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ABSTRACT

By and large, the major theories of leadership have not dealt with impact of public executive leaders on followers' performance in a precise and coherent, qualitative research manner. In fact, much leadership work has centered around a dominated empirical focus on style rather than substance in relation to leadership. In addition, most of the leadership work has not adopted a top-level executive focus in the public sector. Theories or research findings developed at lower managerial levels do not necessarily apply to executive levels.

A new grounded low-range theory examining the impact of public executive leaders on followers' performance is presented and qualitatively tested. It is called the Top-Executives Assessment Model of Followers Performance Variables (TEAM). By using the major concepts and the research results from the managerial areas of ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation, the TEAM theory deeply examines the question of how the top-level public leader's abilities affect followers' performance. Propositions and hypotheses are developed to generally investigate the TEAM theory's applicability to public executive leadership. A sample of 31 Colorado top-level public officials is selected. Intensive interview technique is utilized to obtain data on the subject.
Amazingly, the results indicate that public executives rarely consider their leadership, on the surface, to involve their employees; rather they tend to focus outside their departments, toward constituents, or vision, or their executive agenda. It would appear that the TEAM dimensions are not of top of mind salience to these public executives. Of the four TEAM dimensions, only motivation and formal cooperation surfaced recognizably and typically implicitly as dimensions in Public Executive Leadership. Interestingly, the TEAM dimensions surfaced here among State executives in Education, Health, and Personnel — three arenas in which management theory training seems more naturally present. Viewing the entire TEAM theory, the interviewee input can be seen as a relatively reliable (it is consistent) indicator that the theory is face valid in the overall sense. The executives do see themselves as having managed ability, motivation, roles, and cooperation even if they do not delineate them in concept or in action.

This abstract accurately represents the content of the candidate's thesis. I recommend its publication.
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CHAPTER 1
PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION

This chapter illustrates an important feature of the study. It begins with a general informative introduction; followed by several major statements on the focus, purpose and scope of the study. A new theory-building in the field of managerial leadership is presented and discussed. Propositions and hypotheses are also addressed here.

General Introduction

Much of the contemporary literature in public management centers on leadership of our complex and complicated governmental agencies. Leadership has long been a focus of theorists, researchers, and practitioners. Nevertheless, it appears that despite numerous theories and research studies of leadership, there is no universally accepted approach. However, it becomes apparent that effective leadership is necessary for organizational effectiveness and that performance of employees is typically poorer when it is absent. But what makes for effective leadership? There is no simple or single answer to this important question.

The analysis of leadership first requires identification of the process or quality being studied. That is, the concept of leadership must be defined in a way that will identify the kinds of things being examined. Unfortunately, the literature on leadership provides no agreement on a single definition, a situation which is not uncommon in the study of organizations or in the social sciences generally. Perhaps the major definitional problem concerns the relationship of "supervision" and "leadership." Almost all organizations have individuals designated to tell others what to do, to monitor their performance, and to take action to ensure that
they do what they are told, at least within acceptable limits. People who are assigned these responsibilities are referred to by titles such as "supervisor," "manager," or "executive." Are they all leaders? Is what they do leadership?

In one sense, the answer to these questions is no. Some supervisors are ineffective in securing desired behavior. Others rely on rewards and punishments provided by the organization. Some writers on the subject would deny that influence of this kind is leadership, because they reserve the use of that term to refer to influence based on inspiration, admiration, or appeal to followers' aspirations (Peters and Austin, 1985). An additional complication is that some members of the organization may influence the behavior of others even though they are not in supervisory positions. Such informal leaders may get people to do what is desired because they are admired, because they are persuasive, or because they have knowledge needed in a given situation (Fleishman, 1973).

All of these points are valid observations. The individual who influences others solely on the basis of formal authority does not satisfy the popular idea of what a leader is, an idea which may be somewhat vague. Also, the informal leader certainly exists in organizations.

A major task confronting public managers is to provide leadership and secure effective performance in a world that is becoming increasingly specialized and interdependent. Leadership has become the quintessential problem in public management. The dynamics of leadership have remained very much a puzzle. We still know little about what makes a good leader. But this is not for any lack of research on the subject. The late scholar of leadership, Ralph Stogdill, made the discouraging statement that "there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept" (Bass, 1981,
p. 7). Stogdill in his **Handbook of Leadership** reviewed 72 definitions proposed by scholars between 1902-1967. But this lack of consensus has not discouraged researchers. The proliferation of literature on leadership is amply reflected by the increase in the number of articles listed in the **Handbook**. While the old (1974) **Handbook** referred to only 3,000 studies, 7 years later, the number exceeded 5,000. Unfortunately, as Mintzberg (1981) has suggested, the popularity of leadership research was not equaled by its relevance. He states: “Even the titles of the theories — new no less than old — reveal the nature of their content — plodding and detached. Since the beginning, there seems to have been a steady convergence on the peripheral at best, and all too often on the trivial and the irrelevant” (p. 250). Mintzberg was not alone in criticizing excessive abstraction in the study of leadership. Bass (1981, p. 26), in his recent edition of the **Handbook of Leadership**, noted that if a theory of leadership is to be used for diagnosis, training, and development, it must be grounded theory — grounded in the concepts and assumptions acceptable to and used by managers, officials, and emergent leaders.

**Focus, Purpose and Scope of the Study**

**A New Theory-Building**

A grounded low-range theory examining the impact of public executive leaders on followers' performance is presented and qualitatively tested. A sample of 31 Colorado public officials (executive departments **directors** and **deputy directors** and the **managers** of home rule cities) is selected. Intensive **interview** technique is utilized to obtain data on the subject. The chief focus of the study is the public leaders' role in assessing performance deficiencies in followers and the kinds of treatments they implement to alleviate such deficiencies and increase followers' performance effectiveness.
The new theory presented and tested in this study is called "The Top Executives Assessment Model of Followers Performance Variables — TEAM." By using the major concepts and the research results from the managerial areas of ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation (Wofford, 1979; Hackman and Oldham, 1980; Rosenbach and Taylor, 1989; and Bennis, 1990), the TEAM theory deeply examines the QUESTION of how the top-level public leader's abilities directly affect followers' performance. It assumes that the analytic and perceptual ability of upper-level leaders affect the way organization members behave and perform their tasks (House 1971; Ivancevich and McMahon, 1977; Forbes and Barrett, 1978; Becker, 1978; Wofford, 1982; and Tjosvold and others, 1983). Propositions and hypotheses are developed to generally investigate the TEAM theory's applicability to public executive leadership.

The range-level for the focus of this study is as follows:

High-Range Focus: Leadership Theory

Mid-Range Focus: Understanding the Mechanisms by which Upper-Level Leaders Directly and Significantly Affect Followers' Performance.

Low-Range Focus: A Study and Analysis of the Role of Top-Level Leaders in the Public Sector in Assessing the Deficiencies in the Followers' Ability, Motivation, Role Perception, and Formal Cooperation and also in Taking Actions to Alleviate Deficiencies which Inhibit Followers' Performance.

Moreover, the theory presented in this study has the following important characteristics:
• It views the upper-level leader, regardless of the leadership style, as a person who continuously monitors and analyzes deficiencies in the existing conditions which determine followers' performance and takes action to alleviate the deficiencies.

• It maintains the notion that the leadership process occurs within an organizational context that influences the followers' performance variables.

• It sees the follower's performance as caused by four factors: ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation.

By this emphasis, the study departs from the focus on leader style or behavior dimensions which has been emphasized by leadership theorists for the past two decades (Likert, 1961; Fiedler, 1967; House, 1971; Fleishman, 1973; Vroom and Yetton, 1973; Stogdill, 1974; Blake and Mouton, 1978, 1981; Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich, 1985; Miller and Toulouse, 1986; Conger, 1989). It accepts the basic position of House's (1971) Path-Goal theory that the most appropriate perspective for examining leader effectiveness is in terms of the leader's impact upon the follower's performance.

The basic thesis of the TEAM theory is that followers' performance effectiveness is mostly, if not totally, a function of the upper public leader's ability to assess and alleviate any deficiencies in the followers' ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation. And as a major purpose, this study examines the following fundamental elements:

1. What the leader needs in order to affect followers' performance variables (ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation);
2. What determines each follower performance variable;
3. What makes each follower performance variable deficient;
4. How the leader overcomes or alleviates deficiencies in each follower performance variable.
Public Executive Leadership Defined

For the purpose of this study public executive leadership is defined as a process of influence on a group in a particular situation that stimulates followers to strive willingly to attain organizational objectives, giving them the experience of helping attain the common objectives and satisfaction with the type of leadership provided. Certain key ideas in this definition require explanation (Tosi and Carrol, 1970; Gribbin, 1972; Rosenbach and Taylor, 1989; Hunt, 1991).

Process of Influence

Public managers must relate to and interact with their followers. Leadership is not a now-and-then thing, exercised when emergencies arise. It is a continuous effort on the part of the manager. It seeks not reflex responses to organizational demands but rather that plus factor which makes the difference between mediocrity and excellence. The manager is the leader of his people when — note the verb — they allow him to influence their thinking, their abilities, and their behavior. Influence implies that the manager is accepted by his subordinates, is looked to for guidance and direction, is perceived by them as capable of helping them satisfy their needs and aims.

In a Particular Situation

The quest for an abstraction called leadership has been as fruitless and frustrating as that for the universal solvent. Leadership, like medicine, is never general, always particular. Despite the tendency of many executives to act on the basis of habit and past successes rather than insight into present realities, it seems rather evident that a type of leadership behavior well suited to one situation may be entirely inappropriate in another.
Stimulates Followers to Strive Willingly to Attain Organizational Objectives; Giving Them the Experience of Helping Attain the Common Objectives

This process begins with the leader’s ultimate responsibility to (a) **direct** by allocating authority, by determining necessary functions, by assigning personnel to specific tasks, by maximizing motivation, ability, and commitment in the workplace, by allowing key people the autonomy to perform and achieve, by setting criteria for acceptable output, and by exacting accountability for results according to those criteria; (b) **coordinate** the work of individuals and groups so that they operate as a unified whole; (c) **gain cooperation** from and among her followers by arranging conditions so that they can achieve organizational ends while satisfying some of their job-related needs, by giving an example, and by creating a climate of cooperation and mutual assistance; (d) **control** the efforts of her subordinates by maintaining a feedback system that provides her with valid data early enough in the game to take corrective action; and (e) **review and evaluate** the work of her followers informally and formally not merely to satisfy the requirements of the work but also to help them become more productive and more valuable to the organization.

**Satisfaction with the Type of Leadership Provided**

Although the leader does his best to influence subordinates, he needs to allow them ample latitude for influencing him when they are competent to do so. When they are knowledgeable enough to be of assistance, he consults with his key people; he seeks their suggestions and advice; he provides honest opportunities for them to participate in the formulation of decisions that will affect them, their status, or their work. Over and beyond this, leadership is best seen as a shared function.
The **VALUE POSITION** that underlies the above definition springs from the **leader role of the top-level executive** in which the organization looks to its formal head for guidance and motivation. In his **leader role**, the **executive** defines the atmosphere in which the organization will work.

The tone of the organization is usually sounded by its **top executive**, and the success of the enterprise may well depend on whether he infuses the whole hierarchy with energy and vision or whether, through ineptness or neglect, he allows the organization to stagnate (Harbison and Myers, 1959, pp. 15-16).

Leadership involves interpersonal relationships between the leader and the led; that is, it involves attempts on the part of a leader (influencer) to affect (influence) the behavior of a follower (influencee) or followers in a particular situation. **Power is potential for influence.** However, even though an individual may possess considerable power in relationship to another, she may for a number of reasons (her personal values, apparent lack of necessity to do so, misjudgment) not use all of the power available to her. A leadership act reflects that portion of the power available to an individual which she chooses to employ at the time.

It should be noted, in contrast to the above view, that the concept power frequently connotes a potential for coercion, based, for example, upon physical force, informal social pressure, law, and authority. In actuality, a given leader typically has available not only these external sources providing him with power, but also power derived from such inner resources as understanding, flexibility, and gaining **willing cooperation** of followers.

In analyzing the activities that make up the **leader role** of the executive, it must be noted first that leadership permeates all activities; its importance would be underestimated if it were judged in terms of the proportion of an executive's activities that are strictly related to leader-
ship. Each time an executive encourages or criticizes a subordinate he is acting in his capacity as leader. Most often, he does these things when he is engaged in activities that have other basic purposes — to transmit information or to make strategic decisions. But in virtually everything he does, the executive's actions are screened by subordinates searching for leadership clues. In answering a request for authorization, he may encourage or inhibit a subordinate, and even in his form of greeting, messages (perhaps nonexistent ones) may be read by anxious subordinates.

Some activities may be categorized as concerned primarily with leadership. A special class are those associated with staffing — hiring, training, judging, remunerating, promoting, and dismissing subordinates. Another class of activities includes those primarily motivational in nature, as illustrated by the following anecdotes:

A subordinate turns to the manager for advice on a personal problem and for reassurance that his work is adequate.

The manager uses his authority in a memo to a subordinate: “I was thinking about the lead; wonder if we shouldn’t follow up more aggressively.”

During a tour of the organization, the manager calls on an employee who has been ill; he greets another employee, asks about his work, and compliments him on his achievements.

The executive looks for operations that are going wrong, problems in need of attention, and subordinates who require encouragement or criticism. In effect, it is up to her to maintain a certain degree of alertness in the organization. The executive is able to probe freely because she alone is not constrained by well-defined bounds of authority within her organization. She is the only one in the organization with a very broad mandate — to put this another way, she is the only one who can meddle at will — and her activities clearly reflect this.

In concluding this discussion, two points should be noted. First, the
key purpose of the leader role of the executive is to effect an integration between individual needs and organizational goals. The executive must concentrate his efforts so as to bring subordinate and organizational needs into a common accord in order to promote efficient operations. **Second,** it is in the leader role that managerial power most clearly manifests itself. Formal authority vests the executive with great potential power; leadership activity determines how much of it will be realized. William F. Whyte in his study of a street gang provides an apt illustration of the extent of this power.

The leader is the focal point for the organization of his group. In his absence, the members of the gang are divided into a number of small groups. There is no common activity or general conversation. When the leader appears, the situation changes strikingly. The small units form into one large group. The conversation becomes general, and unified action frequently follows. The leader becomes the central point in the discussion. A follower starts to say something, pauses when he notices that the leader is not listening, and begins again when he has the leader's attention. When the leader leaves the group, unity gives way to the divisions that existed before his appearance (1955, p. 258).

Thus, through the "leader role" the executive welds diverse elements into a cooperative enterprise.

**Research Focus on Definition**

It's important to note that it is extremely difficult to heavily use the definition of leadership stated above in this study because of its virtue of generality. Such definition is applicable to all interpersonal relationships in which influence efforts are involved.

**It treats leadership as a process or function rather than as an exclusive attribute of a prescribed role.** The subordinate often influences the superior, the customer, the group member, and the chairman. In any given relationship, the roles of the influencer and the
influencee often shift from one person to the other. Conceptually, the influence process or function is present even though the specific individuals taking the roles of influencer and influencee may vary. Thus, the leader role is one which is rarely taken continuously by one individual, even under specific conditions with the same persons. Instead, it is one that is taken at one time or another by each individual.

Despite all of the above difficulties, and consistent with the above definition, two observable interrelated indicators are employed to help the researcher determine (a) whether the executives targeted for contact are in fact leaders according to the definition and the model of leadership stated in this study; and (b) whether the willing cooperation of followers is generally gained; those two indicators are illustrated and explained in Figure 1.1 on the following page.

Statement of the Problem

By and large, the major theories of leadership have not dealt with impact of public executive leaders on followers' performance in a precise and coherent, qualitative research manner. In fact, much leadership work has centered around a dominated empirical focus on style rather than substance in relation to leadership. Factors like the analytic and perceptual ability of leaders, their experience, or their capacity to significantly impact followers performance are not incorporated into frameworks that focus only on style. McGregor (1960), for example, is concerned principally with management philosophies based on X, Y theories; House (1971) (1972), with conditions under which structuring and considerate behavior are to be used; Vroom and Yetton (1973), with strategies to determine when the leader should behave in an autocratic or participative manner; Fiedler (1967), with task-motivated and relationship-motivated style; McClelland (1975) (1985) and Miner
1. The Leader's Perceptual Flexibility Regarding Attributes of the Follower and Attributes of the Situation — The range of perceptions which the leader may have available as he seeks "understanding" of follower and situation. In this respect, the leader may seek to share cognitively the follower's total phenomenological field — to see things from the latter's point of view. He may seek to assess the impact upon the follower of stimuli derived from the various elements of the situation. And the leader may wish to predict how he himself is perceived by the follower. Thus, as the leader responds to the follower, the former deals not simply with the latter's relatively stable personality characteristics, but rather with the interaction of these characteristics with stimuli emitted by the leader and by elements in the follower's situation.

2. The Leader's Perceptual Accuracy of Followers — The relevance and correctness of his perceptions of follower's ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation; the leader is effective and accepted by followers as he/she seeks to maximize those perceptions which are both relevant and correct.

This suggests that the leader needs to be skillful in assessing (diagnosing) performance deficiencies in followers as a preliminary to action or treatment. In doing so, he forms a mental image of the barriers and facilitating circumstances that bear on the desired goals of his leadership behavior. He further visualizes (sometimes explicitly and sometimes implicitly) those action pathways open to him which will lead to willing cooperation of followers and performance effectiveness.

This system of action capacities, viewed as a potential for responding behaviorally under a variety of conditions, is the leader's need. It provides the basis for the course which the leader follows in his effort to exert influence toward the attainment of a specified goal by the follower. The degree to which the leader-selected behaviors are actually appropriate, i.e., succeed in moving the follower toward attainment of the specified goal, succeed in ignoring or discarding irrelevant and incorrect perceptions, is a measure of leadership effectiveness.

Further, one causal schema which is particularly pertinent to the leader-follower interaction describes causal explanations for success and failure at achievement-related tasks (Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, Nest, and Rosenbaum, 1972). Weiner et al. (1972) indicate that a follower whose successes are seen as due to ability and effort could be expected to have a very different relationship or exchange (willing cooperation) with the leader than a follower whose successes were attributed to luck or an easy task.
(1978), with leader motivation; Burns (1978) and Bass (1985) with leader behavior which transforms the individual's goals; and lastly many other leadership studies (e.g., Stogdill 1974, Kelly 1967, Blake and Mouton 1978) concentrate, through questionnaire responses, on the narrow question of how the dimensions of Consideration and Initiating Structure relate to followers' performance. Thus, there seem to be grounds for serious concern for studies of leadership in which the styles focus and the questionnaire measures have played a prominent part. A further source of concern derives from studies which suggest that questionnaire measures of leader behavior are too static, since leaders vary their styles to a very considerable degree (Hill, 1973). Many of the more conventional leadership scales, such as Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ), Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ), and the Supervisory Behavior Description Questionnaire (SBDQ) are beset with problems of validity and reliability or both because they fail to exhibit acceptable convergent and discriminant validities (Schriesheim and Kerr, 1977). Moreover, many studies of leader behavior derive from cross-sectional research designs which have been shown to provide dubious conclusions about the direction of causality (Bryman, 1986). All this malady has afflicted the more recent contingency approaches to the study of leadership, as well as the earlier nonsituational approaches (Bryman, 1986). Further, since many leadership theories and models derive from or are tested by research in which the mail questionnaires (questions which make up leader behavior scales) are the predominant method of data collection, many of these theories and models are also rendered questionable.

An additional important obstacle deeply related to this problem is that most of the leadership work has not adopted a top-level executive focus in the public sector (Greenwald, Pratkanis, Leippe, and Baumgardner, 1986). The focus adopted by most of the leadership researchers or
theorists has been primarily lower-level leadership. Theories or empirical findings developed at lower levels do not necessarily apply to executive levels. In particular, there are two major difficulties in applying theories or results from studies of lower-level leadership to upper-level of an organization. First, leadership at lower-levels is qualitatively different from upper-level leadership. Katz and Kahn (1966, 1978), Mintzberg (1973), and others have noted the qualitatively different nature of managerial and leader roles across levels. According to Katz and Kahn (1966, 1978) leaders at the top organizations create organizational structure, formulate policy, insure high performance, and develop corporate strategies. Middle-level leaders interpret and elaborate structure, policy, performance, and strategy; and lower-level leaders use technical knowledge, rewards, and sanctions to administer existing structure. Applying leadership theories developed at low-levels to explain leadership at upper-levels assumes close similarity across levels that is mostly not true. Also, theories developed at lower-levels may provide theoretical blinders since they are based primarily on ideas borrowed from the social, motivational, and cognitive areas of psychology; and this keeps researchers from discovering more appropriate perspectives when they focus on upper-level leadership (Sherwood, 1984; Greenwald, Pratkanis, Leippe, and Baumgardner, 1986). It is very essential, then, that researchers and theorists interested in leadership theory to fully consider upper-levels of management as an important practical domain that need much more theoretical and research attention.

**Specification and Implication of the New “TEAM” Theory**

As shown in Figure 1.2 below, the TEAM theory presented in this study contends that the leadership process involves three primary
**Figure 1.2: The Top Executives Assessment Model of Followers' Performance Variables (TEAM)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Performance Factors</th>
<th>Leader Need</th>
<th>Followers Performance Variables</th>
<th>Leader Treatments to Alleviate Performance Deficiencies in Followers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ability Assessment</em></td>
<td><em>Accurate Feedback on Follower Performance</em></td>
<td><em>Ability Variable; Determined by the Basic Components of Task Achievement:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sufficient Administrative Authority</em></td>
<td><em>Knowledge</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Capability to (a) Perceive what Should be Done,</em></td>
<td><em>Skills</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Influence Followers to Achieve Significant Results,*</td>
<td><em>Experience</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and (c) Bring Order to Chaotic Situations.*</td>
<td><em>Ability Deficiencies Exist because of:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lack of Knowledge</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Low Skills</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Insufficient Experience</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Motivation Assessment</em></td>
<td><em>Accurate Feedback on Follower Performance</em></td>
<td><em>Motivation Variable; Determined by Three Basic Dimensions:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sufficient Administrative Authority</em></td>
<td><em>Task Goal Level</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Capability to (a) Perceive what Should be Done,</em></td>
<td><em>Task Goal Specificity</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Influence Followers to Achieve Significant Results,*</td>
<td><em>Task Goal Commitment</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and (c) Bring Order to Chaotic Situations.*</td>
<td><em>Motivation Deficiencies Exist because of:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lower-Level Goals</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Non-Specific Goals</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Low Level of Commitment to Goals</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Role Perception Assessment</em></td>
<td><em>Accurate Feedback on Follower Performance</em></td>
<td><em>Role Perception Variable; Determined by Three Primary Elements:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sufficient Administrative Authority</em></td>
<td><em>Role Clarity</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Capability to (a) Perceive what Should be Done,</em></td>
<td><em>Role Compatibility</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Influence Followers to Achieve Significant Results,*</td>
<td><em>Role Accuracy</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and (c) Bring Order to Chaotic Situations.*</td>
<td><em>Role Perception Deficiencies Exist because of:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Role Ambiguity</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Role Conflict</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Role Inaccuracy</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Formal Cooperation Assessment</em></td>
<td><em>Accurate Feedback on Follower Performance</em></td>
<td><em>Formal Cooperation Variable; Determined by Two Basic Aspects:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Sufficient Administrative Authority</em></td>
<td><em>Goal Interdependence Among Organizational Members</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Capability to (a) Perceive what Should be Done,</em></td>
<td><em>Goal Interdependence Among Organizational Subunits</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Influence Followers to Achieve Significant Results,*</td>
<td><em>Formal Cooperation Deficiencies Exist because of:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and (c) Bring Order to Chaotic Situations.*</td>
<td><em>Quantitative Work Overload</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Qualitative Work Overload</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Intergroup Conflict</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Alleviating or Decreasing Ability Deficiencies:** Includes the following fundamental elements: Selection and Placement, Transfer (to a job where a follower could accomplish most.)
- **Job Instruction Training**
- **Job Redesign**

- **Alleviating or Decreasing Motivation Deficiencies:** Related to the Leader's impact on goal setting; this involves four major steps:
  - Define the task structure, authority, and accountability involved
  - Monitor the tasks achievement process to remove any barriers to goal attainment
  - Give feedback along the way by counseling and sharing experiences
  - Reward and recognize efforts as well as results

- **Alleviating or Decreasing Role Perception Deficiencies:** Requires three essential actions:
  - In-group exchange (task-related information to clarify role requirements and role actual performance)
  - Providing mode of communication through formal performance feedback
  - Periodic high task orientation (instruction, guidance, and expectations associated with various role sets)

- **Alleviating or Decreasing Formal Cooperation Deficiencies:** Requires three fundamental elements:
  - Applying group-coherence dynamic to the workplace (interaction requirement of the task performance process)
  - Applying the unity of command to the work procedures
  - Rewards dependence on the combined effort of all organizational members
components — the leader, the follower, and the work environment. The theory, as discussed earlier, is concerned with identifying conditions in which upper-level public leader ability yields effective followers' performance. Followers' performance is determined by the followers' ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation. These micro followers' performance variables have a direct effect on performance and also have interaction effects. For example, followers' motivation strongly affects the performance of high ability individuals but has little effect on the performance of low ability individuals. Followers' ability includes the main components of task or work achievement — knowledge, skills, and experience. These ability areas are significant for performance regardless of the nature of the task. Followers' motivation is mainly determined by the task goal level, task goal specificity and task goal commitment. Followers' role perception includes role clarity, role compatibility and role accuracy. Followers' formal cooperation is mainly determined by goal interdependence among (a) organizational members and (b) organizational subunits.

Handling performance effectively involves two basic elements: (1) the analysis of any performance deficiencies in followers, and (2) implementing appropriate treatment to alleviate these deficiencies. Figure 1.2 illustrates what the leader needs in order to assess the followers' performance; and identifies the basic types of treatments the leader would implement to eliminate or decrease deficiencies in each follower performance variable.

Followers' performance is seen as caused by four factors (see Figure 1.2):

- **Ability**, as an important determinant of individual performance, refers to the essential means to get the task done effectively — knowledge, skills, and experience. A follower is considered defi-
cient in ability if he/she demonstrates any of the following: Insufficient job knowledge — a lack of adequate information about job duties and/or job requirements; insufficient experience — a lack of experience with a particular type of job e.g., being unaware of a department policy or productivity standard; low work skills — a worker defining performance in terms of very low personal standards and/or experiencing satisfaction at low levels of performance. The theory holds that the upper-level leader can maximize the follower's ability through placement, transfer, selection, job-instruction training, or the job redesign to allow a closer match of job specifications and individual abilities. As for the other follower performance variables, the leader's behavior with regard to increasing follower ability may be facilitated or inhibited by the nature of administrative authority. For example, the organization may relegate the placement or training function entirely to a personnel department, leaving little opportunity for the leader to act.

• Motivation, as an individual performance determinant, involves three basic dimensions, task goal level, task goal specificity, and task goal commitment. The task goal level is the difficulty level of an assigned or self-generated goal. It's the degree of proficiency or level of goal performance being sought. It is generally agreed that the more difficult the goal, the higher the level of performance (Locke, Shaw, Sarri, and Lathama, 1969). The important point, however, is that it works this way if the goals are accepted. A point of diminishing returns appears to be a real issue concerning goal difficulty. Moreover, if and when a goal is perceived as so difficult that is virtually impossible to attain, the result is often frustration rather than achievement. Task goal specificity is the degree to which the
goal is clearly and unambiguously identified. It's the degree of precision or clarity of the goal. Task goal commitment is the acceptance and desire to attain the task goal level. It's the amount of effort actually used to achieve a goal. Four major treatments are illustrated in Figure 1.2 to overcome deficiencies associated with motivation. In short, leaders must be concerned with these three main sources of motivation because they are concerned with performance.

- **Role perception** refers to the clarity, compatibility, and accuracy of the follower's cognition regarding the role to perform. A follower's high ability and motivation can be rendered ineffective if the follower wastes his efforts in doing the wrong things and not fully understanding his/her job duties. Role perception deficiencies involve three dimensions, **role ambiguity**, **role conflict**, and **role inaccuracy**. Role conflict is the degree of incongruity or incompatibility of the expectations associated with the role. Employees frequently are confronted with situations in which they may be required to play a role which conflicts with their value systems or to play multiple roles which conflict with each others. Role ambiguity is defined as the lack of clarity and predictability of the outcomes of one's behavior; moreover, it is the degree to which clear information is lacking regarding (a) the expectations associated with a role, (b) methods for fulfilling known role expectations, and/or (c) the consequences of role performance. Moreover, role ambiguity could possibly take one or all of the following forms: (a) information is unclear regarding which potential role expectation — A, B, or C — should be performed; (b) it is understood that expectation A should be met, but information is unclear regarding what behavior will in fact yield A; (c) the consequences of behavior A are unclear. It should be noted
that each of these forms of role ambiguity may exhibit a reciprocal causal relationship with dimensions of role conflict. Thus, even though role conflict and role ambiguity are conceptually distinguishable types of role stress, one should not expect their research indices necessarily to be unrelated. An inaccurate role is one that yields outcomes that do not achieve the desired goals. A leader may clearly define what he or she expects of a follower with no conflicts involved. Yet this defined role may yield outcomes that are ineffective. Figure 1.2 identifies three possible treatments to reduce deficiencies in role perception.

- **Formal Cooperation** refers to the notion that leaders need not follow the traditional patterns of organizational structures — that is they don’t have to view the organization as a pyramid (hierarchy) with the leader’s authority following down from the apex. There is a better way to conceive an organization; that is to establish a cooperative approach — a system of organization, which is directed at getting things done rather than something to be placed on a sheet of chart paper. Such approach is the opposite of a strict defined hierarchy of authority and a rigid chain of command (Tjosvold, Andrews and Jones, 1983). As shown in Figure 1.2, formal cooperation variable implies the notion of “goal interdependence” in which organizational members depend on each other for accomplishing their tasks and that the organizational subunits themselves need to effectively coordinate with each other to achieve their work objectives. Basically, such interdependence occurs when two or more groups within an organization must depend on each other to complete their tasks; or that the output of one group serves as the input to other groups in the organization. Leaders can positively influence the
formal cooperation through group-coherence dynamic, unity of command, and rewards dependence on the combined effort of the organizational members. The simple theory of the cooperative approach is that all of the workers, at all levels, are known as associates; there are no designated leaders and followers; persons can cooperatively combine their energy, ideas, and perspectives to accomplish tasks proficiently; most complex tasks are better completed in cooperation than by persons working in a segregated manner. All this creates a system of self-obligation that is both more flexible and more powerful as a motivating tool.

The Dynamic of the TEAM Theory

Having made these basic observations about the TEAM model and its four key performance factors (ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation), I will now discuss some additional considerations that arise in connection with the overall components of the model.

Consistent with the TEAM model, the top executive leaders are expected to have diagnostic and prescriptive abilities. The model suggests that leadership involves the perceptual ability of leaders (they are good at observing how followers are actually doing) and their analytic ability to diagnose what the followers are doing wrong. Coupled with this diagnostic skill is an ability to prescribe treatments that will cure the followers’ dysfunctional behaviors.

In introducing diagnosis-prescription analysis, it is critical to keep the concept in proper perspective with regard to a manager’s need to achieve results. While it is easy to recognize the “big problem” when it arises, it is often the little, rather insidious ones that (because of their cumulative nature) create the most intolerable situations. When a fol-
lower's dysfunctional behavior becomes visible, the leader has two sound responses to fix the situation:

1. I know why it is happening and, therefore, it is only a question of choosing an appropriate action (treatment).
2. I am not sure why it is happening and, therefore, I must analyze the problem prior to fixing it.

There is of course a third reaction which, unfortunately, is all too prevalent, and it is:

3. I think I know the cause and, therefore, I will take an action.

The impact of this reaction is that trial and error takes precedence over conscious analysis. Every "intuitive hunch" yields another response and that can lead to a waste of energy and resources. As "fix" gets piled upon "fix," the true situation tends to get fuzzier and thus more difficult to resolve. The correct definition of the word "fix" means to remove the cause.

In reality, it is wise to note that determining whether the leaders do in fact have the diagnosis-prescription abilities will largely depend on the researcher's attentiveness to whatever behaviors the leaders engage in that seem appropriate to this notion of "abilities." This strategy is consistent with the research approach of this study which is mostly exploratory in nature.

Moreover, in order to achieve a simplified working structure for the TEAM model, the four key performance-factor areas, which the model contains, have been already defined and explained; and the following additional explanation and definitions should help reduce the general complexity of the model.

**Follower Performance Effectiveness**

Follower performance is the foundation of organizational performance. Consequently, leaders must have more than passing knowledge about the
determinants of follower performance. In the context of the TEAM theory follower performance effectiveness refers to the ability of the leader to diagnose what the followers are doing wrong in the areas of ability, motivation, role perception and formal cooperation; and prescribe treatments that will cure the followers' dysfunctional behaviors.

Leader's Ability

A dimension of leadership which refers to the effective utilization of whatever supervisory practices are indicated by the particular requirements of the situation. For the TEAM model, executive leaders are expected to have diagnostic and prescriptive abilities.

Perceptual Ability

A perspective on effectiveness which emphasizes the extent to which the leaders are good at observing how followers are actually doing.

Leadership Effectiveness

The definition of leadership stated in this study focuses on influence efforts rather than upon influence effects. Therefore, the effectiveness of any influence attempt must always be assessed with reference to the leader's intended goal or goals. No leadership act is inherently effective or ineffective; it might be either, depending upon the goals with reference to which it is assessed.

Role

Role relates to the expected behavior patterns attributed to a particular status position.
Role Set
This refers to those employees who have expectations associated with their roles performance. The more expectations, the more complex the role set.

Formal Administrative Authority
It basically resides in the role expectation of the position occupants. Thus, an influence attempt based on authority is generally not resisted because when joining an organization individuals become aware that the exercise of authority is required of leaders and compliance is required of followers. Moreover, there must be some relationship between the responsibilities of leaders and the authority that they exercise; the desired relationship is equality between the two. Yet there is no easy way to assess the relationship, particularly as one examines the responsibilities of upper level leaders. The principle states no formula by which one can equate authority and responsibility, and, in fact, no such formula may exist. Yet this recognition does not violate the basic premise of the principle, which is that if one is expected to direct and assess the efforts of followers, one should also be delegated the right to give orders and the power to exact obedience. The recognition of authority is necessary for performance effectiveness and is a cost of organizational membership.

Intergroup Conflict
Any confrontation or interaction between groups or subunits that hinders the level of formal cooperation within an organization and therefore obstructs the achievement of organizational goals.

Group-Coherence
Two or more employees who interact with each other in such a manner
that the behavior and/or performance of a member is influenced by the behavior and/or performance of other members. In a straightforward manner, this is the “stick-togetherness” quality of a group.

In-Group Exchange

A concept which suggests that it is necessary for a leader to establish a unit or a group to serve as a permanent source of knowledge or information on paths to goal attainment and role requirements.

Job Redesign

An administrative action that involves increasing the range of a job; or building into a job greater scope for personal advancement and more challenging and responsible work; or moving an employee from one to another work station. The hoped-for results are jobs which fulfill important needs and led to effective performance outcomes.

Formal Performance Feedback

The process of providing sufficient information about how leaders view and examine the followers' job performance. Without feedback, knowledge about progress, development and clarity about expectations is difficult to attain.

Task Structure

A factor which refers to how structured a job is with regard to requirements and feedback on the correctness of accomplishing the job.

Reward

One of the most powerful processes influencing followers performance is the leader's handling of the organization's reward system. Not only can
leadership use rewards to increase performance of its present followers, it can also use rewards to specifically maximize motivation and raise the level of formal cooperation among followers as well as organization's subunits. Monetary rewards are important aspects of the reward system, but not the only aspect. Performance of the work itself can provide followers with intrinsic maturity particularly if performance of the job leads to a sense of personal responsibility, effort recognition, and meaningfulness. To the extent that leaders can design work to include these potentialities, the reward system is considerably more powerful than one which relies exclusively on extrinsic rewards (pay, promotion, etc.).

Mode of Communication
The transmission of job instructions and related information and understanding from leaders to followers through the use of direct performance feedback.

High Task Orientation
A concept which refers to the focus of attention and role effectiveness among members of a subunit.

Unity of Command
It refers to the notion that each employee within an organization should have only one superior and that person is usually immediately above in the hierarchy. The purpose is not only to reduce confusion for the role of the individual employee but also to unify direction, promote formal job cooperation and minimize any conflicting roles expectations.

Quantitative Work Overload
A situation in which a follower feels that he or she has too many work-related activities to do or insufficient time to complete a job.
Qualitative Work Overload

A follower's lack of understanding or joint effort to do the job or that performance standards are set too high.

Job-Instruction Training

A dimension of formal training structure which provides a set of guidelines for undertaking on-the-job training for employees. After trainees are introduced to the job, they receive a step-by-step review and demonstration of the job functions. When trainees are sufficiently confident that they understand the job they demonstrate their ability to perform the job. This demonstration continues until the trainees reach a satisfactory level of performance.

In conclusion, then, the TEAM theory or model proposes a new managerial leadership synthesis that provides both a significant and practical approach to managing and increasing followers' performance. It presents workable managerial concepts that can be applied by managers on a day-to-day basis to positively affect the performance of followers.

Central Propositions and Hypotheses

Of course, at this theoretical investigation stage the TEAM theory stated in this study has not received any conceptual research attention. Therefore, from the overall analytical discussion above, the propositions and hypotheses of this study can be stated as follows:

Leader Assessing and Alleviating of Followers' Ability Deficiencies

Proposition 1. If follower ability is deficient the leader may remove the deficiency and assure improved performance by providing job-instruction training opportunities, by selecting followers with the required
abilities, or by altering the job so that it is compatible with the follower's abilities.

**Hypothesis 1.1.** In situations in which followers are deficient in ability, a high level of leader action that increases follower ability will result in a high level of follower performance effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 1.2.** In situations in which barriers inhibit the application of follower abilities to the achievement of task performance, the greater the degree that the leader removes the inhibiting barriers the higher the level of follower performance effectiveness.

**Factors to be considered.**

a. For this study, ability refers, as mentioned earlier, to the task achievement requirements — knowledge, skills and experience.

b. The approaches that the leader may use in alleviating or decreasing ability deficiencies mainly include selection, placement, transfer, job-instruction training, and job redesign.

c. An avenue for enhancing follower performance effectiveness may be found through analysis of the ability demands of the tasks as a basis for taking action to establish a match with follower ability (Hackman and Oldham, 1980; Wofford, 1982).

d. The ability variable aims mostly at matching followers (workers) with job requirements.

e. For the ability variable, it's important that the leader acts directly to instruct and advise followers, and provides more formal training opportunities (Yukl, 1981; Clegg, 1990; Bryman, 1992).

f. Job enrichment approaches, job analysis and in-service training may be a fruitful guide to the leader in redesigning the work to match the workers (Sims and Lorenzi, 1992).
g. Situations may occur in which followers possess the required abilities (knowledge, skills, and experience) but are unable to apply them to the job. Leader effectiveness in this situation is mostly determined by the ability to remove the inhibiting barriers (inaccurate feedback, being ignorant of the follower, stressful relationship . . .).

**Leader Assessing and Alleviating of Followers' Motivation Deficiencies**

**Proposition 2.** If follower motivation is deficient and not at the optimal level for the task, the leader may remove the deficiency and assure improved performance by (a) defining the task structure, authority, and accountability involved; (b) monitoring the tasks achievement process to remove any barriers to goal attainment; (c) giving feedback along the way; and (d) rewarding and recognizing efforts as well as results.

**Hypothesis 2.1.** In situations in which followers tend to have low level goals, leader action that establishes or that influences followers to establish difficult but attainable goals for follower performance results in higher level of performance effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 2.2.** In situations in which follower goals tend to be nonspecific, leader action that establishes or that influences follower to establish specific goals results in a higher level of follower performance effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 2.3.** In situations in which followers tend to have a low level of commitment to goals, leader action that increases follower commitment to performance goals results in an increase in follower performance.

**Factors to be considered.**

a. As stated above, motivation variable is mainly determined by task goal level, task goal specificity, and task goal commitment.
b. The TEAM theory presented in this study contends that the upper-level leader is effective to the extent that he/she is able to establish (by assignment or self generation) goals with an optimal difficulty level.

c. Approaches that the leader may use to influence the goal difficulty level for his/her followers include: providing accurate feedback, being supportive of the follower, training followers in goal setting, and selecting followers with a high need for achievement (Becker, 1978; Latham and Sarri, 1979; Wofford, 1982).

d. The performance associated with specific, hard goals is significantly more effective than performance associated with nonspecific goals of “do your best,” (Smith and Peterson, 1988; McWhinney, 1992).

e. The importance of goal specificity may depend on follower maturity, job interest, decisiveness, and education level (Ivancevich and McMahon, 1977 a, b, c).

f. Leader support is important in reducing the negative relationship of lack of goal clarity with performance (Tosi and Carroll, 1970).

g. The leader may use a number of variables that could affect the level of task goal commitment: expectations of success, values, challenge and meaningfulness of the task, participation, incentives, and competition (Fisher, 1979; Mento, Cartledge and Locke, 1980; Locke, Shaw, Sarri and Latham, 1980).

h. Followers with an internal locus of control, high achievement motivation, and self-esteem tend to have higher commitment (Misumi and Seki, 1971; Runyon, 1973; Dossett, Latham and Mitchell, 1979).

Leader Assessing and Alleviating of Followers’ Role Perception Deficiencies

Proposition 3. If follower role perception is ambiguous, conflicting, or inaccurate, the leader may remove the deficiency and assure improved
performance through in-group exchange (task-related information), formal performance feedback, and periodic high task orientation (instruction, guidance and expectations associated with various role sets).

**Hypothesis 3.1.** In situations in which followers have role perception deficiencies, leader action that decreases or alleviates role ambiguity, role conflict, or role inaccuracy results in increased follower performance effectiveness.

**Factors to be considered.**

a. Role conflict and role inaccuracy have been demonstrated to be correlated with several organizationally dysfunctional outcomes, among them unsatisfactory work group relationships (French and Caplan, 1972), slower and less accurate group performance (Liddel and Slocum, 1976), lower commitment to the organization (Baird, 1969), lower performance evaluations (Haas, 1964), and inadequate perceived leader behavior (Perreault and Miles, 1976; Wofford, 1982).

b. Experimental and longitudinal studies of the effects of role ambiguity reveal that lack of clarity about behavioral expectations causes a greater concern with own (vs. work group) performance, lower actual and perceived group productivity, less concern or involvement with the group (Schuler, 1979), lower job satisfaction, unfavorable attitudes toward role senders (Valenzi and Dessler, 1978; Quick, 1979), and increased tension, anxiety, depression, and resentment (e.g., Caplan and Jones, 1975). Role ambiguity has also been causally linked to turnover (Johnson and Graen, 1973). (Greene, 1973), suggest that the relationship between role ambiguity and self-report performance measures may be confounded. That is, because role incumbents are ambiguous about the behavior required of them by supervisors, they may be working at the wrong things (from the organization's point of view) and are probably unaware that they are doing so.
Leader Assessing and Alleviating of Followers' Formal Cooperation Deficiencies

**Proposition 4.** If formal cooperation is constrained or deficient and inhibits followers' performance, the leader may remove the deficiency and assure improved performance by providing a facilitative cooperative work environment.

**Hypothesis 4.1.** In situations in which a lack of formal cooperation inhibits followers' performance, leader action that builds cooperative relationships systems among organizational subunits and individuals results in increased follower performance effectiveness.

**Hypothesis 4.2.** Leader approach effectiveness in analyzing deficiencies in followers' performance variables and in taking actions to alleviate deficiencies is basically determined by the accuracy of feedback on follower performance variables, the amount of administrative authority of the leader, and the leader's capability to (a) perceive what should be done, (b) influence followers to achieve significant results, and (c) bring order to chaotic situations.

**Factors to be considered.**

a. The TEAM theory presented in this study contends that the effective leader identifies factors in the work environment that constraint follower performance and takes action to remove these constraints.

b. The formal cooperation that the follower receives from individual co-workers, groups, and the leader facilitates the follower's performance (Wofford, 1982; Mahfooz, 1990).

c. Hypothesis 4.1 is mainly concerned with the direct facilitative or inhibiting effect on performance of the cooperative work environment including groupthink dynamics, unity of command, and rewards based on joint effort.

d. H. 4.2 holds that leader approach in handling performance deficiencies is influenced by (1) feedback on follower performance variables.
Thus, as follower goals decrease, leaders take action to restore the
goals; as follower commitment declines, leader attempt to followup, train, provide incentives, etc; (2) organization of authority —
a centralized, limited or insufficient administrative authority may
hamper the leader’s attempt to take action to alleviate deficiencies,
for example, a leader whose analysis indicates that the follower
lacks commitment to goals may be hampered in taking corrective
action if the organization relegates the transfer or the training func-
tions entirely to a personnel department, leaving little opportunity
for the leader to act; (3) leader’s self-confidence in his/her ability
to effectively perceive what should be done — and this may relate
to the amount of experience of the leader and the leader-follower
supportive relationships.
CHAPTER 2

CONCEPTUAL CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LEADERSHIP LITERATURE/THEORETICAL AND RESEARCH FOUNDATIONS

The intellectual pioneers in social research began the quest for understanding leadership by posing the question, "What makes a good leader?" Attempts to answer this question resulted in several intellectual, theoretical orientations, each strongly advocated in its day. All are still somewhat relevant. The first answer was that leaders are not made, they are born. This so-called Great Man (Person) Theory postulated an inherent personality, naturally inclined toward leadership. Following quickly and deeply related, a trait approach assumed ascendancy, arguing that common traits, if identifiable in recognized leaders, would help individuals develop leadership capacities. Difficulty in identifying universal traits led to a behavioral focus. If it is hard to identify common traits, it may be easier and more operationally useful to concentrate on leaderlike behaviors that can be observed, copied, and perfected. Behaviors are concrete, observable, and have formed the foundation of some interesting, useful notions about what leaders do. While more "intellectually pure," behavior theory also proved flawed. Others suggested that factors in the situation in which individual leaders operate impact on leader behavior and must be included in a theory of leadership.

Competing theories abound. We find great men theories, trait theories, person-situation theories, interaction-expectation theories, humanistic theories, exchange theories, behavioral theories, and perceptual and cognitive theories. This confused state of affairs caused some scholars to abandon the subject altogether and focus on more specific problems such as power.
or motivation. Other researchers, however, are less pessimistic, anticipating that the wealth of results constitutes some basis for a cogent theory of leadership. They attempt to escape the labyrinth of contradictory findings and theories of leadership by proposing a contingency paradigm (House and Baetz, 1979). They try to explain the discrepancies in the research, noting that "leadership has an effect under some conditions and not under others and also that the causal relationships between leader behavior and commonly accepted criteria of organizational performance are two-way" (House and Baetz, 1979, p. 348). But in spite of its real merits, one wonders if this contingency paradigm will by itself be sufficient to breathe new life into this often complicated field.

Far richer characterizations of leadership are needed, those taking into consideration both its cognitive and human dimensions. Burns (1978) illustrates a descriptive assessment of some leaders who are able to create a climate of constructiveness, involvement, and care, who engender initiative, and spur creative endeavors. He compared transactional with transformational leadership. While the first type of leader motivates followers by exchanging rewards for services rendered, whether economic, political, or psychological, the latter type of leader recognizes and exploits an existing need or demand of a potential follower. But, beyond that, the successful transformational leader looks for potential motives in followers, seeks to satisfy their higher needs, and engages their full potential. The result of the most adept transformational leadership is a relationship of mutual stimulation and elevation that converts followers into leaders and leaders into moral agents (Burns, 1978, p. 4).

This chapter analyzes and discusses the significant features of the past and present leadership theories and consider a question common to all of them: What should managers do to manage followers performance more
effectively in the workplace? The leader's ability to manage followers performance creatively is becoming more important as the quickening pace of change makes creative perception, inspired judgement, and cooperative management ever more critical. Nine important perspectives are explored below.

**Definitional Dimensions**

Leadership defies precise definition because it is an idea in flux. Leadership has a somewhat mysterious quality about it. It is easy to recognize, hard to describe, difficult to practice, and almost impossible to create on demand in others. Leadership means different things to different people and in different circumstances. It is one thing to a platoon leader in a forward infantry position. It is quite something else to a city manager trying to cope with shrinking budgets, rising citizen consciousness, and a mystifying array of service needs, demands, capacities, and priorities. It is still another thing to fathers and mothers trying to raise their children in today's environment (Fiedler and Chemers, 1984; Fairholm, 1990).

Despite over 200 separate definitions of leadership in the professional literature, some consensus on its various facets is beginning to emerge. Among these central ideas are the following:

**A Group Process**

Leadership is a social activity; it takes place in relationships between people, and between people and groups.

**Followership**

Similarly, leadership always involves willing followers — people who see personal need-satisfaction in following leaders and adhering to the
leader's values, programs, methods, and goals. And leaders, typically, are involved in followership behaviors themselves, for they follow other leaders and have been good followers of others in the past; they know about being a follower from personal experience.

Influence/Power

Leaders typically influence those around them, society generally, and the institutions of society.

Creative Vision

Leaders create a vision of the future. They articulate a clear, attractive, compelling vision of what life, the agency, and the individuals involved can or should be like. They preach that vision, focusing our attention and energies on attaining this "good" future state of being.

Different

Leaders are different from the rest of us. They may be described as charismatic, magnetic, powerful personalities or other similar objectives. At minimum, they are different — set apart — from the run-of-the-mill follower they serve.

Enthusiasm

A part of the difference leaders project is high-energy, enthusiastic involvement. They trigger similar motives in us. We are motivated by the personality and activity of the leaders we volunteer to follow.

Some other, less universal characteristics are often included in these definitions. Among them is communication skills. Leaders are seen as exceptional communicators, personally demonstrating the central group
values and ideals, and as transformers of their institutions. Thus, leadership is both a personal activity and an institutional process.

The Leadership Traits Theories/
The Personal Qualities Approach

The earliest systematic research on leadership was directed toward identifying the traits, or characteristics, of great or effective leaders. The trait approach was based on the assumption that a finite number of individual traits of effective leaders could be found. Thus, most research was designed to identify intellectual, emotional, physical, and other personal characteristics of successful leaders. This is not surprising. All people have marveled at the accomplishments of great people. History is rich with examples of personalities who soared to greatness. It was only a matter of time until enterprising researchers looked for predictors of how individuals achieve greatness. The personnel testing component of scientific management supported to a significant extent the trait theory of leadership (Stogdill, 1974). The traits of leaders have been also studied by observing behavior in group situations, choice of associates (voting), by nomination of rating by observers, and by analysis of biographical data.

An important illustration of the traditional trait approach is the view advanced by Ordway Tead. Long before he wrote “The Art of Administration,” he published a book on leadership. The title was The Art of Leadership (1935). He defined leadership as the “activity of influencing people to cooperate toward some goal which they come to find desirable.” Tead believed that most people want to belong to goal-oriented (purposeful) groups like business firms, churches, and civic clubs. Since only a few can lead, most people, it can be inferred, desire to be led and are comfortable as followers. A few, however, invariably emerge as leaders, and these individuals are of particular interest.
People can be led in many ways. Suggestions can be used and are instrumental in building good relations. Leaders sometimes intimidate, but exhortations are more successful. Tead even gave consideration to the usefulness of persuasive, thorough, logical arguments. However, it was his occasional hint about the situational nature of leadership that was most unusual in his writings. Even though he focused primarily on the traits of the leader, Tead was aware that leaders use the "logic of events" in arriving at the proper time to exercise their influence. Sometimes prospective leaders even create problem situations to which they can uniquely respond. Perhaps that is why we remember the leaders best who have set forth worthy and challenging goals and then responded to them. Lyndon Johnson was known for his idea of the "great society," and John F. Kennedy for his goal of "putting a man on the moon before the end of the decade."

The goals that give leaders power must be definite, must be appealing, and must be ones with which followers can enthusiastically identify. The "law of the situation," as discussed by Follett (1949), implies that the situation is given and the leader merely responds in a unique way. Tead made a similar point but took a different direction by observing that the situation may be created by the perceptive leader, and history testifies that this often is the case.

What It Takes to Be a Leader. Like most early leadership writers and in spite of the "logic of events" and the "law of the situation," Tead believed successful leaders possess certain identifiable traits, with the most important being:

1. Physical and nervous energy. Leadership is hard work, so the leader must have more than the average amount of energy.
2. Sense of purpose or direction. The leader must have goals and inspire others to pursue them.
3. Enthusiasm. Good leaders often feel themselves “commanded by power.” Their enthusiasm is somehow converted into command or influence.

4. Friendliness and affection. Tead did not believe it is better for a leader to be feared than loved. To the contrary, leaders need to be liked by followers if they are to exercise the necessary influence over them.

5. Integrity. True to his conscience, Tead believed leaders have to be trustworthy.

People want leaders who are decisive and who create confidence among followers. Followers need to believe that matters are in good hands. Leaders have to take the heat when bad decisions are made and overcome the temptation to blame others for their failures. Harry Truman’s attitude that the “buck stops here” gained him respect and gave citizens the confidence that someone would address serious problems eventually, even if it was the president. Good leaders need to be effective communicators, have a sense of humor, and, perhaps above all, be good teachers. After all, the leader is the only teacher many employees ever have.

How Leaders Lead. The effective leader communicates expectations to employees and defines the boundaries of followers’ discretions. Tead was idealistic but he understood human nature and was a realist concerning it. He even admitted that power has a corrupting influence and can lead to vanity. A cursory reading of history will verify this generalization. We should, therefore, be on the lookout for hazards of leadership. For example, Tead knew that leaders often have more desire for self-enhancement than the population at large. Sometimes leaders insist on having their own way and take things personally when others disagree. Often they identify so closely with their goals that any disagreement is considered an act of disloyalty. It is exciting to read of the accomplish-
ments of the great people of history, but it is depressing to read of the equally, if not greater, weaknesses of these same people who eventually failed in their response to the "logic of events." In one of his most profound statements on leadership, Tead states that "good leading depends on good following. The leader points the way but the followers must decide that the way is good" (p. 298). This statement is profound because it begins to hint at an idea in leadership that was to emerge much later in the development of the field. This important idea was that leadership depends on more than the personality of the leader.

In a review of 33 studies, Stogdill (1974) found that there is a general trend which indicates that leaders are more intelligent than followers. One of the most significant findings is that extreme intelligence differences between leaders and followers may be dysfunctional. For example, a leader with a relatively high skill, expertise, or knowledge who is attempting to influence a group with members whose intelligence is low may be unable to understand why the members do not comprehend the problem. In addition, such a leader may have difficulty communicating ideas and policies.

Some research results suggest that such personality traits as alertness, originality, personal integrity, and self-confidence are associated with effective leadership (Argyris, 1955; Hornaday and Bunker, 1970). Ghiselli (1963) reported several personality traits which tend to be associated with leader effectiveness. For example, he found that initiative and the ability to act and initiate action independently were related to the level in the organization of the respondent. The higher the person went in the organization the more important this trait became. He also found that self-assurance was related to hierarchical position in the organization. Finally, he found that individuals who exhibited individuality were the most
effective leaders. Some writers argue that personality is unrelated to leadership. This view is too harsh if we consider how personality has been found to be related to perception, attitudes, learning, and motivation. The problem is finding valid ways to measure personality traits. This goal has been difficult to achieve, but some progress, although slow, is being made (Krasner and Ullman, 1973; Lundin, 1974).

Studies of the relationship between effective leadership and physical characteristics such as age, height, weight, and appearance provide contradictory results. Being taller and heavier than the average of a group is certainly not advantageous for achieving a leader position (Stogdill, 1948). However, many organizations believe that it requires a physically large person to secure compliance from followers. This notion relies heavily on the coercive or fear basis of power. On the other hand, Truman, Gandhi, Napoleon, and Stalin are examples of individuals of small stature who rose to positions of leadership.

Using the leaders' performance ratings, Ghiselli (1971) found a positive relationship between a person's supervisory ability and level in the organizational hierarchy. The supervisor's ability is defined as the “effective utilization of whatever supervisory practices are indicated by the particular requirements of the situation.” A measurement of the concept is needed and this is a difficult problem to resolve.

Although some traits appear to differentiate effective and ineffective leaders, there still exist many contradictory research findings. There are a number of possible reasons for the disappointing results. First, the list of potentially important traits is endless. Every year new traits, such as the sign under which a person is born, handwriting style, and order of birth are added to personality, physical characteristics, and intelligence. This continual “adding on” results in more confusion among those interested in identifying leadership traits. Second, trait test scores are not
consistently predictive of leader effectiveness. Traits do not operate singly, but in combination, to influence followers. This interaction influences the leader-follower relationship. Third, the patterns of effective behavior depend largely on the situation. The leadership behavior which is effective in a bank may be ineffective in a laboratory. Finally, the trait approach does not provide insight into what the effective leader does on the job. Observations are needed that describe the behavior of effective and ineffective leaders. Less entertaining, but more instructive, is the criticism of this approach on scientific grounds.

Perhaps the most glaring problem of the trait approach is the lack of agreement on traits. An early treatment of this difficulty was based on examination of twenty studies of leadership, which were found to have identified seventy-nine different characteristics. Two thirds of these had been reported by only one of the studies. Only one trait — intelligence — was found to be important in as many as ten of the research efforts. Yet all were supposedly observing the same phenomenon. Obviously, the methods of observation or the conceptualization of leadership in terms of traits was faulty. Also, trait studies generally do not consider the relative importance of different characteristics, nor do they address their development. For both descriptive and prescriptive purposes, it would be useful to know whether certain characteristics acquired earlier enable some individuals to become leaders or, on the other hand, whether leaders develop certain traits (Gibson, Ivan, and Donnelly, 1982).

Despite these problems, the trait approach should not be dismissed completely. Some scholars and administrators find that the systematic analysis of personal characteristics is useful in selecting employees for supervisory positions, though this is far from an exact science. It is possible that more useful concepts and improved research methods may allow
solution of some difficulties associated with the trait approach. Also, as
discussed below, the contingency approach uses the trait idea in some
ways, with the important qualification that different characteristics may
be significant in different situations. Indeed, it is likely that the range
of situations examined in trait studies, including experimental groups and
social organizations, explains the variety of findings to some degree.

Once again, despite these shortcomings the trait approach is not
completely invalid. Stogdill concisely captures the value of the trait
approach in the following statement:

... the view that leadership is entirely situational in origin and that
no personal characteristics are predictive of leadership ... seems
to overemphasize the situational and underemphasize the personal
nature of leadership (Stogdill, 1948, p. 72).

The following statement in Table 2.1 below presents the main results
of a survey of views on leadership conducted by Development Journal,
1980, 16, pp. 52-55.

Table 2.1: Views on Trait Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moral integrity</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courage</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grasp of economics</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual excellence</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social concern</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political ability</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-affairs expertise</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charisma</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Leadership Behavior Theories/
The Styles Approach

A number of theorists argue for the use of a particular style to bring about high performance levels in areas such as production and satisfaction. The style, or personal-behavioral leadership approaches that have been the most widely used in practice are based on research conducted at the University of Michigan, the Ohio State, and by Blake and Mouton. These approaches have been widely publicized, researched, and applied in organizational settings. Each of the approaches attempts to identify what leaders do when leading (Barrow, 1977; Gibson, Ivan, and Donnelly, 1982).

Since 1947, Likert has been studying how best to manage the efforts of individuals to achieve desired performance and satisfaction objectives (Likert, 1961, 1967). The purpose of most of the leadership research from the University of Michigan has been to discover the principles and methods of effective leadership. The effectiveness criteria used in many of the studies include:

- Productivity per work hour or other similar measures of the organization's success in achieving its production goals.
- Job satisfaction of members of the organization.
- Turnover, absenteeism, and grievance rates.
- Costs.
- Employee and managerial motivation.

Studies have been conducted in a wide variety of industries: chemical, electronics, food, heavy machinery, insurance, petroleum, public utilities, hospitals, banks, and government agencies. Data have been obtained from thousands of employees doing different job tasks, ranging from unskilled work to highly skilled research and development work.
Through interviewing leaders and followers, the researchers identified two distinct styles of leadership which are referred to as job-centered and employee-centered. The job-centered leader practices close supervision so that subordinates perform their tasks using specified procedures. This type of leader relies on coercion, reward, and legitimate power to influence the behavior and performance of followers. The concern for people is viewed as important, but is a luxury that cannot always be practiced by a leader.

The employee-centered leader believes in delegating decision making and aiding followers in satisfying their needs by creating a supportive work environment. The employee-centered leader is concerned with follower's personal advancement, growth, and achievement. These actions are assumed to be conductive for the support of group formation and development.

The potential effect of these two personal-behavioral styles was tested in an experimental study (Morse and Reimer, 1956). This study included 500 clerical employees in four divisions which were organized in the same way, used the same technology, did the same kind of work, and employed individuals of comparable aptitudes.

The work load of the divisions varied and peaked from time to time. At any one time a given amount of work had to be processed. The volume was impossible to change and the only way to increase production was to increase the size of the group.

The experiment with these four divisions lasted for one year. There was a training period for supervisory and managerial staffs lasting approximately six months. Production was measured continuously and computed weekly. Employee and supervisory attitudes, perceptions, motivations, and related variables were measured just before and just after the experimental year.
In two of the four divisions, an attempt was made to make the decision-making process more participative. More general supervision was introduced. In addition, the formal leaders were given training in participative leadership. In the other two divisions which were called the hierarchically controlled divisions, there was an effort to increase the closeness of supervision and to centralize decision making. The formal leaders in these divisions were trained for the same length of time as their counterparts in the participative divisions, but the training focused on company policies, rules, and procedures.

Production increased under both systems. With the increase being 25 percent in the hierarchically controlled and 20 percent in the participative. These increases were achieved by different procedures in the two systems. In the hierarchically controlled divisions, direct pressure and the job-centered behavior of the leaders were assumed to be the reasons for the increase. However, in the participative divisions the clerks themselves reduced the size of the work force and developed a number of procedural changes. It was also believed that production in the participative divisions increased because of the more cohesive effort of the groups and less absenteeism. The indicators of employee satisfaction included absenteeism, turnover, and attitudes. The findings revealed that these indicators improved in the participative divisions and deteriorated in the hierarchically controlled divisions.

The conclusions reached by Likert and other supporters of this leadership approach suggest that employee-centered leadership behaviors are more effective.

The Michigan studies do not clearly show that one particular style of leadership is always the most effective. Furthermore, it fails to predict which style will be the most effective. Finally, it only examines two aspects of leadership — task and people behavior.
Among the several large research programs on leadership that developed after World War II, one of the most significant was Ohio State’s which resulted in a two-factor theory of leadership (Shartle, 1956; Fleishman, 1973; Stogdill, 1974). These studies isolated two leadership factors referred to as initiating structure and consideration. The definitions of these factors are as follows: Initiating structure involves behavior in which the leader organizes and defines the relationships in the group, tends to establish well-defined patterns and channels of communication, and spells out ways of getting the job done. Consideration involves behavior indicating friendship, mutual trust, respect, warmth, and rapport between the leader and followers.

These dimensions are measured by two separate questionnaires. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) attempts to assess how leaders think they behave in leadership roles. The Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) measures the perceptions of subordinates, peers, or superiors.

The initiating structure and consideration scores derived from the responses to the questionnaire provide a way to measure leadership style. Figure 2.1 below provides a hypothetical view of the behaviors of five different leaders. These hypothetical points indicate that leaders have scores on both dimensions. Individual 1 is high on both initiating structure and consideration; individual 4 is low on both dimensions.

**Figure 2.1: The Scores of Five Leaders: Initiating Structure and Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low Initiation Structure</th>
<th>High Initiation Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Consideration</td>
<td>High Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the original research undertaken to develop the questionnaire, there have been some studies of the relationship of these two leadership dimensions and various effectiveness criteria. Many of the early results stimulated the generalization that leaders above average in both consideration and initiating structure were more effective. In a study at International Harvester, however, the researchers began to find some more complicated interpretations of the two dimensions. In a study of supervisors, it was found that those scoring higher on structure had higher proficiency ratings (ratings received from superiors), but also had more employee grievances. The higher consideration score was related to lower proficiency ratings and lower absences (Fleishman, 1973).

The Ohio State personal-behavioral theory has been criticized because of simplicity, lack of generalizability, and reliance on questionnaire responses to measure leadership effectiveness. The critique of Korman is perhaps the most publicized. He has criticized the Ohio State research on leadership in the following manner (Korman, 1966):

1. The researchers have made little attempt to conceptualize situational variables and their influence on leadership behavior.
2. Most of the research studies yield generally insignificant correlations between leader behavior measures and effectiveness criteria.
3. The theory has not provided any answer to the question of causality.

Some of the problems have been partially corrected (Kerr and Schries, 1974). For example it has been pointed out in some other research that many variables affect the relationship between leadership behavior and organizational effectiveness. Some of these include employee experience, competence, job knowledge, expectations for leader behavior, the upward influence of leaders, the degree of autonomy, role clarity, and urgency of time (Cummins, 1972; Hunt and Liebscher, 1973).
In another study, the conceptual framework for the managerial grid assumes that there is an unnecessary dichotomy in the minds of most leaders about the concern for people and concern for production. It is Blake and Mouton's assumption that people and production concerns are complementary, rather than mutually exclusive. They further believe that leaders must integrate these concerns to achieve effective performance results (Blake and Mouton, 1978, 1981).

The thoughts of Blake and Mouton resulted in development of the grid chart. An example of the managerial grid is provided in Figure 2.2 below. Theoretically, there are 81 possible positions on the grid, representing as many leadership styles, but the focus usually centers around five styles: 1, 1; 1, 9; 9, 1; 5, 5; and 9, 9.

**Figure 2.2: An Example of the Managerial Grid**

The 9, 1 leader is primarily concerned with production task accomplishment and has little, if any, concern for people. This person wants to meet schedules and get the job done at all costs. The 1, 9 style reflects a minimal concern for production coupled with a maximal concern for people;
the 1, 1 style reflect minimal concern for both people and production; and
the 5, 5 style reflects a moderate concern for both. The 9, 9 style is viewed
as the ideal approach for integrating a maximum concern for production
with a maximum concern for people.

According to Blake and Mouton, the grid enables leaders to identify
their own leadership styles. Furthermore, it serves as a framework for
leaders to use in assessing their styles before undertaking a training
program that is designed to move them to the 9, 9 style.

Although the managerial grid has not been thoroughly supported by
research, it is still a popular theory of leadership among managers. The
available research is in the form of case analyses. Thus, the grid is popular
among practitioners and is controversial among theorists and researchers
because of its lack of empirical support. Many managers and researchers
refuse to accept the position that the 9, 9 style is superior to other
styles. The situation, people involved, and resources available
need to be placed into any analysis of what style is best. The 9,
9 style in some circumstances would simply be a total failure.

A careful review of the various leadership style theories and research
indicates a number of common threads. Each of the theories attempts
to isolate broad dimensions of leadership behavior. The logic of this
appears to be that multidimensions confound the interpretation of lead-
ership behavior and complicate the research designs developed to test the
particular theory.

The measurement of leadership style for each of the theories is accom-
plished through paper-and-pencil questionnaire responses. This method
of measurement is limited and controversial. The common bases of
these theories are presented in Table 2.2 below.
Table 2.2: The Common Bases of the Leadership Behavior Theories/The Styles Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Factors</th>
<th>Prime Initiators of the Theory</th>
<th>How Behavior is Measured</th>
<th>Subjects Researched</th>
<th>Principal Conclusions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee-centered and job-centered</td>
<td>Likert (Michigan Studies)</td>
<td>Through interview and questionnaire responses of groups of followers.</td>
<td>Formal leaders and followers in public utilities, banks, hospitals, food, manufacturing, government agencies.</td>
<td>Employee-centered and job-centered styles result in production improvements. However, after a brief period of time the job-centered style creates pressure that is resisted through absenteeism, turnover, grievance, and poor attitudes. The best style is employee-centered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiating structure and consideration</td>
<td>Fleishman, Stogdill, and Shartle (Ohio Studies)</td>
<td>Through questionnaire responses of followers, peers, the immediate superior, and the leader.</td>
<td>Formal leaders and followers in military, education, public manufacturing, and government agencies.</td>
<td>The combination of initiating structure and consideration behavior which achieves individual, group, and organizational effectiveness depends largely on the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for production and concern for people</td>
<td>Blake and Mouton</td>
<td>Through interviews and questionnaire responses of groups of followers and the leader.</td>
<td>Formal leaders in electronics and petroleum companies.</td>
<td>The 9, 9 style is related to improvements in productivity, cost, and timeliness of output. Organizations should attempt to stimulate leaders to adopt the 9, 9 style.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numerous personal-behavioral leadership approaches are impressive, but practicing managers are interested in guidelines, results, and procedures to improve their styles. Each of the approaches is associated with highly respected theorists, researchers, or consultants, and each has been studied in different organizational settings. Yet, the linkage between leadership and such important performance indicators as production, efficiency, and satisfaction is not conclusively resolved by the personal-behavioral leadership theories.

Moreover, McGregor's most influential book was *The Human Side of Enterprise* (1960). In this book he proposed the best-known dichotomy of management: Theory X and Theory Y. McGregor called Theory X the “traditional view of direction and control.” When this view is adopted, the leader makes several assumptions about the people under her or his leadership:

- The average human being has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if possible.
- Because human beings dislike work, they must be coerced, controlled, directed, and threatened with punishment if they are to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational goals.
- The average human being prefers direction, wishes to avoid responsibility, and has relatively little ambition. Most of all, security is desired.

The leader who adopts Theory Y, which McGregor refers to as a means of “integrating individual and organizational goals,” on the other hand, assumes something quite different about followers:

- The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play and rest.
- The threat of punishment and external control are not the only means available for increasing effort toward the accomplishment
of organizational goals. Humans are quite capable of exercising self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which they are committed.

- Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their attainment.
- The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.
- The capacity to exercise a high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely not narrowly distributed in the population.
- Under conditions of modern industrial life the intellectual potential of the average human being is rarely utilized.

According to McGregor, the principle that derived from Theory X was that of direction and control through the exercise of authority. Theory Y, by contrast, was based on the principle of integration, or the creation of conditions such that the members of the organization achieve their goals best by aiming their energies toward the success of the enterprise. This principle of integration literally creates the conditions whereby individuals achieve their personal goals in the process of contributing to the objective of the organization — the process of mutual reinforcement.

The assumptions of a leader are important, according to McGregor, because what one believes to be true causes one to behave in a certain way. This behavior, in turn, causes others to behave exactly as one expected. This is the way people create self-fulfilling prophecies. If a leader assumes that followers are lazy, are irresponsible, and must be forced to work hard, it is likely that a system of incentives and appraisal will be set up that guarantees followers will behave in precisely this manner. Precise rules and regulations will be developed, and managers will closely supervise workers to ensure that work is not only completed
but also accomplished in the precise manner that the leader desires. Workers will soon find ways of getting around the system and will eventually behave irresponsibly — just as Theory X predicts.

On the other hand, if followers are assumed to be responsible and mature, a system of incentives and appraisal will be set up that encourages them to behave in a mature and responsible way. Opportunities for professional and personal growth will be provided, supervision will be relaxed, and workers will respond with more mature behavior.

Interestingly, McGregor has been criticized for thinking of leadership only in terms of either Theory X or Theory Y when, in reality, followers possess some characteristics described by both theories. In fact, McGregor apparently recognized the danger of thinking in terms of such extremes and indicated early that leaders should engage in selective adaptation with respect to their assumptions. The amount of control exercised by the leader or manager should be selectively adapted to the maturity and dependency of the followers. Immature and dependent employees require a great deal of control. Perhaps they meet most of the assumptions of Theory X. Mature and independent followers require little control and are best described by the assumptions of Theory Y.

Other criticisms of McGregor are more legitimate. His so-called theory was really a nontheory and was based more on hopes than it was on evidence of any substantive nature (Stogdill, 1974). But The Human Side of Enterprise is a classic of the field not because of its scientific sophistication but because of its clarity and its focus on a "soft" although important part of leadership — what the leader assumes about followers does in fact affect leader behavior. However, to believe that managerial assumptions are the only or even primary source of laziness and irresponsibility on the part of employees cannot be justified intuitively, and this idea has not been investigated enough to allow for such a sweeping generalization.
Likert's work accurately represents the types of issues to be considered when thinking about appropriate and inappropriate leadership styles, and it is based on more and better data than most of the other research in this area. The foundations of this theory of leadership was in 1961. In "New Patterns of Management," two ideas appear particularly significant for managers. First, the most effective leaders/managers are those who form a linking function with people above and below them in the organization. In other words, the leader who functions as a "linking pin" keeps employees aware of what higher management is up to and keeps higher management aware of what is going on among the workers. Second, Likert proposed his famous principle of supporting relationships, which stated that leaders should ensure "a maximum probability" that all interactions in an organization are viewed as supportive and designed to build and maintain a sense of personal work and importance. Likert contrasted various types of organizations on the basis of the type of leadership style used. Other factors he used to classify different organizational systems were the nature of the motivational forces employed, the character of the communication processed, the interaction-influence process, the character of decision making, how goals are set and prioritized, and the manner in which control is exercised. His resulting four organization types are (Likert, 1967):

- System One organizations. Likert applied the label exploitive authoritative to this type of organization. Managers or leaders do not trust followers. Motivation is based on fear, threats, and occasional rewards. Communication flows down from the top and the little that flows up tends to be inaccurate and distorted. Goals are imposed from on high, where all important decisions are made.
- System Two organizations. This type of organization is called benevolent authoritative. Leaders and followers exhibit a "master-servant"
relationship. There is some involvement of followers, at least more than in System One. There are also more rewards and upward communication is better. The relationship between leaders and followers is best described as paternalistic.

- System Three organizations. Likert called this a consultative form of organization because leaders are clearly in control but followers are consulted before decisions are actually made. Upward communication is cautious and unpleasant and information is not freely offered.
- System Four organizations. Likert described this type of organization as participative. Leaders trust followers and believe employees seriously work toward accomplishing organizational goals. Communication is accurate and flows vertically and horizontally. Goals are formulated in a participative manner by people who will be directly involved in decision making and in accomplishing the objectives.

Most leaders develop System Two or System Three organizations, and the move to System Four, which Likert recommended as most preferred, requires significant changes in leadership philosophies. Moreover, one should not expect changes to take place immediately. When new programs are established in large, complex organizations, the manager should expect as much as a year to pass before many employees will recognize that changes are actually taking place, and even more time is required before tangible results can be expected (Likert, 1967). Perhaps this is why attempts to build a System Four organization sometimes fail — it takes time. It is difficult to keep the confidence and enthusiasm of top management long enough to effect the type of changes required by the participative system. However, results of research presented by Likert indicate that it is worth the time and energy spent to move from a System One or Two organization to System Four. Managers using Systems One and Two generate less group loyalty and lower performance goals and expe-
rience greater conflict, less cooperation, less favorable attitudes toward management, and less motivated employees. The result is an organization with lower sales volume, higher sales costs, and lower earnings on the part of everyone. The System Four organization, with its focus on supportive relationships, group decision making and supervision, and high performance goals, attains higher sales and earnings with lower costs.

In summary, Likert’s ideas are consistent with those of McGregor. Both argue that the type of climate management establishes in an organization influences the performance of employees. While both writers recognized that situational variables can radically affect leader behavior, the theme is clear: greater focus on the human factor will lead to higher levels of individual and organization performance. Moreover, even though Likert and McGregor would not deny the importance of situational factors, there is little doubt from their writings that both believed the human relations orientation of Theory Y and the System Four organization to be preferable to other styles of leadership.

With regard to the application of leadership research, behavioral theorists have usually assumed that effective methods can be imparted to supervisors through training. This process is not as simple as it sounds, however. Illustrative research has found that individuals show changes of attitude immediately after training but that the modification may not last after the supervisor returns to his or her job. An important factor in the persistence of new attitudes is the managerial “climate.” That is, a supervisor trained to show consideration will not do so if managers at higher levels do not act in this way. This finding suggests that change needs to be introduced to the organization as a whole, not to single employees, if it is to be effective.

There are other difficulties associated with the behavioral approach. Most basically, this approach encounters problems analogous to those of
the trait studies. Effective leadership does not seem to be the same in all organizations or situations. Researchers regard style as a constant factor, at least over a short period, but supervisors may apply different styles in different situations. For example, a person in a leadership position may behave in one way when there is severe pressure to perform, in another when operations are more relaxed. Recognition of the apparent importance of the situation to leadership style has led to the formulation of various contingency approaches.

**Attribution Theory of Leadership/
The Cognitive Approach**

Attribution theory suggests that understanding and predicting how people will react to events around them is enhanced by knowing what their causal explanation for those events are. Kelly (1967) stresses that it is mainly concerned with the cognitive processes by which a person interprets behavior as being caused by (or attributed to) certain cues in the relevant environment. The emphasis of attribution leadership theory is on "why" some behavior has occurred. Most causes of subordinate or follower behaviors are not directly observable, therefore to determine causes requires reliance on perception. In attribution theory individuals are assumed to be rational and concerned about the causal linkages in their environments (Gibson, Ivan, and Donnelly, 1982).

The attributional approach starts with the position that the leader is essentially an information processor. In other words the leader is searching for informational cues that explain "why" something is happening. From these cues leaders attempt to construct causal explanations that guide his or her leadership behavior. The process in simple terms appears to be follower behavior → leader attributions → leader behavior (Green and Mitchell, 1979).
Kelly suggests that the primary attributional task of the leader is to categorize the causes of follower or subordinate behavior into three source dimensions: person, entity, or context. That is, for any given behavior, such as poor quality of productive output, the leader's job is to determine if the poor quality was caused by the person (e.g., inadequate ability), the task (entity), or some unique set of circumstances surrounding the event (context).

The leader seeks three types of information when forming attributions about a follower's behavior—distinctiveness, consistency, and consensus. For any behavior the leader first attempts to determine if the behavior was distinctive in response to a task; that is, did the behavior occur on this task but not on other tasks. Next, the leader is concerned about consistency, how frequent does this behavior occur. Finally, the leader estimates the extent to which others also behave the same way; if the behavior is unique to one person it is said to have low consensus; if it is common to other members this reflects high consensus.

The judgment of responsibility is considered to moderate the leader's response to an attribution. Clearly, the more a behavior is seen as caused by some characteristic of the follower (i.e., an internal cause) and the follower is judged to be responsible for the behavior, the more likely the leader is to take some action toward the follower. For example, it is possible to attribute an outcome (e.g., poor performance) to factors outside the control of a person, such as not having the tools to do the job well, or to internal causes, such as a lack of effort. When the performance failure is caused by internal forces it could be expected that leader-initiated punishment could be severe.

Attribution theory appears to offer a framework for explaining leader behavior in more insightful terms than either the trait or personal-behavioral theories. It attempts to explain why behaviors are happening.
The trait and personal-behavioral theories are more descriptive and do not focus on the why issue. Furthermore, attributional theory can offer some predictions about a leader’s response to a follower’s behavior.

Two important linkages are emphasized in Figure 2.3 below. At the first linkage point the leader attempts to make an attribution about poor quality performance. These attributions are moderated by the three information sources — distinctiveness, consistency, and consensus. The second linkage point suggests that the leader’s behavior or response is determined by the type of attributions he or she makes. This relationship between attribution and leader behavior is moderated by the leader’s perception of responsibility. Is the responsibility internal or external?

An empirical test of attribution leadership theory examined nursing supervisors who were also considered leaders. Distinctiveness, consistency, and consensus did influence the leaders’ attributions; leaders who made internal cause attributions (e.g., lack of effort) tended to use more punitive behaviors; and leaders tended to make more internal attributions and to respond more harshly when the problems were serious (Mitchell and Wood, 1979).

Figure 2.3: An Attribution Model of Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Cues</th>
<th>Perceived Source of Responsibility</th>
<th>Leader Behavior in Response to Attributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation of Poor Quality of Production</td>
<td>Causal Attribution of Poor Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rejects</td>
<td>Internal Causes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Excess Scrap</td>
<td>*Low Effort</td>
<td>*Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Returned</td>
<td>*Low Commitment</td>
<td>*Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Products Linkage #1 External Causes:</td>
<td>*Lack of Ability</td>
<td>*Demotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Excessive Production Costs</td>
<td>*Improper Equipment</td>
<td>*Redesign Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Unfair Deadlines</td>
<td>*Personal Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Illness of Production Team Members</td>
<td>*Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, the research support for the attributional theory of leadership is limited. There is a need to test the theory in more organizational settings. Understanding the causes of leader behavior or at least searching for these causes seems more promising for managerial use than simply adding another trait or descriptive theory to the leadership literature.

**The Leadership Contingency Theories/ The Situational Approach**

The search for the "best" leadership style never discovered an effective approach for all situations. What has evolved are situation-leadership theories which suggest that leadership effectiveness depends upon the fit between personality, task, power, attitudes, and perceptions (Fleishman, 1973). We will concentrate on the following situation-oriented leadership approaches: the contingency model and the path-goal theory. Each of these approaches relies on a diagnosis of the situation and both are well-related to organizational leadership performance (Gibson, Ivan, and Donnelly, 1982).

The importance of the situation was studied more closely by those interested in leadership only when inconclusive and contradictory results evolved from much of the early trait and personal-behavioral research. Eventually it became known that the type of leadership behavior needed to enhance performance depends largely on the situation. What is effective leadership in one situation may be disorganized incompetence in another situation. The situational theme of leadership is appealing, but it is certainly a challenging orientation to implement. Its basic foundation suggests that an effective leader must be flexible enough to adapt to the differences among subordinates and situations.
Deciding how to lead other individuals is difficult and requires an analysis of the leader, the group, and the situation. This theme is analyzed by Tannenbaum and Schmidt in their model of leadership (Tannenbaum and Schmidt, 1983). Managers aware of the forces they face are able to more readily modify their styles to cope with changes in the work environment. Three factors of particular importance are the forces on the managers, forces on the subordinates, and forces on the situation. Tannenbaum and Schmidt state the situational theme:

Thus, any successful manager can be primarily characterized neither as a strong leader nor as a permissive one. Rather, he is one who maintains a high batting average in accurately assessing the forces that determine what his most appropriate behavior at any given time should be and in actually being able to behave accordingly (p. 180).

The contingency model of leadership effectiveness was developed by Fiedler (1967). The model postulates that performance of groups is dependent on the interaction of leadership style and situational favorableness. Leadership is viewed as a relationship based on power and influence. Thus, two important questions are considered: (1) to what degree does the situation provide the leader with the power and influence needed to be effective, or how favorable are the situational factors? and (2) to what extent can the leader predict the effects of his or her style on the behavior and performance of followers?

Fiedler proposes three situational factors which influence a leader's effectiveness: leader-member relations, task structure, and position power. From a theoretical as well as an intuitive point of view, interpersonal relationships between leader and followers are likely to be the most important variable which determines power and influence. The leader's influence depends in part upon acceptance by the followers. If others are willing to follow because of charisma, expertise, or mutual
respect, the leader has little need to rely on task structure or position power. If, however, the leader is not trusted and is viewed negatively by followers the situation is considered less favorable in Fiedler's theory.

The leader-member relations factor refers to the degree of confidence, trust, and respect followers have in the leader. This situational variable reflects the acceptance of the leader. It is measured in two ways: One method involves asking the followers to indicate on a sociometric preference scale whether they accept or endorse a leader. An alternative method of measurement is the "Group Atmosphere" scale. This measure consists of 10 eight-point items, answered by the followers, one of which is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendly</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Unfriendly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The second most important measure of situational favorableness is referred to as task-structure. This dimension includes a number of components as follows:

Goal clarity — the degree to which the tasks and duties of the job are clearly stated and known to the people performing the job.

Goal-path multiplicity — the degree to which the problems encountered in the job can be solved by a variety of procedures. The assembly-line worker solves problems within a systematic framework, while a scientist has a number of different ways to solve a problem.

Decision verifiability — the degree to which the "correctness" of the solutions or decisions typically encountered in a job can be demonstrated by appeal to authority, by logical procedures, or by feedback. A quality control inspector can show defective parts and clearly indicate why a part is sent back for reworking.

Decision-specificity — the degree to which there is generally more than one correct solution. An accountant working on preparing a balance sheet
has few choices, while a research scientist may have numerous potentially correct alternatives to choose from.

The most obvious way in which the leader secures power is by accepting and performing the leadership role. The leader is recognized as having the right to direct, evaluate, reward, and punish followers, though this right must be exercised within defined boundaries. Position power in the contingency model refers to the power inherent in the leadership position. To determine leader position power, questions such as the following are asked:

• Can the supervisor recommend subordinate rewards and punishments to his boss?
• Can the supervisor punish or reward subordinates on his or her own?
• Can the supervisor recommend promotion or demotion of subordinates? (Fiedler and Chemers, 1974, 1984).

Fielder contends that such questions provide a profile of high or low position power.

So, the three situational factors which seem to be the most important in determining the leader's power and influence are: (1) whether leader-member relations are good or poor; (2) whether the task is relatively structured or unstructured; and (3) whether the position power is relatively strong or weak. A group can be classified as to each of these situational factors. The resulting classification is shown in Figure 2.4 below. It suggests that it is easier to be a leader in groups which fall into situation I in which you are liked, have a structured task, and position power. The situation is more favorable for the situation I leader than the situation VIII leader.
Fiedler contends that a permissive, more lenient relationship-oriented style is best when the situation is moderately favorable or moderately unfavorable. Thus, if a leader were moderately liked and possessed some power, and the job tasks for subordinates were somewhat vague, the leadership style needed to achieve the best results would be relationship oriented.

In contrast, when the situation is highly favorable or highly unfavorable, a task-oriented approach generally produces the desired performance. A well-liked office manager, who has power and has clearly identified the performance goals is operating in a highly favorable situation. A project manager who is faced with a group of suspicious and hostile subordinates, has little power, and has vague task responsibilities, needs to be task oriented in this highly unfavorable situation.

Fiedler's model and research has created a number of pointed criticisms and concerns. First, Graen and Alvares (1971) present evidence that research support for the model is not strong especially if studies conducted by researchers not associated with Fiedler are examined. The earlier support and enthusiasm for the model came from Fiedler and his students who conducted numerous studies of leaders. Second, the meaning of the variables presented by Fiedler is not clear. For example, what is the point at which a "structured" task becomes an "unstructured" task? Who can define or display this point? Finally, critics claim that Fiedler's theory
can accommodate nonsupportive results. This point is specifically made by one critic who states:

"Fiedler has revealed his genius twice; first, in devising the model, which stands like calculus to arithmetic compared with previous leadership models, and second, in his ability to integrate new findings into his models." (Kelly, 1980).

Despite these incisive criticisms, Fiedler's contingency model has made significant contributions to the study and application of leadership principles. He called direct attention to the situational nature of leadership. The Fiedler view of leadership also stimulated numerous research studies and much-needed debate about the dynamics of leader behavior. Certainly Fiedler has played one of the most prominent roles in encouraging the scientific study of leadership in work settings. He pointed the way and made others uncomfortably aware of the complexities of the leadership process.

Like the other situational or contingency leadership approaches, the path-goal model attempts to predict leadership effectiveness in different situations. According to this model, leaders are effective because of their positive impact on followers' motivation, ability to perform, and satisfaction. The theory is designated path-goal because it focuses on how the leader influences the followers' perceptions of work goals, self-development goals, and paths to goal attainment (House, 1971; House and Mitchell, 1974).

The foundation of path-goal theory is the expectancy motivation theory. Briefly, expectancy theory states that an individual's attitudes, job satisfaction, behavior, and job effort can be predicted from: (1) the degree to which the job or behavior is seen as leading to various outcomes (expectancy) and (2) the preferences for these outcomes (valences). Thus, it is proposed that individuals are satisfied with their jobs if they believe
it leads to desirable outcomes, and they work hard if they believe that this effort will result in desirable outcomes. The implication of these assumptions for leadership is that subordinates are motivated by leader style or behavior to the extent it influences expectancies (goal paths) and valences (goal attractiveness).

Some early work on the path-goal theory asserts that leaders will be effective by making rewards available to subordinates and by making these rewards contingent on the subordinates' accomplishment of specific goals (Evans, 1970, 1974). It is argued that an important part of the leader's job is to clarify for subordinates the kind of behavior that will most likely result in goal accomplishment. This activity is referred to as "path clarification."

This early path-goal work led to the development of a complex theory involving four specific kinds of leader behavior (directive, supportive, participative, and achievement) and three types of subordinate attitudes (job satisfaction, acceptance of the leader, and expectations about effort-performance-reward relationships.) The directive leader tends to let subordinates know what is expected of them. The supportive leader treats subordinates as equals. A participative leader consults with subordinates and uses their suggestions and ideas before reaching a decision. The achievement-oriented leader sets challenging goals, expects subordinates to perform at the highest level, and continually seeks improvement in performance (House and Dessler, 1974). The research studies done by House and Dessler suggest that these four styles can be practiced by the same leader in various situations. These findings are contrary to the Fielder notion concerning the difficulty of altering style. The path-goal approach suggests more flexibility than the Fiedler contingency model.
The path-goal theory has led to the development of two important propositions:

1. Leader behavior is acceptable and satisfying to the extent that the subordinates perceive such behavior as an immediate source of satisfaction or as instrumental to future satisfaction.

2. Leader behavior will be motivational to the extent that it makes satisfaction of subordinates' needs contingent on effective performance and it complements the environment of subordinates by providing the guidance, clarity of direction, and rewards necessary for effective performance (House and Mitchell, 1974, p. 84).

According to the path-goal theory leaders should increase the number and kinds of rewards available to subordinates. In addition, the leader should provide guidance and counsel to clarify the manner in which these rewards can be obtained. This means the leader should help subordinates clarify realistic expectancies and reduce the barriers to the accomplishment of valued goals. For example, counseling employees on their chances of receiving a promotion and helping them eliminate skill deficiencies so that a promotion becomes more of a reality are appropriate leadership behaviors. The leader works at making the path to goals for subordinates as clear as possible. The style that is best suited to accomplish this is selected and applied. Thus, the path-goal approach requires flexibility from the leader to use what is appropriate in a particular situation.

Two types of situational or contingency variables are considered in the path-goal theory. The two are the personal characteristics of subordinates and the environmental pressures and demands with which subordinates must cope in order to accomplish work goals and derive satisfaction.

A personal characteristic which is important is subordinates' perception of their own ability. The higher the degree of perceived ability
relative to the task demand, the less the subordinate will accept a directive leader style. This directive style of leadership would be viewed as unnecessarily close. In addition, it has been discovered that a person’s locus of control also affects responses. Individuals who have an internal locus of control (they believe that rewards are contingent upon their efforts) are generally more satisfied with a participative style, while individuals who have an external locus of control (believe that rewards are beyond their personal control) are generally more satisfied with a directive style.

The environmental variables include factors which are not within the control of the subordinate but which are important to satisfaction or to the ability to perform effectively. These include the tasks, the formal authority system of the organization, and the work group. Any of these environmental factors can motivate or constrain the subordinate. The environmental forces may also serve as a reward for acceptable levels of performance. For example, the subordinate could be motivated by the work group and receive satisfaction from co-workers’ acceptance for doing a job according to group norms.

The path-goal theory proposes that leader behavior style will be motivational to the extent that it helps subordinates cope with environmental uncertainties. A leader who is able to reduce the uncertainties of the job is considered to be a motivator because he or she increases the subordinates’ expectations that their efforts will lead to desirable rewards.

Figure 2.5 below presents the main features of the path-goal approach. The path-goal approach has not been subjected to a complete test. Parts of the model, however, have been examined in field settings. One study found that when task structure (the repetitiveness or routine of the job) was high, directive leader behavior was negatively related to satisfaction; when task structure was low, directive leader behavior was positively
related to satisfaction. Also when task structure was high, supportive leadership was positively related to satisfaction, whereas under low task structure there was no relationship between supportive leader behavior and satisfaction (Dessler, 1974).

Figure 2.5: The Main Features of the Path-Goal Model (House, 1971)

The path-goal model warrants further research attention. There is still some question about the predictive power of the path-goal model. Greene (1979) suggested that subordinate performance may be the cause of changes in leader behavior instead of, as predicted by the model, the other way around. A review of the path-goal approach suggested that the model has resulted in only a few hypotheses being developed. These reviewers also point to the record of inconsistent research results associated with the model. They note that research has consistently shown that the higher the task structure of subordinate jobs, the higher will be the relationship between supportive leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction. How-
ever, the second main hypothesis of the path-goal model has not received consistent support. This hypothesis — the higher the task structure, the lower the relationship between directive leader behavior and subordinate satisfaction — has received only some support (Schriesheim and DeNisi, 1979).

On the positive side one must admit that the path-goal model is an improvement over the trait and personal-behavioral theories. It attempts to indicate which factors affect the motivation to perform. In addition, the path-goal approach introduces both situational factors and individual differences when examining leader behavior and outcomes such as satisfaction and performance. The path-goal approach makes an effort to explain why a particular style of leadership works best in a given situation. As more research accumulates, this type of explanation will have practical utility for those interested in the leadership process in work settings.

Two important models for examining leadership have been presented in this section. Both models have similarities and differences. They are similar in that they (1) focus on the dynamics of leadership, (2) have stimulated research on leadership, and (3) remain controversial because of measurement problems, limited research testing, and/or contradictory research results (Hollander, 1978).

The themes of each model are summarized in Table 2.3 below. Fiedler's model is the most tested and perhaps the most controversial. His view of leader behavior centers on task- and relationship-oriented tendencies and how these tendencies interact with task and position power. And the path-goal approach emphasizes the instrumental actions of leaders and four styles to conduct these actions — directive, supportive, participative, and achievement-oriented.
Table 2.3: The Themes of Two Important Situational Approaches to Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Leader Behavior Style</th>
<th>Situational Factors</th>
<th>Outcome Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiedler's contingency model</td>
<td>Task-oriented</td>
<td>Task structure</td>
<td>Leader/Group’s effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship-oriented</td>
<td>Leader-member relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Position power</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Path-goal Theory</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Follower characteristics</td>
<td>Satisfaction and improved performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The situational variables discussed in each approach differ somewhat. There is also a different view of outcome criteria for assessing how successful the leader behavior style has been.

Lastly, it is wise to note that Hersey and Blanchard (1977) developed a contingency theory of leadership to explain the fact that consideration and initiating structure are not consistently related to leader effectiveness. That is, if a leader emphasizes either one — or both — it does not necessarily result in success. Their life-cycle theory extends Blake and Mouton’s (1978) managerial grid work.

The theory is concerned with two broad categories of leadership behavior:

- Task behavior; the extent to which leaders are inclined to organize and define roles, explain activities, and establish well-defined communications channels and task accomplishment processes.

- Relationship behavior; the extent to which leaders are likely to maintain personal relationships; open communications channels; and provide socio-emotional support, psychological strokes, and facilitating behavior.

Hersey and Blanchard focus on only one situational factor — follower maturity, or the capacity to set high but attainable goals, willingness
to take responsibility, high level of education and experience. Maturity involves **two** components: job maturity and psychological maturity. They recognized other factors in the situation (e.g., expectations of the leader’s boss, nature of the task, etc.), but ignored them in their model.

They find that, as the level of maturity increases, the leader should use more relationship-oriented behavior and less task-oriented behavior to a point where followers have a moderate level of maturity. Beyond this level, the leadership should decrease relationship-oriented behavior and decrease task-oriented behavior as well.

While Hersey and Blanchard’s theory contains a certain logic and focuses on “effective” behavior of leadership, it **fails** to relate its concepts to practical experience. It **ignores** relevant variables important to a full understanding of leadership (e.g., task goal commitment, goal interdependence, etc.), although it is built on sound theoretical foundations.

**Leadership Versus Management**

The literature, while vague in making specific delineations, does reaffirm that leadership and management are different. For example: “Leadership is a unique form of art, requiring both force and vision to an extraordinary degree. There has long been a widespread belief . . . that what the country really needs is a top-flight businessman to run the government . . . this misses the mark. Management is one thing. Leadership is another.” (Nixon, 1982). A manager represents a process. The leader represents a direction of history. Great leadership requires a great vision and the capacity for action (Nixon, 1982). Managers have as their goal to do things right. Leaders have as their goal to do the right things (Bennis and Nanus, 1985).
We can loosely consider leadership to be the art of influencing people to accomplish organizational goals, while management is the ancillary and subordinate science of specifying and implementing means to accomplish the same ends. Leadership is ends oriented; management is means oriented.

Consider the following. Managers maintain the balance of operations; leaders create new approaches and imagine new ideas to explore (Zaleznik, 1977). Managers are transactional; leaders are transformational (Burns, 1978). The leader integrates the goal of the individual with the goal of the organization (Hersey and Blanchard, 1977). Leaders define the goals of the organization and then design an enterprise distinctively adapted to these ends (Zaleznik, 1977).

Leadership was the first executive skill developed. It was only later in history that management skills were developed and became predominant in our organizations. History tells us that the first leaders were charismatic — set apart from their fellows in some specific ways. But inspiration is hard to control. Leadership on the basis of charismatic gifts is erratic. The movement we see in history has been from revelation to logic, from inspiration to ceremony, from charisma to management of systems, from concern with the development of people to a focus on their control (Hollander, 1964; Fairholm, 1990).

At the beginning of this century, scholars were strenuously debating this momentous transition from appointed, hereditary, or revolutionary leaders to calculating, power-seeking, authoritarian, and political masters of public relations. We have come to distrust charismatic gifts and we have replaced them with ceremonies and procedures that can be timed, organized, and controlled. What has taken place in our modern societies over the past century or two is a fatal shift from leadership to
management. Captain Grace Hopper, the grand old lady of the U.S. Navy, is calling our attention to this shift by contrasting leadership and management. She suggests that we cannot manage people into battle—or into full commitment to any important social enterprise. We can only lead them in these seminal social activities (Gardner, 1990).

But can we teach leadership? Can leadership be taught? We try. The world is full of leadership-development programs. But we really cannot teach leadership any more than we can teach genius. All we can do is sharpen skills and capacities for leadership already present in the individual (Gardner, 1990).

The qualities of leaders in all fields are the same: leaders are the ones who set the highest examples. They open the way to greater light and knowledge. They break the mold. Leaders are inspiring because they are inspired; they are caught up in a higher purpose, devoid of personal ambition; they are idealistic, incorruptible (Nixon, 1982).

There is necessarily some leader and some manager in each of us. The problem is one of a proper balance of these skills in self and in the organizations we serve. In too many people and organizations, the manager predominates—to the virtual exclusion of leadership (Fairholm, 1990).

The problem can largely be traced to control of money, a central facet of management today. What makes the world manageable is money. By converting all activity to money (numbers), everything can be compared, processed, computerized, handled—in short, managed (Bryman, 1986).

It had been said that the manager knows the price of everything and the value of nothing, because for managers, the value is the price. Yet intelligence, performance effectiveness, integrity, sobriety—traits managers seek out in interviews—cannot be directly bought. Leadership, in contrast to management, places a higher value on these intangible traits.
Moreover, there is much more to being a manager than becoming a leader. Leadership is but one element of the overall managerial job. This is something that many behavioral scientists have failed to recognize. Is it any wonder that at times line people, knowing unconsciously that they were dealing with staff people who have never felt the burning white light of ultimate accountability, have responded to their suggestions with an attitude of “You must be kidding. What do you think I’m running, an annex of the Salvation Army?” Yet leadership is obviously a desirable, even necessary ingredient of executive success (Fairholm, 1990).

One can manage a concentration camp without necessarily being the leader of the inmates. Leadership is not so much a function of status or authority as it is of the quality of the relationship, the interaction that takes place between the leader and his followers. It is not a question of having power over subordinates; it is a matter of having influence with them. Accordingly, certain distinctions must be made (Mintzberg, 1973).

First, management and administration are geared to the achievement of organizational objectives. Leadership may be exercised to thwart the attainment of these very objectives. Specifically, the leader may use his abilities to further not the welfare of the organization but his own interests. Again, management always has a strong input of the logical, the rational, the financial, the impersonal, the analytical, the quantitative. Leadership, in contrast, always involves the chemistry that exists between the alpha fish and those he leads. The manager has ample organizational resources to make subordinates engage in required behavior. He is primarily responsible to higher management. The leader, on the contrary, relies chiefly on his personal resources to get people to do as he wishes. He may well be primarily responsible to his “constituency,” those who follow him. Finally, supervision, management, and administra-
tion are intrinsically connected with levels within a given agency. Leadership, however, may be exercised by anyone at any level, depending on the situation and circumstances that define the kind of leadership required. In a sense, then, the title to manage others is a gift of the higher echelons, but the title to lead others is a gift of the followers. But what should be clear, lastly, is that the job of the upper manager is first to determine what is to be done and second to see that it gets done, whether he goes about these tasks in a democratic, autocratic, or other leadership fashion. His responsibility is to insure that needed inputs are provided to achieve overall goals while coordinating these inputs with those of other departments in order to facilitate the work of the whole organization. Over and beyond this, the manager's role is that of a change agent, introducing innovations that will enhance the performance and promote the improvement of his work group, changes that would not occur in his absence. If they would take place without him, then he is merely an overseer with a high-sounding title and is probably overpaid.

Leadership Paradigms in the Public Sector

Leadership in the public sector is characterized by reliance on followership, power, and related concepts that set it apart from other activities carried on in public organizations. Some of these critical issues in the practice of leadership are discussed below. They form part of the warp and woof of practical public management in today's complex organizations at state, local, and national levels and in all specialties (Gardner, 1990; Fairholm, 1990).

In regard to followership paradigm, it is important to state that there can be no leadership without followers (Browne, 1950). Leadership is inseparable from followers' needs and goals. Followers subordinate themselves, not to an individual who is utterly different, but to a member
of the group who has superiority at the time and who, at other times, is prepared to be a follower just as they are (Hollander, 1964). The essence of the leader-follower relation is the interaction of persons with different levels of motivation and power potential in the pursuit of a common goal, or at least a joint purpose.

Leaders provide followers with a direction for accomplishing goals of consequence. They initiate, articulate, and focus follower goals. It is a mutual process, leadership and followership; leaders are at times also followers, and followers are at times leaders. Yukl (1981) describes follower behavior as a function of power. He uses “counterpower” to refer to follower power over leaders. He notes the leader’s dependence on followers as the primary source of this counterpower.

Scott and Hart (1979) emphasize obedience as a central feature of followership. They propose two points of view: obedience corrupts followers (for example, Watergate figure and former Attorney General John Mitchell) and followership promotes organizational health and is needed. They draw upon the work of the philosopher John Rawls in dealing with the morals of obedience. According to Rawls (1971), followership carries with it moral duties (as does leadership). Followers are obliged to refuse to obey if the order violates the rules of justice. If disobedience does not deter the leader, the follower must appeal to public opinion.

Turner (1957) places emphasis on identifying characteristics of followers. He defines a following as “a collectivity made up of persons interacting in some measure to express their admiration of some public figure.” Followers develop a definite group sense, interact extensively among themselves, and develop norms and/or symbols that distinguish the ingroup from others. They develop a hierarchy based on proximity to the leader and his recognition of them. Followers acquire all the information
they can about their leader and interpret the leader's opinions on various subjects. They identify with their leader, gloat in his success, and suffer personally under his setbacks. The prestige of the leader translates that commonplace into the profound. The leader defines the position followers take on key issues.

Nearly everyone in the administrative world is a follower of someone else. Therefore, getting along with superiors is critical to success. Being an effective follower is just as important professionally as being an effective leader. Indeed, the leader-follower relationship can be conceived as an open social system, open to the outside environment and sensitive to external constraints. The open system imports energy and power and information, transforms it, and exports goods and services. The transformation process involves power, information, and feedback to the system from the effect of the outputs on the environment (Katz and Kahn, 1978).

Another important functional component of public executive leadership is the power paradigm. Power is the essence of leadership. It constitutes the extra element in interpersonal relations that allows the leader to impact others and secure their willing compliance. Rollo May (1972) defines power as the ability to cause or prevent change. Kahn (1964) calls it the process of effecting the policies of others, and Bertrand Russell (1938) defines power as the "production of intended effects." Power allows people to modify the behavior of others. The source may, and does, vary but the objective appears universal: power allows the individuals to affect, to sway, to impact others' behavior in ways that the power user desires.

At one level, all interpersonal relationships are leader-follower, power relationships. We are constantly moving from a directive position to a follower one in our contacts with others. At times we are involved in persuading others to do something we want them to do — to follow our
orders, to get us something, to laugh at our jokes, or to understand and respect our ideas and values. At other times — often in the same conversation — we are persuaded, made to laugh, or induced to do things that the other person wants us to do. In leadership contexts, power can be seen in a much larger dimension as a personal, rather than merely positional, concept. The operative characteristic of leadership is its intimacy, involving a personal power relationship between one leader and one follower reiterated in a series of one-to-one relationships. These power relationships are constituent parts of organizational life.

Few concepts are more vital or more central to the understanding of leader behavior in organizations. Whether it is treated as the aim of organizational behavior or as instrumental to other ultimate objectives, power is a necessary part of the leader’s interaction with people. It must be considered a cornerstone of both leadership theory and practice. It is the essence of leadership behavior. It is also central to subordinate-to-superior interaction and to the myriad relationships we experience with the many peers and external contacts who help make up the fabric of organizational interaction.

Many leadership concepts have power connotations. For example, authority may be defined as a manifestation of power characterized by position and relationship within the formal, hierarchical system. Authority connotes the legitimate right of the holder to command, decide, or determine the way the organization will go. It is an obvious manifestation of power, connoting the formally granted rights inherent in the organizational position held.

In fact, our organizational laws, rules, standards, policy, and regulations are all manifestations of political influence — that is, of power. Power is at the heart of the management of influence generally through-
out the organization, and this management of influence is at the heart of leadership.

**Executive Leadership, How Is It Different?**

Although the notion of executive leadership has been discussed extensively in the popular press, it has not been a major concern of leadership researchers and theorists. Their focus has been primarily lower-level leadership (Greenwald et al., 1986). Commendably, few studies have adapted a top-level focus. Miller and Toulouse (1986) have investigated the effects of chief executive personality in corporate strategy and structure; illustrating that initiative and the ability to act and initiate action independently were related to hierarchical position in the organization. Meindl, Ehrlich, and Dukerich (1985) reported that how accurately top-level management teams perceived the environment was positively related to the economic performance of their organization. Donaldson and Lorsch (1983) undertook an in-depth study of executive decision making, illustrating the direct implication that the effective executive may, and should, display different styles of leadership and problem solving depending on the type of problem faced at a particular time. Leadership theorists Pfeffer (1981), have noted that executive leaders can have a substantial impact on organizational performance or outcomes through either **direct means**, such as formulating appropriate corporate level strategy, reducing personnel costs, increasing quality control and definition and functional specification roles, or by **indirect means**, such as effectively managing the symbols that help build commitment of employees to an organization, strengthening productivity norms, strengthening quality norms, enhancing participative decision making norms, and enhancing image of organization or product. Direct means often involve the appli-
cation of influence and/or power applied either externally or internally. For example, reducing costs often involves through decisions that require internal power to implement. Indirect means often require that top executives be effective symbols or good communicators.

Tushman and Romanelli (1985) argue that executive leadership is often critical in both overcoming internal resistance to change and in building the reorientation. Moreover, how effectively top-level leaders manage such reorientations is a crucial determinant of organizational performance. Chandler's (1962) historical accounts of the development of organizations makes a similar point. He argues that executive leaders have a large impact in shaping strategic choices and notes that dramatic changes in strategies and structures often occur only when top executives also change. Dutton and Jackson (1987) argue that the nature of leaders' cognitive categories help them interpret trends in their organization or environment, thereby narrowing the range of actions they may consider. The same situation could be interpreted as a "threat" or as an "opportunity" depending on how it was categorized by leaders. These different interpretations affect leaders' processing of information as well as social processes involving communication and persuasion. Such work shows how the cognitive processes and schemas of executive leaders affect the more macro strategic choices they consider.

In considering the assumption that executive leadership is causally related to organizational performance, Pfeffer (1977) argues that it is not surprising that leadership should have some observable effects on organizational performance. First, the selection process for managers or for those chosen for leadership positions result in a homogeneous group of persons promoted. Second, leaders are part of a social system that constrains behavior by defining and limiting the range of possible action. Finally, forces external to the leader's control may substantially affect
organizational outcomes, thereby limiting or diluting a leader's impact on organizational performance.

House and Baetz (1979) briefly review the literature on leadership effects and disagree with Pfeffer's position. They conclude that leadership can account for significant amounts of variance in a variety of criterion measures, particularly if the parameters that moderate the relationship between leader actions and outcome variables are considered. In an examination of 193 manufacturing organizations over a 19-year period, Weiner and Mahoney (1981) found that top leadership did account for more variance in follower performance than did many environmental or organizational factors.

Fundamentally, then, executive leaders are seen as transformers of their institutions. **Transformational executive leadership** requires an ability to influence the actions of others. This influence must include the ability to recruit and retain followers who are effective in the attainment of organization goals.

The sources of this influence stem initially from the executive's power base in the structure of the organization. But in the long run, an executive's influence depends upon the ability to persuade by reason and personality and to demonstrate from accomplishments that the overall goals (and the programs for attaining them) are in concert with the interests and capabilities of all subordinates and associates.

Further, transformational executive leadership requires (1) the foresight, intellect, and judgment demonstrated by creativity or innovation in functional areas of finance, product, process, and performance development, and (2) the inner force needed to devise and administer complex operating, organizational, and control structures (Gardner, 1990).

In addition, such leadership is characterized by the ability to weld together the human and the entrepreneurial aspects (Schwarz, 1984).
When executive leadership is defined in these ways, leadership improvement can be approached optimistically. This characterization presumes that leadership can be acquired and improved. Leadership, which is defined by behavior — what to do and how to do it — can be learned by a manager.

But what about the very nature of executive leadership functioning and its difference from what middle managers and supervisors do?

Barnard claims that "Executive work is not that of the organization, but the specialized work of maintaining the organization in operation" (1966, p. 215). And David Braybrooke takes one further step and suggests that top managers are needed only because of imperfections in the organizational system.

As one investigates, one seems to discover that an executive can be said to do something clearly identifiable only when he is doing something that in a larger or more perfect organization would be done by a subordinate, or, in other words, it would seem that the more specialized the role of leadership becomes, the more difficult it is to say what a leader does.

For in a perfect organization, would not every specialized power be delegated to some specialized functionary? The man at the top would be left with nothing, or what seems to approach nothing, to do (1964, p. 534).

Katz and Kahn identify four reasons for leadership that relate to imperfections and unpredictabilities, both inside and outside the organization:

• The incompleteness of organizational design.
• Changing environmental conditions.
• The internal dynamics of organization.
• The nature of human membership in organizations (1966, pp. 304-308).
Arguing in a similar vein, a number of writers claim that true executive managerial work involves only unprogrammed activity — dealing with the issues that are new and different (see, for example, Myers, 1967). And then we have the complementary view of the classical writers that top managers focus primarily on those tasks that are removed from the day-to-day concerns of operating the system — such as planning or organizing.

A research evidence, however, indicates that each of these views tells only a part of the story. Certainly executives must take the broad view; they must do unprogrammed work; and they must buttress the system where it is imperfect. But they must also involve themselves in certain regular operations (like performance feedback); and they must make decisions that are fully expected (resource allocation, for example). Each executive must have a sufficient formal authority to, among other things, carry out a group of basic, regular duties.

Combining these regular duties with those related to change and imperfection in the system, a statement of the five basic functions of the top executive reflects how such functions differ in kind, to some extent, from those at the middle and lower managerial levels (Argyris, 1953; Bavelas, 1960; Mintzberg, 1973; Greenwald et al., 1986):

1. The primary purpose of the executive is to ensure that his organization serves its basic purpose — the efficient production of specific goods or services. This gives rise to the next two purposes of the executive.

2. The executive must design and maintain the stability of his organization's operations. The executive must program the operations of his organization and monitor these programs to ensure a steady pattern of workflow. He must correct deviations when they occur and
he must allocate new resources, as they become available, to ensure the smooth flow of operations. As leader, he must develop and sustain an atmosphere in which the necessary work will get done. Essentially, he must ensure that the organization functions as an integrated unit.

3. The executive must take charge of his organization's strategy-making system, and therein adapt his organization in a controlled way to its changing environment. As monitor he must be familiar with environmental trends and as leader he must provide direction for his organization and introduce change in such a way that the organization adapts to it without unnecessary disruption. The maintenance of a balance between stability and change is among the top manager's most difficult tasks.

4. The executive must ensure that his organization serves the ends of those persons who control it. He must act as the focus for organizational values. Influencers exert pressures on him to have the organization serve their ends. The executive must interpret the values of each influencer, combine all these to determine the true power system, and then inform his subordinates of this in the form of organizational preferences to guide them in their performance and decision-making.

5. The executive must serve as the key informational (feedback) link between his organization and its environment. Only the executive, because of his formal authority, is capable of creating that vital link between certain special sources of information and his organization. In essence, the executive takes relatively ambiguous and unstructured data inputs from inside and outside, sorts these out and gives order to them, and then transmits clear information down the line.

6. As formal authority, the executive is responsible for the operating of his organization's status system. Although the work is often routine
and programmed, the executive must nevertheless perform a number of duties to operate his organization's status system. Included here are activities associated particularly with the resource allocation and performance feedback.

Moreover, a research evidence has indicated that the level in the hierarchy and the function supervised do account for more variation in managerial jobs. Shartle, for example, found that "one study of a number of job variables in a naval organization suggested that less than half of the performance could be ascribed to the man and a little over half to the demands of the particular job" (1956, p. 90, 94).

A number of conclusions appear frequently in the literature. Moving down the hierarchy, the job becomes more structured, the "real-time" roles assume more importance, and some of the characteristics are more pronounced. Furthermore, there is considerable evidence of role specialization by function. Specifically, managers at lower levels appear to be more concerned with the maintenance of work-flows, and this leads them to emphasize the "real-time" aspects of their jobs. In comparing Mintzberg's study (1968) of chief executives with Sayles's study (1964) of lower- and middle-level managers, for example, we find that the chief executives collected a wide variety of information to be used in strategy-making of a broad nature; the lower-level managers collected information to maintain the steady flow of work in their organizational units.

In conclusion, it is my understanding that managers at all levels perform common roles, but with different emphasis and skills; and in many jobs, no matter what the level, it is the incumbent himself who determines whether he will control the job or the job will control him.
Final Critical Remarks

From all the comprehensive literature and research reviews descriptively and critically discussed in the previous sections, it is clear that the research study of leadership has no shortage of explanations but they do not represent a steady accumulation of knowledge. However, various explanations have been refined, particularly with regard to recognition of the situational or contingency perspective. While successful application of most of the approaches discussed above has been reported, it is possible that the variety of individuals and situations encountered in the world of organizations means that there will always be limits to explaining leadership and applying that knowledge. Moreover, the study of leadership itself has not resulted in an absolutely reliable science of leadership. Simon (1976) notes:

... if there were no limits to human rationality administrative theory ... would be barren ... The need for an administrative theory resides in the fact that there are practical limits to human rationality, and that these limits are not static but depend upon the organizational environment in which the [leader's] decision takes place. The task of [leadership] is to design the environment that the individual will approach as close as practicable to rationality . . . .

The study of leadership will continue to address subjects which involve a certain degree of indeterminacy; because administration is an activity of humans in a complex and changing environment, limits on predictability seem unavoidable. Yet advances in understanding which improve leadership effectiveness are possible. The approaches to studying leadership discussed in this chapter represent the most significant of such advances.
CHAPTER 3

THE STUDY DESIGN (METHODOLOGY) AND EXECUTION

This study design aims at applying the TEAM theory to the evaluation of top-level officials in the State of Colorado. In particular, it explores and examines how top level executives at both the state and the local level of public administration in Colorado affect the performance of their followers or subordinates. The essential characteristic of the TEAM approach is that it relies on QUALITATIVE (rather than quantitative) measures of leader role in handling performance deficiencies in followers. This approach is much more consistent with the nature of leadership, which is a qualitative phenomenon that cannot appropriately be measured in absolute units or quantitative terms.

The principles on which the TEAM theory approach to the study of leadership rests are: 1) The view of the upper-level leader as a person who continually monitors and analyzes performance deficiencies in followers and implements suitable treatments to alleviate them, 2) The notion that the leadership process occurs within an organizational and managerial context that influences the followers performance, 3) The view of the follower’s performance as caused by four factors: ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation.

The Study Data Sources: Sample Selection/ Data Collection Method and the Procedural Technique

The sample of this study consists of the executive directors and deputy directors of the twenty Executive Departments in the State of Colorado; and the managers of eleven “home rule” cities in
Colorado. It is a **purposive** sample that can highly lead to a conceptual understanding of the TEAM theory.

These Executive Departments are as follows: Higher Education, Education, Social Services, Highways, Labor and Employment, Institutions, Administration, Health, Corrections, Natural Resources, Local Affairs, Revenue, Agriculture, Law, Personnel, Planning and Budgeting, Military Affairs, Regulatory Agencies, State, and Treasury (Lorch, 1983). Only three department heads are elected, Treasury, State, and Law; others are appointed.

As far as the cities are concerned, the study deals with the cities that are administered on the basis of **home rule**, i.e., those that possess guaranteed autonomy from the state government. (Home rule cities are contrasted with statutory cities, which are administered according to statutes laid out by the state legislature and can be changed by the state legislature unilaterally.). So, the main reason for selecting home rule cities has to do with the fact that this form of city administration is the rule in Colorado and it is certainly more conducive to the study of the effects of the behavior of public managers on their followers, since city managers enjoy significant autonomy under the home rule model. These cities are: Alamosa, Boulder, Golden, Greeley, Gunnison, Colorado Springs, Denver, Fort Collins, Westminster, Manitou Springs, and Pueblo (i.e., eleven cities all in all). Thus this study deals with a sample of twenty State-level officials (i.e., ten executive directors and ten deputy directors of the Executive Departments mentioned above), and eleven city managers (i.e., the managers of the above mentioned cities).

The procedure in which the TEAM theory approach is applied to these two samples is through an **intensive one-two hours personal or phone interview** with each official included in the sample above. These interviews are **semi-structured** in nature; and aim at identifying the
precise effect of the leaders upon the performance of their followers. Each interview focuses on certain key areas or variables, which have a profound impact on the leader's influence on his followers (see again Figure 1.2 illustrated previously in Chapter 1). One such area is ability. There the leader is responsible for removing follower performance deficiencies. Part of his/her task consists of the removing barriers to the efficient function of employees working in his/her department. The same essential principle applies to the area of motivation. Namely, the leader is responsible for raising the level of motivation on the part of his employees whenever it is low, establishing specific goals whenever the prevailing climate is one in which employee motivation is thwarted by unclear goals on the part of the organization, and for increasing follower commitment to the organization goals whenever the degree of this commitment is declining. Also, the leader is responsible for the employees' perception of their roles. Namely, the leader must make sure that employees have a sound perception of their goals, one that is crystal-clear and not confused by contradictory goals on the part of management. In this respect, the leader can make sure that the followers have correct perceptions of their goals by acting so as to remove or alleviate role ambiguity, conflict, and inaccuracy. The fourth and final variable to be discussed in the interviews is the principle of formal cooperation. There the leader is responsible for creating a cooperative work environment in which goal interdependence is ensured, goals are coherent, intergroup conflict is reduced or eliminated, and appropriate managerial mechanisms are used to tackle performance deficiencies. The names and addresses of all the executives targeted for contact were obtained through a request made to the Colorado Managers Association (CMA). Telephone calls were made to each executive's office to insure the accuracy of the names and addresses provided by the CMA. Letters indicating the purpose of the
study and a request for participation were mailed out to all officials who were targets for contact. After that, each executive (respondent) was directly contacted by telephone in order to establish his/her willingness to participate in the study. Once this agreement had been obtained and the access was made available, the executives' secretaries were contacted in a similar manner to arrange times for interviews.

Table 3.1 on the following page represents the executed plan of the study including the completion or response rate.

The overall response or completion rate, as Babbie (1989, p. 242) indicates, is a major guide to the representativeness of the sample respondents. He states that if a high response rate is achieved (as is the case in this study) there is less chance of significant response bias than if a low rate is achieved. Babbie further mentions that a response rate of at least 50 percent is adequate for analysis and reporting; a response of at least 60 percent is good; and a response rate of 70 percent is very good (Babbie, 1989). The point then, is that the percentage completion rate of this study (93.5%) constitutes a highly acceptable rate for analysis and reporting.

Measurement and Instrumentation

Interviews were conducted on respondents' work environment during the formal business hours. The anonymity of the public official (relative to his/her responses was maintained. All interviews were designed in such a way as to allow a relaxed conversation and to establish a comfortable rapport leading to open responses. Clearly, personal or telephone interviewing, as an investigative instrument, does provide much more opportunity for the respondent to open up and talk freely, a process that cannot be done with any mail questionnaire technique. The interviews were semi-structured in nature. Each interview has lasted between one and
Table 3.1: Completion of the Study Investigative Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments/Cities</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Investigative Instruments</th>
<th>Responses to Participation</th>
<th>Date Comp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Transportation</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/6/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Greeley</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/6/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gunnison</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/10/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Labor &amp; Employment</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/11/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pueblo</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/12/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Denver</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/13/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Collins</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/13/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Regulatory Agencies</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/16/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Golden</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/18/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Military Affairs</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/20/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Agriculture</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/20/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Treasury</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/23/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Boulder</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/26/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Health</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>12/30/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Administration</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/3/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/6/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Westminster</td>
<td>Assist. Mgr.</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/7/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Law</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/7/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Alamosa</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/7/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Higher Education</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/8/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Corrections</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/8/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Personnel</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/9/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Colorado Springs</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/9/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Institutions</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/10/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Revenue</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/11/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Planning &amp; Budgeting</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/14/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Local Affairs</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/15/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Social Services</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1/15/92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of State</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Personal Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Manitou Springs</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Telephone Interview</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completion Rate: 93.5%
two hours and was tape-recorded (with the respondents' permission). A special technical operation called "Recorder-Assisted Telephone Interviews (RATI)" was used to tape-record all the telephone interviews. Also, all the interviews were fully transcribed in order to capture as much data as possible. The volume size of the transcripts is about 740 pages.

The questions asked of respondents were open-ended in order to maximize the chance of learning their own points of view. In particular, a simple direct approach easy on questions and heavy on responses was used so that it would be possible to tap both the variety of meanings associated with the idea of leadership and the factors which respondents feel influence their ability to analyze and correct performance deficiencies in followers. The preestablished questions designed for this study were meant to be a general plan of inquiry, and not step-by-step structured questionnaire (see Appendix B). Indeed, during the interviews the answers evoked by my initial questions shaped my subsequent ones. This flexibility stemmed from the fact that I did have a pretty clear idea of what I wanted to ask; my role was to ask a question, hear the answer, interpret its meaning for general inquiry, frame another question either to dig into the earlier answer in more depth or to redirect the respondent's attention to an area more relevant to my inquiry. In short, I put myself in a position where I had to listen, think, and talk at the same time. Essentially, the respondents did most of the talking.

The set of open-ended questions that were used to elicit the views and opinions of those involved covered topics that included (1) experiences and span of supervision; (2) descriptions of roles and relationships with subordinates; (3) meanings and interpretations of "public executive leadership" in the context of the TEAM theory; (4) needs for accurate feedback, sufficient authority, and capability to analyze problems, suggest solutions,
and influence followers to adopt them (diagnostic-prescriptive abilities); (5) success or unsuccess of the respondents' interventions when attempting to overcome performance deficiencies in followers; (6) followers' ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation assessments; and (7) factors determining whether willing cooperation of followers is generally gained in the workplace. It was from responses to these sets of inquiries that material reported in this study was obtained, making use of the transcripts of the tape-recorded interviews. The advantage of drawing on qualitative data deriving from a variety of leadership roles and situations is that it provides, as Yin (1984, p. 48) has indicated, more compelling evidence for validity. Lastly, one important consideration was the fact that some of the executives interviewed illustrated abstract thoughts, but others preferred to reason from concrete experiences (e.g., case analysis). It was so important to me to be very alert to the particular language, words, and images used by subjects in responding so that it would be possible to observe accurately and render these complex observations into words, and also to ground the theory of this study in the perceptions and expressions of the executives themselves.

**Limitations of the Study**

The limitations of this examination and its results form along the traditional dimensions of reliability and validity or the lack thereof.

As with almost any piece of qualitative research, the results here are of limited reliability. Even with carefully crafted, consistently worded questioning, a single state sample will produce results of limited reliability.

However, an n=29 selective sample, carefully generated and tested, is reasonably reliable for generalization to larger, similarly defined populations.
But it is wise to take into account that the probable differences in public official jurisdictions, appointments, capacities, education, experience, and viewpoints across states limit the probable representatives of the results from a single state.

An additional limitation relates to the notion that whether the TEAM constructs are in fact utilized takes precedence over how they are utilized because the issue of "how" depends largely, if not totally, on the situation of each agency and its own managerial needs. Moreover, it is important to realize that with almost any piece of qualitative research it is not advisable to generate propositions and hypotheses unless there is a reasonable and logical expectation that (a) sufficient and significant data can be achieved and (b) a high response rate is possible to accomplish. This limitation is, to some degree, minimized by the considerable magnitude of the study interviews.

The strength of qualitative research is its ability to provide in-depth, valid input. This examination certainly provided valid input, but much more needs to be done to further investigate the TEAM constructs.

First, the interview questions were very open-ended, thereby allowing sometimes for unguided responses and for somewhat easy escape from focus on TEAM theory tenets. But fortunately, and in most cases, as each interview progressed, it became apparent that more and more productive responses were forthcoming.

Second, a limitation of "unbiased" questioning is its difficulty sometimes to provide interactions that cause the respondent to dig deeper, to consider new information, to consider different perspectives. Most of the interviews, however, did provide the interactive process so beneficial to increasing more diverse, in-depth.

Third, and may be more important, some respondents appeared to be largely foreign to management theory, management training, and
management in general. It's not clear in some cases that they knew what they were being asked, what they were talking about. It appears that a learning curve is necessary for increased validity of respondent input.

**Justification of the Investigative Design**

The basic thrust of the qualitative research design followed in this study is that of the interpretation of action, events, and perspectives through the eyes of those being investigated. Such an approach is taken to contrast sharply with the tendency in quantitative research to impose (rather than expose) meanings, since it is the investigator who sorts people out in terms of preconceived conceptual schemes. The implications of this quantitative approach can be clearly discerned in the contingency approaches to leadership. Thus, a typical article investigating an aspect of the path-goal theory (House and Mitchell, 1974), a prominent exemplar of the contingency approach, might look at the extent to which a directive leadership style contributes to group performance under varying conditions of task structure. Leaders will be arrayed along a continuum of directive leadership, as will situations in relation to the variable, task structure. Both of the central notions, directive leadership and task structure, are imposed by the research, with little recognition of the significance of the phenomena to which they refer to the leaders themselves. This omission is of potential importance not least because aspects of both leader behavior and the situation may be of greater (or lesser) significance when viewed from the actor's perspective.

Consequently, it is being suggested here that a qualitative approach to the study of leadership may be fruitful, not simply because it takes the actor's viewpoint as a central focus, but because, in so doing, it may bring to the surface issues and topics which are important yet which are omitted by relying on the researcher as the source of what is relevant. It can also
be anticipated that a qualitative researcher will emphasize the variety of situations and milieux rather than override them. As Sims (1979) has pointed out, questionnaires are extensively used by researchers concerned with leadership in organizations because they “are useful vehicles for operationalizing concepts (variables) that are generalizable across many different organizational situations” (p. 209). Sims goes on to observe: “Questionnaires thus lend themselves very easily to research efforts directed at the recent ‘contingency’ approaches to leadership research” (Sims, 1979, p. 209). By contrast, qualitative research takes greater notice of variety in social life and the different forms that the objects which underlie concepts may assume (Blumer, 1955).

The point that is being made here is that the injection of qualitative studies may allow greater attention to the way in which leaders think about leadership and about how they respond qua leaders to the variety of situations they confront (rather than what the investigator perceives to be important). Such a strategy may bring concepts and data into closer alignment, as well as allowing greater purchase on the question of the variety of ways in which leadership and phenomena related to it are experienced. In other words, rather than rely upon broad, somewhat abstract situational characteristics, i.e., task structure, position power, etc., researchers may find it more helpful to derive measures of aspects of the situation which are more grounded in the perceptions of leaders in their specific setting of what is relevant and important. Such prescriptions are in line with Mintzberg’s (1982, pp. 254-255) recommendations for leadership researchers:

Stop trying to fit the world into your abstract categories, especially ones so far removed from how leaders actually behave . . . [Do] your research in order to create richer, more relevant constructs, and when you have them, do more research to enrich them still further [emphasis in original].
Mintzberg suggests that too much measurement in leadership research is imposed by the researcher and so is insufficiently grounded in people’s (especially practitioners’) experiences, a state of affairs which at least in part explains the mystification many leaders experience when confronted with a body of research which is supposed to account for, and often help to improve what they do.

Lastly, an important goal of the design is to guarantee the objectivity of the results derived. Namely, open-ended questions are used in order to enable respondents to provide whatever information they deem necessary, without any preoccupation introduced by the way in which the questions are asked. (Of course, the responses can be manipulated by participants, but this is true for every study that uses responses to questions as its data.)

**Method of the Data Analysis**

It is clear from the way in which the study questions are formulated that they are open-ended questions which yield purely qualitative data. For this reason, the standard tools of statistical analysis (i.e., the organization of the data in a frequency distribution, calculation of parameters, estimation of confidence intervals and statistical significance) are not possible in this context. Instead, the appropriate approach to analyzing such data is the Extended Quotation Analysis (EQA). This method uses “inductive logic” to derive general (abstract) principles from particular (concrete) information provided by the participants in the above interviews. In other words, this method of analysis develops a mode of reasoning and conceptual themes from the interviews, rather than “coding” themes and conducting a quantitative analysis, (Easterby, Thorpe and Lowe, 1991). Taking into account the overall context (i.e, the
kind of questions asked, the relationship of a certain answer to others, the overall tone and direction of the responses provided by the individual in question), the researcher can reach conclusions possessing general validity from the results generated from the study interviews.

EQA as combined with “analytic induction” method, gives us exhaustive knowledge of the situation under study. It is mainly concerned with the notion that any particular methodology must be examined and assessed in the light of the total process of research and theory formulation. Put simply, the keystone of this method is that “we have to know what before we can explain why.”
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY: CONCEPTUAL
QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE INVESTIGATION(*)

The following is an illustration and examination of the findings of 29 semi-structured interviews with Colorado state and local (municipal) executives. The interviews focused on their views and thoughts of managerial leadership and followers' performance in relation to the four major dimensions of the TEAM theory:

- Ability ➔ Motivation ➔ Role Perception ➔ Formal Cooperation

In addition, the interviews have covered some other important aspects in the executives' needs for (a) accurate feedback, (b) sufficient authority to manage, (c) willing cooperation of followers, and (d) capability to analyze performance problems, suggest solutions, and influence subordinates to adopt them.

This chapter is organized into three major sections:

- **Discussion** and qualitative analysis of the study results, pointing out, through analytical statements, the main features of the findings as they relate to the TEAM theory tenets, propositions, and hypotheses.

- **Implications** and interpretations, illustrating the practical significance of the results and the impact on the four key performance factors.

- **Conclusions** regarding validity and reliability of the results and the TEAM constructs.

(*) For complete and detailed overview of the study results, please consult Appendix A in the back section.
Discussion and Analysis

Public Executive Leadership

Based on the collected data, Public Executive Leadership (PEL) is rarely seen along the four Key TEAM dimensions. Rather, PEL is seen largely as a matter of vision, service, and stewardship; and frequently the interviewees just sound plain bureaucratic.

Vision: “Trying to make sure that we set a vision for the organization . . . where we are going . . .”

Service: “It is public service,” “… looking at best interest for the constituent.”

Stewardship: “It would mean the responsible management of….” “… steward of tax payer dollars.”

Bureaucratic: “It means being responsible for the administration of that phase of government.”

The interviewed public executives rarely consider their leadership, on the surface, to involve their employees; rather they tend to focus outside their departments, toward constituents, or vision, or their executive’s agenda, or public policy.

Of the four TEAM dimensions, only motivation and formal cooperation surface recognizably and typically implicitly as dimensions in PEL, and only in eight interviews each. It would appear that the TEAM dimensions are not of top of mind salience to these public executives. Interestingly, the TEAM dimensions surfaced here among State executives in Education, Health, and Personnel — three arenas in which management theory training seems more naturally present.

Determining Ability Level

Four major means of determining ability surfaced: Recruitment and selection criteria, ongoing performance observations, formal periodic per-
formance appraisals, and informal and formal share input meetings. Interestingly, many of the public executives mentioning one of these means do not mention one of the others, suggesting that the means are frequently not used in combination. In the extreme, it appears that for some determining ability is a concern only at job commencement, while for others it is only a concern once there has been ongoing employment; and for some it involves both front-end and ongoing assessment. Those focusing on recruitment/selection criteria can be summed up by “I hire to the job description,” thereby apparently assuring an able employee has been hired.

Use of ongoing performance observations is typically frequent and informal, involving “walking around observations” and impressions of the employee’s overall ability to “meet deadlines” or “accomplish objectives.” For some, it is more formal and focuses on regular observations of the employees meeting of formalized objectives.

Use of formal periodic performance appraisals was mentioned by some, typically State executives utilizing the PACE system sometimes in combination with a department devised appraisal system. “The state has a PACE form . . . [and] we’ve developed a new performance plan for our division directors.”

A substantial number use formal input meetings with employees and other managers to gain shared input about manager, employee, and department performance. “Getting feedback from others . . .” “I have periodic meetings with staff.” (One could surmise that Formal Cooperation is inherent to these directors).

Handling Deficiencies and Dealing With Poor Match

When the issue is handling an individual employee’s deficiencies,
training is by far the interviewees' most frequently recommended course of action. In the second tier of responses are "transfer," "task reassignment," and "one on one discussion/teaching."

If the issue changes to dealing with a poor match between ability and job, then training is less likely to be mentioned. "Quality management," close supervision, correction actions, demotion, reassignment, transfer, and termination can be construed as a sequence of how to deal with a poor match if training fails.

Maximizing Ability

Interviewee input varied widely by department or municipality. The role of selection/placement in maximizing ability is seen as key by those able to avoid the personnel system — typically those having high priced professionals — while those having to use the (state) personnel system frequently see selection and placement as a hindrance (or possibly as an excuse).

Ongoing or regular training is seen as key to maximizing ability, but most of the state executives have zero to few dollars for it. "We are under funded." But in a few state departments, notably Personnel, Social Services, Training, and Law (by law), training is as much used as it tends to be among city managers (with more dollars?). Some state departments have training for basic but not higher level employees.

Transfer is used by many state directors both as a means of losing and gaining employees whose gain or loss is seen as key to maximizing departmental performance, and it is seen as successful by some. Interestingly, some state managers may not transfer because "it's difficult for state employees" while others do it because "it's so easy in the state." Transfer may be a more used means for maximizing ability in a good sized total
organization like the state, whereas municipalities can be too small for transfers.

**Job Redesign** is not used by some — "State system is too rigid for this" — is used a little by many "because of technology changes" — and used a lot by a few. Those who use job redesign to maximize ability are divided between those who redesign the job to fit the employee's abilities and those who do it to maximize the organization and not the individual.

On balance, all four TEAM concept **ability maximizers** have **validity**, but are used differentially because of perceived and real constraints. Almost all executives feel they have **managed ability** successfully, sometimes in spite of a personnel system seen as rigid and restrictive or budgets that preclude formal training programs.

**Ability Investigative Indications**

**Proposition 1.** If follower **ability** is deficient the leader may remove the deficiency and assure improved performance by providing job-instruction training opportunities, by selecting followers with the required abilities, or by altering the job so that it is compatible with the follower's abilities.

**Yes.**

The research clearly confirms the general tenet of Proposition 1, with **selection** and **training** being seen as the primary keys to attempting to enhance ability. While **training** is seen as key, it is also not used by many because of lack of financial resources. **Transfer** and **job redesign** are also operative, but are frequently, but not always, seen as difficult to utilize in a rigid, centrally controlled state personnel system. The city managers appear to have more flexibility. The state directors appear to pin much of their hopes on proper initial selection of the right person.

**Hypothesis 1.1.** In situations in which followers are deficient in ability, a high level of leader action that increases follower ability will
result in a high level of follower performance effectiveness.

Yes, with significant confirmation.

Virtually all of the directors regard themselves as effective managers, effective leaders, given their span of control. Most feel they have optimized the ability level of their department, given the constraints. The primary constraints are budget for training and external control (by Personnel) of personnel moves.

Hypotheses 1.2. In situations in which barriers inhibit the application of follower abilities to the achievement of task performance, the greater the degree that the leader removes the inhibiting barriers the higher the level of follower performance effectiveness.

Supported, but the data related can be interpreted in more than one way. It appears that the executives who train or redesign in spite of monetary or system constraints are the ones most likely to feel they have maximized performance.

Determining Level of Motivation

Clearly the two dominant interactive means of determining motivation are observations of output and conduct. “If the job gets done, the employee is motivated.” “Willingness to take on a job.” “The quality of their work.” “Willingness to work overtime.” Also mentioned are interactions that display attitudes and intuition. Some of the directors said “all my employees are motivated.” One director said motivation is determined by the annual employee survey (clearly not a hands-on manager!).

Handling Motivational Deficiencies

If deficient motivation is diagnosed via poor output, then job training to increase ability is seen as possibly productive. For most non-skill related motivational deficiencies, feedback and communication are seen as key to
correction. A possible feedback/communication sequence is: “Let him know, get his reasons, make corrections, get agreement on what is expected and provide encouragement.”

Some see motivational deficiencies as intractable and requiring “moving on.” Others refer the matter to the state personnel system. Increased job challenge and a pay raise were also cited as ways to handle motivational deficiencies.

In light of TEAM theory constructs, it is clear that task structure, task counseling, and performance feedback are inherent to most of the managers’ responses when it comes to handling deficiencies.

Increasing Level of Motivation

While TEAM theory thinking seems to apply to individual employee motivational deficiencies, it appears to be much less active when considering the director's work force as a whole. Task structure and especially task counseling appear to play a diminished role in total work force motivation but an enhanced role with “problem” employees. On the other hand, performance feedback and reward recognition are typically part of the overall management of motivation.

**Task structure** is not a pervasive part of these directors' ongoing management of motivation. Some see it as beneficial for low level employees or on a special case basis, but many see it as constraining and rigid (and, therefore as dulling motivation). Those who task structure appear to do it informally or as more of a goal setting process. Those who don't task structure want their employees to be flexible, to be self-directed.

**Task counseling** is even less frequently a part of those directors' ongoing motivation management. Those who task counsel see it in terms of working together, frequent staff meetings, and monitoring.
Performance feedback is almost universally endorsed and more or less pursued by these directors. "You can't overdo it." It is seen as needed on a constant and immediate basis. Only one director says annually is enough.

Reward recognition is an area of key motivational importance, but one which is seen as hard to deliver meaningfully in the state system. Certificates of Commendation and pats on the back are most frequently cited. There is hope that non-monetary "attaboys" will translate into the rewards of self-fulfillment. Among municipal managers, bonuses for exceptional performance are more likely. One manager said he does not reward/recognize individual performance, but rather team performance.

Almost all executives feel that motivation has been managed effectively, either by them directly or by their assistants.

Motivation Investigative Indications

Proposition 2. If follower motivation is deficient and not at the optimal level for the task, the leader may remove the deficiency and assure improved performance by (a) defining the task structure, authority, and accountability involved; (b) monitoring the tasks achievement process to remove any barriers to goal attainment; (c) giving feedback along the way; and (d) rewarding and recognizing efforts as well as results.

Yes, especially as regards points b, c, and d.

Concerning motivation, task structure is the least employed and appears to be seen as salient most frequently for low level employees. Monitoring, feedback, and reward/recognition are seen as key to managing motivation. Two additional points: motivation is largely managed on an individual, problem basis, and managing ability is frequently seen as key to managing motivation.
Hypothesis 2.1. In situations in which followers tend to have low level goals, leader action that establishes or that influences followers to establish difficult but attainable goals for follower performance results in higher level of performance effectiveness.

Yes.

Virtually all of the directors feel they have positively influenced performance via management of motivation deficits. In fact, many indicate that they have "more concerns about their subordinates who are working too hard and putting in too many hours and they have to watch that they don't burn out than they do with followers who may need to be motivated . . ." This is exactly the opposite of what one would expect to find in government.

Hypothesis 2.2. In situations in which follower goals tend to be non-specific, leader action that establishes or that influences follower to establish specific goals results in a higher level of follower performance effectiveness.

Moderately demonstrated.

Consistent indications regarding this hypothesis take the form of helping employees reassess their career interests, providing opportunities through training processes, and sometimes remodifying the job descriptions to maintain task specificity. A number of executives, however, have not demonstrated any "effective" way to establish "specific" attainable goals for their subordinates simply because they "lack the resources to apply to the corrective actions that are necessary . . ."

Hypothesis 2.3. In situations in which followers tend to have a low level of commitment to goals, leader action that increases follower commitment to performance goals results in an increase in follower performance.

Yes.
The directors clearly feel they can and have produced commitment to performance goals via monitoring and feedback as previously illustrated. Additionally, many indicate that they secure and increase commitment to goals by (a) maintaining the notion that the employees have a sense that what they do is important and meaningful, (b) creating an atmosphere in which the value system on getting the work done, meeting deadlines has a very high return on job security, and (c) removing, when possible, any distractions in subordinates’ life that may cause them to minimize focus on their work (e.g. family problem, dislike their coworkers, hate their boss . . .).

Assessing Clarity, Compatibility and Accuracy of Role Perception

Responses here take five general routes:

• Clarity et al. is assured by job descriptions, organizational charts or fixed personnel system definitions. “Your role is pretty clear in the State system.”
• Clarity et al. or the lack of it is observable by employee or team performance — “the end result.”
• Such assessment is not my responsibility, rather “supervisors do it.”
• Such assessment is ongoing because roles are fluid, “shifting to fit the job.”
• Such assessment is gained through feedback, through interactions. “We have daily meetings.”

As with assessment of ability and motivation, assessment of role clarity is a management function for many, i.e., they assess and manage roles. But, it is a non-function for others who regard it as a system responsibility that is (and should be) outside their management — “Employee roles are in writing.”
Handling Role Ambiguity

Role ambiguity is handled head-on and requires either a one-on-one or group interaction. The one-on-one approach involves the director receiving "explicit instructions," or "talking about it," or "clarification and correction." Sometimes the one-on-one approach is viewed as not a one-on-one between manager and employee but as a one-on-one between two employees in conflict.

Group interaction is used by many because it involves the whole team and team feedback for the individual can be effective in itself or as a precursor to a one-on-one.

No matter the general form of role ambiguity resolution, only a few of the directors regard such resolution as problematic. Virtually all regard their role resolution route as successful, whether or not they can define it.

Creating Sound Role Perception

Whether or not the directors use the TEAM terminology regarding creating sound role perception, most would see themselves as employing in-group exchange, and many say they employ formal performance feedback. High task orientation is not widely employed and in fact, it is frequently not understood as a concept. Those directors having examined or implemented TQM or a variation are somewhat familiar with TEAM construct lingo.

In-group exchange, while not a term used by most of the managers, is perceived by those embracing it as taking the form of:

- Regular (weekly?) management meetings and
- Unit, team, or sub-group employee meetings

Typically, in-group exchange is seen as a management group function or an employee sub-group function and not both. While most endorse their
concept of in-group exchange, a few find it counterproductive. "It stifles creativity."

**Formal performance feedback** regarding role perception is seen in the same light (as the same thing) as feedback regarding motivation. If they do one thing, they do the other and they either do it formally, informally, or the state does it for them. The responses suggest that the dimensions of **motivation** and **role perception** (and to some extent **ability**) are not differentiated in most of these directors' management approach.

**High task orientation** is greeted either with a question mark ("what?") or as something done when special needs, special projects are at hand. In these special cases, some directors bring "special groups together for special projects" and they "focus on putting the right people together for priority efforts." Those who greet **high task orientation** with a question mark may also greet it cynically — "Theory doesn't mean much."

**Role Perception Investigative Indications**

**Proposition 3.** If follower role perception is ambiguous, conflicting, or inaccurate, the leader may remove the deficiency and assure improved performance through in-group exchange (task-related information), formal performance feedback, and periodic high task orientation (instruction, guidance and expectations associated with various role sets).

**Quite possibly occurring.**

While very few can be seen as employing **periodic high task orientation**, the directors frequently use what is called **in-group exchange** and **formal performance feedback**, and it appears to be directed sometimes at role performance. It appears, however, that role performance is seen by many as a given, as pre-defined, and possibly as immutable. It further appears that many of the responses here were seen as synony-
mous with parallel questions regarding management of motivation. It is not clear that management specific to role perception is more than tokenly present; rather role perception management very likely to be seen as an inherent component of the management of motivation.

**Hypothesis 3.1.** In situations in which followers have role perception deficiencies, leader action that decreases or alleviates role ambiguity, role conflict, or role inaccuracy results in increased follower performance effectiveness.

**Demonstrated clearly, but not fully confirmed.**

The directors say they have been effective in increasing follower performance in this arena, but this assertion is suspect. Most do not appear to address role perception in a formal way, and it is frequently bundled with motivation. Therefore, it is not clear to what their affirmation of effectiveness relates. What they are saying is that "things are going pretty well or even very well, so I must be effective." Practical examples specified in this arena have little to do with role perception; they mostly relate to dilemmas facing job description modifications.

**Assessing Coordination and Formal Cooperation**

As with assessment of motivation and role clarity, assessment of coordination and formal cooperation is typically accomplished via:

- Observation of employees.
- Interaction with employees.
- Output of employees and the department. "If work gets done, then no problems."

It is not typically a formal assessment, except for a few executives using "TQM concepts;" — [We] involve everyone in the organization in meeting — even exceeding — customer expectations. Issues such as sharing of one definition of quality by all members of the organization, long-term com-
mitment to quality by top management, willingness of rank and file to invest in documenting and studying the work process (which is a function of how many times before reforms have been promised and left unfulfilled) have been applied to the workplace. Success isn’t certain but TQM is not recommended without qualification.

**Barriers to Cooperation and Coordination**

The two TEAM variables here — work overload and intergroup conflict — appear to operate very differently upon formal cooperation. **Intergroup conflict** can be a barrier to cooperation, but it usually has not been a problem, and when it is, the directors are likely to produce interactions or mediations that solve the conflict. “Have them get together to work it out, and if needed I step in.” **Work overload** appears to be a staple of these departments, but it is not a barrier to cooperation. In fact, work overload appears to be frequently a cause for cooperation, both formal and informal. “We reprioritize and work together.”

**Increasing Formal Cooperation**

At this point in the interview, it is clear that most executives feel they have addressed this arena in previous responses. They indicate as much, or they give virtually identical answers to the ones given in the parallel questions regarding role or motivation.

**Group-coherence** is seen as largely the same construct as ingroup exchange and as such, it is utilized, especially among management staff. For some it is ongoing, for some it is special case related, and for some it is formalized as in a retreat. Again, most regard management team meetings as a staple of sound management.

**Unity of command** is reduced by most to chain of command, and they largely embrace C of C thinking. A few see unity of command as involving
multiple managers cooperating to present a united front.

**Reward on combined effort** is frequently regarded as the same as reward for individual effort, either because of confusion or because both occur simultaneously. Those differentiating individual versus combined reward see rewards for combined effort as important and as "something that should be done more frequently." Some just say they do not reward combined effort (only individual effort?).

**Formal Cooperation Investigative Indications**

**Proposition 4.** If formal cooperation is constrained or deficient and inhibits followers performance, the leader may remove the deficiency and assure improved performance by providing a facilitative cooperative work environment.

*Consistently supported.*

The directors generally do not regard their area's performance to have been constrained by lack of formal cooperation. "It is not a problem." They feel that ongoing meetings (groupthink?) have maintained cooperation. Formal, out of the ordinary groupthink, while infrequent, has taken the form of retreats whose focus may have been problem solving and building formal cooperation.

**Hypothesis 4.1.** In situations in which a lack of formal cooperation inhibits followers performance, leader action that builds cooperative relationships systems among organizational subunits and individuals results in increased follower performance effectiveness.

*Demonstrated clearly.*

The executives are likely to say they have been effective in this arena; specific actions cited as unique to building formal cooperation include the built-in strategic planning and an emphasis on measurement, offering tools (groupthink, reward equity . . .) employees can use as they work
together in teams; another action cited involves that decision making for improvements be based on collective effort. Involving those closest to the client in improving work processes not only increases cooperation and secures conflict avoidance but also reduces employee frustrations. Moreover, one state department, increasingly committed to cooperative-oriented approach, used to pride itself for taking only five days to process a loan application on an insurance policy. This met internal standards developed 20 years ago. When a department "cooperative team" looked at their process through the eyes of policy holders, however, they realized it was really taking two weeks with mail time, week-ends, and the time it took Treasury to process the check. Policy holders needed their money sooner. By setting up a special mail box and by also accepting faxed applications, the department was able to cut its internal turnaround to 1.6 workdays. It was the same service, but with the team cooperative effort, it delivered faster.

**Hypothesis 4.2.** Leader approach effectiveness in analyzing deficiencies in followers performance variables and in taking actions to alleviate deficiencies is basically determined by the accuracy of feedback on follower performance variables, the amount of administrative authority of the leader, and the leader's capability to (a) perceive what should be done, (b) influence followers to achieve significant results, and (c) bring order to chaotic situations.

*Yes, with average confirmation.*

Moving away from formal cooperation per se, it is clear that most of these directors regard themselves as diagnostic observers and as givers of prescriptive feedback, and that their prescriptions have resulted in observable increases in performance. But it is clear from the directors' opening remarks concerning Public Executive Leadership that
most of the **visionary** executives, and only some **bureaucratic** executives, do not see themselves as direct managers for their workforces — leaders yes, but maybe not managers. Their focus appears not to be on **diagnosis** and **prescription**. **Chaos** has apparently not been present — good management must have prevented it. Additionally, it appears, but in a general sense, that **flexibility** and **accuracy** do exist in the executives' perceptions of their staff. This suggests that **willing cooperation** of followers is, to a reasonable degree, present. The following statement represents the general responses related to this notion: "[We] as managers ask lots of questions, extend and elaborate upon the ideas of subordinates to promote discussion of issues and sharing of information, and avoid . . . orders . . . and instructions to allow . . . subordinates to contribute to decisions . . . and work process . . ." 

**Implications and Interpretations**

The results, as specified earlier, indicate support for most of the TEAM theory constructs, as well as some other impacts that were not originally hypothesized. Other fruitful findings emerging from the study include insights about executive's perception of his role and his staff, factors shaping performance feedback, and the role state personnel system plays in shaping individual competence (ability), performance, and motivation.

The results suggest that strong public executives who possess experience and good policy and management skills may, in effect, substitute their personal skills for those of subordinate followers. This finding tends to reaffirm a conclusion by Light (1978, p. 171): "[Public executives] appear to do best when they know how to get along with other people." In conjunction with skilled public executives, the capacities of subordinate followers may be enhanced by better direction and renewed enthusiasm,
but their potential contribution is simultaneously diminished because their skills are less consequential. It may also be a function of underlying tenure patterns, reflecting that the process of "learning: and "teaching the ropes" detracts from the individual performance of participants in such a process (Ingraham, 1987).

Another area in which the results shed new light involves the determinants of follower competence, performance and motivation. The findings suggest some conventional and some unconventional relationships. The relationships among competence, motivation, and performance are entirely conventional (Perry and Porter, 1982). The relationships between agency performance, skilled executives, and follower motivation are relatively unconventional. In general, individual motivation appears to be responsive not only to individual rewards and direction (i.e., performance awards and appraisal accuracy), but also to contextual factors such as public approval and agency performance. Although these relationships are frequently discussed in the literature, they have seldom been identified researchably (for an exception, see Romzek and Hendricks, 1982).

Clearly, the present findings provided a reasonably good support for the TEAM constructs. Most of the findings are consistent with the logic of the TEAM theory dimensions. What all of this implies can be briefly illustrated as follows:

Assessing Ability Level

- Four major means of determining ability surfaced: Recruitment and selection criteria, ongoing performance observations, formal periodic performance appraisals, and informal and formal share input meetings. The means, according to the collected data, are frequently not used in combination.
• Use of **ongoing performance observations** is typically frequent and informal, involving “walking around observations” and impressions of the employee’s overall ability to “meet deadlines” or “accomplish objectives.” For some, it is more formal and focuses on regular observations of the employees meeting of formalized objectives.

• Use of **formal periodic performance appraisals** was mentioned by some, typically State executives utilizing the PACE system sometimes in combination with a department devised appraisal system.

• A substantial number use **formal input meetings** with employees and other managers to gain **shared input** about manager, employee, and department performance. “Getting feedback from others ...” “I have periodic meetings with staff.”

• When the issue is handling an individual employee’s deficiencies, **training** is by far the interviewees’ most frequently recommended course of action. In the second tier of responses are “transfer,” “task reassignment,” and “one on one discussion/teaching.”

• If the issue changes to dealing with a poor match between ability and job, then training is less likely to be mentioned. “Quality management,” close supervision, demotion, reassignment, transfer, and termination can be construed as a sequence of how to deal with a poor match if training fails.

• Role of **selection/placement** in “maximizing ability” is seen as key by those able to avoid the personnel system — typically those having high priced professionals — while those having to use the (state) personnel system frequently see selection and placement as a hindrance (or possibly as an excuse).

• **Ongoing or regular training** is seen as key to maximizing ability, but most of the state executives have zero to few dollars for it. But in
a few state departments, notably Personnel, Social Services, Training, and Law, training is as much used as it tends to be among city managers (with more dollars).

- **Transfer** is used by many state directors both as a means of losing and gaining employees whose gain or loss is seen as key to maximizing departmental performance, and it is seen as successful by some. Interestingly, some state managers may not transfer because "it's difficult for state employees" while others do it because "it's so easy in the state."

- **Job Redesign** is not used by some — "State system is too rigid for this" — is used a little by many — "because of technology changes" — and used a lot by a few. Those who use job redesign to maximize ability are divided between those who redesign the job to fit the employee's abilities and those who do it to maximize the organization and not the individual.

- On balance, all four TEAM concept ability maximizers have validity, but are used differentially because of perceived and real constraints. Almost all executives feel they have managed ability successfully, sometimes in spite of a personnel system seen as rigid and restrictive of budgets that preclude formal training programs.

**Assessing Level of Motivation**

- Clearly the two dominant interactive means of "determining" motivation are observations of output and conduct. "If the job gets done, the employee is motivated." "Willingness to take on a job." "The quality of their work." "Willingness to work overtime." Also mention are interactions that display attitudes and intuition.

- If deficient motivation is diagnosed via poor output, then job training to increase ability is seen as possibly productive. For most non-skill
related motivational deficiencies, feedback and communication are seen as key to correction. A possible feedback/communication sequence is: “Let him know, get his reasons, make corrections, get agreement on what is expected and provide encouragement.”

- Some see motivational deficiencies as intractable and requiring “moving on.” Others refer the matter to the state personnel system. Increased job challenge and a pay raise were also cited as ways to handle motivational deficiencies.

- In light of TEAM theory constructs, it is clear that task structure, task counseling, and performance feedback are inherent to most of the managers responses when it comes to handling deficiencies.

- Task structure and especially task counseling appear to play a diminished role in total work force motivation but an enhanced role with “problem” employees.

- Task structure is not a pervasive part of these directors’ ongoing management of motivation. Some see it as beneficial for low level employees or on a special case basis, but many see it as constraining and rigid (and, therefore as dulling motivation). Those who task structure appear to do it informally or as more of a goal setting process. Those who don’t task structure want their employees to be flexible, to be self-directed.

- Task counseling is even less frequently a part of those directors’ ongoing motivation management. Those who task counsel see it in terms of working together, frequent staff meetings, and monitoring.

- Performance feedback is almost universally endorsed and more or less pursued by these directors. It is seen as needed on a constant and immediate basis.

- Reward recognition is an area of key motivational importance, but one which is seen as hard to deliver meaningfully in the state system.
Certificates of Commendation and pats on the back are most frequently cited. There is hope that non-monetary “attaboys” will translate into the rewards of self-fulfillment. Almost all executives feel that motivation has been managed effectively, either by them directly or by their assistants.

Assessing Level of Role Perception

- Responses consistent with the logic of the TEAM theory in this area take three important forms:
  a) Clarity et al. or the lack of it is observable by employee or team performance — “the end result.”
  b) Such assessment is ongoing because roles are fluid, “shifting to fit the job.”
  c) Such assessment is gained through feedback, through interactions. “We have daily meetings.”
- As with assessment of ability and motivation, assessment of role clarity is a management function for many, i.e., they assess and manage roles. But, it is a non-function for others who regard it as a system responsibility that is (and should be) outside their management — “Employee roles are in writing.”
- Role ambiguity is handled head-on and requires either a one-on-one or group interaction. The one-on-one approach involves the director receiving “explicit instructions,” or “talking about it,” or “clarification and correction.”
  Group interaction is used by many because it involves the whole team and team feedback for the individual can be effective in itself or as a precursor to a one-on-one.
- Whether or not the directors use the TEAM terminology regarding creating sound role perception, most would see themselves as employing
in-group exchange, and many say they employ formal performance feedback. High task orientation is not widely employed and in fact, it is frequently not understood as a concept. Those directors having examined or implemented TQM or a variation are somewhat familiar with TEAM construct lingo.

- In-group exchange is seen as a management group function or an employee sub-group function and not both. While most endorse their concept of in-group exchange, a few find it counterproductive. “It stifles creativity.”
- Formal performance feedback regarding role perception is seen in the same light (as the same thing) as feedback regarding motivation. If they do one thing, they do the other and they either do it formally, informally, or the state does it for them.
- High task orientation is greeted either with a question mark (“what?”) or as something done when special needs, special projects are at hand.

Assessing Level of Formal Cooperation

- Assessment of this concept is accomplished via:
  — Observation of employees.
  — Interaction with employees.
  — Output of employees and the department. “If work gets done, then no problems.”

It is not typically a formal assessment, except for few executives using “TQM concepts.”

- Intergroup conflict can be a barrier to cooperation, but it usually has not been a problem, and when it is, the directors are likely to produce interactions or mediations that solve the conflict. “Have them get together to work it out, and if needed I step in.” Work overload appears to be staple of these departments, but it is not a barrier to
cooperation. In fact, work overload appears to be frequently a cause for cooperation, both formal and informal. "We reprioritize and work together."

• **Group-coherence** is seen as largely the same construct as ingroup exchange and as such, it is utilized, especially among management staff. For some it is ongoing, for some it is special case related, and for some it is formalized as in a retreat.

• **Unity of command** is reduced by most to chain of command, and they largely embrace the logic of this concept. A few see unity of command as involving multiple managers cooperating to present a united front.

• **Reward on combined effort** is frequently regarded as the same as reward for individual effort, either because of confusion or because both occur simultaneously. Those differentiating individual versus combined reward see rewards for combined effort as important and as "something that should be done more frequently." Some just say they do not reward combined effort (only individual effort?).

**Willing Cooperation of Followers**

It is generally gained because many executives interviewed seem to indicate the:

• **Accurateness of their effort in making good use of followers’ skills and abilities in their present jobs.**

• **Meaningfulness of the work subordinates do on their jobs.**

• **Flexibility in changing perceptions about subordinates and the work they do.**

• **Subordinates’ satisfaction with the chances they have to accomplish something worthwhile.**
Executives' Diagnostic-Prescriptive Abilities

The executives interviewed range from visionary to bureaucratic. It appears that they only have a moderate focus on diagnosis and prescription. The following indicators surfaced:

- Executive jobs are viewed as an opportunity to make positive, long-term improvement to government service.
- Mentioned frequently is the constant effort to ensure accountability for honest, and efficient public service.
- Many executives interviewed seem to play an important role in the policy-making of their agencies.
- Administrative authority of the executives is present to the extent that they are able to reassign their subordinates to best accomplish the departments' missions.
- Many executives have clearly demonstrated some important managerial skills (e.g., vision, bringing valuable experience to their jobs, support and uphold merit principles, recognizing exceptional accomplishment).

So What? Conclusions

As in most qualitative research, the question of the reliability and validity of the conclusions which can be drawn from this collected data are not completely out of concern (Kirk and Miller, 1986). There is a reasonable confidence, however, that the general views and opinions of the interviewed executives would not differ from other public executives in the State of Colorado. In other words, these results are reliable to the extent that general conclusions about the views and thoughts of Colorado public executives can be made. Nevertheless, it is possible that the opinions and views of public executives in other parts of the country would
differ. But even with this possibility, it is reasonable to make generalizations to larger, similarly defined populations.

I do feel that in so far as I was able to explore the views and opinions of those executives, the conclusions are highly valid. That is, I have little doubt that the views and opinions expressed were truthful and fully reflected the actual thoughts of the participants in the study interviews. Moreover, the views expressed by the executives closely match the original expectations of the TEAM theory. This leads to further accept these results as valid. As such, these views form a useful basis for suggesting directions for further research.

The conclusions which can be drawn from this study are as follows:

• When it comes to an examination of managing ability and managing motivation, the public sector executives can be seen as TEAM theory receptive, but not necessarily TEAM theory agents. When it comes to managing role perception and especially to managing formal cooperation, the directors are not unreceptive, but they are very unlikely to be able to differentiate management of these two constructs from what they are doing for ability and motivation.

• It appears that management of subordinates tends not to be what these directors see as their primary responsibility, but rather it is a natural by-product of their other, more central activities. They are public officials whose concern are vision, public policy, stewardship of public moneys, and/or constituents.

• Clearly, ability is managed, is optimized via selection and especially training, and to a lesser extent by job redesign and transfer.

• TEAM theory thinking also applies to managing motivation but typically only on an individual or problem basis, especially as regards task structure and task counseling. Performance feedback and reward recognition are seen as staples of motivation management.
• With very few exceptions, the directors' later-in-the-interview responses regarding role perception and formal cooperation are no longer fresh. Ingroup exchange and group-coherence are seen as positive and virtually identical to each other and to the management meetings they use to deal with motivation or ability issues. Performance feedback is essentially the same no matter whether motivation, role perception, or formal cooperation is the focus. It's ditto for reward. The directors don't differentiate between feedback and reward by TEAM construct — any given appraisal or attaboy covers motivation, role, and cooperation, and probably ability.

• Viewing the entire TEAM theory, the interviewee input can be seen as a relatively reliable (it is consistent) indicator that the theory:
  —Is face valid in the overall sense. The directors do see themselves as having managed ability, motivation, roles, and cooperation even if they do not delineate them in concept or in action.
  —May be valid, but is currently not salient. These directors don't think of management along the basic four TEAM dimensions without considerable prompting. "What is high task orientation?" In fact, most don't think in terms of any management theory.
  —May not be valuable as a fully articulated framework for many of these directors because once they have able, motivated employees they are likely to feel they are home free.
  —May not be appropriate for public officials who are merely stewards of the public trust and for whom the personnel system takes care of ability, motivation, roles, and possibly even cooperation. Such passive stewards appear more prevalent in state departments than in executive city management.
  —Has demonstrated overall construct validity because maximizing ability, increasing motivation, creating sound roles, and in-
creasing formal cooperation, even if not consciously articulated, have been positively influenced by what can be considered the basic action components of TEAM theory, i.e., in-group exchange, performance feedback, and reward.

Some final points are worth noting. First, the TEAM is a complex, multifaceted theory. And the present data were sufficient for only a post-test of the effects of TEAM constructs. A research design incorporating a pre-test or other types of controls was preferable. However, no baseline data were available for the variables represented in the model. Second, drawing conclusions about the adequacy of the implementation of TEAM or definitively attributing causality to TEAM were not the primary purpose of the analysis. The purpose was more limited: to assess and test the consistency between present qualitative findings and the original logic or expectations of the TEAM theory. Lastly, and before proceeding to the next chapter, it is also wise to note that further research could build upon the findings of this study by improving measurement of some of the TEAM variables and adding terms to the model to measure the actual implementation characteristics of TEAM theory dimensions across public agencies.
CHAPTER 5
LESSONS LEARNED, WISDOMS GAINED
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

So much for the tasks of public executive leadership. Any attempt to
describe a social process as complex as executive leadership inevitably
makes it seem more orderly than it is. Public executive leadership is not
tidy. Decisions are made and then revised or reversed. Misunderstandings
are frequent; inconsistency is inevitable. Achieving a goal may simply
make the next goal more urgent: inside every solution are the seeds of
new problems. And as Gardner (1990) has pointed out, most of the time
most things are out of hand. No leader enjoys that reality, but every
leaders knows it.

This chapter deals with the lessons learned and wisdoms gained from
this study. It concludes with a number of recommendations that ought
to be considered as management options in order to gain greater perform­
ance and more managerial excellence.

Lessons and Wisdoms: The Good,
the Bad, and the Boring

Given the study findings, analysis, and conclusions, the research has
produced valuable lessons, and even what could be called wisdoms.

As a logical inference generated from the study findings, it appears that
the best leaders are philosophical in the sense that they possess a
comprehensive vision, the capacity for flexible, inventive thinking and the
ability to make decisions and act in an ambiguous and uncertain envi­
ronment. Effective public executive leaders are also aware of concrete
details, complex interpersonal dimensions and political realities that
characterize organizational behavior. The logic of the TEAM theory could prepare or help executives and managers to become reflective realists, and master the increasingly complex interpersonal, social, political and ethical dynamics of the contemporary workplace.

An important factor, however, is that it is apparent that public executive leaders are frequently neither leaders nor managers when it comes to their staff. They may be visionary; they may be political “servers,” and they may be responsive to the electorate; but they are frequently not leaders of their staff. They may also be bureaucratic “servers” willing to accept (even to promulgate) the inability to take responsible actions even in the case of their own employees.

Colorado’s public executive leaders, especially in state government are likely to be unschooled in management and leadership. Many appear receptive to such schooling and many do not.

For some public executive leaders, management theory and techniques will be seen as “stunk” and at best as something to be suffered through and condescended to. Some, however, will be eager and hopeful about the possibilities, especially if it is a widely accepted philosophy or program such as TQM.

There are, of course, always better ways of doing things. As far as the study findings are concerned, the concept of “if it isn’t broken, don’t fix it” has to go. This research fully endorses the total quality management concept which has to do with continuously striving as a team to find better ways of doing the job. The key is to get a total commitment from your employees, but remember, without employee involvement, there is no commitment. As a public executive, you must especially take the time to get to know your employees, to get to know their gifts and skills. You don’t move them to new jobs or assignments until you really understand what
they can do well. Then you can move them, if that's what's needed to utilize their skills better, to make them and the organization more productive.

At the same time, you work to get your people to buy into your ideas. You want them to think of an idea as their idea, because then they'll do almost anything to accomplish the objective. You can't get them to buy in if you dogmatically insist that your view must be adopted blindly, without thought or discussion. Rather, you lead people by a process of reasoning to the point where they adopt the idea as their own, where they accept it with enthusiasm.

When that happens, there's almost nothing that can keep them from reaching the goal. And when they do reach it, you make sure to give them the credit for doing it.

As far as the study is concerned, this is the real challenge of public executive leadership: to get people to buy into an idea, to think of it as their own, and then, when the goal is reached, to give them full credit. And above all, you give them the authority and responsibility to do the job right. You don't tell your followers how to do it; you tell them what to do. And then you let them do it. Moreover, if a public executive wants his/her subordinates to feel like they are on his team, he must show his trust in them, he must show them that he respects their ability and that he wants them to use their skills in the best way they can. That means he must preserve their initiative, their freedom of action, and make them full participating members of the team.

Only a good public executive can do all of that well. It takes patience; it takes skill; and it takes a willingness to let subordinates get the credit.

Another insightful lesson relates to the general dissatisfaction with the performance appraisal system; there is a lack of agreement on its purpose. Should it merely evaluate performance, or critique and improve it as well? Should it be used primarily to determine salaries and prospects for
promotion, or as a means of training and career development? Should it focus on how an employee does the job or the results achieved? Just who is it supposed to help, the employee or the supervisor? The truth is, no performance-review system can accomplish all these goals, but confusion about conflicting purposes often undermines attempts at effective evaluation. And the real problem is not how well managers can evaluate performance, but how willing they are. The problem is one of motivation, not ability.

On the other hand, it is wise to realize that there are very real structural, bureaucratic constraints on the learning and application of any management theory. Learning is likely to be constrained by lack of budget. Application is likely to be constrained by an inflexible personnel system that leaves little room for management of staff. Nonetheless, it appears that management theory that can work in small ways within the constraints would be accepted and applied by many.

Focusing on state government or large, multi-departmental municipal government, there is reason to believe that any management or TQM or TEAM programs will be effective only if they are implemented across all departments and not just on a department by department basis. Especially critical is the personnel department's granting of freedoms to apply such programs. Furthermore, the results of the TEAM theory can guide multi-state focus group research and, subsequently, a large sample survey project.

It appears that implementation of management programs will be easier and probably more effective in smaller municipal governments with their smaller bureaucracies and more direct control by a single public executive.

There is a need for public executives to embrace the tenet that responsiveness to constituencies requires effective management of staff and not just posturing.
Recommendations

An effective application of **TEAM theory** by public executive agencies requires **more or less** of the following:

- The credibility, wide acceptance, and extensive press of programs like TQM.
- The ability to be easily seen as effective in structures where personnel moves by the executive are sharply constrained by the personnel system.
- Implementation across all departments within the system of government.
- A relaxation of personnel system rules.
- Public executive leaders who themselves have been to school, formally or informally.
- Public executive leaders who truly want to lead and manage their staffs to effective action.
- Frequent travel to talk with the public and to see how the department actually operates in the field.
- Sharing information and views from top to bottom, and encouraging face-to-face communications.
- A willingness to tolerate failure, duplication and to foster competition.
- Insisting on performance from all employees and a tough-minded willingness on the part of all executives to take appropriate steps within the framework of existing personnel protections to eliminate the incompetent, the unwilling, and the insubordinate.
- Knowing precisely what needs to be achieved with the formal performance appraisal, such as determining raises, evaluation, criticism, training, or morale-building.
- Being able to give honest and constructive criticism on followers' performance when necessary. Most employees don't want a meaningless
pat on the back. They want to know where they stand and how they can improve.

- Using informal performance progress reports or mini-appraisals to help spot problems before they become serious.
- Short periods of assignment of key executives to private organizations that deal with the department to see how it looks from “the other side.”
- Special bonus systems for those who spend or save public fund wisely or accomplish outstanding work.
- Being able to present TEAM theory in a way relates directly to the executive’s situation and staff. Currently the theory appears to gain salience, and seems consistent as it progresses from one construct to another.
- Finally, it has to be very inexpensive to learn and implement.

**Final Remarks**

The practical significance of the study findings is indeed present. Implications of the substantive findings can logically stand for theory-building in the area of ability, motivation, role perceptions, and formal cooperation. And as the findings of this investigation seem to fully or partially support the hypotheses, the TEAM theory is found to have reasonable construct validity. The current study helped to establish a valid TEAM constructs. Its results suggest that future research effort to use and enhance these constructs are warranted. All the four key performance-factors need further investigation especially for their relationship to performance increase and effectiveness. Efforts to reduce or alleviate performance deficiencies associated with the four key TEAM dimensions thus become important undertakings. For example, it may be that per-
formance ineffectiveness is not an inherent outcome of role ambiguity, conflict, low motivation, or lack of cooperation. Rather, public organizations might be able to take steps to prevent performance deficiencies from occurring in these situations. In this regard, the development of a managerially sound measure of executive's ability as related to follower's performance has practical as well as theoretical payoffs. With the TEAM dimensions developed here, public organizations could diagnose their current situations, pinpoint particular job features and perceptions of total jobs that are problematic in performance, and attempt to prevent or reduce future performance deficiencies. Such preventive techniques, as the data suggested, require the ability to analyze employees' job performance deficiencies validly. The data reported in this study are coded, tested, and analyzed only enough to generate, hence, to suggest theory. Additional testing of the theory, when necessary, is left to more rigorous, possibly quantitative, approaches.
APPENDIX

A. Comprehensive Overview of the Study Results

The findings in this section are organized according to the interview question sequence with each executive. To maintain confidentiality, the executives' (respondents') names are omitted; and each participant is identified by a codified (different) symbol (e.g., A, A-1, A-2 . . . B, B-1, B-2, etc.), and it is placed right before specifying his/her responses.

Role Definition: Public Executive Leadership

Executive, A

"Leadership to me is simply being able to formulate a vision and then communicating that in a way that people can understand it and getting a consensus building and moving in the direction of whatever that vision happens to be."

Executive, A-1

"People who can work with the system and make the system respond. And secondly that have a little bit more risk taking than an average employee. Because they tend to be more outspoken, more willing to try things."

Executive, A-2

Need to understand the strong role government plays in peoples' lives. "Because it is a big factor in what happens in this country and in most, there is an obligation on the part of the people who are in a position to put policy into place."
Executive, A-3

Leadership is promoting "quality government service to the citizens and to the other state agencies. Our department mainly serves the other state agencies. And if we can help them to do their job better than the rest of the government will benefit from it."

Executive, A-4

"Management of budget and administration and great effort in the area of public policies. And then it also involves representing a particular constituent group."

Executive, A-5

Representing the values of society. "To provide the environment with the tone of how we deliver services, how we spend public money, who we are responsible to, how we are responsive."

Executive, B

"It means the ability to lead people into a work ethic and the ability to complete the requirements that are in the department."

Executive, B-1

"Public leadership is identifying problems or issues. Identifying potential alternative solutions to those problems or issues. Then making the decisions and acting on the solution, on the selective solution for those decisions."

Executive, B-2

"Public leadership goes across the public as well as the organization that you lead. Having a broad understanding and hopefully a good relationship with all others who might be involved in what you do."
Executive, B-3

"It means providing direction in terms of public policy. Setting a tone of what direction you want this particular entity to move in. Also, setting an agenda for execution of the policy, whatever it might be in many given area."

Executive, B-4

"Trust with leading government, leading, managing the resources that are appropriated by the legislature based on public policy. It carries with it motivating, leading, developing a public work force."

Executive, B-5

"Leadership in the legislative or in an elected position, you're really in a position to make policy based upon a constituent input and then looking at what's the best interest for the entire state or the federal government or the local community."

Executive, B-6

"Translating the policy elected in politically appointed people into implementing those actions."

Executive, C

"The execution of an administration of governmental programs and services. Leadership, . . . is finding out what people want to do and doing it, or whether it is exerting some, trying to exert some influence toward a reasoned collaborative direction."

Executive, C-1

Thinks as a "steward of tax payer dollars and resources" and having a "significant responsibility to the Executive of the state to assure that
the executive philosophies and policies for corrections management is carried forth.”

Executive, C-2

Leadership involves direction and vision for the future. “People who work in the public sector need to be committed to providing excellence in public service to the public for the tax money that we take in.”

Executive, C-3

“To make sure that the funds that come into the treasury are invested as safely as possible . . . and basically make as much money for the state.”

Executive, C-4

“A responsibility to provide leadership, whose vision is tied to the long-term goals of the organization, the requirements of the statues, etc.”

Executive, C-5

Need to believe in the important role the government plays in our society. “I think you have to be very comfortable in working in a complex, highly democratic environment where everyone is asking to participate and to be a part of the decision-making process.”

Executive, C-6

“Someone who is in a public sector position, who is in an executive role . . . usually a chief executive position.”

Executive, D

“Well, in my particular case, it’s public service, me serve the needs of
the public as far as street [maintenance], snow removal, trash collection, building department, Stapleton International and Denver International.”

Executive, D-1

“It means the designated individual that be responsible for the administration or overall direction of that phase of government.”

Executive, D-2

“Leadership refers to the responsibilities that executives have in terms of creating a direction for the organization, a vision, setting up processes so the vision can be translated into plans and get accomplished.”

Executive, D-3

“Trying to make sure that we set a vision for the organization as a whole, where are we going, what do we want to try accomplish.”

Executive, D-4

“It means coping with declining trust at our level because of what is going on at levels above us at the state and particularly the federal level.”

Executive, D-5

“Public leader is person that innovates, starts new programs, finds more cost effective ways and looks for more effective and efficient management of government through innovation.”

Executive, D-6

“It would mean the responsible management of both the business operations and the citizen’s concerns.”
Executive, D-7

“It means having the responsibility from a public sector perspective for leading a governmental agency.”

Ability Assessment

Executive, A

Determining level of ability. Relies on college degrees, past experience and performance, position descriptions, reference checks and interviews with the applicant.

“After hiring, it is a matter of evaluating.” Sitting down with the staff and comparing expectations of employees to that of the organization. “You simply work progressively along through the year in ongoing evaluation. We try and keep it on a positive plane, so that we help individuals find strengths and weaknesses as we go, so we can remedy those.”

Increasing level of ability.

Training. Training in-house is only at the secretarial level. Limited for managerial people. “We do need to have some place that managerial people can go and have seminars, short seminars, to keep skills up to speed, in terms of working with people, coming up with new theory and having discussions, which is not something that is done regularly after people get degrees. But we do encourage people to take classes, whether it would be beneficial to correct the deficiencies or the weaknesses.”

The limited amount of training they have done is seen as successful.

Transfer. “Within the department, we don’t do a whole lot of transfer.”

“Our big success in terms of . . . building skills and helping people . . . is the state counseling service available for state employees. We encourage people to go to that counseling service.”

Job Redesign. “We job redesign all the time. It’s something that we do
probably on a very continuing basis. We do so much of that we've come up with just generic titles for positions.”

Executive, A-1

Determining level of ability. By performance. If “they are accomplishing the goals or the objectives that we have set out . . . then I assume they have the ability to do that.”

Maximizing ability. Feels utilizing the techniques below has been successful in maximizing ability. Cites reasons for success as “good judgement . . . and taking your time to select people.”

Selection and placement. Background and “talking to people about them . . . The most important thing any manager does is select people, promote people, and get rid of people. Everything else pales by comparison.

Job redesign. Use job redesign. Described as occurring when change from having “switch board operator . . . [to where] everybody answers their own phone, or, moving someone out of an area whose not very good into an area which they will be more successful, changing the duties because of the individual.”

Training. Do not do much training. “For the most part we expect our people to arrive on the job ready to do the work that they were hired to do.”

Transfer. Uses transfer to benefit. “Transfers are often one of the ways people recruit, it's very easy in state government, to get people into a job if they already have a similar classification in state government.”

Executive, A-2

Determining level of ability. Determines by having staff meet expectations. “I expect the three principle managers that report to me to be able to answer any question that comes up in their area of expertise.
[Also expect them] to present some new way of doing things. And I expect them to be able to communicate some enthusiasm for what they are doing for the people that work for them."

**Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience.** Handles by working directly with the person involved. “I try to do as much as I can. I think you learn by teaching, and sometimes the resolution of one problem is that we got a solution to another problem that comes later. The other reason I try to do it, is I want managers who have a problem coming here” and discussing ways to fix it.

Feels has been successful in overcoming the deficiencies.

**Maximizing ability.** Feels has been successful in maximizing ability. “I suspect part of it is just the old business about persistence being the most important quality a person can have. And I have just let people know that you don’t fail unless you quit trying, and I think I’ve been able to communicate that.”

**Selection and placement.** Generally relies on state personnel system. But “when you’re selecting somebody from within your own staff, you know something about them and you’ve got a history. The people I have selected have generally been good people, and they’ve responded very well, and they’ve provided a lot of good suggestions.”

**Transfer.** Do not do because of small staff. “Except for the compliment of people I’ve got here, the biggest single function that reports to me is budget and fiscal and there is only four people that are there.”

**Job redesign.** Do not do a great deal of job redesign. “That’s a tough one for me. The typical response is you’ve got a new job, you need a new person. If you lose a person, you have to lose a function. The idea of sorting things around so that it will work better is very, very foreign to a lot of people.”
Executive, A-3

**Determining level of ability.** Follows PACE system. Also uses “individual performance objectives and every year [we] sit down with each division director and they come up with what they consider their performance goals for the next year. In practice, if we're not planning to fire somebody, or discipline them, if we're just looking at somebody's performance and how they can improve, I think it's more intuitive and it's more what we hear from our customers.”

**Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience.** Typically does not face this problem. “In all cases, the people I directly supervise got where they are because they do know what they are doing. It's the P.R. and customer satisfaction side that needs to be worked. Some of these people, for instance, they are very technically skilled, but don't know how to deal with customers.”

Feels have been moderately successful here. “It's hard to change people's personalities and so you have people who are good people and you have people that are good technical people, and sometimes you can't be both.”

**Maximizing ability.**

**Selection and placement.** Keys on commitment, not college degrees or experience. “If I had a division director position open, the most critical factors that I would be concentrating on would be quality management.”

**Transfer.** Says is difficult for the State system. “I think the major hinderance there is the personnel system. If someone is not happy with what you're doing to them, or if it affects their pay, then they can appeal it, and you have to document bad performance before you can work through it. It almost has to be mutually voluntary.”

**Job instruction training.** Little chance for training. “This state is
terribly under-funded for training. I don't have a budget to offer that. What we're doing right now is sort of an internal training.”

Job redesign. Questions the feasibility. “We did make one attempt under the previous executive director to combine two divisions, and have one director over that. It didn’t work very well.”

Executive, A-4

Determining level of ability. Through selection, when they are hired. “They have to meet particular standards and qualifications. We [also] have an ongoing performance evaluation where we insure that any and all their responsibilities are being carried out.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. If not an essential part of the job, by reassignment or redesign. “If it’s a situation where they have been given a task to do that was not required, we have to look at reassigning that task to someone else or there is the ability to change a job description.”

Maximizing ability.

Job redesign. Uses job redesign, but, “if they no longer qualify for the job then there is a process by which we would actually remove them from the position because their particular skills would no longer be needed or would not be consistent.”

Transfer. Also transfer people. “We would try first of all within the department, or if that’s not possible, throughout the state personnel system . . . “and ultimately, of course, if their skills are no longer pertinent to State Government, it could lead to a lay off, but that would be very rare, and it would be the last resort.”

Success. Feels reassigning has been successful. Has been based on intimate knowledge of people's skills. “... most of our own personal
experience here has been with reassigning duties, so that their skills are utilized where they are really needed. You might reassign duties to other individuals within the department, that has been successful."

**Executive, A-5**

**Determining level of ability.** Looks “much more at potential because I expect that the experience is going to shape someone, no matter who they are. That’s done through all the testing pieces, plus I almost always have a panel, where at least five other people can interact with them.” Also has applicant interview with other people in the department.

**Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience.** Works with people to overcome lack of knowledge using a “‘buddy system’ or going out and doing some hands on things locally. If it is skills, also we can use the ‘buddy system’ thing with some role modeling. Lay out some very specific expectations.”

Regarding success, does not “see it as being my job to overcome the lack of skills as a manager.”

**Maximizing ability.**

**Selection and placement.** Concentrates on finding a good match. “You need to do a lot of up front work to be very clear on what you want in a position, and then try to match skills, inclinations, personalities to that.”

**Job instruction and training.** Offers on-going training. “We have training that’s generic, that anyone can attend. Management seminars. We also have specific training, that is for people to help people deal with specific problems.”

**Job redesign.** They frequently do job design. “We do it when there is a skill level that is not up to par, and we need to build on skill levels. We design a job differently when a person is learning. We redesign around individual’s health problems or temporary illness, temporary disability.”
Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Has faced this before. One of the things I do “is some very intensive but informal discussions. Sometimes we get much more formal about what is” really needed and they tailor some special training. “Then I usually work with an employee to give a time line.”

Executive, A-6

Determining level of ability. “For those people that are under our direct supervision, what we’ve done over the last year is develop a new performance plan approach for our division directors. The state has a PACE form, which it is sort of standard way of evaluating state employees.”

Handling insufficient knowledge, skills or experience. Not seen as a problem. “It’s much more a question of whether or not they’re carrying out the initiatives of this administration.” Have fired people but, “you basically need to do it with a fair amount of documentation.”

Maximizing ability. Keeps people motivated by giving “them enough work that will result in them spending 150 percent of their time on their job. It’s basically in terms of expectations of performance in the assignments we give them.”

Job instruction training. “There really isn’t any money for training in our budget. It’s more a matter of them working with us to develop what the direction is going to be for their specific program and then carrying that out.”

Executive, B

Determining level of ability. Uses State system. “Usually by the . . . PACE System. But it is not difficult.”
Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. “We do training. We also send them to the necessary training facilities that would give them better knowledge. Most of them are experts in their field. There really has not been a problem.”

Feels that “by applying my direction to where the department is going that it gave people a goal” increased performance effectiveness.

Maximizing ability

Selection and placement. Cited difficulty in working in State system “We’re hampered somewhat in that because we have a state system and people have certain rights that we have to make sure that we don’t violate.”

Transfer. Transfers when necessary to find a match. “They seek a position that they are happy going and when we do that we increase the production so we try to match the people as well as we can with the job to be done.”

Job instruction and training. “We lack funds for training and development.”

Job redesign. “We redesign constantly and rework to get a more efficient operation.”

Executive, B-1

Determining level of ability. Through frequent evaluation. “We evaluate everyone every six months. First of all, it’s technical ability. The ability to analyze a request for a budget issue. Second factor is communication skills. The third factor probably is inter-relationship with people.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Described as “sort of learn as you go. Our role is to critique that for them, maybe ask some questions of them that they didn’t think to ask of the agency.” Says “by and large we are” successful in overcoming problems.
Maximizing ability.

Transfer. "One alternate we have used in the past is to change agency assignments. We either try to transfer them into, find them something else in the state, or encourage them to find something else somewhere else that they enjoy doing better. Most of the people that have left this office with, probably one or two exceptions, have gone into other state agencies, state departments."

Job instruction training. Use training as called for. "Training approach, coaching kind of approach."

Executive, B-2

Determining level of ability. Through joint effort with staff. "It has to be a shared vision, a shared goal. It takes a lot of work within your organization to accomplish that. If you have done that, then you are in a much better position to be able value, are you achieving your goals."

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Through training. "We try very hard to identify and provide a training opportunity for our ... people." Feels has been 50% successful.

Maximizing ability. "We try very hard to be open to moving people where they are going to be more successful. We try to have an openness here. Any time you get a big organization you wind up with a lot of structure. Sometimes that structure doesn't really lend itself real nicely to saying to an individual you know I really think that what you're doing is not rewarding to you."

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. "You provide them an atmosphere to allow for success. You need to provide an environment for them to succeed. More quality management."
Executive, B-3

Determining level of ability. Both formally and informally. “You do it through a formal instrument. We have derived one here. At the same time, you need to have informal structures. You need to do lots of ‘atta-boy’s.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Through working with the lawyers to look at cases differently and through education. “In terms of lack of skills development, those can be handled through continuing legal education. If you get to the point where you have a person that simply is not competent because he just doesn’t have the ability.”

Believes has increased performance effectiveness in the past.

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. Typically concentrate on this. “We don’t take a natural resources lawyer and tell them they’re going to be a criminal appeals lawyer. Just by the nature of our business, we’re doing that. We’re concerned with excellence, in terms of past performance. We also look at what recommendations we have, who is supportive of them.”

Transfer. “We do some of that when we find out someone is unhappy or the clients are unhappy with performance.”

Training and development. “We have mandatory continuing legal education for all lawyers in Colorado and that’s by law.”

Job redesign. “We’ve done some of that. Most of it doesn’t come from internal design, but rather from what the clients want.”

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. First, through education. “If we can’t do that, we’ll look at a possible transfer. Failing that, we would suggest that they might be happier elsewhere.”
Executive, B-4

Determining level of ability. Primarily through observation of performance. "It starts with recruitment and selection. Surrounding yourself with good people. And it amounts to motivating them and holding them accountable."

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. First by training. "Trying to develop and train, to get the most potential there is." Ranges from selecting people who "left the ground running... to terminating people who were not meeting the minimal expectations of the job."

Feels has been successful in overcoming these problems. "I think so. It's a constant challenge. You're never finished."

Maximizing ability.

Transfer. Does some transfer, but need to be careful does not pass problem onto others. "Maybe the person won't work out over here, but they would work out over there. And I think that is sometimes legitimate. But if you have someone that is a problem, you don't know what to do with them. Your best judgement is you don't think anybody else will know what to do with them either, and you will just move them around. It's bad management."

Job instruction training. "I think there are two kinds. I think there are formal structured kinds of training, and there is day-to-day teaching and training."

Job redesign. Should not be done solely for the person. "I think job redesign can come about when the organization changes, when the need of the organization changes."

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Assist or terminate. "I try to assist them in finding it. Sometimes it's not in government. We are not a welfare organization. Some people need to get out and get back to school and totally retrain."
Executive, B-5

Determining ability levels of the staff. Determines through interaction with staff. “I have periodic meetings with them.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Use both in-house and external training “to make sure that we match those skills to the needs that the department has and the individual.”

Feels has “absolutely” increased performance effectiveness. “We’ve been able to meet our goals with a set amount of money — not line item budget — and in four years have never asked for a budget increase.”

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. “Our goal is to look at a particular position to determine what strengths are needed in that position . . . and look for a person who has the strengths in those particular areas.”

Transfer. “One of the goals when I came here was that we were going to do all of this without laying off a single person, which we’ve done. The other is that we were going to do this by allowing people to maximize their own skills.”

Job instruction training. Difficult due to budget constraints. “We, therefore, because of the way we’ve been able to develop the confidence in the legislature, have been able to create our own training budget through our internal resources and our internal saving.”

Job redesign. Do “a lot of it. And we do it in conjunction with the employees who work in those jobs.”

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Transfer, counseling and training. “Depending upon the outcome or all of those things, we deal with the employees by talking to them.”

Executive, B-6

Determining level of ability. By observation of productivity. “One
is personal observation, one is the productivity of their unit, do they meet their statutory mandates, do they meet deadlines, is their work of sufficient quality."

**Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience.** "You try to get training that's appropriate for it, [and] in some cases, you reassign work load."

Feels has been successful. "There is a willingness to address deficient areas."

**Maximizing ability.**

*Selection and placement.* "Selection and placement in the public arena and state government is deplorable. It's very imprecise, it's not subjective enough, they've gone too far to make it an objective system."

*Transfer.* Frequently uses transfer. "The state system is fairly flexible in that. We have used transfer to fill our personnel office's spot. It's generally at a lower level than I would be hiring for. But the state system is relatively fast on the transfers."

It works because "you would expect it to because you usually know the capacities of the people."

*Job instruction training.* "In the public area it's probably less organized that it might be in the corporate arena."

*Job redesign.* Describes as job evolution. "There are elements of what I would call more evolutions of jobs. I don't think it is as technical as job redesign, the state system is pretty rigid in that standpoint."

**Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required.** Described removing people as difficult and time consuming. "Through corrective or disciplinary actions. A corrective action is a nondisciplinary action to call attention to the problem and try to remedy it."
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Executive, C

Determining level of ability. "Performance outcome."

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. By providing training. "You try to provide training or access to the training to try and enhance the skills."

Feels measures for handling or correcting such deficiencies has increased performance effectiveness in the past.

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. Described maximizing overall abilities as being "very limited because the administrative areas are changing so fast, and resources are very limited for training. The medical area of the department of institutions has been somewhat limited in selection because of pay."

Transfer. Have brought in people from both within the agency, and from elsewhere within state government. Feels transfer has worked for them when they have done it.

Job instruction training. "I think that's very essential and very critical but I don't think we're able to do enough of it. You are so short staffed."

Job redesign. "I think that occurs too." They have redesigned jobs to fit "misfit" employees. Feels has worked "reasonably well."

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. By providing training. "I hope that there is some effort to provide them the skill or training to bring them up and if not, that there is some effort to relocate them to another position." And if neither of these is present "I hope then that they are reclassified so that they are not over-compensated for the tasks they are performing."

Executive, C-1

Determining level of ability. Primarily through performance,
“management by walking around is a term we use frequently. One can quickly sense the condition of the prison operation.” Also “monitor through executive staff meetings” monthly wardens’ meetings.

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Wardens “have significant experience and knowledge of their field and of corrections or they couldn’t get to be a warden in the first place. If I find that there are areas within the prison that are not appropriately attended then I would discuss that with the warden in the privacy of his office and point the shortfalls out to him or her.”

Feels these methods have been successful.

Maximizing abilities.

Selection and placement. Selection and placement is “not as good in Colorado as is usually the case on the national scene. The Colorado Department of Corrections is negatively affected by Colorado personnel rules and law. “Feels it” just becomes a major management undertaking to try to remove from office someone who cannot or does not perform satisfactorily.”

Transfer. “We can do that to some extent. We transfer someone rather than deal effectively with them through the personnel system because the personnel system is so onerous.”

Job instruction and training. Feels that “that’s of course the way to do it.” The problem “with our department is the legislature seems to completely fail to recognize the value of training, and so our training resources are all but nonexistent.”

Job redesign. “That happens pretty much as a matter of natural course and particularly here in Colorado corrections over the past five years because our very significant growth and expansion.”

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Describes as being very difficult. “The personnel system is so
onerous it somewhat disables us from dealing effectively with that person. Secondly, we do not have the training resources necessary to put that person back through training, and thirdly, we probably abuse the idea of transferring people by transferring a bad egg to a another basket, not changing the egg. It's not something we do very effectively."

Executive, C-2

**Determining level of ability.** Background and performance. "I studied their background and "evaluating what they have looked into."

**Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience.** Through interaction with staff. "Usually we do a debriefing to try to understand precisely where they went wrong and what went wrong, and would have been a better course of action."

Been successful as long as person is capable of analytical thought.

**Maximizing ability.**

**Selection and placement.** Sometimes fit job to employee. "If we see someone who is very talented, we oftentimes ask that person what they want to do."

**Transfer.** "If somebody else has talent that I know I need, I will try to work with that division director to see if I can recruit that person to my staff, if I have an opening."

**Job instruction training.** "We don't do any training, but we send them out for training. The department of personnel does training and we get all kinds of seminars through here."

**Job redesign.** "We do some of that, [but] it's difficult within the state personnel system, because the classifications are fairly rigid. We do try to figure out who's good at what, and shift the projects around and change the jobs as much as we can within the system to meet the individuals' specific talents."
Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Communication. "The first thing you do is bring into their awareness ... that they are failing in terms of meeting their overall goals and objectives. The second thing you do is discuss with them how they could learn to do better."

Executive, C-3

Determining level of ability. "Technical skill, leadership and organizational skills."

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Informal training. "There are certain publications ..." on how to make decisions given certain kinds of factors, especially in the financial industry." "I think another real valuable tool that we use in helping them make decisions if they have a lack of knowledge is stakeholder analysis, we do a lot of that too."

Not sure about the effectiveness because he has only been there for four months.

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. Feels could be done better. "We deal with the Colorado Personnel System here ... so if I want to hire somebody I have to do go a list that is given to me by State Personnel. If I have a position here that cannot be met by anyone in State Personnel then I can go outside of it, but that's highly unlikely."

Transfer. Is done often. "A lot of people don’t feel they are learning adequately or they feel that they can’t do the job will just be put on a transfer list and they go out."

Training and development. Is also done often. "The professional staff takes care of their own training and development ... which helps them keep abreast of a lot of things. A lot [people] will take night courses to
better hone their skills. In terms of support staff, the Colorado Personnel System has workshops, on learning data base programs."

Job redesign. “I think it’s a great idea, and we have a lot of flexibility in [job redesign].”

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Close supervision. “We work with them real well. All of our managers are more than willing to help people. If the raw material isn’t there then we have to make other arrangements and either put them on a transfer or try to get someone who is more qualified to receive the training.”

Executive, C-4

Determining level of ability. Difficult to do. “You try to get somebody to make a statement to you and you try to follow it up and see where it leads you. I believe you cannot use the standard questions when doing a final interview.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. “My expectation is that people will always ask if they don’t know. Most managers do not have the time to provide day-to-day close supervision. The workloads are too great.”

Has been able to overcome some problems. But, “I’ve had to fire staff after their first year.”

Maximizing ability.

Transfer. “Our clerical support staff can transfer. But as far as our professional staff, it’s here or get another job.”

Job instruction training. “The current trend in government has to do more with less. You’ve got less opportunity to spend the time to develop somebody or to begin to shape jobs to people’s skills.”
Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Through interaction with the employee. “What I do first is realize that it’s my fault for hiring them. Therefore, I have to take extra measures to remedy the situation. I have to make it clear to them where there’s a shortfall.”

Executive, C-5

Determining level of ability. Through periodic meetings and feedback. “And getting feedback from others in terms of the performance of my top management team is important feedback that I can get from through the community and city council, as well as from rank and file employees.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. “Solving the problem are the ones that have the first hand knowledge and background to deal with it.”

Feels measures for handling or correcting deficiencies have increased performance effectiveness in the past. “I think I’m a pretty good motivator of my staff and I think I get a lot out of them.”

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. “In hiring people I use a very open process, and I involve a lot of people, especially those people that are going to be directly affected by the individual who is being hired.”

Transfer. “We’re trying to do more in terms of providing promotional opportunities within the organization and I think that can be a very effective motivator of performance. We need to do more in terms of providing career opportunities and growth through transfers.”

Job instruction training. Feels “much more needs to be done. We have placed a high priority on this, [and] allocated $100,000 to organizational
development and training effort. That is one of the top priorities I have as manager.”

*Job redesign.* “We do quite a bit of that. We will look at somebody’s abilities, we’ll look at one’s family and personal needs, and if the person is a good employee, we’re interested in keeping that employee and we’ll be flexible in terms of flex time, job sharing, those sorts of things.”

**Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required.** Feels the “organization has done a good job in dealing with those employees. I think we have to give employees an opportunity to show that they can measure up. . . . But, if somebody doesn’t measure up” then a job is created elsewhere in the organization for them, and I simply don’t believe in that.”

**Executive, C-6**

“Each position has a job description which includes the qualifications that have been established. So you would look to the kinds of requirements that would be appropriate for the work.”

**Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience.** Provides ongoing training, but, “ordinarily, you wouldn’t have someone in a position of that level that wouldn’t be pretty closely qualified.”

Regarding increasing performance, “that’s a pretty subjective type of think. I don’t know that there’s a way at the executive level that you measure those things very specifically or very precisely.”

**Maximizing ability.**

*Selection and placement.* In some positions (such as police and fire), you have very structured procedures. In other areas, “I think the city seems to have done pretty well in providing opportunity and helping people get the abilities to move into supervisory types of positions.”
Transfer. Is used infrequently “because the skills needed in one department are not very useful in another one.”

Job instruction training. “That’s one of the areas in which I think our organization has not done too well; in fact, in our new budget, we’re putting more emphasis on that.”

Job redesign. “There’s always a little bit of that. I don’t think that that’s a major thing that we use.”

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Training. “I haven’t had much experience with that here. In my previous position, which was very similar, what you try to do is to help that employee get the training. If that doesn’t work, then it’s a matter of trying to assist that employee in finding an alternative employment.”

Executive, D

Determining level of ability. By production. By “production, the number of complaints from the public, the way they handle the employees beneath them, the usual.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Not seen as a problem. “They work their way up. So, we know pretty much what they, [can do] . . . and we have performance evaluations on them each year, we could do it more often if needed.”

Feels have been successful. “I think we’re doing fine, yeah.”

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. “Some of us are appointed by the Mayor . . . I know public works, and the people under me, he’s appointed three of them that they are all career service employees, and they are knowledgeable of public works.”

Transfer. “We don’t do much of that with other departments, we do it within public works a lot, but it is usually a similar task. So, we don’t
cross train too much, because we like the expertise in each department that we have.”

Job redesign. Do little job redesign. “Usually the task to public works, it's pretty much the same all the way. [However], we're building a new airport, and that's somewhat different, and we hire certain individuals for that.”

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. “We'll either transfer them out to another job, terminate them, or we will reassign their duties.”

Executive, D-1

Determining level of ability. Observation. “It's primarily personal observation and just basically personal comments, either through the community or through others as to whether the individual's doing a satisfactory job or not.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. “If I'm aware and knowledgeable of that, I would probably compensate by either involving others that would have that information.”

Feels measures for handling and correcting such deficiencies have increased performance effectiveness in the past.

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. “I think we have tried to do that with new positions that I've had the opportunity to fill.”

Transfer. “We do that. We have a basic philosophy . . . to . . . select people within the organization, secondly, select people within the city, thirdly, then to go to the outside.”

Training and development. “Very little [training], limited. Limited for the department head other than what he or she as a self-motivator does on their own.”
Job redesign. "We do very little of that. I guess the closest would be to . . . combine certain tasks, departments or functions. But it depends on the person and the person's knowledge and the jobs."

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. "I think by mutual agreement, they probably look for another job."

Executive, D-2

Determining level of ability. Results. "We set up goals every year and look at those at the end of the year to see how the results have been. The other is looking at leadership. Some of that assessment of their ability is intuitive, just observing their communication skills, their interpersonal skills, feedback from within their organizations about how people feel about that person as a leader, in addition to the tangible results."

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Training. By "setting up some sort of action plan that says they will attend this time management training or seminar within this time frame."

Feels measures for handling and correcting such deficiencies have increased performance effectiveness in the past. "Of course, it's much easier in areas that are more technical and knowledge-based."

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. "I'm not sure, how much impact selection and placement has in maximizing their ability. Certainly selection is important in getting good people, but then beyond that, training, I think, is even more important."

Transfer. "Sometimes that works. We don't do very much of that in our organization, though, but we're certainly open to a situation. The ones that I'm aware of, at lower levels in the organization, have worked well."
Job instruction training. “Training is really the key to not only maximizing ability, but providing effective services, so we try and do a lot of that. Of course, there’s limited funds available.”

Job redesign. “We do some of that, but I don’t get involved in it at all.” Is done at the personnel department level. Does not know how well it has worked.

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Guidance and training. We “try and provide the feedback, the guidance, and the training so people get to the appropriate level. If not, then try and find some position or job in the city that matches their ability level. If that doesn’t work, in some cases, we have to terminate people.”

Executive, D-3

Determining level of ability. If meet objectives. “We primarily operate on a series of objectives that are set between the supervisor and the employee, no matter what the level in the organization.”

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Through training. “That’s part of the objective process, where we have newer staff members or less experienced staff members or where something surfaces . . . and would be objectives we set in terms of training.”

Feels has been successful.

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. Want best person possible. “We have a very competitive process for promotion, which includes assessment centers, bringing in outside people to help us make sure it’s an objective assessment, making sure that it’s widely advertised, sometimes just within the organization, but often times externally even nationwide. And we feel like that’s been very successful in having a healthy organization.”
Transfer. Is common. "There's been a lot of cross movement in the organization. We have a police officer that's now an investment officer with the city, we have meter readers that are now in animal control."

Job instruction training. Is valued highly. "We're very high on training and development in terms of that being an important component of our organizational structure here. You treat employees as being a valuable resource."

Job redesign. Redesign is common. "We're sort of in the constant process, our organization has gone from 100 employees in 1970 to over 600 full-time employees right now. Just by the nature of that change in an organization, new divisions are created . . . it's just a dynamic process. We feel that we've been pretty successful in doing that, but that's something you just have to constantly work on."

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. "When they are department heads, when they are that high, there doesn't seem to be any place to go for us, so we've replaced those people. People lower down in the organization, basically what happens is, they stay where they are at and the organization moves around them."

Executive, D-4

Determining level of ability. Done intuitively. "I have never really done it with formal tools, I do it by benchmarking certain projects that I can measure, how well they are doing."

Handling lack of knowledge, skill or experience. Training or transfer. "If they just simply can't handle it, [I] face up to it to make the tough decision to make the change."

Feel measures have increased performance effectiveness in the past. "I've seen just as many blossom and grow when offered training as I've seen fall flat on their face."
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Maximizing ability.

*Selection and placement.* "I'm too early in my tenure here to give you a good answer . . . I'm in the process of learning on that issue."

*Transfer.* "I've transferred some people into management positions since I've been here and seem to be having some success but those people competed with others from outside the organization to get those positions."

*Training and development.* "We're just learning that here. They're making the resources available. From what I've seen from what has been offered to date, it seems to be working."

*Job redesign.* "I think job redesign occurs every day you walk into the office. As far as our city's ability to maximize employees, the jury is still out."

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. "Demote. Offer to train, and then demote if they aren't able to cope with it."

Executive, D-5

*Determining level of ability.* Experienced and observation. "If I hired them myself I have a lot more opportunity to evaluate them through their past experience and work history. But once they are on the staff, I evaluate them through regular meetings, regular communications."

*Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience.* Training. "For my staff, I let them develop. There are specific budgets for staff development and seminars and conferences and I allow them to go."

Feels measures for handling or correcting such deficiencies have increased performance effectiveness in the past. "When you nurture a person and let them grow to their full potential, they benefit from it and therefore have a little more positive output and outlook on life and on their job performance."
Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. "It's very good. I think by allowing myself to pick and choose the staff the way that I can do when there's openings developed in the positions, gives me an opportunity to build upon people that I think would fit well with the team."

Transfer. "I don't use it."

Job instruction training. "We do some in-house but mainly because of our location, we send people out of Alamosa to get training."

Job redesign. "I think it's a good thing, if the job description was not doing what you need to be doing, you need to redesign it, you need to make it appropriate for the organization. We did similar things to that in our finance department, totally reorganized that."

Do not ever do job redesign to fit the individual.

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. By working with people. "I have a policy procedure in place where we try to work with them. We let them know very specifically what their weaknesses are, what they need to rectify them and what the consequences are if they don't."

Executive, D-6

Determining level of ability. "My evaluation centers on their knowledge of the job they do and the management skills."

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Training. Feels measures have increased performance effectiveness in the past "because I trust people, I know enough about the operations of the City that I can perceive when there will be problems."

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. "We place a high value on allowing people to be promoted into positions that they might be qualified for."
Transfer. "The same way [as selection and placement]. One of the things since I have taken over as City Manager that I have placed so much emphasis on is dealing with the employee."

Job instruction training. When promoting, "sometimes that means that they have to get specialized training or education regarding it and we encourage that."

Job redesign. "We did some, have done in the last three years, some extensive reorganization in our public works area."

Says worked "very well" for them.

Dealing with employees whose level and ability does not match required. "We would ask them to get training to maximize their ability in that position."

Executive, D-7

Determining level of ability. It starts "with setting clear cut expectations and then, the subordinate and the manager sit down and develop a work performance plan for a year . . . and agree upon that plan."

Handling lack of knowledge, skills or experience. Training if possible. "The real skill problems, that can't be corrected by training or education than probably that individual doesn't fit in that role."

Feels results have been mixed. "I've had successes in that regard, and I've had some real failures where people just didn't have the ability to perform at the level that they were at."

Maximizing ability.

Selection and placement. Feels "we do a pretty good job in this particular city. I think on a percentage basis, we probably have a very good batting average."

Feels success can be attributed to "the ability of the person who is making the selection."
Transfer. “My observation is that we do a reasonable amount within organizations . . . but there are some very directed fields that people just are not able to transfer a different category of assignments to another category of assignments.”

Job instruction training. Training is done through human resources department. “We could do a better job at training, but I think we do an adequate job here.”

Job redesign. “We do not do very much of that, no.”

Dealing with employees whose level of ability does not match required. Try to transfer, but, “if a person doesn’t fit in the position then the person has to be excised. But we do make an effort to relocate somebody if it’s possible.”

Motivation Assessment

Executive, A

Determining level of motivation. “The main place that you look for motivation . . . is how well a job gets done.” Also . . . “the attitude they bring to that particular job. It is not hard to assess motivation . . . in terms of attitude and their obvious concept of feeling about the clients, the people that they work with and the service they provide.”

“But to keep people motivated, is a difficult task.” “And you really can’t . . . go out and motivate everybody individually. People have to be self-motivated.”

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. “You work with that in the same way you do with technical skills, you identify it, you address it with the individual, you sit down and talk about expectations of the organization . . . and the individual” and discuss why they don’t fit. “Then you try and help the person find some source that can remedy that.”
Successes. For the “hard core” people that are not motivated, reports a “50/50” success rate.

Increasing level of motivation. Spoke of enrichment, that “they have a responsibility and they can do that task however they want to do it, as long as it gets done.”

Task counseling. “We spend a lot of time when we develop the expectations and the job descriptions of taking people through that, so they understand it.”

Performance feedback. Constantly do feedback. “In the evaluation system, in terms of the task performance or identification of the role.”

Reward recognition. Described as difficult in the state system, because there is a set pot of money would have to “rob from Peter to pay Paul. In public agencies, you do most of your reward recognition in status kinds of things.” Rewards such as “lunch with the Commissioner or a Plaque.”

Executive, A-1

Determining level of motivation. Says the people in the department are all motivated. “I have more problems with people that work for me who are working too hard and putting in too many hours and I have to watch out that they don’t burn out than I do with people that I need to motivate.”

Handling lack of proficiency, precision, or commitment. If are able, they provide the training. If there is not a good fit, “then the best thing is to assess what they are good at, and move them into that area.”

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. Feels there is little need to provide task structure. “We deal with interesting issues, that while there may be some [dull jobs], I don’t think it is a big problem.”
"The other thing is our mobility, I think we've probably done more than any department that I have ever heard of in state government to promote" people out of routine jobs.

Performance feedback. Offer feedback on a daily basis. "The good supervisors do that on a routine basis, people always know how they are doing because they are being talked to about it."

Reward recognition. Do much reward recognition. "We tend to be fairly conscience in this department about the reward recognition. "... We have everything from Employee of the Month, to Public Acknowledgements, to Meetings in which Letters of Commendation."

Executive, A-2

Determining levels of motivation. Determines motivation through observation. "The three managers that report to me directly, each come in here from time to time to express something. That's important, as an indication of motivation."

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. Either through reassignment or if the motivation is not there, the person may be terminated. It really is a problem where you've got somebody who . . . doesn't feel like they need to make any contribution, they are not going to fit into this kind of an organization.

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. Restructures on an on-going basis. "I try to rely on the people who do their jobs to be the experts. When it comes to reorganizing a job, I ask them to help me make it fit better to everything we have to do.

Task counseling. "I tell them what I want by way of goal, and they tell me how we are going to get to the goal, and then I support them. If
they are wrong, I am right there with them when they get the heat, so they know that, and I think that helps.”

Reward recognition. “We take our state employees from time to time to what the National Guard activities are so they can see what they are supporting.”

Executive, A-3

Determining level of motivation. Relies on intuition and observation. “I think you can tell when you have someone working for you whether they are just sitting in their time or whether they really care about the work.”

Handling lack of proficiency, precision, or commitment. Feels does not exist here. “I think that I don’t have that problem in this department. I think we have the proficiency, we have the motivation, and I think we have the desire.” If did face the problem, would “be to try and help bring them along. As a last resort, I would have to go through the disciplinary system.”

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. “We set out performance goals for the year, because we’re talking about high level people and it is much more difficult to structure tasks for people at that level, but you do set up performance goals, and you do measure them periodically to see if they have met them and if not, why not, and maybe the goals need to be changed, you have to be more flexible.”

Performance feedback. Offers formal feedback every year. “We have to do a formal evaluation every year, which we do.” If there is a problem, “we sit down with the manager and say there’s problem. Staff meetings that we have to discuss the Malcolm Baldridge criteria and to try to figure out how to implement those in our division.”
Reward recognition. Rewards only for lower level employees. "For our lower level employees for most of the department we have several award programs. [For the] director level we have no bonuses because there is no such thing allowed. Recognition comes mainly through . . . letters of compliments from other departments." To make sure that the Governor's office knows about it.

Executive, A-4

Determining level of motivation. Determine motivation by observation of output. Also have annual performance review. "We can measure their output" and determine if they are meeting certain goals that are established for performance.

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. Would deal with it in performance evaluations. Would need to be corrected by the employee. "If it's the supervisor's opinion in the rating that they have not improved this deficiency, then you do have the ability to go through the personnel process of corrective action. "We have had some motivational problems, primarily commitment problems where we've had to address them and we have been able to correct them."

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. Is up to each supervisor on a case by case basis. "We do not have a structure from top to bottom to implement that."

Performance feedback. Relies heavily on performance feedback. "One of the more structured ways that we have to actually give them some kind of performance feedback, obviously we encourage our managers to communicate freely with the employees."

Reward recognition. Do not have ability to use monetary reward in the state government, "so our rewards have to be something other than monetary."
Executive, A-5

By observation. "I know that because they are here consistently early, they stay late." Involves them in the planning to help motivate the employees.

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. Has dealt with lack of commitment. "One was from a manager who was very close to retirement, and had a good deal of illness, and simply did not want to do his job anymore. What was getting in his way, was that he was going to have to retire, and he was trying to back off that. We found a way to make that easier for him. Another one was an issue where someone came to work in social services who truly did not believe in the things that we value. I never was able to deal with that much."

Regarding successes, "I think it has to do with the agreement, that is worth working on. When you don't have that with both parties, then I think it's very difficult to overcome motivation problems."

Increasing level of motivation.

Performance feedback. Feedback is something "that I do fairly consistently. If it is somebody where I have a conscious effort, then I make sure that I send feedback."

Reward recognition. Involves this, and involves award ceremonies, or formal performance plan. Once or twice per year.

Executive, A-6

Determining level of motivation. Stated that motivation is high. "The clients that they are working for and the Governor, and the Governor's appointee as head of this department. And that's a significant amount of the motivation."

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. Says people are committed. People "are here because they want to be here. If
they are not motivated, they don't belong here. Part of our people end up paying part of their travel for business related work because we don't have money in our travel budget."

**Increasing level of motivation.**

*Reward recognition.* Do as much as possible. "One of the things that we do pretty regularly now is try to meet with the broad range of employees within the department. To let them know that we both know what they are doing and we appreciate what they are doing, but then also through are employee appreciation events that are coordinated with the Governor's employee appreciation that we do recognize those people who have outstanding performance."

**Executive, B**

**Determining level of motivation.** By observation. "Whether they get the job done or not."

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** "I haven't been subjected to any problems there. The staff is very adept to making those things happen. I really believe that what we have done in this department since I've been here has increased the motivation to get it done because they can see the success of accomplishing things that make employers and applications and citizens more pleasantly surprised with a government entity than what they have seen in the past."

**Increasing level of motivation.**

*Task structure.* "I really can't answer it."

*Task counseling.* "We don't do task counseling."

*Performance feedback.* "We do performance feedback. We do through the PACE evaluation."

*Reward recognition.* "We don't have any. We try to do the recognition
from the Executive Director with a Certificate of Appreciation and also in some cases a day off their choosing."

Executive, B-1

**Determining level of motivation.** "You try to motivate. Based upon our turnover, for instance, which has been we've had the same staff now basically for two years. I think we've been very successful for what we've tried to do."

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** Some people need to be reassigned. "When we first came to this office in 1987 we found some people who were here for four or five years and tired of it. We have never . . . we've not actually had to fire anybody in the four years I've been here. But we've had to encourage people to find something else to do. And typically found it."

**Increasing level of motivation.**

*Task structure.* Ensure people assigned to a project provide a strong fit. "We make sure that those people are assigned to that project. Because it's something that they're interested in, and it's something that they're excited about doing. They've been produced by people who were excited about what they were doing. And it shows by virtue of the quality of the document."

*Performance feedback.* Do as much as possible. "Telling people when they have done a good job and making sure we have staff meetings every two weeks."

Executive, B-2

**Determining level of motivation.** Subjectively, by observation. "You can't measure on a scale from one to ten and put it in a formula and way
you're motivated. It has a lot to do with interaction and the openness the atmosphere that you create."

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** Handle through communication. "Being able to communicate, having an openness to be able to sit down and talk about, learn about what is it that is causing the deficiency. I say well over half of the deficiencies are either in perception you have what an individual has over what, what you're not going to overcome if you don't have the dialogue."

Feels measure have successfully increased motivation in the past.

**Increasing level of motivation.** "I think all of those (task structure, task counseling, performance feedback, and reward recognition) are necessary. You need to have some structure, you need to be able to understand. But the reward side can be anything from a simple comment such as, you did a great job, I really appreciate that, to promotion, recognition and a lot of different ways — that's where you really get a reward."

**Executive, B-3**

**Determining level of motivation.** By depending on written instruments. "Because the farther removed you get from direct day-to-day impact and interaction with the staff, the more difficult it is without some form of written instrument."

**Increasing level of motivation.**

*Task structure.* "I just don’t do much of that anymore."

*Task counseling.* "I don’t."

*Reward recognition.* "Absolutely. We send people to conferences when we can. We'll make sure people have a Bar program paid for. We're constantly on the lookout for things that would make a particular person happy."
Executive, B-4

**Determining level of motivation.** By the output and interaction with employees. “You talk with your employees and you encourage them to talk about what they’re feeling, what they’re thinking, what they’re doing, and you give them feedback.”

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** Through interaction. “I pull them into conversation and into dialogue and I ask them to tell me what is their view.”

**Increasing level of motivation.**

*Task counseling.* “I identify the expectations that aren’t being met. I identify that performance is not getting done at a level that is acceptable.”

*Task structure.* Expects more from higher level people. “An entry level employee desk level job might need more structure, more direction.” With a “division director . . . I expect to give very general assignments.”

*Performance feedback.* Does a great deal. “You can’t over do it. People have a need to know how are they doing. Sometimes written, sometimes verbal communication.”

Executive, B-5

**Determining level of motivation.** Through ongoing interaction with employees. “I have 96 offices around the state, and I visit every one of them and I continue to do that on a regular basis. So, it gives you a feel for how people are feeling about what’s going on.”

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** “I think commitment is the biggest problem. I think lack of proficiency and lack of training, you deal with through helping the person become more proficient, providing training, providing an atmosphere where they can succeed.”

Feels has been successful and has increased motivation.
Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. Some jobs are structured; others are not. "An investigator in the gaming division doing an undercover investigation on a cheating violation" lacks structure. There's a lot more independence involved."

Task counseling. Use task counseling. "Business planning and setting the performance standards for the job and talking about it."

Reward recognition. "It's mostly tied to personal recognition. We've done such things as the Governor's performance team, which is an award that we created quite frankly and that the Governor gave out to members in the Department of Revenue so that we can come up with cost saving innovative ideas on how to do things."

Executive, B-6

Determining level of motivation. "You look at their productivity, you look at their willingness to accept new tasks and challenges. Motivation of public employees is much more difficult to deal with managerially because you don't have the options" because of financial constraints.

Handling lack of proficiency precision or commitment. Feels people Smith works with "have risen to the level . . . [that] their commitment is pretty well demonstrated. If it's not there, you're prone to try and get the people out of those jobs. I'm more prone to try and work through the problem."

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. "That's relatively difficult, and I don't think the department has an awful lot of ability in trying to restructure a task."

Task counseling. Not done. "We deal more with broad problematic policy issues rather than a specific task."
Performance feedback. "I'm a great believer in very immediate feedback, that is if someone does a good job, I would imagine there are times with fair frequency where I will jot a note to someone that this was done very well."

Reward recognition. Described as being "fairly difficult in the state system." Do publish "an employee newsletter that cites examples of where individual employees who have done well, as kind of a surprise to them, where it goes to all employees."

Executive, C


Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. Feels has not had that problem. "But what I would do is to try to determine the reasons for the lack of motivation. We've been doing more in TQM on employee involvement, that sort of thing."

Feels success is "is not attributable to the administrative or supervisory, I think it's maybe it's just a atmosphere, or . . . selection."

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. Through interaction with employees. "I have Monday morning meetings at which we discuss a number of things. I would say that they are given maximum flexibility to function, to apply their expertise to their skill areas."

Task counseling. "I work much more closely with the people on particular tasks in budget and accounting."

Performance feedback. "This office . . . is very task oriented." [I try to] have a little more interchange and I think though that's particularly true as you get further on down like in ADP."
Reward recognition. Uses evaluation of both casual and more casual and more formal basis. “It’s absolutely essential because I don’t think a number of the people here would do the things they do for the pay that they receive. So, there has to be some benefit, some satisfaction, and some recognition of jobs well done.”

Executive, C-1

Determine level of motivation. Determines by the “extent they seek self-improvement, and to what extent they involve themselves in pursuing further education or training programs.” Another indicator to us is their willingness to work overtime.

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. “We’re long suffering with those problems, because we have no effective way to deal with them because we lack the resources to apply to the corrective actions that are necessary.”

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. Has been “reasonably successful in that approach. The American Correctional Association has set standards and established national standards for correctional operations and management over the past three years we have been instituting these national standards as our management modality and been communicating to staff what these standards are.”

Task counseling. Uses task counseling. “That’s methodology we use to assure that they understand what the standards require. They understand what they have to be doing to comply with that standard, and that does require considerable counseling with staff at all levels.”

Performance feedback. Says there is constant feedback.

Reward recognition. Described as being limited. There is little they can
do “except word of mouth and pats on the back. We have nothing financial that we can do.”

Executive, C-2

Determining level of motivation. By observation. “I can pretty much determine their motivation levels by how they report back to me on projects that I've given them, how much they've done, how much energy they've put into it, how clearly they have looked at it, how thoughtful they have been.”

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. “Usually the first thing I do is try to . . . discover the genus of it. After that you just address whatever solution will meet it.” Feels has been successful in increasing motivation. Bases success on being “willing to sit down with them and talk to them about the problem.”

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. “I think our department has a great ability to maximize motivation . . . through feedback and follow through [not by] making a task more rigid.”

Task counseling. Feels is important. We “sit down with [employees] and talk about what they're doing . . . and . . . where they might look for help.”

Reward recognition. “About the most we can do is either promote somebody or give them a commendation letter, because our structure holds us back. A fair amount of our reward and recognition systems are controlled by the state personnel system.”

Executive, C-3

Determining level of motivation. “Initially through the interview process. I think a lot of state employees are renown for not being highly
motivated, but I think the more challenging the work, the more motivated they are, the more mundane the work, the less motivated.”

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** Handled mostly by the State Personnel System. “If it’s a minor problem like they are not up to speed on handling a certain thing, we usually handle that internally, but if there is a real problem, we have to address it formally through State Personnel.”

**Success in increasing motivation.** Described as not particularly successful. “The things I would really change have to do with the dependence on the upper echelons of management. I think a real problem is nobody is willing to take responsibility for a decision.”

**Increasing level of motivation.**

**Task structure.** Also relies on the State Personnel System. “The system writes out what their responsibilities are. And there is a very clear understanding as to how that operates.”

**Task counseling.** “We have of ability to do that. We do it all the time.”

**Performance feedback.** Continually offers feedback, but could improve. “It’s a participatory management attitude. I think that we could improve greatly in that area . . . by having more of a team management kind of concept around here. Sometimes bureaucracy militates against the whole idea.”

**Reward recognition.** “I think those have value, but I think in many respects . . . it doesn’t mean much.”

**Executive, C-4**

**Determining level of motivation.** Hard to deal with lack of motivation. “Once you hire somebody, if you have an employee who loses motivation, that’s very hard to deal with. [With] our laws, if you don’t do
something, you get penalized. Essentially somebody has decided that they are just tired of doing the work, that they don’t want to move on."

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.**

“Commitment is the tough one there. I think we need to be clear with our employees about what we mean about commitment. He doesn’t really care about huge salary increases, he does care about doing the job right.”

**Increasing level of motivation.** Use frequent meetings. “I try to meet with everybody as a group Monday morning. It’s our understanding that one of the purposes of that meeting is for questions to be discussed by the group.”

**Executive, C-5**

**Determining level of motivation.** Performance. “A highly motivated employee is going to perform extremely well, an employee who is not motivated is going to be a poor performer.”

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** For the top management, “[I] let that person know directly that the performance is lacking and that it has to come up to standards. If it doesn’t come up to standards, then there’s going to have to be decisions made and one of those decisions would be that the person would no longer be with the organization.”

Feels because has only been there eight months, cannot say if measures have successfully increased motivation in the past.

**Increasing level of motivation.**

**Task structure.** “I think people are motivated because they believe in what they’re doing . . . [and that] they believe what they are doing is important. And I think the more flexibility that an employee has to perform their job, the more likelihood of and employee being motivated to do well.”
Task counseling. "I think you're using academic jargon here that isn't particularly relevant. I think that you have to let employees know whether or not" there is a fit.

Performance feedback. "I think it is absolutely critical that employees are constantly given feedback on their performance. You need to do it verbally all the time, and it needs to be done when there is good work performed, and when there is not such good work performed."

Reward recognition. "I'm really torn on this, I am not sure that monetary rewards, are a motivator, and it is something we're examining here."

Executive, C-6

Determining level of motivation. "Observation and communication with employees throughout the organization."

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. For proficiency, "you try to deal with through training. If people don't have a commitment to the organization or to the work they're doing I think you've probably just got to help them find a way to do something else."

Feels measures have successfully increased motivation in the past.

Increasing level of motivation. "There is an employee appraisal system. I have not actually been here long enough to have gone through one with my department heads. We have a pay-for-performance program in the city. I would say that one has been fairly successful."

Executive, D

Determining level of motivation. "If you pay a person they usually are motivated to do their job. But to do it a little better you have to train them well, make their working conditions the best you can, you give them the ability to promote if they do a better job."
Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. Dealt with in evaluation. "That's part of the evaluation, and they do get pay raises, that's what pay is about."

Feels this system has been effective. "Extremely so."

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure and task counseling. "We don't do much of that. We have personnel people in each department, but they deal mostly with career service moves."

Performance feedback. "We give some of that. We tell them where we think they can improve in their performance evaluation."

Reward recognition. Use reward recognition. "Pay, of course. We can't give bonuses and things like that, because of our pay procedures the career services sets up. But we give pins for five years, and we give certificates for outstanding work, and things like that."

Executive, D-1

Determining level of motivation. "By performance, primarily, as to their attitude and their style and their method of accomplishing their job."

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. By observation. Says it works because he "works under a premise that those people either know or don't know whether they're doing a job. They're aware whether they're doing a good job or not."

Feels measures have be successful. "I would think so, yes, because those people that don't, aren't around."

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. "I don't know to what degree department heads use that as a mechanism, but we don't do a lot of that at our level."

Task counseling. "We don't do much of that."
**Performance feedback.** "Yes, but it's perceived the person's done a good job . . . or bad job."

**Reward recognition.** "Only in the typical pat-on-the-back or you've-done-a-good-job, or a recognition before the elected officials. It's more of an individual thing."

---

**Executive, D-2**

**Determining level of motivation.** "That's real, real difficult. I guess it's mostly subjective and intuitive, just in terms of communication and contact with people, what their attitude is."

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** Feedback. "Since I'm dealing with people who are top managers, there's an expectation that with the proper feedback, they'll make the adjustment."

Feels measures have successfully increased motivation in the past; "yes sometimes, sometimes no." When it hasn't, has not considered revising them because "I don't think lack of motivation is a big issue in our organization, so we don't spend much time on it."

**Increasing level of motivation.**

**Task structure.** "We put a lot of emphasis on self-directed teams, and emphasis on employees coming up with ways to solve customers' problems."

**Task counseling.** "I sort of put counseling under the whole are of mentioning, much of which may not be related to how to write a memo or some other task."

**Performance feedback.** "I think that's extremely important. People at all levels have to have feedback about what's going well and what's not going so well, so they understand, and can make changes."

**Reward recognition.** "We de-emphasize individual reward recognition."
We would prefer to focus more on teams and our results of the team in improving customer service."

Executive, D-3

**Determining level of motivation.** “We do employee surveys. Once every three years we do an employee survey that’s anonymous, mailed to every city employee. And we have about a 98 percent response rate.”

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** “At the upper levels of management if there’s a lack of commitment, there’s something personal going on in that person’s life . . . you just have to address them on a case by case basis.”

“I think that’s worked very well, because we have a number of . . . personal problems.”

**Increasing level of motivation.**

**Task structure.** “At the department head level there’s a lot more flexibility to do that. The jobs are not particularly structured.”

**Task counseling.** Is done based on feedback from employees. “We try to make sure that, if some task is not working very well . . . it’s a regular communication process.”

**Reward recognition.** “Among the department heads themselves, we probably do less than we do with everybody else is the organization. However, we have come to appreciate that recognition is a very, very powerful tool for motivation.”

Executive, D-4

**Determining level of motivation.** “I don’t do it on a formal basis. ‘Perceptively’ would be the answer to that question.”

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** “Train.”

For precession or commitment, is by observation. Feels measures have
successfully increased motivation in the past. "Decentralizing and letting people do their jobs, getting off their backs, [has] increased productivity and creativity."

**Increasing level of motivation.**

*Task structure.* "We're in the process of working on that now. This team approach I saw ... we're just now getting into that at Gunnison."

*Task counseling.* "I believe we're going to get into that as well. I have an employee task force working on this with me."

*Performance feedback.* "We're going in that direction. The motivational performance feedback is ... going to gear movement along pay ranges and ... bonuses."

*Reward recognition.* Do offer bonuses.

**Executive, D-5**

**Determining level of motivation.** By observation. "Seeing if they are putting out the work, if they are coming to work, if they is no complaints coming in from the exterior environment."

**Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment.** "Have conversations, evaluate, be very specific of what the short comings are, what needs to be improved, allow the individual to go through training to do that or provide the necessary discipline to motivate the individual."

Feels measures have "somewhat" increased motivation in the past.

**Increasing level of motivation.**

*Task structure.* "I think we're successful in that. There are certain areas that you can provide a structure for task services, provide details to monitor and analyze it."

*Task Counseling.* "We have staff meetings, and when I have a project there is usually a lot of conversations involved with the department head responsible for it."
Performance feedback. "It’s very important to have a monitoring device in place that you can analyze and have feedback. I’m a strong believer in trying to get all the feedback that is possible."

Reward recognition. "I think it’s good. We do a lot of reward recognition, we have bonus plans, we have rewards and certificates. We acknowledge good performance to public and to the city council. And I think we have created a good attitude and motivation by doing so."

Executive, D-6

Determining level of motivation. "I have never had a problem with motivation. They are all very aggressive. They are new employees to the city, most of them."

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. Handle with interaction with employee. Involved a personal problem. Addressed the situation by "determining specifics and how it effected their job and I called them in and sat down and talked to them about it."

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. "That is almost like program budgeting. That is goal setting and how you follow up to determine whether or not people have reached those goals."

Task counseling. Do not do task counseling.

Performance feedback. "We have a merit based pay system now that [has a] very extensive multi-form evaluation process" and gives feedback. "It is mandatory. You don’t wait for that yearly evaluation."

Reward recognition. "We have no monetary rewards other than merit increases for a job well done. We have employee recognition now for longevity that we initiated this year."

Feels the system "so far seems to be working. I don’t see at this time a lot of unrest compared to what we had a few years ago."
Executive, D-7

Determining level of motivation. Primarily by observation. "To a large degree, it becomes self-evident whether somebody is motivated or not just by the way they conduct themselves."

Handling lack of proficiency, precision or commitment. Training. "If people can't perform . . . [you] try to motivate them, and then ultimately if you can't, then you have separate from the organization."

Feels measures have been successful.

Increasing level of motivation.

Task structure. "There are some jobs that are very structured [that] . . . people tend to lose motivation more quickly, comparable to an assembly line type thing."

Task counseling. "Oh, yeah," but, "I'm not sure that it helps necessarily in motivation but it helps in the success of the activity."

Performance feedback. "We do that." Feels has helped motivation.

Reward recognition. Uses bonuses. "We have an achievement award program in our organization where we can pay people additional monies up to five percent of their salary during the course of a year for ongoing successful performance."

Role Perception Assessment

Executive, A

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Described clear separation of duties as difficult. "Program areas will cross over the whole department. So, I sit down every two weeks with all of the top management people."

However, "personnel is relatively easy, you got your old line staff charts, and it's not difficult to determine role expectations in an organi-
zation, and what the job function ought to be. That kind of stuff is relatively easy."

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** Deals first with the entire group to define the problem. Then “most people are willing and able to adjust to their role within an organization.” Then deals one on one if necessary. “Ninety-nine percent of the time that works out pretty comfortably.”

**Creating sound role perception.**

*Ingroup exchange.* Does in weekly meetings he described as his “kitchen cabinet” of Assistant Commissioners.

---

**Executive, A-1**

**Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.** Says there will always be conflict. Described as “part of the dynamic that goes on on a daily basis and that's not necessarily bad.”

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** Determines first if it is a problem of ability related roles. “If it's ability then you can find out where their weaknesses are, and see if you can overcome that, and if it's ability, something they will never be able to do, then you need to assign them to do something else with different.”

**Creating sound role perception.**

*Ingroup exchange.* Use ingroup exchange through “... staff meetings about once a month. We also have more impromptu meetings related to particular tasks, ... of four or five people.”

*High task orientation.* Use periodic special assignments.” Described as a “dynamic process” and a need to communicate when problems arise.

---

**Executive, A-2**

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** Handle these by
involving the staff. "I think the best way to do that is to involve the people who have to wrestle with the ambiguity. That way, [everybody] knows what's going on.

Feels has solved the problems.

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. Reports much use of ingroup exchange. Have weekly meetings and "the four of us just sit here and talk about what's going on. I have prided myself on being able to get problems identified and fixed before my boss ever found out we even had a problem."

High task orientation. Reports use of high task orientation. "We try to shuffle jobs around sometimes [by] covering absences with people who work for somebody else. One of the challenges you have is to make it clear to everybody that helping the other guy get his job done when we're short of people is part of their job."

Formal performance feedback. Uses the State of Colorado PACE system. Says "is better than the military system in some regards, but it's still not the best thing in the world" because it is too structured. Objective evaluations can be interpreted negatively.

Executive, A-3

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Described as being intuitive. "You watch and see what's going on, and you try to give them instructions and direction, but not all roles are made for all people. There are going to be some that just don't fit in, and you have to deal with that too by the system."

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. Deal with this by moving the employee, ideally within the same department. "I think ideally what you would like to do is to persuade the individual that his role would be better doing something else than what he's doing."
Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. Done in meetings. “It’s through the quality meetings where we go through exercises of the Baldridge Criteria.”

Executive, A-4

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Feels comes down to supervisors making that assessment. “We don’t have a formal method for assuring that.”

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. Assigning the right roles to the right people “comes down to the individual supervisors making that assessment. We don’t have a formal method for insuring that.” Does not recall an example of conflict.

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. “We are establishing employee teams where they have the ability to have this kind of interaction.”

Formal performance feedback. “Part of this is now coming out of the Governor’s commitment to total quality management and so we’re in the very beginning stages of the implication of total quality management in this department and throughout state government. But we’re utilizing that more and more.”

High task orientation. Have had some orientation about this concept. Has been at the “division director level of the line manager level but we are in the process of doing it all the way down the line and we have had two seminars where we brought in total quality management structures.”

Executive, A-5

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Interacts with people. “And if there is ambiguity there, work until that is clarified. Secondly, I think you watch, listen, and observe how people explain their
role and responsibility to other people. Third, I think you look at the outcomes.”

Also “talks about it” when face the problem of ambiguity or conflict with the roles. Feels has been successful.

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. “There is a lot of discussion among colleagues, the sorting of things out before it is formalized.”

Formal performance feedback. Gives much feedback. “We certainly do the formal performance evaluation process that’s required in the state system, but we also do, with a new employee, or someone who is under a new supervisor, a much more frequent feedback. Ninety days, six months.”

Executive, A-6

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Says is clear to people. “I think now because we have a new performance plan system in place, things are pretty clear as to what we expect from people.”

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. Handle with interaction. “Primarily through conversations with the individuals, and we really don't have that kind of problem.”

Executive, B

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Assesses “by end result.”

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. Handle by working directly with employees. “Our employees are allowed to grieve. If it gets to be that point, we try and we are trying to have supervisors involve people more in the operations so to speak so that they will feel more comfortable.”
Feels has been successful in increasing performance by involving people. “Their production increases, they feel more comfortable, they like better what they do, especially if they have the ability to help form it.”

**Creating sound role perception.**

*Ingroup exchange.* “The management team at least does that almost weekly. It works very well.”

*Formal performance feedback.* “Well, we do that.”

*High task orientation.* “I think basically that is theory that somebody thought of and it really doesn’t mean much.”

**Executive, B-1**

**Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.** Described “as somewhat of a problem in this office. As a budget analyst, when an agency comes in with their first request, the first thing you have to do, you’re an adversary. Because someone says I need a million dollars to do this, and the first response in our office is why? What for? We try to foster communication between the two on a healthy basis, I mean on a factual kind of basis.”

**Creating sound role perception.** “In group exchange, formal performance feedback, high task orientation. We do, some in group exchange. I think it’s pretty fair to say that we run a pretty democratic office. Every person in this office is probably in my office once or twice or sometimes five times a day.”

**Executive, B-2**

**Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.** Assess through productivity. “If you define it and as the person understood it. Now did you get it done? How much of it did you get done?” Feels measures have increased performance effectiveness. “You have to be willing in most cases
where you need to roll up your sleeves, jump in there with them to help them. You've got to be willing to do that."

Creating sound role perception. "You have a lot of nice words and high structure there (in-group exchange, formal performance feedback, and periodic high task orientation), and I don't disagree with any of them. But I'll tell you if you only show up when there is a problem, then you are not in tuned with your organization."

Executive, B-3

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. By relying on middle management to give the feedback. "Is the role properly defined? Is that person the proper person to be in that position or role?"

Believes these measures for dealing with these problems have increased performance effectiveness in the past.

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. Feels is important. "I think that's a real positive key to the management of a large number of people. If you have a bunch of people not communicating, sitting in separate offices and never talking about mutual problems and possible solutions, you don't advance very much."

Formal performance feedback. "It is in place, yes."

High task orientation. "It depends. You would hope that all of your people are capable of high task orientation."

Executive, B-4

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Through interaction with employees. "I encourage them to talk and tell me. I have an individual conference with everyone that I supervise. Eight people at least
twice a month. Also I meet with my management team once a week for two and half hours every week."

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** Feels has been successful in overcoming conflict. "I think so, I think I'm a successful manager."

**Creating sound role perception.**

*Ingroup exchange.* Believes in much interaction. “You do things by talking with people, and by conversation and dialogue. It gives them a chance to ask questions to clarify, to follow up, to probe.”

*Formal performance feedback.* “You try to catch someone in the process of doing something right, you compliment them.”

**Executive, B-5**

**Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.** “Some of the roles are statutory, so it's real easy to assess. The management ones . . . are assessed based upon what we as a collective group have defined as the role of the department based on state public policy. We talk about it almost on a daily basis.”

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** Through interaction with employees. “We talk about what the expectations are and then we talk about whether or not we're meeting those and if we aren't, why aren't we.”

Feels the dialogue in dealing with these problems has “absolutely” been effective.

**Creating sound role perception.**

*Ingroup exchange.* “We've had those for four years. And that's part of the participatory management focus that we have here.”

*Formal performance feedback.* Done often. “We do it quarterly, but on an annual basis we sit down and put together the performance plan, we
evaluate it formerly on a quarterly basis, but we're in touch on a daily basis."

*High task orientation.* "That's the whole Deming philosophy of total quality management that we've incorporated here. And we started that four years ago."

**Executive, B-6**

**Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.** Feels needs to be a mind set change in public employees and "the policy and upper level people are going to have share and recognize that they work for a board of directors, the executive branch and the legislative branch."

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** By interacting with people. "You try to bring people in and you define for them what their roles are. I think one of the problems in government is that too much is left to the individuals to define their own role, and sometimes it has to be an imposed role, that this is what your role is."

Feels there are "mixed reviews" regarding success in increasing performance effectiveness in the past.

**Creating sound role perception.**

*Ingroup exchange.* "I'm not a big believer in ingroup exchange, I think more of a small one on one or maybe at a small group level it may be useful, but not in terms of consensus seeking."

*Formal performance feedback.* Done annually. "There's an annual requirement that's a pretty standardized measure of a number of different things, everything from management to mass media, interpersonal skills to communications, productivity measures and things like that."

*High task orientation.* "What?"
Executive, C

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. “Within the state personnel system, I think that it is pretty clear for most people, because the tasks are pretty well defined, not only in the job descriptions, but also in the planning process which is a required process.”

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. “We try very hard to do is to get up front understanding and to get... agreement of all the participants on what the policy is going to be and I need to get them involved in the development of policy in a cooperative manner.”

Regarding successes, “I think we’re learning and it has improved a great deal. I would like to see TQM more fully implemented in the department.”

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. “I think that is what we're doing.

Formal performance feedback. Also use performance feedback.

High task orientation. “We have subgroups on a myriad of different things.”

Executive, C-1

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Described as not being difficult to do. “For example, the role of a tower officer, there's just so much that he does. The role is very clear and specific. The role of a cell block officer is very clear and specific.”

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. “Our staff have simply got to know what's expected of them and they've got to comply with their instructions and orders. If it surfaces, and of course it does, it's usually pretty minor in its nature.”

Feels dealing with it when it happened has been effective.

Creating sound role perception.
Ingroup exchange. Said is difficult to implement. “We’re a 24 hour a day, seven day a week operation, and we have staff working in the same prison who have never met each other. The opportunity to get a few staff together for any purpose is almost nonexistent.”

Formal performance feedback. Yes. They use performance feedback.

High task orientation. “That would come regrettably primarily as a byproduct of a disturbance problem.” Hopes they respond in a manner that is “appropriate and effective.”

Executive, C-2

Assessing clarity, capability and accuracy. “Their roles are defined by their job specification, and the personnel system is responsible for defining them. They have a written document that tells them what their job is suppose to encompass.”

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. Through interaction. “If people have misunderstandings about what their job is I would deal with that by calling them in and talking to them about it, and comparing it to the PC Aide.”

Regarding successes, “I don’t feel like a role clarification has been very necessary here.” When it has happened, it has worked.

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. Supports ingroup exchange. “My people [are] divided into units and I think they usually ask questions within their own units.”

Formal performance feedback. “We’re required by the personnel system to evaluate them once a year and more often if they are problematic, and so we have to do that, it’s a legal requirement.

High task orientation. “We have special groups to do special projects. And they derive their role understanding from the special group, because it may change from group to group.”
Executive, C-3

Assessing clarity, capability and accuracy. It is clear because it is in writing. "Whether they have the capacity to accept that kind of role is determined at the interview level, and I would say that our managers are smart enough to determine whether they have the capability to do the job. Whether they are ultimately compatible, I think only time tells."

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. "We try to be very very explicit about what is required, what we want to be done. We don't try to leave it up to everyone to determine what their role is."

Feels has not been there long enough to measure effectiveness of dealing with role problems.

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. "We have a management team that is responsible for that."

Performance feedback. "We have an evaluation every six months of all employees."

High task orientation. Feels that there is "no problem there. Everything around here is very task oriented. Cashiers do cashing work, everything is so narrow."

Executive, C-4

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Feels is an ongoing "challenge to keep it clear. I don't think it's something that you can clarify every day."

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. By facing them head on but with understanding. "I would support a staff person on a decision that I don't exactly agree with that I can stomach, and let them feel that support, as long as they understand not to do it again."
Feels has been successful "most of the time. I think that generally I've had the chance to work with good people, who really are trying to do the right thing."

**Creating sound role perception.** Feels employees are getting what they expect from the weekly meetings. "If I thought that they didn't, I would change it. So [I] include them, let them have a chance to think through it more. I try to bring people in, instead of saying, 'Well, Dan, most of use disagree with you, so you lose.'"  

Executive, C-5

**Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.** "One thing that I have to do is constantly assess where the best spot in the organization exists for carrying out a specific task or function, and increasingly we're looking at that taking place through task forces and teams of individuals, rather than assigning the responsibility through the normal bureaucratic chain of command."

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** "I simply try to clarify them and correct them the best I can." Feels measures have been successful. "I think I keep them fired up in terms of motivating them."

**Creating sound role perception.**

**Ingroup exchange.** Information is freely exchanged. "I think that knowledge is shared here . . . and depending upon the situation and the circumstances, we look for the people that have the best knowledge, the best history of dealing with it."

**Formal performance feedback.** "I think it is imperative. I think it needs to be in writing."

**High task orientation.** "We focus on priorities here, and we assemble the right people to address those priorities, and we do it in a very energetic manner."
Executive, C-6

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. "I think it's been pretty good. I think there's been a tendency to be more specific in defining roles more precisely than I would personally like to see."

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. Interaction with employees. "You try to work with the people involved to try to get them to raise their questions and get answers."

Regarding increasing performance effectiveness in the past, "in some cases, yes, in some cases no."

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. "I think that has probably worked better in some areas than others because due to the nature of the organization and the variety of sub-groups."

Formal performance feedback. "I'm sensing that it's been effective, but I really don't have a good first hand impression of that."

High task orientation. "I don't know what that is."

Executive, D

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. "Job descriptions are written for each one, everybody knows exactly what their job is. And they know that when they do their PP, they know before that."

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. "We call them in before ... the PP. If the guy is not doing the street lights right, we tell him so. Keep in mind, we have got a job description on every job we do."

Feels has been successful. "We're the best department in the country as far as public works is concerned."

Creating sound role perception.
*Ingroup exchange.* “We delegate. We have a lot of people we delegate to.”

*High task orientation.* “We drive the streets, and we know what’s going on. If we see a problem . . . we say rather than let that break up, go over and fix it.”

**Executive, D-1**

*Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.* “In those cases where the person is in charge, but not necessarily knowledgeable to the extent that we think he ought to be, we would probably include other people that would have that knowledge.”

*Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.* “If people are in conflict, then my role is to make those individuals confront one another somewhat determine some type of a mutual agreement between themselves, either formally or informally.”

Feels measures for dealing with these problems have increased performance effectiveness in the past.

*Creating sound role perception.*

*Ingroup exchange.* “We have nothing. Realizing that the people that make those policy decisions are the elected officials. So we rely on them.”

*Formal performance feedback.* “We don’t do any, but I think it is probably productive. If you have some mechanism that requires you and that subordinate or department head to sit down and some formal method, whether it’s nothing more than a blank sheet of paper, [it] probably has some merit.”

**Executive, D-2**

*Assessing clarity, capability and accuracy.* “I guess the most
important step is making sure there is something in writing that specifies the roles. Beyond assessing the clarity, it's just looking at it and using common sense to see, does this describe adequately the role for this particular position or person, are there conflicts, are there overlaps, and resolving those.”

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. Interaction. “It may take some group discussion, maybe even some facilitation with somebody sitting down with two or more people and going through a process of reaching agreement on roles and relationships.”

Feels these measures for dealing with these problems have increased performance effectiveness in the past.

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. Is encouraged to develop “mission statements, which helps to clarify roles of various departments or sections or teams within the organization and the way we do that is with the small groups of employees working at that.”

Formal performance feedback. Infrequent. “Formal performance feedback normally occurs only once a year or twice a year. It's an opportunity to spend a little more time and clarify roles and performance, but I think you have to do more than just that.”

High task orientation. “I don't have any thoughts on that.”

Executive, D-3

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Through feedback from employees. “Because we do evaluations on all of our employees and part of that is a process of getting the feedback...they understand their role and what they are supposed to be doing.”

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. “They come
across, those problems, but ... they should be resolved or ironed out on a ongoing basis. But those situations do arise."

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. "We've got both formal and informal processes that work. There's regular division and department head meetings and so there's a lot of exchange within those groups. And then we have a lot informal settings."

Formal performance feedback. Done more informally. "After you have been working with them for ten years, you really try to streamline, what you're doing in these formal processes, and you get a lot more during the informal process during the year."

High task orientation. "There's just numerous occasions where we have department heads working together, department heads and division heads working together [and] trying to accomplish a particular project."

Executive, D-4

Assessing clarity, capability and accuracy "On paper they're very clear. I think it is idealistic to think that in any governmental organization, specifically one this small, that you're going to get absolute role definition and role clarity, simply because of the size of the organization."

Dealing with ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. "Hit them head on. We don't try to avoid conflict over role definition and ambiguity. People are now talking to each other about these issues."

Feels measures for dealing with these problems have increased performance effectiveness in the past. "They are increasing performance effectiveness now. There was a corporate mentality here that if somebody griped, give them a title and give them some money and then they'll go away. We stopped doing that."

Creating sound role perception.
Ingroup exchange. "The role of a manner is to lead and to not stifle any creativity and I think you start to stifle creativity when you put any bounds on it by creating any kind of a group."

Formal performance feedback. Are now setting up. "If we get a lot of buy in by the employees [it will work]. If it's indeed a whole organization document . . . all getting an equal chance to have a say in its structure and its uses, I think you will get a valid instrument."

High task orientation. "I think we're doing that. I've taken certain things and gone to employee groups who have to deal with outcomes of management decisions and say, 'here's a management decision that needs to be made, what do you think."

Executive, D-5

Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy. Use written job descriptions. "I think it's very good. It's been a system that's been in place and modified because of the feedback and refined, through job descriptions, duties, and the specific services that we deliver."

Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy. "We have procedures in place that would deal with conflict, we have grievance procedures, and also disciplinary procedures, and also methods of conflict resolution."

Feels measures for dealing with these problems have increased performance effectiveness in the past. Offers "persistence" as the reason.

Creating sound role perception.

Ingroup exchange. "I think we're very successful in that. We have communications with the general public, and newsletters, and media and so forth, and my people are perceived as a cohesive group."

Formal performance feedback. "We have an annual report, which goes through and assesses what we were successful in and what we weren't
and what the problems were, and what our goals are for the next year, and I think it is very good evaluation tool.”

*High task orientation.* “I think we do that through our department meetings . . . through department policies that are in place . . . and certainly through the counseling and evaluation process of the department head to their staff.” Feels is working well. When it has not worked, says “some people just aren’t willing to be team players, aren’t willing to be part of group effort.”

**Executive, D-6**

**Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.** “You can very fast determine somebody else’s technical knowledge. I pretty much judge the end result in how it is received.”

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** “Directly to the source and [ask the people involved] to talk to each other.”

Feels the measures have increased performance effectiveness in the past. “I think it has been very effective with this particular group of people.”

**Creating sound role perception.**

**Ingroup exchange.** “I believe that we can all do more in that area. We are doing several things with citizens’ groups and the public now. One thing in particular comes to mind, — citizens’ perceptions of, how we spend their money.”

**Formal performance feedback.** “They have a chance to comment, they have a chance to perform their own evaluation and then it is put in their file at the same time and it is discussed at the same time.” Feels the process helps. “I have not had any problems defining roles. So, so far we seem to be pretty clear on what our roles are.”
**High task orientation.** "Management team ... work together to make recommendations in different areas. For the most part ... they provide input and they work in these small groups well together."

Executive, D-7

**Assessing clarity, compatibility and accuracy.** "We have descriptions that are clearly written for every position in the city."

**Handling role ambiguity, conflict or inaccuracy.** "We do everything that we can by virtue of position descriptions to preclude those things from occurring."

Feels measures for dealing with these problems have increased performance effectiveness in the past because is a “teamwork environment where people really perceive that they are responsible for working together and not apart from one another.”

**Creating sound role perception.**

**Ingroup exchange.** “I think we do that through teamwork. We aren't always successful, but we ... bring the people together and sit down and we talk about it and try to solve it.”

**Formal performance feedback.** They use on an on-going basis.

**High task orientation.** "We have activities that ... pull a group of people together for and create high energy focus. [It] occurs all the time in the organization."

---

**Formal Cooperation Assessment**

Executive, A

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.**

Described as easy to determine. “You know if the job is not being done, it's relatively easy once you sit down and delineate expectations of indi-
viduals" and the organization. Says lack of cooperation and coordination has "never reached a severe enough level to interfere with output."

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* Described as always overloaded. Said out of eighty state funded positions, are talking about taking twenty. "We spend an awful lot of time talking about priorities, sharing, and how to get different places together in terms of time, how to use your time."

**Increasing formal cooperation.** Feels the Kitchen Cabinet and in-house by the Commissioner has increased cooperation. But that, "group efforts are not recognized. We haven't recognized units within the department . . . we really spend most of our time on individuals."

*Group-coherence dynamic.* Do not do group think "as a formal process . . . but within the organization we have the Commissioners Coordinating Council" which deals with policy issues.

*Unity of command.* Do use unity of command. If there is a problem, "I would [solve] it through the individuals who are directly responsible for supervising them. The worst morale problem I could create is to jump over the top of people who are responsible for running the various units, and go run their unit for them, or trying to deal with that directly."

Says procedures for handling cooperation problems has "certainly" been effective.

**Executive, A-1**

*Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.* Assess cooperation through observation. "If it's my group, we'll pick it up in our meetings, and we'll try to iron out solutions, brainstorm, and figure out how to get it resolved. If I am having trouble with two managers, I tell them to shape up and get their act together. They need to be talking to each other. Normally, I don't have to do that."
Feels have been successful in overcoming problems associated with cooperation and coordination.

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* "One of the things state government can put a value on is administration. Our department has grown 50 percent in the last six years. It's hard to get positions that are going to be doing personnel work, managerial work, or administrative kinds of work."

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* Typically involve many people in decision making. "We have tried to use the concepts of team building and customer orientation on a day to day decision making. It involves a lot of the employees of the department through committees . . . which allows for much more employee input, and greater buy-in by the employees themselves."

Executive, A-2

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.**

Reports much cooperation in Military Affairs. "This department is responsible for a Civil Air Patrol, the Army National Guard, the International Guard, and each of those three activities has a different federal national response system, they are not all the same." The result is cooperation.

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Intergroup conflict.* "We do have that problem. Part of "the problem is the tendency that people have to mark a little line around their group. Some of the people who work here as state employees feel like they are treated as if they are not part of the team by the federal employees, who are far more numerous. From time to time the best way to resolve a conflict is for one person to take the entire responsibility for something."
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Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. Believes in functioning as a group. “I really believe that we need to applaud the activities of an entire group when the group has functioned very well. I’m going to get a lot of people involved in doing this. It’s a minor item but you would be surprised how important these social things are to some people.”

Executive, A-3

Assessing cooperation and coordination. Described as difficult to do. “A few years ago when I started here, it was like each division was an island, their little empire to itself, they had nothing to do with each other, even though they did. It probably worked well on paper, but didn’t really accomplish much.”

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload and intergroup conflict. Feels top leadership is showing more interest in overcoming these problems. Feels are becoming more successful in overcoming these problems.

Group-coherence dynamic. Does on an on-going basis. “That’s what we try to do in the management staff meetings. What we’re doing and have been for the past six months or so is going through each of Malcolm Baldridge Criteria, which is a structure.”

Unity of command. Use unity of command. “The Executive Director and myself are unified in the direction we’re going. Staff people go to her or the Director depending on who is available and expertise.”

Reward on combined effort. “There is none of that right now. The Governor has a program of employee appreciation awards that come out in October, and he does have a category for team effort. I don’t think we do enough of that.”
Executive, A-4

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.** Went on a retreat recently “where an entire division of our employees met for two days outside of the office setting. They were asked to go through a rating process where they gave us feedback on their feeling of cooperation within their own division.”

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* Said they “are finding that in some areas there is tremendous work overload because of the budget cutbacks.” Are being forced to cut the work force.

*Intergroup conflict.* Described some intergroup conflict, but have been successful in resolving. “We would primarily [work] with the supervisors, and they would have to try and work out the conflict.” Have not experienced “to the degree that would require disciplinary action.”

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* Not familiar with term, but “we utilize that in the form of staff meetings at various levels. We have what we call our senior management staff, that would involve all of our line managers and division directors, as we call them as well as our senior staff here in the Commissioner’s office. It works very well.”

*Unity of command.* Use unity of command. “The directive would be given to the supervisor, and the supervisor would be charged with carrying it out, utilizing his or her own staff to do so. It would be very rare that I would give a directive to an employee that is supervised by someone else.”

Executive, A-5

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.** Strong sense of team work. “I think that there is a sense of working here that
the value is any problem solution that any one person can come up with, is going to be a better solution if you've got more heads working on it."

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* Spoke of overload being common. "We prioritize and re-prioritize all the time."

*Intergroup conflict.* Lets managers handle problems. "Unless there is absolutely an impact, I don't usually mediate between managers, nor do I usually go in and say this is the way it's going to be."

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* Typically involve groups in decision making. "It's those groups, from managers to secretaries, who got together and said here is what we want to propose."

*Unity of command.* Spoke of need for trust between herself and the executive director and working together to "hash things out."

*Reward on combined effort.* Believes in rewarding the group. "I think it is probably the most destructive thing when a group of people get together and come up with a product, and then one individual is credited with it."

**Executive, A-6**

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.**

"Within this office the cooperation/collaboration is very good, between the divisions it's getting better, but it hasn't, historically it's not been all that good. Most of the divisions have viewed themselves as independent. It's only been in the last year since Salazar has been our Executive Director, that he really has forced the divisions to work as teams."

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* Describes as something they live with. "We just basically work through it. Most of the issues are externally imposed . . . and"
when they need something in two days, they need something in two days. And you just put in the time necessary to get it done.”

*Intergroup conflict.* Described in best interest for people to work out problems. “For most of the division directors in their performance plans, 15 to 20 percent of their performance plan is based on cooperation and collaboration, and so part of the lack of cooperation would be reflected in their performance evaluation.”

*Increasing formal cooperation.*

*Group-coherence dynamic.* Is common. “Division director meetings every month. We had a planning session for two days last summer with the follow up day last fall.”

*Reward on combined effort.* Described reward being a good evaluation. “There’s very little reward in the public sector, because there is not money for bonuses or anything like that. Probably the biggest complaint that I have about the state system is that there isn’t a whole lot of capability in there to reward outstanding achievers.”

**Executive, B**

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. By observation. “We can determine that pretty easily by whether the task is accomplished or not.”

*Barriers to cooperation and coordination.*

*Work overload/intergroup conflict.* Deal with conflict “by explaining it as a team and they have to deal with those customers.”

Feels that treatments to these problems has “absolutely” increased formal cooperation.

*Increasing formal cooperation.*

*Group-coherence dynamic.* “We are doing that, we’ve just come through
a training session from the management team on leadership versus management.”

Unity of command. “We are trying to break away from that. You have a top heavy organization with a lot of mid management that is not necessarily needed.”

Reward on combined effort. Rewards are verbal. “The only reward we can give them is to tell them that they have done an excellent job.”

Executive, B-1

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. Assess by observation. “Because we’re the governor’s budget office, we are asked a lot of times to arbitrate disagreements between departments. In an arbitration type of situation, if we feel that everyone sort of walks away happy, and there is no complaining and arguing about it, we feel that we’ve been successful.”

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload/intergroup conflict. “We have found times when we’ve had to take people that are not assigned to a particular area get involved in that area because the person that is assigned there is not being successful in getting any meetings of the minds.” Feels that has been successful in overcoming “9 times out of 10.”

Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. Involves people in decision making. But, “if we fall short in anything, sometimes it's in clearly prioritizing tasks for staff. Sometimes so many things are happening, you got one person whose got four different things to do.”

Executive, B-2

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.
Through communication. “There needs to be a communication link that goes on and on a fairly regular basis.”

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Work overload.* “Overload is not uncommon. You’re probably more likely to have those individuals be supportive when there is a work overload.”

*Intergroup conflict.* Dealing with intergroup conflict is handled by “creating an atmosphere that hopefully they are more inclined to want to work together. I would guess that I have been more successful than I have not been successful.”

**Increasing formal cooperation.** Sure. Use all three of them (group think dynamic, unity of command, and reward based on joint-effort). I am least inclined to use this unity of command. Group-coherence, occurs more often than you might believe in an organization. Reward on joint effort is probably tougher in the government than we would like to admit.”

---

**Executive, B-3**

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.** “Some you get from the inside, but mostly from the department heads in state government, in our case you’re going to get it from the Governor, and so on.”

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload/intergroup conflict.* They try to reduce work overload. “It’s a given in a major law office that you’re not going to get away with a forty-hour week. It’s also a given that if you work those long hours, there should be some sort of monetary reward and there should be some “time-off” types of rewards. We try to accommodate both ways.”

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* Done in small groups. “We’re probably too big to do that with the whole department.”

---
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Unity of command. "Yes, everyone has one person that they report to. But [it is] important that everyone feel that they have access to all levels of command.”

Reward on combined effort. “Absolutely.”

Executive, B-4

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. Through interaction with employees. “I let them know that I expect it. I deal with conflict immediately, when I see groups not working together, are fighting, or unhealthy competition, I call them in and I say what’s going on?”

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload. When face work overload, handles either by “redistributing the work, [or] bringing in extra resources, temporary people. Sometimes I will move out of my leadership role.”

Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. “Yes, that’s a high value for me.”

Unity of command. Does not use unity of command. “I would not discourage a subordinate from coming in. Sometimes they are intimidated by their supervisor. Sometimes there are blocks to their communication.”

Reward on combined effort. "I think that everything we do around here is on joint effort. Joint effort is very important in any organization regardless of size.”

Executive, B-5

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. Assesses through the “total quality management concepts that we have here.”
Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload. Work overload is often present. "there are certain times that work overload is there because you don’t have control over it, it’s an external factor, you deal with [it]. The problem is never eliminated."

Intergroup conflict. "We usually let the groups handle it. When it reaches a level where they can’t do that, there are certain points where either I or the Deputy step in and we typically don’t mandate one way or the other, we typically mediate how we get to a resolution. On occasion we mandate it."

Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. "I think that is the same question in a different form that we’ve already done."

Unity of command. Sometimes uses unity of command. "We have matrix management and we also have single people who manage, it depends on the job."

Reward on combined effort. "Oh, absolutely."

Executive, B-6

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. Through informal observation. "In the absence of complaints, you look more for evidence of recognition of cooperation through comments or through project status reports that site someone for being cooperative."

Barriers to formal cooperation.

Work overload. For work overload, "you divert resources from other areas to try to deal with it or divert the work to other areas."

Intergroup conflict. "In a group conflict you bring the people in and try to discern what the problems are and see if you can resolve them."

"In certain instances" feels has been able to increase formal cooperation.
Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. "I have personal reservations about whether it's effective or not. One of the reasons is it's very difficult for the state to secure professional enough resources to implement that sort of a program, most of the agencies don't have the organization development capabilities... so they try to do it on a shoestring and they do a relatively poor job."

Unity of command. "It's mixed. There has to be a lot more offering of leadership from beneath than you it is given by authority."

Reward on combined effort. "That's almost nil. The people that work directly with me, it would be more individual."

Executive, C

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. "Performance or outcome."

Work overload/intergroup conflict. Have not handled work overload "very well. We have tried to distribute, try to be aware of the work load and try to distribute and redistribute it, but when resources are being reduced, it gets very difficult to do that."

Feels "that our approach to the problems and involvement of people throughout the department" and has increased formal cooperation.

"The exchange of information has been very useful."

Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. Not sold on group-coherence. "I don't think of group-coherence as a very positive sort of mechanism and most of the people in this department... simply won't buy into something just because they're told they should buy into it."

Unity of command. "Command isn't even a word we use here. We try
to get involvement of employees and clearly the executive leadership is very influential and will influence, but not command.”

Reward on combined effort. Feels “almost everything in the Department of Institutions is done through a joint effort. I think we do have cooperative efforts and that it’s likely through cooperative efforts that we’re able to accomplish what we accomplish, and I think most people here would recognize that.”

Executive, C-1

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. We use the “militaristic approach to doing business with all of our staff. We even have the military titles of sergeant, lieutenant, captain, major, those kinds of things.”

Said this chain of command works for them.

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload. Described as there being no work overload “because it’s almost all shift work.”

Intergroup conflict. Described “practically zero intergroup conflict. I think probably being paramilitary and . . . the work posts so narrowed in their focus . . . I don’t [see] . . . its application to our business as an issue.”

Increasing formal cooperation.

Reward on combined effort. Not applicable to them on the “day to day grind of doing business.” However, “our wardens all work together and they cooperate. If one warden is having an issue of some kind, he wouldn’t hesitate to call his fellow wardens, and they would pitch in and resolve the issue.”

Group-coherence dynamic. Also described as something that would not work for them.
Executive, C-2

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. “You can assess it fairly well from the amount of problems that come up having to do with cooperation between units.”

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload. “With work overload I try to sit down with the people who are overloaded and help them to reprioritize the tasks.”

Intergroup conflict. Through interaction. “If it is a conflict between two people who work for me I bring them into my office and I talk to them and try to get to the bottom of it and help everybody reach resolution. If it is between people lower than those who report to me, I talk to the supervisor.”

Feels these processes have been successful in increasing cooperation.

Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. “Our department thinks getting people together to think about how to resolve a problem [is positive].”

Unity of command. “By and large they have just one supervisor to report to. People report to the person just above them.” Feels works well for them.

Executive, C-3

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. Feels there is need for improvement “I think that is where we need a lot of work. There’s got to be greater communication between our departments.”

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload/intergroup conflict. Deals with problems with interaction with employees. “I try to bring the parties together to talk it out. I think it works fairly well. Sometimes they will mask their true problems with one another in the interest of equilibrium.”
Feels his treatments of these problems has increased formal cooperation through “isolating the areas where things can be negotiated and working it out.”

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* Feels could participate in more group-coherence. “I think we have to use retreats and staff meetings to be more effective in that regard, because I think a real problem we might be having is departmental isolation.”

*Unity of command.* “I think there is a lot of unity of command in the vertical sense here. [It is] not lateral. I don't think it is working that well.”

*Reward on combined effort.* Difficult to do. “I think it's very difficult . . . because it is so structured and rewards come from other places . . . For example, . . . [in] giving someone a raise, that comes because they have been here a certain length of time.”

**Executive, C-4**

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.** “I think one of my roles is to create an atmosphere where you can constructively make suggestions to somebody.”

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* Described always having work overload. “We don’t have time to do all our work like we would like to. We’ve got to work together.”

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* Believes in using group-coherence. “I think you have to have an organization where the individuals can challenge the leadership internally.”

*Reward on combined effort.* “In the J.B.C. staff, I tried to get the staff to understand that our reward was when the committee said something positive about the staff as a whole. It’s the same thing here.”
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Unity of command. "Since I've always worked for a committee or a commission, there's not unity of command at that level."

Executive, C-5

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. By letting people know that "we operate as a team here, that there's no room for turf battles, and hold people accountable for that standard."

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload. "Work overload is probably the hardest thing, because I think people here tend to take on everything that is suggested . . . and usually that's more than what they should be taking on, so that's a very difficult subject."

Intergroup conflict. "When a conflict arises between interdepartmental jurisdiction, I try to deal with it as openly as I can, in setting clear expectations of there's just not room for turf battles."

Feels treatment of problems has increased formal cooperation because "I think people intuitively want to cooperate . . . so I think there's a growing recognition that success will come through cooperation, and that employees need each other."

Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. "We do a lot of that."

Unity of command. "Employees here operate within an organizational structure, but in terms of their day-to-day work, they are far more likely to have interaction and responsibility with other employees, not just with those that they report directly to."

Reward on combined effort. "I think that is very important. We're looking at it very seriously. We don't have a system in place that allows us to reward teams, but it is something that we're looking into seriously."
Executive, C-6

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. “A lot of long-service employees . . . have worked things out and have tended to develop good working arrangements and relationships.”

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Work overload. “That’s probably one of our big problems at the present time. Our organization is several departments. We have not the resources to add additional employees.”

Intergroup conflict. Not seen as a problem. “In our kind of organization, each department has its primary responsibilities. I think when those things develop, I expect the department heads to be talking to each other and working together.” Feels has been successful in increasing formal cooperation.

Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. “I think that that’s probably one of the most common things that occurs. I’ve tended to encourage that and encourage department heads to have with some regularity.”

Feels “most of the time it works.”

Unity of command. “Most of our organization charts look like that. I have tended to think that’s not a real good thing to over-emphasize. I find that many times people have to work for multiple groups or multiple supervisors on particular tasks or projects.”

Reward on combined effort. Feels should do more. “We should be focusing more on group reward, and group review and appraisal than individual.”

Executive, D

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. “That’s why you have a pyramid for management. For example, if we are going
to pave a street, we make sure all the utilities are properly maintained . . . we always go coordinate with the utilities companies, public service, and Mountain Bell."

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* "Work overload is not a problem. No one is ever overworked."

*Intergroup conflict.* "We have problems because there is so many different people to coordinate with. Feels has been successful in “learning how to coordinate things. You still make mistakes . . . but you try to correct that next time.”

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* "We work in teams. We get two days of what we call a retreat, where all the management people are up on Lookout Mountain and we were working together, talking teamwork and so forth, and we teach teamwork."

*Unity of command.* "We use a chain of [command], we go top-to-bottom."

*Reward on combined effort.* "We always do that. Double groups working on snow removal, if we get in trouble, we bring more . . . We keep the group effort."

**Executive, D-1**

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. “To put it very bluntly, if there’s no problems, we make the assumption they’re doing a good job.”

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* "If they need more help, we give them more help. If the tasks they’ve been assigned exceeds their personal capabilities or manpower . . . we sit down and supplement that with other additional help.”
**Intergroup conflict.** "If it's a conflict between different departments, then it would be my procedure to get those two or three or four individuals in conflict and discuss it."

Feels that his treatments of these problems have increased formal cooperation. "Anything that we would do would be based on the assumption that you're trying to increase that productivity or solve the problem."

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* "The closest thing we come to that is a team effort on a project. But it's primarily because those individuals are parts of the total."

*Unity of command.* "Yes, I believe in that."

*Reward on combined effort.* Nothing "other than the typical you've-done-a-good-job, pat-on-the-back recognition."

---

**Executive, D-2**

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. "There's not a real quantifiable measure that I can look at and assess that, it's more on an as-it-occurs anecdotal basis."

**Increasing formal cooperation.** "I think that's real important, and that's what we try and do, is recognize, people for a team accomplishment as opposed to individual accomplishment."

---

**Executive, D-3**

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. Through observation. "We look at that based on ... interactions that occur. We try to assure it ... and we ask them to solve problems as a group."

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* Described as common. "In government there never seems to be enough resources to do or accomplish all the demands that
are placed on you. [But] if people have ownership and they participate and they believe in what you're doing, it doesn't become a burden anymore, it becomes something really want to do.”

**Intergroup conflict.** “We get those groups together and try to work it out.” Feels these treatments have “definitely” increased formal cooperation.

**Increasing formal cooperation**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* “We do a lot of that and we think it's a good idea. We are expanding it . . . a lot of ad hoc task forces are created to address particular problems.”

*Unity of command.* “It's pretty clear in our organization in terms of . . . who you work for. But because we use so many task forces and project groups . . . I might deal directly with the division head or I work on a task force directly with employees that are under somebody else.”

*Reward on combined effort.* “We do that as well, where we'll reward a whole group rather than perhaps an individual. And we believe in that.”

**Executive, D-4**

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.** “It has been a habit of mine to take the budget document, go into retreat with department managers, and say ‘what did the council tell us’ . . . let's understand what we're dealing with here. With this group I've never put any bounds on anybody.”

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* “Contract it out.”

*Intergroup conflict.* By “making it clear that I'm not going to tolerate any intergroup conflict and then lead by example, set a tone of action by management that doesn't foster that.”
Feels treatments to these problems have increased formal cooperation. Every day people are coming in and giving "starting to talk and they're not only talking to me but they're talking to each other."

**Increasing formal cooperation.**

*Group-coherence dynamic.* "I don't know that . . . I like management imposing boundaries, I don't know that I like group dynamic peer pressure creating boundaries either."

*Unity of command.* "I don't like that approach. I don't like the word command. I like the word leadership. I don't like the word command."

*Reward on combined effort.* "I like that. I think that's one of the mistakes that government has made is through this blind staff, this military command structure, this civil service, the inability to pay bonus, legislative restricting, public perception. Everybody says the public sector can do it better, why is that? Because the private sector doesn't have any constraints put on it."

**Executive, D-5**

**Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees.** From feedback. "Communication, staff meetings . . . what's the perception, how's morale. We have a committee of employees that usually voice those kinds of concerns. I meet with them and we discuss the issue."

**Barriers to cooperation and coordination.**

*Work overload.* By spreading work around. "We do some reassignment of duties, and have other people assume certain duties if it seems like the logical step" Also increase staff "if it's appropriate."

*Intergroup conflict.* "We try to deal with it when we find out about it. There are going to be conflicts and we just try to address issues."

**Increasing formal cooperation.**
Group-coherence dynamic. "We think it's very successful, we do that through our department head and also through staff level meetings."

Unity of command. "That's basically how our department head situation is set up, and it seems to work." Feels works well for the organization. "The chain of command is acceptable that way."

Reward on combined effort. "We do that a lot, we give credit where credit is due, and we do make sure that outstanding performance is acknowledged."

Executive, D-6

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. "If something goes wrong, or if I have people approach me that something is not working well, that is the way I assess it. I [also] have individual meetings with all of my staff."

Barriers to cooperation and coordination.

Intergroup conflict. Offer seminars. "I have had two outside people come in the last eight months, for stress management." Says on scale of one to ten, has been a "seven or eight" in effectiveness.

Group-coherence dynamic. They "do a lot of that."

Unity of command. "I, of course, am the manager and have the final decision, but . . . there are group recommendations that are made."

Reward on combined effort. "I believe people need to be told how good of a job that they do and they need to be reminded of it as well as when they don't do a good job. Individually and as a team."

Executive, D-7

Assessing cooperation and coordination among employees. "We spend so much time on team work, we assess it on the basis of our successes."
Barriers to formal cooperation.

Work overload. Handle by redistributing. "It's the manager's responsibility to begin to create some kind of work load distribution that doesn't overload" to avoid mistakes.

Intergroup conflict. "The basic way to handle it is to sit down and talk about it, and be open and candid and we try to do that."

Feels treatments of these problems have increased formal cooperation.

Increasing formal cooperation.

Group-coherence dynamic. "We do a lot of participative management stuff, we believe."

Unity of command. "We try to insure that people work for only one person not getting directions from a whole array of people."

Says it seems to "work relatively well."

Reward on combined effort. "We have a lot of team programs that are rewarded through the achievement award process."

Dealing with Performance Problems

Executive, A-6

"You sit down and you talk through with the individual what the problems might be as to why it is that they are not performing. If they are having problems with too much to do or not enough direction or something like that, generally we try to work to solve that problem. The next level is corrective actions, that type of thing, which could lead up to termination."

Executive, B

"If it is brought to our attention we try to make the changes that are necessary to remove the barriers from the employee so that they can accomplish their task."
Identify deficiencies "usually by verbal conversation or written documents." Feels the system works very well.

Executive, B-1

"Try to do first of all, I try to do an honest evaluation of their performance. Rather than sugar-coating everything, I try to honestly evaluate their performance, I try to say that on a performance evaluation."

Executive, B-2

Varies by the situation. "There is no one way to do that — it depends on the situation." Either I know why it happens or I'm not sure why it happens and so I have to analyze it, first. Part of it is being able to communicate having that relationship with any organization that individuals say to themselves: I don't feel uncomfortable talking to that manager."

Executive, B-4

Still with interaction with employees. "If it's somebody I supervise who has a performance problem, I convey to them that I perceive that there is a problem, and have them tell me about their side of the story, and then we begin the problem solving."

Executive, B-5

"Identifying them, I think, is easier than removing them in a public sector arena, because of the state personnel system. Identification really comes with having, knowing what your expectations are, knowing what your performance plan is, and measuring that on a regular basis."
Executive, B-6

“Sometimes you ask people what the obstacles are and you try to identify them either through observation or through identification by other parties.”

Executive, C

“You identify them either by observing or by their performance or outcomes or products.

Executive, C-2

May not remove the deficiencies, but “you certainly bring it to the person’s awareness that you think it is a negative trait or behavior or whatever, and that it is not positively impacting their business outcome and you discuss with them different ways that . . . the situation could be remedied in order to make them more successful.”

Executive, C-3

Relies in part on flow charts. “I think one of the things that has really helped is flow charting responsibilities. Just flow charting the movement of work.”

Executive, C-5

“You got to identify them” and be frank and honest with them. “You need to let an employee know whether these are major or minor, and if you do not have confidence in the employee . . . that has to be told and the employee has to move on.”

Executive, C-6

Depends on the particular problem. “I don’t know if I have a general
approach. I think it's something that would have to be evaluated in individual cases."

Executive, D

"We're constantly upgrading that way of doing the streets but we've got people here with a lot of experience . . . if somebody comes in and says I did this in Seattle, we may listen to it . . . but we still do what we think is best for Denver."

Executive, D-1

"In our city, after the person passes their probationary period, then there's no evaluations. And everything beyond that point is . . . a negative confrontation, because from that point forward it's discipline."

"If you make an assumption that it's not a corrective procedure and it's a negative procedure, then it probably works well."

Executive, D-2

"Generally, through discussion of people involved, trying to identify those obstacles and then take a look at what our options might be in changing them or removing them."

Executive, D-3

"Some of that relates to technology equipment, some of it relates to work environment. The main way that we do that is using our employee survey and then also trying to stay in touch with our employees in terms of feedback."

Executive, D-4

"You have to be brutally honest with . . . people who work with you
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and you have to trust each other enough to accept that honesty. This management staff here can talk pretty bluntly to each other at times. I think you remove them by simply allowing everyone in the organization to be free-thinking and “led” rather than directed.”

Executive, D-5

“A lot of it is very obvious . . . you can tell where there’s deficiencies. It’s very easy to see if we are falling short of that, both because of internal feedback and external feedback.”

Executive, D-6

Deal with by identifying the deficiencies. “The process of eliminating [involves] bringing that deficiency forward and work on whether or not there is a way to eliminate that deficiency.”

Executive, D-7

“That would nothing more than a continuous evaluation of what impediments are to accomplishing what your goals and objectives happen to be.”

Perception of Staff

Executive, A

Assures is accurate through close hands-on work with employees.

“We as an organization have certain kinds of values and we develop those together . . . we sit down and we have formal evaluation system, we have expectations, we have goals, those kinds of things and we either achieve them or don’t achieve them. And so that’s my reality check.”
Executive, A-1

Get perceptions through personal observation and communicating with staff. “My primary responsibility is to make sure that the people reporting directly to me know that I understand how they are doing their jobs.”

Executive, A-2

Relies on observation and input from others. “I’ve got friends in other departments in state government who give me advice and council. I ask our other friends to keep me informed.”

Executive, A-3

Develops through hands-on work. “If you can understand the basic concept as a manager, you have to know the broad level, higher level issues. It took six months to really learn the technical stuff that I needed to know.”

Executive, A-4

Believes perception is “quite accurate . . . because have very close communication with the people that I supervise directly. And that communication is frequently not formal communication.”

Executive, A-5

To be sure the perception is accurate, “I ask them. I’ll ask them — this is what I think, am I reading you right?” Mostly, the perceptions are “accurate.”

Executive, B-1

Feels is accurate based on interaction with staff. “We are open and communicative with our staff.”
Executive, B-3

Feels perception is accurate. "I hope so, because there's good communication between the staff and me."

Executive, B-4

"I'm never exactly sure [that the perception is accurate]. I'm not perfect . . . that's why I always ask them to tell me."

Sometimes "but not always" changes her view.

Executive, B-5

Feels perception is accurate and flexible.

Executive, B-6

"Maybe not flexible, I think it's accurate. I'm not a real flexible person."

Executive, C

"I have a very high regard for them, I hope that is accurate and I presume that it's flexible because I try maintain and want them to maintain the high standards."

Executive, C-2

Feels is accurate and flexible "most of the time . . . and you have really guarded against prejudging a situation when you see a pattern of behavior."

Executive, C-3

Feels is accurate and flexible. "I would say so, simply because I know them, and I know daily work well enough."
Executive, C-4

"I never know if it is accurate, that's what I worry about. "Am I viewing this person correctly? They have to be honest with people and say this is what I see and a chance to say. That would usually increase the performance of that individual."

Executive, C-5

"I think I'm a fairly good judge of people, but whether that translates into absolute accuracy, I would say not. But ... one would not get in the position of being city manager unless one's perception was based upon some form of reality."

Executive, D

Shares with his staff his perception and feels has some flexibility of perception. Feels the perception is accurate because they "have meetings every Friday and we talk about problems."

Executive, D-3

Feels is accurate and flexible. "I feel like you've got to deal with different people in different manners and I've gone through some assessments myself in terms of how I am perceived. And one of those perceptions was that I was flexible."

Executive, D-5

"I think I have a pretty good grip on it [because] we're a very effective and efficient organization and it shows that we perform well. We're a pretty cohesive team."
Executive, D-6

Feels is accurate and flexible. “I would say so because ... I have some very definite ideas on leadership ... and in order to be flexible I need to have a continuum of information flow between the people that I deal with and myself.”

Executive, D-7

Feels is flexible and accurate “because I believe that we have a pretty successful organization and we have people that are demonstrating success and that’s established by the perception of the city council and the people in the community.”

Needs for Being More Effective in Analyzing and Correcting Performance Deficiencies

Executive, A

Financial resources. “I’m working with some foundations right now to see if I can get them to fund our staff development program. If I could develop a better staff development program internally for the remedy of the deficiencies that is something that I would really drastically ... help motivation, it helps the whole ball of wax.”

Executive, A-1

Described need for more feedback. “I think I could use a better feedback system that’s data driven. Other than that, my personal span of controls is a little too large and I would like to get it down to about eight instead of eleven.”

Executive, A-2

Understanding people. “I think probably the biggest single difficulty that I have is understanding how some people are motivated.”

Executive, A-3
More money and a better reward system. "Money would definitely help. And, it's crazy to me that the guy who works for us over in the mail room has the same protections as his division director. The responsibilities are so much broader and the measurement of performance is so much more difficult, and so much more subjective the higher up you get that I don't think the same personnel system ought to apply to all levels of employees."

Executive, A-4

"Greater flexibility in terms of rewards."

Executive, A-5

Time and resources. "I personally need more time. Secondly, I need resources to teach managers and improve skills. Most of the resources that we have available are fairly generic for managers. Third, I think that we really need a way of rewarding managers."

Executive, A-6

"Financially or educationally reward people who are performing well and allowing a bit more flexibility in dealing with non-performers. Now, need too much documentation to release someone."

Executive, B-1

More time with staff. "We take a lot for granted, we assume people know what their role is, we assume people are happy with what they're doing, we assume that people know that we think they are doing a great job. What I could probably do to be more effective, is to spend a little more time not assuming, but doing it."

Executive, B-3

Fewer constraints. "I'd like to have greater autonomy to move bodies
and people around. I'm somewhat constrained and the Attorney General is also very much constrained by the legislature."

Executive, B-4
Additional training. "I think that you can never do too much of that. Recruitment and selection of good people is the most important."

Executive, B-5
Flexibility. "I think that thing that almost all government entities need is more flexibility in the personnel system, and more flexibility in the budgeting system and flexibility in the personnel system."

Executive, B-6
"Time. Quite frequently we'll be pulled off on something that we never anticipated that might involve half of my time for a week or a month, and a week prior to it occurring you never knew it was on the horizon."

Executive, C
"Time."

Executive, C-1
Staffing and funding. "We sometimes feel ourselves to be bastard step children of the legislature, and the legislature in its wisdom makes many decisions which can negatively impact our staffing situation."

Executive, C-2
Described an understanding in employees. "I think I need a spirit of openness where people are able to listen and look at themselves, and not be threatened . . . because someone has found something wrong with one piece of their performance."

Executive, C-3
“My perception of a lot of way things work in the government, they have a very clandestined view of the department, very clandestined view toward information, and they hold it very close. If you could get people to loosen the grip on some of that, things would work a lot easier.”

**Executive, C-4**

Additional funding. “I think the policy makers in this state need to decide what policy decisions they want to make, and then let us managers manage the best we can.”

**Executive, C-5**

Time. “Probably more time interact, discuss and reflect with employees. We get very task oriented, and often there is not the time.”

**Executive, D**

Time. “We could all be more knowledgeable of what we are doing, it’s just that you don’t have time to get the knowledge when you’re performing the necessary tasks.”

**Executive, D-3**

“I really don’t think I need to do a lot more to correct performance deficiencies. The people I work with . . . there’s not really what I would call a lot of deficiencies, there’s just things that probably could just do incrementally better.”

**Executive, D-5**

“A degree in psychology. I need to develop more understanding of human dynamics. I need to understand individual motivations more.”

**Executive, D-6**

“I can’t think of anything that I need. The knowledge that I have of
the city, my gut tells me a lot and it tells me where to look to begin to analyze why there are problems.”

Executive, D-7

“I think the key is continual establishment of the expectations and feedback and that should solve a large degree of the problem.”
B. Plan of Inquiry —
Interviews Questioning Areas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: _____________________________</th>
<th>Date: ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position and Experience: ______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Background: ______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of staff under your direct supervision: ______________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regarding "Broad" Leadership**

1) What does public executive leadership mean to you?

2) How do you practically apply such meaning to your leadership role? And specifically to your perceptual function of your staff?

**Regarding Ability Variable**

1) How do you determine and evaluate the ability levels of your staff?

2) How do you handle insufficient or lack of knowledge, skills, or experience of those you supervise in your staff?

3) Do you feel that your measures for handling or correcting such deficiencies have increased performance effectiveness in the past? If not, have you considered revising them, and how? Reasons behind success or unsuccess . . .)

4) What's your thought about the ability of your Department (or City) in maximizing the overall ability level of subordinates through (a) selection and placement, (b) transfer, (c) training and development, and (d) job redesign?

5) How do you deal with employees whose level of ability does not match that required by their positions?

---

*Probing for responses is employed in these interviews to solicit more complete answers to questions. It is a neutral, nondirective phrase or question used to encourage a respondent to elaborate on an answer, especially if such answer is informative enough for analytical purposes. Examples include "Anything more?" "How is that?" "What would be an example of that?" "In what ways?"
Regarding Motivation Variable

1) How do you determine and assess the motivation levels of your staff?

2) How do you handle problems involving lack of proficiency, precision, or commitment as related to task goals?

3) Do you feel that your measures have successfully increased motivation in the past? If not, have you considered revising them, and how?

4) What's your thought about the ability of your Department (or City) in maximizing followers motivation through (a) task structure, (b) task counseling, (c) performance feedback, and (d) reward recognition?

Regarding Role Perception Variable

1) How do you assess the clarity, compatibility, and accuracy of roles assigned to employees in your Department (or City)?

2) How do you deal with problems involving roles ambiguity, conflict, or inaccuracy in your Department (or City)?

3) Do you feel that your measures for dealing with these problems have increased performance effectiveness in the past? If not, have you considered revising them, and how?

4) What's your thought about the ability of your Department (or City) in creating a sound role perception (clear, accurate, and compatible) through (a) In-Group Exchange, (b) Formal Performance Feedback, and (c) periodic High Task Orientation?

Regarding Formal Cooperation Variable

1) How do you assess the level of cooperation and coordination among employees and subunits in your Department (or City)? "Goal interdependence"

2) How do you handle problems involving work overload, or inter-group conflict in your Department (or City)?

3) Do you feel that your treatments to these problems have increased formal cooperation? If not, have you considered revising them, and how?
4) What's your thought about the ability of your Department (or City) in establishing a cooperative work environment through (a) group-coherence dynamic, (b) unity of command, and (c) reward based on joint-effort?

Three More Questions Concerning the Leader’s “Needs” in Evaluating and Alleviating Followers Performance Deficiencies:

1) How do you “identify” and “remove” elements that hamper performance efficiency in the workplace?

2) What do you think you really need in order to be more effective in analyzing and correcting performance deficiencies in your followers?

3) How flexible and accurate is your own perception of your staff? (Do you read and check your staff correctly? . . . How?)
C. Letters of Request for
Personal and Telephone Interviews

Dear Mr. _____,

I'm a doctoral candidate at the Graduate School of Public Affairs, CU-Denver. I'm conducting a number of interviews with some high level public managers in Colorado for the purpose of completing my dissertation work. The dissertation focuses on the question "What should public managers do to manage followers' performance effectively in the workplace?"

A new theory-building called "The Top Executives Assessment-Model of Followers' Performance Variables (TEAM)" and its application to the upper public sector management in Colorado will be investigated through intensive personal interviews. The distinguishing feature of this new TEAM theory of leadership dynamics is its integration of both behavioral and cognitive approaches to managerial behavior. It theoretically explains how top-level public managers can significantly affect followers' performance variables (ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation).

I certainly value your opinion, knowledge, and experience. To complete this dissertation, I need to schedule at least one hour and a half personal interview with you. The interview format includes an investigative plan designed to collect your views and thoughts on managerial leadership.

You were selected and strongly recommended by my doctoral committee to participate in this dissertation research. Please be aware that every single answer you mention in the interview will be considered totally confidential and used only for the purpose of completing this project. And if you wish, I will mail a copy of the written report to you right after completing the research stages. I hope you will find it both enjoyable and informative.
For following up with the above request, you will be called soon. Please feel free to call me at 499-9723 if you have any questions. You may also call my major advisor, Professor Steve W. Delcastillo, at 556-8200.

Sincerely,
Thamir M. Motairi

Dear Ms. _____,

I'm a doctoral candidate at the Graduate School of Public Affairs, CU-Denver. I'm conducting a number of interviews with some high level public managers in Colorado for the purpose of completing my dissertation work. The dissertation focuses on the question “What should public managers do to manage followers’ performance effectively in the workplace?”

A new theory-building called “The Top Executives Assessment-Model of Followers’ Performance Variables (TEAM)” and its application to the upper public sector management in Colorado will be investigated through intensive telephone interviews. The distinguishing feature of this new TEAM theory of leadership dynamics is its integration of both behavioral and cognitive approaches to managerial behavior. It theoretically explains how top-level public managers can significantly affect followers’ performance variables (ability, motivation, role perception, and formal cooperation).

I certainly value your opinion, knowledge, and experience. To complete this dissertation, I need to schedule at least one hour and a half telephone interview with you. The interview format includes an investigative plan designed to collect your views and thoughts on managerial leadership.

You were selected and strongly recommended by my doctoral committee to participate in this dissertation research. Please be aware that every single answer you mention in the interview will be considered totally confidential and used only for the purpose of completing this project. And
if you wish, I will mail a copy of the written report to you right after completing the research stages. I hope you will find it both enjoyable and informative.

For following up with the above request, you will be called soon. Please feel free to call me at 499-9723 if you have any questions. You may also call my major advisor, Professor Steve W. Delcastillo, at 556-8200.

Sincerely,

Thamir M. Motairi
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