicated that the Social Potency and Interpersonal Relatedness (IR) factors from the Chinese Personality Assessment Inventory (CPAI-2) had a direct effect on Behavioral Complexity in both self- and subordinate-perceptions, but not in superior-perception. Social Potency and IR also explained specific leadership behaviors in both self- and subordinate-perceptions, but not in superior perception.