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Abstract

This thesis investigates the relationship between performance measures and people in manufacturing organisations. Existing research on performance measurement has concentrated on the strategic importance of measures and the nature of measurement itself. There is little focus on the impact of these measures on people's behaviour, this work has closed this gap by forming a theoretical view of the organisational variables that influence behaviour. The reference model, developed from motivation theories, identifies the critical organisational variables and illustrates how they interact. The variables of primary interest are performance measures, organisational goals and rewards systems, although the importance all of the variables is acknowledged.

To test the impact of the variables in the reference model a consequences chart was developed. The chart maps the relationship between organisational variables and people's behavioural responses. It is a logical interpretation of the reference model and forms the basis of a series of predictions about people's behaviour. The chart predicts the 'consequent' behaviours that result when organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems do not reinforce one another. Data was collected through a series of interviews with production teams at Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd., the case study site, and a consequences chart was completed for each team.

When the predictions were compared against the findings at the case study site they were not supported. It was found that specific types of misalignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems, (for example targets and measures reinforce one another but rewards are focused elsewhere) do not produce an array of characteristic behavioural responses from people. It was evident however, that the teams tended to have one dominant response to a situation. It was concluded therefore from the results, that the prediction of people's behaviour using a consequences chart was not feasible. However, it was possible to begin with a typical behaviour and plot its cause by examining the variables on the consequences chart.
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Chapter One

Introduction

‘In measurement began our might...’

W B Yeats

The intensity of competition in the manufacturing market place has increased dramatically over the last two decades. This environment has led industry and academia alike to examine organisations and look for areas that could be re-structured to increase performance. As a consequence advanced manufacturing techniques have evolved, however can the same be said for the way performance is measured? Today many firms have changed their manufacturing processes yet are still persisting to gauge themselves against financial metrics designed to measure radically different organisations. Traditional measures were based on long production runs of standard products and this type of focus is no longer relevant. These inappropriate measures encourage inappropriate behaviour. For example, traditional cost based manufacturing measures can give a false impression of the cost of direct labour, often encouraging making to stock and high machine utilisation, taking no account of bottleneck scheduling. Also building to stock is not advantageous if you are operating a JIT system or if storage costs are at a premium. New performance measures related to strategy and critical success factors etc. have been cited by many as the key to manufacturing competitiveness in today’s global market. Although these new metrics may be more appropriate than financial measures this does not necessarily preclude them generating dysfunctional responses. This research looks at the impact of both traditional and new performance measures on performance from an organisational behaviour standpoint.

In this thesis an organisation’s characteristics have been examined in terms of the alignment between the performance measurement system, the goals of the organisation and the reward systems. The situational characteristics of the business have also been defined. The aim is to identify the many variables that influence people inside companies, although, how people choose to behave is dependent upon personality and learnt patterns of behaviour in response to antecedent events. It is assumed that the situation should present a consistent message to people re-enforcing the goal set. For example, the management style should be consistent and respond to measures by
producing consistent rewards aligned to goals. However, if there isn’t alignment and for example measures and rewards do not reinforce one another then the individual within their team may have enough internalised messages to counteract the organisational incongruence, alternatively they may not. This is where personality comes in; individuals own needs may be so strong that it doesn’t matter what the organisation does.

It is proposed that the self-reinforcing system (with situational and organisational variables aligned in such a manner that they give a consistent message to people) can further the vision of the company and enable the individual to develop a consistent style that supports the value system of the company as well as their own. If a company knows its value system it can then select a variety of people who will fit into this consistent structure.

This approach was developed from early work by Hopwood (1974) in the behavioural accounting field and is consistent with work completed by Blake and Mouton (1985). The Blake-Mouton grid states that management style (or behaviour) is influenced by five major variables: the organisation, the situation, personal values, personality and chance. The importance of chance in this is the coming together of congruence and incongruence of the various variables over time. Blake and Mouton stress congruence between the various influencing variables as does this research. The grid has been in existence for approximately forty years although the validation experimental work has met with mixed results. The assumption behind the grid is key to this research. The situational and organisational variables have been expanded focusing on the measurement-reward issue and the variables that are external to the individual or team should be a reinforcing set. The other variables in the grid are not dealt with in detail although the importance of all the factors is acknowledged. How people respond (behave) depends fundamentally upon individual or team values, personality and the chance dimension. These three Blake-Mouton variables have not been analysed in great depth and therefore the actual behaviour of people in unconstrained situations is not possible to predict from this research.

This research will increase our understanding of the impact that performance measures (together with their associated targets and rewards) have on people from an
organisation's point of view. The research will also identify what should be done to produce a harmonious set of values that reinforce the goals of the company.

The thesis is divided into ten chapters and has a typical research structure that could be described as hourglass. The research begins with a broad examination of the literature available on performance measures and the field of interest is established as the relationship between performance measures and people's behaviour. The subject is narrowed further by the development of a reference model and its subsequent operationalisation into a consequences chart. The research problem is further specified by the generation of hypotheses and data is then collected to explore these points. At this stage the thesis broadens out again to examine the data set and draw some conclusions. These are then generalised back to the initial area of interest, the relationship between performance measures and behaviour. This process is depicted by the illustration below:

Figure 1.1 The overall structure of the thesis

More specifically the first chapter introduces the research project and places the study in its context. The second chapter is a review of previous work in the field. This is an extensive chapter because of the multi-disciplinary nature of the research. This chapter ends with the development of a reference model. In chapter three the reference model is converted into a consequences chart. Chapter four is a synopsis of the literature on research methodology. It also presents the research propositions drawn from the reference model and the planned research design. Chapter five expands on the research propositions and presents a library of consequences chart called profiles. Chapters six and seven present the results of the case study. The former presents the initial results of
the control group exercise and the changes made to the chart in the light of the findings. The latter the results of the main case study work and the demonstration work-study. This chapter also discusses the results with respect to the predictions made by the library of profiles. Chapter eight discusses the findings of the research and interprets the results with respect to the hypotheses and discusses their implications. The limitations of the work are presented and the usefulness of the consequences chart as a management tool is assessed. Chapter nine reaches some conclusions from the research and chapter ten suggests future possible directions for research in this area. At the end of the thesis the references are presented in alphabetical order, together with an addendum containing a list of the publications generated by this research and details of the video produced in conjunction with the case study company Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd.
Chapter Two

Literature Survey

Overview

The primary objective of the literature review is to gain a comprehensive overview of the information available on performance measures and locate the key publications of importance. This chapter reviews the literature available on performance measurement in manufacturing companies and also other areas in which they are found. From this study, the direction of the subsequent research can be defined and the possibility of developing a reference model explored.

The first stage of the literature review focuses on the different types of performance measures found in companies and also the different frameworks in which they can be applied. It concludes by making a case for further research into behaviour and performance measures.

The next stage focuses on the relationship between performance measures and task-related behaviour. It examines the different kinds of behaviour found in the workplace and identifies frameworks that seek to predict behaviour. The variables that influence behaviour are also determined and the view that you can influence task-related behaviour is presented.

The publications in this chapter were located by using a wide variety of databases across a number of fields to ensure a broad spectrum of both approaches and results regarding performance measures were located. On-line search procedures were also adopted. Sources utilised include ABI-Inform, SOSIG, Guardian/Observer archives, MCB publications search engines, ALTA-VISTA, OPAC and other web-sites including the Performance Measurement Homepage.

This chapter of the thesis is divided into sections to reflect the stages described above. The first presents a review of the literature pertaining to performance measures and the second discusses relevant literature from the field of organisational behaviour.
Preface

As this research is focused on the impact of performance measures it is appropriate to begin with a definition of the subject area. Neely (1993) interprets the terms as follows;

**Performance measure**
A metric used to quantify the efficiency and/or effectiveness of action at a point in time. Where efficiency is defined as how well something is done and effectiveness how economically resources are used.

**Performance measurement**
The process of quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of action at a point in time

**Performance measurement system**
A set of metrics used to quantify the efficiency and effectiveness of actions at a point in time.

There has been a significant increase in the performance measures literature over the last decade. A great deal of interest has stemmed from the desire of manufacturing companies to attain “world class” status and the fact an effective and efficient performance measurement system is key to achieving this goal. World class being defined by Schonberger (1986) as

*World class manufacturing is a set of concepts, principles, policies, and techniques for managing and operating a manufacturing organisation. Its goal is the continual improvement of quality, cost, lead time, flexibility and customer service.*

The Manufacturing Engineering Group at the University of Cambridge completed a great deal of the early work into performance measures in the UK. They have also compiled and maintained a database of strategic and performance related literature. This database although not specifically focused on performance measures can illustrate the dramatic increase of interest in performance improvement based literature and research. The database has approx. 500 entries beginning in the fifties. If you consider journal papers only, figure 2.1 can show you the dramatic increase in publications.
The increase in literature on performance measures over time

Date (Years)

No of papers

The drop in literature in 1997 is because the database has not been fully updated for that year yet, rather than it is reflection of a drop in interest in the subject. How long can this volume of output continue though?

It is also interesting to see the source of these publications. The majority of the articles can be found in management journals but there is a significant percentage in business and human resources journals, accountancy journals and manufacturing journals. It is also interesting that though fewer in number, the journals that focus exclusively on quality still contain many articles on performance related issues.

Figure 2.2 illustrates the proportion papers in each of the journal groups.

Figure 2.1 Performance measures references
Where
1 management journals
2 miscellaneous business and human resource journals
3 accountancy journals
4 manufacturing engineering journals
5 quality journals

On the whole the research in the field has focused on two main areas. Those who attempt to identify the key performance areas and metrics on which an organisation must focus to become world class and those which focus on developing frameworks or systems in which performance measures can be applied.

1 A discussion of the literature
1.1 Performance Measures

In the manufacturing literature it is argued that performance measures should be aligned to strategy, that is they should be used to reinforce the importance of certain strategic variables (Skinner, 1969). This idea was developed further by Neely et al (1994) and they concluded that though this may be an organisation's aim, it does not always happen in reality. Other researchers have also documented the apparent difficulty of translating strategy into relevant goals and performance measures (Anderson, Cleveland and Shroeder, 1992; Hayes and Wheelwright, 1984; Hill, 1989). Mintzberg (1978) stated that strategy could only be realised through consistency in both decision-making and action, a performance measurement system should facilitate this. However, Goold and Quinn (1988) surveyed 200 UK companies and found that only 11% claimed to have a strategic control system, where a control system is analogous to a performance measurement system.

Leong et al (1990) proposed that the key dimensions of manufacturing performance are quality, delivery speed, delivery reliability, price (cost) and flexibility. However these terms have multiple definitions and can each generate several metrics. For example quality can produce 10 valid dimensions: performance, features, reliability, conformance, technical durability, serviceability, aesthetics, perceived quality, humanity or value (Neely, Gregory and Platts, 1995). Several authors have proposed that strategy can be realised through performance measurement among them Neely, Mills, Platts,

White (1996) maintains that while there is a growing realisation of the need for non-accounting manufacturing performance measures there is no consensus on what these measures should be or how they should be applied. One hundred and twenty five measures were found that relate to manufacturing strategy and he classified them into a taxonomy on the basis of competitive priority, data source, data type, measure reference and process orientation. Flexibility attracted the most metrics and delivery reliability the least. He suggests that this taxonomy could assist in the selection of appropriate measures.

In order to implement strategic performance measures most managers agree on several factors:

1. The process must be initiated from the CEO down
2. The process of determining strategic measures is almost as important as the measure itself
3. Measures stress that a company should only measure what it wants to manage. (Brancato, 1997)

Roberts (1994) examined the gap between strategy (strategic intent) and actual performance. Through a series of case studies he examines the pros and cons of performance measurement systems related to an organisation's strategic position. He concluded that it would be necessary to incorporate environmental scanning into new frameworks and that most performance measures should be non-financial.

Considering the service sector briefly, Fitzgerald et al (1991) suggest that there are two basic type of performance measure in any organisation – those that relate to results (competitiveness, financial performance) and those that focus on the determinants of results (quality, flexibility etc.). It has also been proposed that in the profit-based service industry, organisations need to develop their own set of performance measures across six dimensions of competitive strength (Brignall et al, 1991). Measurement
across these dimensions will monitor the continued relevance of their competitive strategy. These attributes, which differ slightly from the ones proposed for manufacturing organisations by Leong (1990), are competitiveness, financial performance, quality of service, flexibility, resource utilisation and innovation.

Rather than focusing on what should be measured other authors have proposed the features of effective performance measures and how to successfully implement them in organisations.

Performance measures are also widespread in Government. It has been argued that the reason why performance measurement in Government has not achieved greater success is that measures have become too bountiful, and too operationally focused. A strategically focused approach will create a more effective means of determining performance against objectives (Atkinson and McCrindell, 1997).

The following design criteria, drawn from Lynch and Cross (1991); Azzone (1991), Massella and Bertele; and Fortuin (1988) would produce effective performance measures:

1. Performance measures should be simple to understand and exact about what they measure
2. Performance measures should be reported in a simple format
3. Performance measures should have an explicit purpose
4. Performance measures should be objective, not opinion based
5. Performance measures should provide information
6. Performance measures should have visual impact
7. Performance measures should be relevant, now and in the future
8. Performance measures should be related to specific stretching but achievable targets.
9. Performance measures should provide timely and accurate feedback
10. Performance measures should focus on improvement not variance
11. Performance measures should be based on trends not snapshots
12. Performance measures should be based on processes that can be controlled by users alone or in co-operation with others
13. Performance measures should reflect the business process; i.e. the
supplier and the customer should be involved in the definition of a measure.

Blenkinsop and Davis (1991) have produced a nine-point list of factors that must be considered when designing a performance measurement system. Globerson (1985) has proposed a set of guidelines with which a performance measurement system can be constructed and Maskell (1991) has developed the seven principles of performance measurement system design. Integrated performance measurement systems should also include elements such as benchmarking and customer analysis (Gregory, 1993; Hazell and Morrow, 1992). More recently Flapper et al (1996) have produced a three-step technique with which to design a consistent performance measurement system. They observe that performance measures are often created on an ad hoc basis and not enough attention is paid to the relationship between measures. This practice among others can lead to sub-optimisation. Some general considerations about the relationship between measures are presented in Wisner and Fawcett (1991) and Doumeingts(1994).

Schmenner and Vollman (1994) discuss the problems associated with having the wrong performance measures, or not having the necessary measures in place when trying to manage effectively, and presents the results of a survey of senior management from all over the world. Twelve items were identified as being important areas in the search for improvement. Questions were posed on the effectiveness of the performance metrics in place to measure these items. ‘Gaps’ between the importance of long-term improvement and the effectiveness of relevant measures were highlighted; ‘false alarms’ associated with unnecessary measures were also identified; these latter were consistently related to direct costs, labour efficiency and machine efficiency, and certain other industry specific measures.

Doyle (1994) argues that high performance is not about exceptional performance in one or two measures, but about gaining satisfactory results along a broad set of criteria. Finally, Fisher (1992) examined the use of non-financial measures at five high technology manufacturers. He concluded that there were both strengths and weakness attached to using these performance measures, one of the deficiencies being that there was no tie-in between non-financial performance and financial performance.
1.2 Financial measures of performance

Modern performance measures are seen to follow strategy in the literature, however traditionally financial measures have been used by the vast majority of companies to formulate their strategies as well as guide their managers in the operation of the business (Daniels, 1996). This despite the fact that traditional accounting does not provide a valid indication of financial health (Allen, 1990) and disastrous consequences can result from simply focusing on financial measures (Evans, Ashwoth, Gooch and Davies, 1996) and though they have well documented shortcomings including

1. promotion of short-termism
2. encouragement of long production runs
3. do not encourage continuous improvement
4. generate inventory build-up
5. do not contribute to external aims e.g. customer satisfaction, quality etc.
6. maximise plant and labour usage (Kaplan, 1988)

The Japanese have developed alternative accounting systems which overcome these problems and help to define the role of accounting in a world class organisation (Monden and Sakurai, 1989). In Japan, financial measurement systems function in a way that is very different from their Western counterparts. For example, continuous improvement is the mainstay of Japanese manufacturing. It is a long term strategic objective of almost every firm. The performance measures/accounting practices have been developed to reinforce this goal and the behaviours that are required to support it. The function of the performance measurement system is to ‘influence’ rather than to ‘inform’. The concern of high level managers would be to ensure the system reflected the cost reduction priorities of middle managers and shop-floor workers. Whether the overhead allocation system emulates the precise demands each product makes on corporate resources is less of an issue (Hiromoto, 1988). The Japanese research into performance measurement stresses ‘targets’ and the measurement of the gap from the targets. This technique generates direction, and momentum for change within the work force. The value of intrinsic measures such as culture and peer pressure, are also examined, (Yoshikawa, Innes and Mitchell, 1989; Sakurai 1989).

It is evident the role of performance measures and accounting practices in Japan is very different from its counterparts in the West. In the UK the focus is on cost control and
the function of accounting practices is to determine accurate product costs, whereas in Japan the emphasis is on both cost control and cost reduction (Blenkinsop and Burns, 1992). In addition manufacturers have traditionally used a mix of financial and non-financial measures to rate performance, avoiding the problems of short termism. The long-term aim is to contain actual manufacturing costs. The performance measurement systems of Japan are very much in line with their production philosophies. This is perhaps one of the reasons why Japanese production techniques do not always succeed in the West when they are transplanted. They are not supported by an appropriate performance measurement system.

The conflict that exists between modern manufacturing techniques and financial measures has generated much research. In terms of redesigning measures for a time based organisation (Barker, 1993 and Azzone et al, 1991) and also more specifically for Just-in-Time operations (McNair, Mosconi, 1987; Green, Amenkhienan, Johnson, 1991; Crawford, Cox, 1990; McNair, Lynch and Cross, 1990). Hendricks (1994) explains why ‘traditional’ performance measures i.e. those based on data derived from standard accounting routines, are not ideal for the JIT environment, and goes back to first principles in considering the types of measures required and the need to link them to all levels of management. Thirty-two appropriate performance measures are briefly listed and discussed under the categories of customer delivery, quality, flexibility and productivity.

Dhavale (1996) discussed the problems caused by using traditional, finance based performance measures in advanced manufacturing environments. He suggests that they may: not link with strategic objectives; encourage sub-optimisation; include non-manufacturing allocated or non-controllable costs and be less appropriate than non-financial measures. Too many measures can obscure key factors and too few ignore some parts of the manufacturing process. He proposes four reasons why financial measures continue in popularity despite their faults and suggests that different performance measures are needed for different levels of management. He also lists 14 desirable properties of performance measures.

Accounting practices are changing and the literature contains some interesting case studies. For example when Caterpillar changed the basis of its control system from cost
centres to profit centres and implemented new financial and non-financial measures it was rewarded with increased productivity and customer service and income increased to record levels (Hendricks, Defreitas and Walker, 1996).

1.3 Performance measures in frameworks
The 1993 the CIMA report concluded the following
1. Most companies base their decisions on financial performance measures
2. Board members, bankers and external investors use financial measures exclusively
3. Executives tend to be receptive to the use of internal non-financial measures.

Following on from point 3, McKinnon and Bruns (1993) published in Management Accounting a paper outlining what production managers want to know and the kind of measures they need. They want (and need) a balanced picture of the state of the business and information that is both operationally and financially based. In the same year Kaplan and Norten (1992) published the ‘balanced scorecard’ framework designed to present a concise and ‘balanced’ picture of a business. It focuses on four key perspectives: financial, internal business, customer and innovation/learning. Consultants have used the scorecard extensively but it has been criticised for having no benchmarking or competitor viewpoint (Neely et al., 1995). In 1995 a chief executive was ousted from a corporation after a drastic re-engineering programme supported by 34 measures in a balanced scorecard did not yield any benefits. His successor threw the concept out and adopted a back to basics approach (Birchard, 1996).

The Balanced Scorecard was later redeveloped by Kaplan and Norten as a technique with which a business could be strategically managed, as a way to link performance measures to strategy and as a strategic learning tool (1996a, b and c).

Keegan et al (1989) proposed a performance measurement matrix, it has four generic components: internal and external measures and cost and non-cost measures. It is similar to the balanced scorecard but has the advantage of incorporating an external view. This means that competitor performance could be monitored, a measure the
balanced scorecard would not present.

In order to overcome the limitations of the traditional performance measurement systems a variety of other systems have been proposed. Cross and Lynch (1988) proposed the strategic measurement, analysis and reporting technique (SMART). It is a four level pyramid of objectives and measures. At the foundation of the pyramid are operational measures and at the apex corporate vision.

To address the needs of advanced manufacturing environments an Integrated Dynamic Performance Measurement System (IDPMS) was developed in conjunction with industrial partners. The IDPMS integrates management, process improvement and factory shop floor. The three areas are linked through reporting tools by a set of performance measures and performance standards (Ghalayini, Noble and Crowe, 1996).

Vantrappen and Metz (1994) propose that a different kind of performance measurement system is required to steer the innovation process. They describe a four-dimensional spectrum of performance measures and a pyramid model to link metrics at various levels.

Neely et al (1995) have also produced a comprehensive workbook with which to design a performance measurement system. The performance measurement system design process has been specified, with the aim of defining a set of balanced measures that are integrated; are linked to business objectives, current activities and drivers of performance; show how the management loop should be closed and drive business unit performance in the desired direction.

In terms of auditing performance measurement system Dixon et al (1990) have developed a methodology for auditing whether a firm is encouraging continuous improvement. McDevitt et al (1996) have developed a reference model for auditing the structure of a performance measurement system and have developed a workbook to accompany it.

Finally, with a slightly different orientation to the above techniques Vitale and Mavrinac (1996) have listed seven warning signs, which indicate that the redesign of the
existing performance, measurement system is necessary. They believe if any one of the signs below is present, it's time to re-examine performance measures:

1. Performance is acceptable on all dimension except profit
2. Customers don't buy even when prices are competitive
3. No one notices when performance measurement reports aren't produced
4. Managers spend significant time debating the meaning of measures
5. Share price is lethargic despite solid financial performance
6. Performance measures haven't been changed in a long time
7. Corporate strategy has recently changed

1.4 Comment

Traditionally performance measures have been seen as a way of quantifying the efficiency and effectiveness of actions. Over time however it has become increasingly apparent that performance measures also provide a means of influencing behaviour. Given that inappropriate performance measures encourage inappropriate behaviour, it can be seen the design of appropriate performance measures is a fundamental business activity (Cambridge Working Paper, 1994).

Considering that Lynch and Cross (1991); Keegan et al (1989); Kaplan and Norten (1992); Neely, Gregory and Platts (1991), Dixon, Nanni and Vollman (1990); Hopwood (1974); and others have observed the influence of performance measures; there is a surprising lack of empirical research into the impact of performance measures on task-related behaviour.

Dumond (1993) observed that it is possible that a performance measurement system can enable organisations to develop a consistent pattern of behaviour on the part of individuals making decisions. Her research has focused on the effects of performance measures on decision-making and employee comfort levels. The results show that the effect of performance measures compared with other organisational factors are significant.

Daniels (1996) investigated the behavioural consequences of performance measurement in cellular manufacturing. Through a case study he illustrated the shortfall of traditional
measures of manufacturing performance and analysed a performance measurement system and its behavioural consequences. The work led to the introduction of a cell generated performance measurement system that drives Kaizen. Also in the area of continuous improvement (CI) and Kaizen Caffyn et al (1996) developed a CI capability model which produced a series of behavioural norms associated with CI.

As early as 1956 the dysfunctional consequences of performance measures were being documented. Ridgeway (1956) noted that

1. the indiscriminate use of
2. undue confidence in and
3. reliance on financial measures

was a result of insufficient knowledge of their effect. Financial performance measures were seen to have undesirable consequences for overall organisational performance and it was concluded their motivational and behavioural consequences were inadequately understood. Later Rosen and Shreck (1967) would detail some behavioural consequences of financial measures. They clearly stated that the negative behavioural effects of accounting performance measures limit the contribution of accountancy to a firm’s efficiency. More recently, Waeytens and Bruggeman (1992) presented a field study of the dysfunctional behaviour caused by manufacturing performance measurement systems. As yet no reference can be found that details any dysfunctional responses to modern performance measures. Although perhaps the many case studies that detail how the implementation of new manufacturing practices are failing addresses part of this gap in the literature.

If the definition of performance measures is widened to incorporate work on control systems many relevant texts investigating the impact on behaviour can be found in the literature. The table 2.3 presents a selection (which is in no way comprehensive but is illustrative) of authors who have published work that relates organisational control systems and behaviour.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Area of research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajzen, I; Madden, JT (1986)</td>
<td>Prediction of goal directed behaviour attitudes, intentions and perceived behavioural control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansari, SL; Bell, J (1991).</td>
<td>Symbolic, behavioural and economic roles of control in organisations and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruns, WJ; Waterhouse, JH (1991)</td>
<td>Budgetary control and the impact of organisational structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goold, M; Quinn, JJ (1990)</td>
<td>Strategic controls.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govidarajan, V; Gupta, AK (1985)</td>
<td>Linking control systems to business unit strategy impact on performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopwood, A (1974)</td>
<td>Accounting measures and behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaworski, BJ; Young, SM (1992)</td>
<td>Dysfunctional behaviour and management control an empirical study of marketing managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant, K (1985)</td>
<td>Organisational controls and discretionary program decision making a field study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from the literature that there are few current publications discussing the impact performance measures have on behaviour and any dysfunctional consequences they may have. Conversely there are plenty advocating their use. An examination of current research projects on performance measures around the world also reveals that although the softer aspects of performance measurement are now researched more often there are still comparatively few researchers in this area. (See appendix 2 for the list of current research projects.) A great deal of research has been completed in the accounting field but it has focused on the impact of specific metrics, rather than why dysfunctional behaviour is generated. Its is also worth noting that most of the work completed has been through quantitative study, and qualitative techniques or analysis have not been used.
1.5 The case for research into behaviour and performance measures.

It is the gap in the manufacturing literature just described that this thesis plans to explore. It is important for a performance measurement system to provide goals or targets, effective ways to measure progress towards these targets and to provide feedback. Without these three components a performance measurement system has no focus or practical purpose. A framework that does not mutually reinforce these components will create confusion and erratic performance. It will no doubt generate some form of dysfunctional behaviour as well. The broad aim for the next stage of research is to analyse what must an organisation get right apart from its performance measures, to stop generating dysfunctional responses from its members. It also must be determined what definition of behaviour the thesis will adopt and what different kinds of behavioural response have been found in the workplace already. The term behaviour in the context of this thesis means task related or on-the-job as opposed to more cognitive responses such as withdrawal or projection. For the moment the definition of behaviour is everything we say and everything we do, however this may not be the definition of behaviour used after the completion of the next stage of research.

There is a great deal of research into behaviour in the workplace in the organisational behaviour field and this literature will now be explored. This phase examines behaviour in organisations and the frameworks that have been developed already to explain it. The view that performance measures influence behaviour will be investigated and the direction that this thesis will take, in the light of this second review of the literature will be presented.

It can also be observed that there is a need for qualitative based work on performance measures when examining the effect that performance measures (both financial and modern metrics) are having on behaviour.

The final section of this chapter will summarise the findings of the literature.
Performance measures and their relationship to 'on-the-job' behaviour

Section overview

2.1 Behaviour in the workplace

2.2 Frameworks that seek to explain OJBs and other behaviour

2.3 The variables in the workplace that can influence OJBs

2.4 The view that you can influence OJBs

2.5 The need for a reference model

2.1 Behaviour in the workplace

The initial literature review indicated that measures of performance have become very important in the modern manufacturing organisation. It has been shown that an organisation's overall performance is a function of the aggregate behaviour of its employees (Goodman & Dean, 1982; Tannenbaum, 1971). An extension of this concept is that organisational performance can only be irrevocably improved when employee behaviour is improved. Although it is unlikely that employee behaviour is the only factor that influences organisational performance. As a consequence this section discusses some of the literature available on recorded behaviour patterns within the workplace.

2.1.1 Typical Patterns of Behaviour

The organisational behaviour literature typically focuses on four aspects of behaviour:

1. Productivity
2. Absenteeism
3. Turnover
4. Job Satisfaction (An attitude but nevertheless important)

These four behaviours can be described as outcome behaviours. They have characteristically been measured in organisational change research. Relevant papers include Orden (1979), Pate et al (1977) and Paul & Gross (1981). Unfortunately research into specific on-the-job behaviour patterns is relatively infrequent (Robertson et al 1993).

On-the-job behaviours are 'patterns of actions' that are specifically related to
completing tasks or work. It is these ‘on-the-job’ behaviours (or OJBs) that this research focuses on, as the objective of the thesis is to link the application of performance measures in UK manufacturing companies to observed performance related behaviour. If the thesis is considered in this context, neither the investigation of cognitive responses such as withdrawal, or projection nor the study of general outcome behaviours is appropriate. The following literature will therefore focus on finding OJBs that could be studied in conjunction with performance measures.

A set of behaviour patterns known as Workstyle behaviours have been shown to be associated with positive organisational outcomes i.e. improved performance (Porras and Hoffer, 1986). In her doctoral thesis Hoffer (1986) found the more frequently these OJBs were observed the more effective the organisation. Two categories were defined, behaviours found at all organisational levels and those found at a managerial level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Organisational Levels</th>
<th>Managerial Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating Openly</td>
<td>Generating Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>Leading By Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Responsibility</td>
<td>Functioning Strategically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining A Shared Vision</td>
<td>Promoting Information Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving Problems Effectively</td>
<td>Developing Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting/Supporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Flexibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the doctoral study, 36 organisations were examined for the perceived frequency of the Workstyle behaviours and the performance of six financial measures. The correlation between the Workstyle behaviours and the measures was very significant. There was also a strong correlation with job satisfaction but no relationship with the rate of employee turnover (Hoffer, 1986).

There are other behaviour patterns that have been shown to promote organisational effectiveness; these are termed prosocial organisational behaviours. (Brief and Motowidlo (1986); Smith, Organ and Near (1983)). These have been described as
behaviours which go beyond normal role requirements, for example behaviours such as taking action to protect the organisation from unexpected danger; suggesting ways to improve the organisation; speaking favourably about the organisation to outsiders etc. All these behaviours enhance an organisation's ability to survive and reach its goals. Prosocial behaviours are not universally beneficial though. For example helping organisational members who help co-workers achieve personal goals that are inconsistent with organisational goals. Brief and Motowidlo have defined thirteen prosocial behaviours. They are as follows:

**Pro-social behaviours**

- Assisting co-workers with job-related matters
- Assisting co-workers with personal matters
- Showing leniency in personnel decisions
- Providing services or products to customers in a consistent manner
- Providing services or products to customers in an inconsistent manner
- Helping customers with personal matters
- Complying with organisational values
- Suggesting Improvements
- Objecting to improper directives
- Putting extra effort into the job
- Volunteering for extra assignments
- Staying with the organisation
- Representing the organisation favourably

These behaviours can be beneficial to the organisation or dysfunctional depending on their context. These are behaviours that are observed within organisations but they can not be considered task related, and will not be called OJBs.

The literature typically specifies absenteeism, low commitment and high turnover as behavioural issues that are detrimental to an organisation. There are few details of other negative behaviour patterns or OJBs. However in the field of organisational politics Ashforth and Lee (1990) have developed a catalogue of defensive behaviour in organisations. Defensive behaviour is the reactive defence of self-interest. These OJBs
enable individuals to reduce a perceived threat or to avoid unwanted demands. Three categories are defined and within these fourteen specific OJBs are listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Avoid Action</th>
<th>To Avoid Blame</th>
<th>To Avoid Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overconforming</td>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Resisting Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing The Buck</td>
<td>Playing Safe</td>
<td>Protecting Turf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Dumb</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalising</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothing and Stretching</td>
<td>Misrepresenting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalling</td>
<td>Escalating Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This work is unique as previous work in this field concentrated on proactive actions such as negotiation, ingratiating and persuasion (Kipnis and Schmidt, 1982; Mintzberg, 1983).

A limited number of observed behaviour patterns in the workplace were found in the behavioural accounting literature. The earlier work in the field revolved around the behavioural aspects of budgeting and people's responses to incentives. Much of the subsequent work in the field has focused on standard setting, motivation and performance (Young, 1988).

Merchant (1985) has identified several workplace behaviours:

1. Behaviour displacement - the folly of hoping for A while rewarding B
2. Gamesmanship - actions that improve measures of performance without producing any positive economic effects. For example the creation of slack resources or data manipulation
3. Negative attitudes - for example job tension, conflict, and frustration
4. Operational delays - for example as encouraged by excessive bureaucracy

In conjunction with Chow and Kato he has also investigated the impact of organisational controls on management myopia. Where myopia is an excessive focus on short term issues (Merchant, Chow and Kato, 1996).

Jaworski and Young (1992) have also examined behaviour in the workplace but they
focus on managerial behaviour. They investigate when managers:

1. Gamed performance indicators
2. Manipulated information flows
3. Falsified data

Although the behaviour patterns described above are OJBs they are not sufficiently different from the empirical work described by Ashforth and Lee (1990) to merit their being grouped with the OJBs. For the same reason the behaviours that have linked to successful Kaizen implementation in Caffyn (1995) will not be used in this study.

Vardi and Wiener (1996) have identified three organisational ‘misbehaviours’. They defined misbehaviour as ‘any intentional action by members of organisations that violates core organisational or societal norms’ and produced three variations on this theme.

1. Misbehaviour to benefit self
2. Misbehaviour to benefit the organisation
3. Misbehaviour to inflict damage

This work is closely linked with generating a new theory of motivation. Unfortunately definitions for the type of actions that fall into these three categories are not suggested. The work examines the relationship of personal factors such as personal need satisfaction and moral development and organisational factors such as organisational culture and cohesiveness. Although innovative this work is aligned very closely to the cognitive aspects of motivation and behaviour, and the behaviours are too loosely defined to benefit this research.

The OJBs defined so far are presented in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OJB</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating Openly</td>
<td>Behaviour promoting or reflecting the direct giving and receiving of information relevant to getting the job done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>Behaviour promoting or reflecting the involvement of relevant persons in the processes of identifying and solving problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Responsibility</td>
<td>Behaviours reflecting acceptance of responsibility and taking initiative in carrying out organisational tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining A Shared Vision</td>
<td>Behaviours reflecting a clear formulation, understanding and commitment to organisational philosophy, values and purposes and a commitment to high standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving Problems Effectively</td>
<td>Behaviours reflecting a problem solving orientation to difficult organisational issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respecting/Supporting</td>
<td>Behaviours demonstrating respect and support for others as worthwhile individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Flexibility</td>
<td>Behaviours reflection attention to and use of human process issues in one-on-one, group and inter-group situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiring</td>
<td>Behaviours reflecting a probing, inquiring, diagnostic orientation to the organisation and its environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenting</td>
<td>Behaviour promoting or reflecting an openness to trying new things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overconforming</td>
<td>Action is often avoided by resorting to strict interpretation of one responsibility or rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing The Buck</td>
<td>Transferring responsibility for a task or a decision to someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Dumb</td>
<td>Individuals avoid task by falsely pleading ignorance or inability. Managers often play smart and pretend to knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalising</td>
<td>You treat other people as numbers or objects to distance yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothing and Stretching</td>
<td>These practices are designed to make you appear continuously busy and productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalling</td>
<td>'Footdragging' tactic where you appear more or less supportive publicly while doing little or nothing privately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Rigorously documenting activity or fabricating documents to project an image of competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Safe</td>
<td>An individual can avoid blame by evading situations that may reflect unfavourably on them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Developing explanations that lessen your responsibility for a negative outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>The classic effort to place negative outcomes on an external factors that are not entirely blameworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresenting</td>
<td>The manipulation of information by distortion, embellishment, deception or selective presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalating Commitment</td>
<td>Vindication of an initially poor decision by escalating support for the decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting Change</td>
<td>A catch all for a variety of behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting Turf</td>
<td>Defending task domain from encroachment by others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Frameworks that seek to explain OJBs and other behaviour

There are many theories that seek to explain behaviour in the workplace. The most widely researched and tested are those in the field of organisational psychology, the motivation theories. This field has expanded considerably over time and includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychodynamic Theory</td>
<td>Freud, 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviourism (or reinforcement theory)</td>
<td>Skinner, 1953 &amp; 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Babb &amp; Kopp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Evaluation Theory</td>
<td>R De Charme, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Theory</td>
<td>Walster, Walster &amp; Berscheid, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectancy Theory</td>
<td>Vroom, 1964; Porter &amp; Lawler, 1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Characteristic Theory</td>
<td>Turner and Lawrence, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hackman and Oldman, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting Theory</td>
<td>Latham and Locke, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tubbs, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Cognitive Theory</td>
<td>Bandura, 1977 &amp; 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Theory</td>
<td>Lord &amp; Hanges, 1987; Klein, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Theory</td>
<td>Snyder &amp; Williams, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-centered work motivation theory</td>
<td>Kanfer &amp; Heggestad, 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5 A Summary of Motivation Theories to Date

---

1 Where motivation is defined as the readiness to exert high levels of effort towards organisational goals, subject to satisfying an individual/external need.
The theories of motivation analyse why people behave in the way they do. It is frequently investigated in respect of needs, motives, drives and goals. It is closely linked to personality. The earlier theories are based on internal drives and needs, the latter though, recognise the influence of environment on individual behaviour. None of these theories specifically identify measures of performance as having an impact on the way people behave.

If an individual spends a considerable amount of time in a working environment, it can be assumed it will influence their behaviour. Therefore if organisations can be designed which encourage constructive member behaviour (Hackman 1981, Pierce, Durham and Cummings, 1984) then by the same logic performance measurement system’s can be developed to encourage constructive behaviour too. However it has been shown that organisational characteristics designed to overtly control behaviour can instigate reactions such as aggression, withdrawal, apathy and minimisation of the amount of work performed (Strauss, 1963).

In the organisational design field Robertson et al (1993) proposed a useful model that summarises how an organisation affects individual behaviour. It proposes that the work setting is composed of

1. Social factors: Individual and group characteristics, organisational culture
2. Physical Setting: Physical features of the working environment
3. Technology: Work flow and job design
4. Organising Arrangements: Formal structures and reward systems

These four factors affect individual behaviour, and therefore the ‘outcomes’ for the organisation. The outcomes being organisational performance and individual development. The motivation literature is more sophisticated than this model in terms of assessing cognitive responses.

One of the first models that examined the effects of the organisation on group behaviour was Homans' Model (1950). It determined the effect of a reward system on behaviour, and was based on the Hawthorne findings. This model emphasises the relation between the activities that are required from a group, and those that emerge from within the
group itself. It states that group behaviour can be observed in terms of an external system and an internal system; each with its own activities, interactions and sentiments. The external system contains the activities, interactions and sentiments the group must carry out to survive. The internal system contains the activities, interactions and sentiments which emerge from the individuals such as like/dislike of people/job, attitude to work etc. The later models of behaviour such as the expectancy theory, goal setting theory, social cognitive theory and control theory all focused on the individual as opposed to the group.

In 1974 Hopwood developed a model of behaviour (Figure 2.6) which linked behaviour to performance measures. It was the first model to directly relate performance measures to behaviour. He proposed that an organisation’s purpose defines desirable behaviour patterns but an individuals personal goals defines the actual behaviour within an organisation. The role of the performance measurement system is to highlight those behaviours that are important in the organisation and the role of the reward system to reinforce the performance measurement system. Later research by Otley (1977) refined the model but it remained essentially the same.

The field of behavioural accounting has become more established since Hopwood’s work. However, the study of performance measures and behaviour has focussed on linking specific measures to specific behaviours in quantitative studies rather than continuing his theme of modelling.

A great deal of literature also examines the influence of participation in the budget process. Jaworski and Young (1992) proposed a relationship between context factors (goal congruence, perceived peer dysfunctional behaviour and information asymmetry); mediators (person-role conflict and job tension) and dysfunctional behaviour among managers. Nadler and Tushman (1977) proposed the use of a similar model but introduced a feedback loop. They proposed that the working environment and past managerial behaviour interact with the organisation and individual to produce individual and group behaviour. It is a weakness inherent in both these models that they consider only managerial behaviour and are not very specific about what organisational components are having what effect.
In the strategic control literature Hrebiniak and Joyce (1984) proposed a re-enforcement model. This paper proposes that individuals are calculative receptors and that control systems can influence them. Individuals interpret situations and assess the perceived costs and benefits of different responses and then choose the most advantageous. The model also proposes the use of rewards or sanctions to modify behaviour. This concept is drawn from behaviourism. The model is however simplistic compared against the motivation theories on which it is based and has had no empirical testing.

2.3 The variables in the workplace that can influence OJBs.

An individual's response to a situation is influenced by many variables. These factors can be summarised into three groups:

1. Internal factors - factors personal to the individual
2. External factors – factors that influence the individual
3. System factors - organisational structure and design factors

Internal factors are those which are personal to the individual. They include variables such as personality, attitude and values. Personality has been described as “those relatively stable and enduring aspects of the individual which distinguish him from other people and at the same time form the basis for our predictions concerning his future behaviour” (Wright et al., 1970). The concept of a locus of control is considered to be a dimension of personality (Rotter, 1954). This theory assumes that people will differ in their attitude to control. Externals feel that the outcome of their efforts is controlled by forces and events external to themselves whereas internals are convinced that control is an internal matter related to their own efforts and talents. Consequently, an individual will behave very differently within the confines of a performance measurement system depending on the nature of their locus of control. An attitude is an opinion of the advantages and disadvantages of a behaviour, (Ajzen and Madden, 1986). This belief is influenced by the recall of thoughts and associations from memory. It is a good predictor of behaviour and is incorporated into many of the theories of motivation. An alternative theory is that attitudes influence behaviour by selectively activating thought processes from a person's memory (Fazio, 1986). It proactively influences the choices and beliefs to be evaluated, when an individual makes a decision on a course of action (behaviour). Values are the basic convictions that a specific mode of conduct is
personally or socially preferable to an opposite mode of conduct or endstate. These values will be ranked according to their relative importance in a value system. Values will influence attitudes.

External factors that influence an individual include group norms, the prevailing culture and the leadership style. When an individual is part of a group their behaviour is perhaps different than when they are members of an autonomous unit. The behaviour of a group is modified by shared norms, norms being standards of behaviour. Individuals are expected to conform to group norms and are encouraged to do so by the use of rewards and sanctions. The overt use of pressure on individuals to comply can have negative implications (Chell, 1987) and can undermine the cohesiveness of the group. Leadership is the ability to influence a group towards the achievement of goals. There are many different styles of leadership and each will affect an individuals ability to achieve those goals. Organisational Culture can be defined as a set of values that help people in an organisation understand which actions are considered acceptable and which are considered unacceptable (Moorhead and Griffin, 1992). Sub-cultures also exist within organisations. These can be attached to different roles, functions or levels of the hierarchy (Hampden-Turner, 1990).

System factors are related to the organisation's structure, they include the reward system and the performance measurement system. It is this inter-linkage between incentives and measurement that is especially important. The closer that rewards can be tied to measures the greater the influence of the measure on behaviour. The physical environment that individuals work in and their job design will also influence behaviour. These factors are important and can not easily be categorised. Their relationship to performance measurement system design is not clear but they certainly could be considered moderating factors.

Each of the above factors will be moderated by the individuals personal experience and their ability to learn. Learning is the relatively permanent change in behaviour that occurs as a result of previous practice or experience (Robbins, 1993). (Learning is only observable through behaviour change and can not be quantified directly.) Individuals who are sufficiently motivated can change their behaviour (i.e. learn) to improve their performance. The implication is that performance measurement systems should
incorporate learning to enable maximum performance to be achieved.

Several authors have grouped together the factors that they consider have the most influence in the workplace. They include both personal factors such as personality, attitudes etc. to the more prosaic like physical setting. Some examples of these groupings are presented below.

2.3.1 Proposed variables groupings that influence organisational behaviour

- Klein (1989) specifies feedback, needs, interests, abilities, resources and time.

- Hunt (1992) specifies structure, systems, leadership, group membership, perception, abilities, motives and power.

- McKinsey 7-S (1983) framework identifies staff, structures, strategy, systems, style (culture & management), skills and super-ordinate goals (shared values).

- Porras & Robertson (1992) identified four primary sets of factors that influence individual behaviour and therefore organisational performance.
  1. Organising arrangements: goals, strategies, structure, policy & procedure, admin. Systems, reward systems and ownership
  2. Social factors: culture, management style, interaction processes, informal networks, individual attributes
  3. Technology: machinery, IT, job design, work flow, technical expertise, technical procedures, technical systems
  4. Physical setting: space configuration, physical ambience, interior design and architectural design

- Robey (1986) in his micro-perspective work identified two sets of influencing factors. Personal characteristics such as ability, motives, perceptions, personality, expectations and values. And organisational characteristics such as leadership style, climate, job design, structure and reward system.

Although the number of attributes quoted varies between each of the proposed sets the
differences between them are minor. Each author has identified the importance of the individual.

2.4 The view that you can influence OJBs

Porras and Robertson (1992) propose that the alteration of tangible on-the-job behaviours performed by individual organisational members is a key effect of successful planned organisational change efforts. They also note that inherent in all cognitive models of behavioural change is the importance of the individual’s environment as a source of information about appropriate behaviours. Also in her article on participation Neuman (1989) argues that the level of participation in decision-making is shaped by environmental factors - people will do, as the workplace requires of them. Continuing this logic, the work setting should therefore influence the OJBs that can be found. Although it must be acknowledged behaviour choice is a balance between the individual’s evaluation of an environment based on their needs and personality, and also the signs they receive from the work setting as to what On-The Job behaviours are appropriate/rewarded.

The approach of this research will be to determine the impact of work setting on OJBs. The importance of individual differences is acknowledged but the thesis will not explore their impact at this early stage. This approach has support in the literature. It has been found that the extreme variability within and among organisations renders normative theories less useful in understanding organisational behaviour than models that recognise situational contingencies (Lichtman and Hunt, 1971). It has also been shown that individual difference measures (e.g. personality differences) are not consistently related to goal setting effectiveness (Locke and Henne, 1986). As a consequence they may not be consistently related to on-the-job behaviour. Although there are many theories of personality, a relationship between these theories and performance (or behaviour) is difficult to establish, despite the many personality trait tests on the market and their huge data banks (Hunt, 1992).

Finally as Duerr (1974) succinctly put it,

*If large numbers of people behave in ways that are undesirable, you may have to look at the managers’ actions and the organisation to determine the reasons.*
2.5 The need for a reference model

Modelling behaviour in the workplace has been the main focus of researchers within the organisational behaviour field. In the accounting field research on behaviour has generally used quantitative methods that examine the prevalence of certain behaviours. In his review of research in the behavioural accounting field Brownell (1988) stated that different approaches might now be appropriate to further the knowledge of the field. He suggests using a more qualitative approach rather than resorting to modelling.

How OJBs change in response to performance measures is perhaps best understood within the context of a model, as the model would be able to establish the different variables that influence people; rather than just the attributes that affect a certain type of behaviour. There are a variety of frameworks available in the field of organisational behaviour, particularly in the area of motivation as it is closely linked to behaviour and performance in the workplace.

The reference model will be constructed using the following steps:
1. The criteria for the selection of the reference model will be stated
2. A description of the possible reference models will be presented
3. The potential models will be critiqued
4. The reference model will be presented
5. The meaning and role of the reference model will be discussed

2.5.1 The criteria for the selection of the reference model

The decision over which model or combination of models, to guide the research was made by first determining the required capabilities of the model and then selecting a model which was a close match. The following criteria were developed:

Criteria 1.: - The model must have the capability to make predictions, the presence of a feedback loop would facilitate this.

Criteria 2.: - The model must specify both organisational and individual variables.
There are two strands of motivation theory. The first are the need or content theories of motivation: the hierarchy of needs; ERG theory; achievement and power motivation; dual factor theory and theories X and Y. The second strand of motivation theories are known as cognitive or process theories. They include goal setting; expectancy theory and equity theory. Although there are differences between each of these theories they all recognise individual and situational influences that are likely to affect outcomes. Also they are all predictive in that they are concerned with how people will behave. Other fields in which behaviour is modelled include accounting, management control and organisational development. Likewise they all focus on predicting behaviour from certain situational variables.

The aim of the research is to determine the effect of performance measures on behaviour; hence the model used must have the facility to foretell events. This criterion eliminated the use of the need theories of motivation.

Two of the process theories of motivation provide a link between rewards and performance, Porter and Lawler’s (1968) expectancy theory and Klein’s (1989) control model of motivation. Three other models that examine behaviour and relate it to variables in the workplace were also found in the literature survey.

1. Hopwood, 1974
2. Hrebinak & Joyce, 1984 (The Re-Enforcement Model)
3. Porras and Robertson, 1993

The second model illustrates behaviour in the workplace very clearly but is simplistic compared to the theories of motivation. The third model was developed as a framework and was not detailed enough to warrant further development as a possible research model. However, the work by Hopwood (1974) was found to be complimentary to those theories and strengthened their relationship to performance measurement systems. The next step was, therefore, to amalgamate the Hopwood model with one of the two remaining theories of motivation. The next step is therefore to discuss the three models in further detail before reviewing their validity.
2.5.2 Description of the possible reference model components

The measurement-reward model

The model in figure 2.6 is the reward-measurement process model as defined by Hopwood. The model was developed to illustrate the relationship between rewards and measures and show how they interact to change behaviour.

The organisation's goals (purposes) or strategy define (A), the behaviours required to achieve the organisation's goals. However it is the personal goals of employees that define (B), the behaviours actually present in the organisation. As you can see the area of congruence between A and B is dependant on the performance measurement system. The role of the performance measurement system is to focus attention on behaviour patterns that are measured and as a consequence rewarded. The use of performance measures to indicate personally significant behaviours (i.e. those which will satisfy personal needs for material prosperity, recognition and achievement) means the behaviour of individuals (B) will incorporate measured behaviours (C). As measured behaviours (C) are within (A) the organisation is re-enforcing behaviours that will enable it to achieve its goals. Otley (1977) later refined the model and this version of the model is shown in figure 2.7.
As you can see Otley has delineated the model slightly and rephrased certain definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hopwood, 1974</th>
<th>Otley, 1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of behaviour which are necessary for</td>
<td>(A) Behaviour necessary to achieve organisational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieving wider organisational purposes</td>
<td>purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects of behaviour which subordinates are likely</td>
<td>(B) Behaviour actually engaged in by individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to concentrate on in fulfilment of their personal</td>
<td>manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals</td>
<td>Measured behaviours (C) Behaviour formally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measured by control system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8 The meaning of the terms (A), (B) and (C)

Unfortunately the situation shown in figures 2.6 and 2.7 is ideal and the control system of an organisation often better represented by the variations illustrated in figures 2.9 and 2.10.
In figure 2.9 the performance measurement system is dysfunctional and is pulling behaviour away from the organisation's goals. In addition if the system of rewards does not re-enforce the performance measurement system conflicting goals will arise and the system will again generate inappropriate behaviour patterns.

Figure 2.10 is a functional performance measurement system. It shows actual behaviour being pulled towards required behaviour. However not all the measures are being acted on and so circle (B) does not entirely cover circle (C).

The model suggests that it is the process of measuring tasks and the associated receipt of rewards for performance that drives this change. But these can not be the only drivers, although they may be the most tangible. The cognitive processes behind behaviour change are far more sophisticated and a better account of their influence will be required to support the model before it can be used to design an effective management tool.
The Expectancy Model

Porter and Lawler (1968) developed the expectancy model shown in figure 2.11 from Vroom's expectancy theory (1964). It expands the model to account for not only effort but also an individual's abilities, traits, and role perception. Performance (behaviour) is related to two kinds of reward:

1. Intrinsic Rewards (Challenge, Achievement etc.)
2. Extrinsic Rewards (Pay, Promotion etc.)

An individual will be satisfied when they receive both kinds of reward. The level of satisfaction will depend on the difference between the actual reward the individual receives and what the individual perceives as a reasonable (or equitable) reward.

The feedback loop between satisfaction and the value of the reward indicates that intrinsic rewards are important when an individual receives adequate reward for their effort. The feedback loop between intrinsic rewards, extrinsic rewards, and perceived equitable value shows that if good performance (behaviour) is rewarded the perception that effort equals reward will grow stronger.

Many management accountants have examined the performance measurement system and its association with reward systems. They have found that confidence in the
performance measurement system will be low if the individual feels that some aspect of their performance should be measured and it is not (Porter, Lawler and Hackman, 1978). Confidence will also be lost if the measures give misleading results (Hirst, 1981). This loss of confidence means that the perception of what standard of behaviour will be rewarded will be low. If an individual’s performance is not rated correctly then a greater effort will not necessarily equate to an increased reward. It is this possibility that leads employees to distort metrics to make their performance seem better (Likert, 1961). Finally, although this model has been criticised for assuming individuals are such logical decision makers, there is some empirical support for its findings (Pinder, 1984).

The Integrated Control Model of Motivation

The control theory of motivation assumes that an individual’s behaviour is governed by a system where the individual’s current state is compared against a desired state. An individual would then change their behaviour to minimise any shortfall. This model is illustrated in figure 2.12.

![The Klein control loop model of motivation](image-url)

**Figure 2.12 The Klein control loop model of motivation**
This complex model is best understood by reading the explanation below abridged from Klein, 1989: An integrated model of work motivation, Academy of Management Review, 14, 150-172.

- Box 1: A goal or standard is a desired position that triggers behaviour and performance.
- Boxes 2 and 3: The person follows a course of behaviour and performance of particular tasks.
- Boxes 4 and 5: Feedback on performance is received, and this compared with the standard by the comparator.
- Boxes 6 and 7: Where no discrepancy or error is detected by the comparator, the person knows that their behaviour to date is acceptable.
- Boxes 8 and 9: There is an error or discrepancy, two courses of action are open to the individual. The first is where the situation is familiar, and the person engages in unconscious scripted response. The second course of action arises if the reasons for the discrepancy between actual and desired conditions are not immediately obvious. In box 9 the attempts to attribute a reason to the error or discrepancy.
- Box 10: Out of the attributional search come questions such as is the goal still appealing, and what is the expectancy of achieving it? Answers to these questions are reflected in the subjective expected utility of goal attainment.
- Box 11: The individuals personal characteristics and situational factors can influence the value the person places on attaining the goal.
- Boxes 12 and 13: as a result of the impact of personal and situational characteristics on the subjective expected utility of goal attainment, two things can happen. There can be a change of goal (Box 12) or a change in behaviour (Box 13) or both.

This model includes many of the recent developments in research regarding behaviour. However it has not been validated by significant empirical research, perhaps because it is quite new. It does have the advantage that it incorporates changes to both goal standards and the individual’s work setting. It is also supported by the cognitive
theories of motivation.

2.5.3 A critique of the reference models

The purpose of the reference model is to illustrate the integration of performance measures and other important attributes of the workplace with on-the-job behaviour. The basis of the reference model is the measurement-reward process model as defined by Hopwood in the early seventies. To increase its relevance to this work the framework will be joined to a motivation model. This joining of two models will enable a better understanding of how the organisation can influence the individual. The measurement-reward model provides an understanding of how performance measures together with ancillary targets and rewards influence behaviour. The model is strengthened by the addition of motivation constructs. Motivation theory expands on the relationship between the individual and the workplace. It illustrates the mechanism by which behaviour can change and defines other important variables in the workplace. For example, the importance of feedback is not specified by the measurement-reward process model. Before choosing the most appropriate motivation model to be incorporated in the reference model, both will be critiqued.

Expectancy theory

The expectancy theory was first published by Vroom in 1964. The model was in two parts, the first for the prediction of valences towards outcomes and the second for the prediction of forces towards behaviour (Mitchell, 1974). The purpose of the model was to explain how individuals:

1. Decide to enter or leave an organisation - a behaviour
2. Decide to enter or leave an occupation - a behaviour
3. Decide on the job effort - a behaviour
4. Measure job satisfaction - an outcome
5. Determine good performance - an outcome

Several models have been derived from the original expectancy model, however the differences in each have been conceptual rather than fundamental. It is therefore useful to examine the criticisms of both Vroom's expectancy model and the modified Porter and Lawler version (Heneman and Schwab, 1972). In the seventies research of Vroom's theory was widespread and created a great deal of debate. The majority of the
criticism has been levelled at those who claimed to have empirically tested the model and hence validated it. The reason being that their methodology was faulty (Heneman and Schwab (1972); Mitchell (1974); Miner (1980); Behling and Starke (1973); Campbell & Pritchard (1976) and Kennedy, Fossum and White). The premise of expectancy theory is that an individual makes a choice to behave a certain way from several alternatives. The model should therefore be validated through testing whether the predicted choices match the actual choices. In behavioural terms a within-subject test. However the majority of research has used an across-subject test which shows variance in actual behaviour across a sample. Other criticisms have been made against expectancy theory and these are summarised below in table 2.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicts forces on behaviour as opposed to actual behaviour</td>
<td>Mitchell, 1974; Klein, 1989; Nickerson &amp; McClelland, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The model does not implicitly involve awareness of a choice in decisions/behaviour</td>
<td>Wanous, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is doubt that individuals are as rational as the model requires in the working environment.</td>
<td>Pinder, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical testing has focused on the academic community limiting the ability to generalise the theory.</td>
<td>Wanous, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests have generally been in a single organisation and have focused on only one job.</td>
<td>Campbell and Pritchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trend has been to use questionnaires, until 1983 no interviews had been carried out as part of a test.</td>
<td>Wanous, 1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The theory has been validated assuming that valence; instrumentality and expectancy are independent variables, which is not necessarily the case.</td>
<td>Pinder, 1984 Campbell and Pritchard, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An individuals control over their performance in the working environment is limited.</td>
<td>Pinder, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The theory accounts for changes in terms of an individuals expectancies or anticipated valences. It can not account for changes in behaviour when these variables remain the same.</td>
<td>Atkinson and Birch, 1974 Kuhl and Atkinson, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall the model is too complex to accurately validate.</td>
<td>Lawler and Suttle, 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no clear specification of effort in the literature so measurement of this variable is meaningless. The model can not therefore be validated.</td>
<td>Campbell and Pritchard, 1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.13 A summary of the main criticisms of expectancy theory

Since 1974 when the methodological failings of the validation work were highlighted more within-subject empirical testing has been carried out and despite its faults the expectancy theory has been shown to present a fairly accurate picture of the decision
process behind behavioural change (Kennedy, Fossum and White).

The most widely used version of expectancy theory is the version presented by Porter and Lawler in 1967. (As illustrated in figure 2.11). They altered the model so it focused exclusively on job effort and included organisational factors. The incorporation of these situational variables meant that the implications of equity theory had been accounted for. Their modification addressed what they felt to be the primary weakness of the original model, that it was explicit in defining actions and outcomes and the different kinds of expectancies associated with each (Lawler and Suttle (1973); Porter and Lawler (1968); Campbell and Pritchard (1976)). The model itself was developed from research carried out with managers and focused on their attitudes to pay and organisational effectiveness. They tested the model cross-sectionally as opposed to over time and the selection of managers to take part in the investigation was not random.

An assumption inherent in Porters and Lawler’s (1968) model is that outcomes other than pay engender the same response. It should also be observed that no sanctions appear in the model. The conceptual difference between Porters and Lawler’s expectancy theory and Vrooms is that the former refers to the value of rewards, whereas the latter refers to the valence of rewards. This is an important distinction. Valence is the anticipated value of any reward. Porters and Lawler’s use of the term value indicates true value and obliquely refers to pay.

However, the model does illustrate well the fluid nature of motivation. The empirical research upholding the theory has been criticised and a fair amount of supporting evidence has been amassed. This has shown why some employees are more productive than others. If the correlation between performance and reward is clear, productivity will be high. As many organisational members do not have a great deal of control over their performance and are not rewarded for good performance it is not unsurprising that the validity of the model has been suspect. In work settings where individuals have greater control over their performance etc. the accuracy of the model’s predictions may improve.

In summary the limitations of using the expectancy theory are: -
1. It only has good prediction capabilities in specific circumstances (Wanous et al, 1983)
2. Sanctions are not included amongst the variables
3. The behaviour of groups or even groups impinging on an individual's behaviour is not explicitly accounted for
4. The empirical testing of the model was not comprehensive and this may detract from the validity of the current research (Mitchell, 1974; Campbell & Pritchard, 1976)

Control loop meta-model of motivation

Klein (1989) developed the control loop meta-model of motivation as part of his doctoral thesis. The driving factor behind its creation was the fact that his review of the literature revealed the need for a meta-theory to direct future theoretical and empirical research. The model was developed with a control loop framework and specifically addresses the issue of behaviour in the workplace. The concept of using control theory to represent motivation is not new and has been attempted by several authors (Carver and Scheier, 1982; Taylor et al, 1984; Lord and Hanges, 1987; Campion and Lord, 1982). The incorporation of a number of different motivational constructs in a single control loop framework was however innovative. (Figure 2.12 shows the Klein meta-model). Klein has combined ideas from attribution theory, control theory, expectancy theory, feedback theory, goal-setting theory and information-processing theory.

To date no papers have been found which specifically address use of this model and this raises questions over its validity. This may be because it is rather early to find these types of publications. The model has been described as the most appropriate basis for providing a meta-theory or general framework within which more specific theories can address particular motivation issues (McKenna, 1994).

In its defence the literature on which the model is based is extensive and the control framework has been used very successfully in other fields. In addition this type of framework lends itself to performance measurement system design as it based on a closed feedback loop. The individual perceives a gap between the expected outcome and the actual outcome, and changes their behaviour to close this discrepancy. The
performance measurement system provides direction for this change in behaviour. There has been some empirical testing of the control model’s predictive capabilities and the results have generally been found to be supportive (Kanfer, 1992; Lord & Kernan, 1989). The response to overshooting a target has not been investigated (Ilgen and Klein, 1988), Taylor et al (1984) do not make a distinction between hitting a target or overshooting but both Hollenbeck (1988) and Carver & Scheier (1982) both contend that the effect of a positive deviation will be much less than a negative deviation.

Selection of motivation model
Much has been made in the literature of the expectancy theory apparent lack of empirical support. This failing can also be levelled at the meta-model that incorporates expectancy theory constructs. However if you consider that expectancy theory is constrained by

1. individuals having control over their choice of behaviour
2. the need for only performance to be rewarded

and that these circumstances are not often found in the working environment, then as discussed previously it is not unsurprising that the empirical support for the model is not conclusive. This could be a flipside justification of the model’s validity. An extension of this rationale is that expectancy theory describes an ideal organisation and therefore would provide a point of reference for investigating organisations. As there is widespread use of cellular manufacturing techniques and different management practices such as Kaizen etc. a little more freedom has been introduced into the workplace and therefore the validity of expectancy theory in an industrial setting has not necessarily been compromised.

Despite these points the theory most suited to amalgamation with the measurement - reward process model is the control theory of motivation. The expectancy theory although supported by empirical evidence has been superseded. The control model presents a more sophisticated framework of decision making in the workplace and in addition incorporates expectancy theory concepts. The control model was not chosen because it was more complex but because it better reflects behaviour choice. It differentiates between awareness of choice in behaviour and an instinctive response to
the current situation. The shortcoming of selecting the control model is that it does not offer the possibility of producing an idealised work environment with which you could compare any organisation.

2.5.4 Presentation of reference model

Figure 2.14 shows the reference model.
The diagram on the right represents a motivational view of behaviour choice and change, i.e., the process which moves circle (B).

Figure 2.14 The complete reference model
2.5.5 The meaning and role of reference model

What does this component do?

This component of the model illustrates the link between the key variables that the thesis will investigate. That is organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems and on-the-job behaviour.

It does however gloss over the mechanism by which behaviour could change and therefore it is joined by a meta-model from the motivation literature.

Why is the reference model especially useful?

The reference model is useful in that it visualised many of the issues the thesis must examine and also provides a source from which some hypotheses about performance measures and on-the-job behaviours may be drawn. Aside from providing a sound theoretical base it also serves as an aid to formulating the experimental work. Also although not the objective of this research the generation of an effective management tool would be a useful output. The use of a model may provide a framework through which one can be developed.

What does this component do?

This component of the model expands on process by which behaviour changes. It provides a framework within which the organisational structure and OJBs may be investigated and an image of how the organisation can influence behaviour. It also strengthens the measurement-reward process model by defining a possible mechanism by which behaviour changes.
Chapter Three

Consequences Chart

Overview
In this chapter the reference model is converted into the consequences chart. This chart is the tool which tests the impact of the variables defined by the reference model on people's behaviour. It begins with an explanation of structure of the consequences chart, including a breakdown of what each element contributes. A glossary of the terms used on the chart is then presented and the limitations of the tool are discussed. The chapter ends with a summary of the literature review and identifies the next stage of research.

3.1 The operationalisation of the reference model
Apart from the verification of hypotheses it is hoped that this research will produce a management tool that can be used to help companies ensure that they have a supportive environment to ensure people perform to their best ability. The consequences chart has been developed from the reference model and helps meet these dual objectives. However, the thesis is primarily concerned with investigating the relationship between performance measures and behaviour in industrial organisations.

The consequences chart consists of four parts and was generated by following the logic of the reference model. The first part examines the performance measures, the reward systems and the organisation goals to see if they provide a consistent message to people. This section comes from Hopwood's (1974) measurement-reward process model.

The second part is based on motivation theory and it examines the value of the many organisational attributes that influence people at work. The variables here are drawn from the literature review. As indicated in section 2.1 there are many frameworks which specify the variables with the most influence in the workplace. The attributes specified in the model were drawn from a mixture of frameworks to provide a broad picture of the workplace. The term attributes is more appropriate than variables at this stage because the chart seeks to ascertain if they are there or not, it does not evaluate them on a scale.
The third part of the consequences chart is related to how people or teams make their decisions about what to do and is drawn from Klein’s (1989) meta-model of motivation.

The final section of the consequences identifies the resulting on-the-job behaviour patterns. This leads back again to Hopwood’s (1974) model of desirable and undesirable behaviours in the workplace. The behaviour patterns shown are the OJBs listed earlier in the literature review. Some of these are dysfunctional for the company as a whole. For example stretching/smoothing is a term used in some companies to describe a behaviour pattern that involves the slowing down of work to maintain an image of busyness.

In this research it is assumed people generally work to their best ability and want to do a good job. However, if there is something wrong in their working environment they may get the wrong messages about what they should do. As a result their behaviour can be defensive, for example keep your head down, not contribute, look busy and many others. At the worst sabotage and alienation can result. It is in everybody’s interest that a positive environment exists to encourage the best from people.

3.2 A schematic of the consequences chart
A schematic version of the chart is presented in figure 3.1.

Figure 3.1 A schematic of the consequences chart
3.3 The role of each chart section
Considering the chart section by section

**Operational and Strategic Variables**

If you consider a person within a team inside a manufacturing company, you first of all examine the consistency of the messages that the company is giving to the person. Is the team being measured and are the rewards aligned and supportive of the measures. These measures and rewards may not be formally defined they may be informal. However, you check to see if they are consistent with each other. If they are not then people will make a judgement about what is important by what is informally or formally rewarded by recognition or pay or something else. They will then work to maximise their valued rewards. Sometimes these rewards will be administered by other team members and it may have little to do with organisation purpose. So the final check is to see whether the measures and rewards are supportive of some overall company goal or purpose.

For example a team may have very clear measures and rewards and the membership has clear messages about what to do. However, the company measures relatively simple things and other things that it may want such as some degree of innovative behaviour are not measured. People may still be innovative if they perceive that the company rewards and values innovative on-the-job behaviour.

**Situational Variables**

People are unlikely to perform effectively if they do not receive any feedback about how well they are doing. They may also perform badly if they are dissatisfied with their pay or conditions. The second part of the chart determines whether the individual perceives that they are working in a supportive environment. It does this by judging the influencing conditions. Some of the variables examined are the feedback, task design issues, context of the work, style of leadership, and organisation culture and history. In the experimental work, once the pattern of variables is determined, it is compared to see if it matches expectations. This could give a clue about the sorts of OJBs that on average may result from the mix of variables in a particular company.
The third part of the consequences chart attempts to determine how the team or individual behave with the set of organisational and situational variables. In the chart the psychological aspects of the individual are inherent in the process flow but are not investigated in detail. The assumption is that most people will behave in a reasonably consistent manner in response to the various conditions or variables that influence them. However, from this third part of the chart you can get some insight and only that, to how the individual or the team behave particularly in stressful situations. For example if the team find it impossible to meet the performance targets then do they normally give-up and back away or do they search for and demand new performance standards to be defined.

The final section of the chart is a results section. It lists the OJBs (positive and negative) that may be observed in an organisation.

A full consequences chart is presented in figure 3.2.
Figure 3.2 The Consequences Chart

**Strategic & Operational Variables**

- Organizations purpose
- System of rewards
- Performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organizational goals</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by performance</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Variables**

- Control over performance
- Charity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

- True
- False

**Task Variables**

- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

- True
- False

**Feedback**

- Recognition for performance
- Stimulation for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

- True
- False

**Organizational Variables**

- Organizational culture
- Sub-Culture

**Rescue Choice**

- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Comparison
- Error?

- No feedback as expected
- Feedback re-enforces behaviour
- Behaviour continues

- Yes feedback is not as expected
- Feedback produces an unconscious script
- Unconscious script

**Worker's behaviour**

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inquiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

**Defensive behaviour**

- To avoid conflict
- Overconforming
- Passing the buck
- Depersonalizing
- Squeezing
- Stalling
- To avoid blame
- Buffering
- Playing safe
- Manipulating
- Escalating commitment

- To avoid change
- Resisting change
- Protesting turf
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3.4 A glossary of terms used in the chart

The variables of the chart fall into four main categories as shown below in figure 3.3.

1 Operational & Strategic Variables

*Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems*

2 Situational Variables

*Individual attributes, feedback, task characteristics and organisational attributes*

3 Response Choice

*Behaviour reinforced, behaviour changes or scripted response*

4 OJB Choice

*Defensive or Workstyle OJBs recorded*

Fig. 3.3 The four main components of the consequences chart

Each component was derived from the reference model. To summarise part one was defined by the Hopwood component of the reference model. The organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are listed and their congruence assessed.

Part two, the situational variables were defined by the Klein meta-model of motivation, which identified individual and situational variables as having an effect on behaviour in the workplace. The research specified these variables further by taking a cross-section of variables from the organisational design literature. The choice was made by examining several sets of variables that had been defined as influencing behaviour by other researchers and building a representative set.

Part three of the chart was taken from the Klein meta-model of motivation. The control loop specifies the different choices available on receipt of feedback and these have been translated directly on to the chart.
The researcher interpreted part four of the model. The Hopwood component of the model states that desirable or undesirable behaviours result, depending on the nature of the alignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems. The researcher defined desirable OJBs as ‘Workstyle Behaviours’ as previous research had identified a relationship between the occurrence of these behaviours and good performance. Good performance being measured by six financial metrics. The defensive OJBs were adopted as the undesirable OJBs as other researchers had shown they have negative effects on both organisations and individuals.

The following is a complete listing of the terms on the consequences chart and their definition for the purpose of this study.

Glossary of terms

Strategic & Operational Variables

The organisation’s purposes or goals, the reward system and the performance measurement system should re-enforce one another. This relationship is represented by part one of the chart and the extent of misalignment is scored.

Individual Attributes

Control over Performance: The extent to which an individual’s performance on a task is free from constraints outside their control.

Clarity of Role: The degree to which a role has a set of expected behaviour patterns attributed to it in a social unit.

Ability & knowledge: An individual’s capacity to perform various tasks in a job.

Motivators: The extent to which an organisation provides the individual with responsibility, advancement, opportunity for growth and achievement, recognition and the quality of work itself

Hygiene Factors: The level of status attached to work and job-security. Also the quality of working conditions, company policy & administration, supervision and salary

Feedback

Recognition for performance: The degree to which personal recognition is contingent upon objectives being met.
Sanctions for poor performance: The degree to which personal reprimand is contingent upon the failure to meet objectives.

Rapid feedback: The time difference between performance and receipt of feedback, where feedback is defined as individuals/groups obtaining information about the effectiveness of their performance.

Feedback from peers/managers: The extent to which feedback from management or colleagues helps improve performance.

Task Characteristics
Task variety: The degree to which a job requires the exercise of a number of different skills and talents.

Task identity: The degree to which the job requires completion of a whole and identifiable piece of work.

Task significance: The importance of the job.
Feedback from task: The degree to which carrying out work activities results in feedback

Autonomy: The degree to which the jobholder is free to schedule the pace of his or her work and in determining the procedures to be used doing it.

Organisational Attributes
Organisational Culture

Power culture is found where senior managers exert considerable influence and power within the organisation. The managers are likely to manage in an autocratic way.

Role culture relates to situations where positions within the organisations are the focal point of attention. The demands of bureaucracy (e.g. compliance with rules) are prominent.

Team culture applies where the organisation has values & mechanisms to integrate people within teams. It promotes successful completion of projects by teams managing projects.

Achievement culture values success and personal growth. The climate encourages people to exercise initiative in conditions of high levels of autonomy

Management Style

Telling - a directive approach, specific instructions are provided.
**Selling** - Line manager explains decisions and provides opportunities for clarification

**Participative**: Decision-making is facilitated by the manager rather than carried out.

**Delegating**: Responsibility is turned over to individuals

**Types Of Behaviour**

**Defensive Behaviour (as defined by Ashforth and Lee)**

**To Avoid Action**

**Overconforming**: Action is often avoided by resorting to strict interpretation of one responsibility or rules

**Passing The Buck**: Transferring responsibility for a task or a decision to someone else

**Playing Dumb**: Individuals avoid task by falsely pleading ignorance or inability. Managers often play smart and pretend to knowledge

**Depersonalising**: You treat other people as numbers or objects to distance yourself

**Smoothing and stretching**: These practices are designed to make you appear continuously busy and productive

**Stalling**: ‘Footdragging’ tactic where you appear more or less supportive publicly while doing little or nothing privately

**To Avoid Blame**

**Buffing**: Rigorously documenting activity or fabricating documents to project an image of competence

**Playing Safe**: An individual can avoid blame by evading situations that may reflect unfavourably on them

**Justifying**: Developing explanations that lessen your responsibility for a negative outcome

**Scapegoating**: The classic effort to place negative outcomes on external factors that are not entirely blameworthy

**Misrepresenting**: The manipulation of information by distortion, embellishment, deception or selective presentation

**Escalating Commitment**: Vindication of an initially poor decision by escalating support for the decision

**To Avoid Change**

**Resisting Change**: A catch all for a variety of behaviours

**Protecting Turf**: Defending task domain from encroachment by others
Workstyle Behaviours (as defined by Porras and Hoffer)

Collaborating: Behaviour promoting or reflecting the involvement of relevant persons in the processes of identifying and solving problems

Taking Responsibility: Behaviours reflecting acceptance of responsibility and taking initiative in carrying out organisational tasks

Maintaining A Shared Vision: Behaviours reflecting a clear formulation, understanding and commitment to organisational philosophy, values and purposes and a commitment to high standards

Solving Problems Effectively: Behaviours reflecting a problem solving orientation to difficult organisational issues

Respecting/Supporting: Behaviours demonstrating respect and support for others as worthwhile individuals

Processing Facilitating Interactions e.g. Interpersonal Skills: Behaviours reflecting attention to and use of human process issues in one-on-one, group and inter-group situations

Inquiring: Behaviours reflecting a probing, inquiring, diagnostic orientation to the organisation and its environment

Experimenting: Behaviour promoting or reflecting openness to trying new things

3.5 The limitations of the chart?

Once verified through experimental work the chart can potentially be used to help in the design of the working environment to see if the company has established an environment that will support desired behaviour. Alternatively it can be used as a diagnostic tool. If the company perceives that there is something wrong then it can examine the value of the influencing variables to see if there is anything obvious that needs adjusting.

The chart and associated hypotheses need to be tested experimentally and it is likely that the number of variables will increase as testing begins in the manufacturing companies. As it stands it could prove to be a very useful tool that although cannot predict psychologically disturbed behaviour, can provide a framework that enables the people to work to best effect with the company. It could also give the company a clear understanding of the consequences of some of the situational variables that influence
performance. It also explores an aspect of performance measurement research not previously investigated.

There are limitations to the chart. For example does it include all the important variables that have an impact on task-related behaviour? Is it too simplistic to only identify if a variable is present or not, should perhaps a scale be used? The impact of personality is also not accounted for; and this may reduce the validity of the chart. The experimental work may reveal further weaknesses in the chart as well as setting some parameters on its accuracy.
3.6 Summary

The review of literature can be represented as an inverted pyramid. The research began by examining all the general literature available on performance measures and narrowing until a point where some specific research propositions could be explored. This process is illustrated by figure 3.4 below. The next chapter will present the research design and propositions and inferences that can be drawn from the work to date.

Performance measures are examined, as are financial measures of performance and the frameworks within which they can be applied.

The absence of literature exploring the impact of performance measures on behaviour is noted.

An investigation into performance measures and their relationship to workplace behaviour is completed.

The variables that influence behaviour are determined. The view that these together with performance measures have the most effect on organisational members.

The generation of a reference model to illustrate the relationship between performance measures and task-related behaviour.

The operationalisation of the model into a consequences chart.

Research Propositions

Figure 3.4 A summary of the progress to date
Chapter Four

Research Methodology

Overview
This chapter begins with a discussion of the research propositions that can be drawn from the literature review. A synopsis of the literature available on research methods is also presented. The aim of this section is to describe the theory behind research design and show how this has influenced the proposed methodology. The actual research design and data collection plan is also presented. The chapter will end with a review of the limitations of the design and a summary of the key points.

4.1 Planned discoveries

Research Proposition
After completing a review of the literature available it is proposed that performance (of an individual, team or group) will benefit from alignment between performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards. The main hypothesis of the research is therefore:

The performance of individuals, teams or groups will be above average when performance measures, organisational purpose and rewards are mutually reinforcing. Performance is defined as consistently meeting or exceeding targets.

The null hypothesis associated with this proposition is that when performance measures organisational purpose/goals and rewards are not mutually reinforcing performance will either be average or poor.

Examination of the reference model and consequences chart also leads to another proposition. It is suggested that the various misalignments possible between performance measures organisational purpose/goals and rewards will produce different behavioural responses. The research design must therefore determine what the impact of alignment is and also what affect any misalignment between performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards has on behaviour. Specifically do certain
kinds of misalignment typically generate particular defensive behaviours?

It should be noted the following assumptions are inherent to the reference model and need to be addressed when the results are discussed in chapter eight:

1. From an individual’s perspective it is important that there is congruence between most of the variables in the reference model.
2. From an organisation’s perspective it is important that there is congruence between performance measures organisational purpose/goals and rewards.

Where congruence means mutually reinforcing and in agreement.

From the investigation into the impact of misalignment on an organisation it also may be possible to infer from the results that:

1. The impact of a performance measure on behaviour is reduced if it is not supported by a reward system. Where behaviour is defined as a pattern of actions.
2. The impact of a performance measure on behaviour is reduced if it does not support a clear target or purpose. Where behaviour is defined as a pattern of actions.

The next stage of the research is to develop a research design to explore the points put forward for investigation.

4.2 The theory of research design

Research Paradigms

A paradigm is a theoretical framework. A research paradigm defines to a large extent the structure of the investigative design. Therefore any knowledge gained from the research is relative, dependent upon the paradigm chosen. T.S. Kuhn, a science historian, first used the term paradigm; it was applied to summarise all the factors, both scientific and sociological that influence a research design.
Research paradigms are derived from philosophy, where philosophy is a way to acquire, validate and use knowledge. Research philosophies define the way an investigation acquires and validates knowledge on a subject. In management research there are two main philosophical traditions (Easterby-Smith et al, 1995). The classical approach to research design is known as positivism. Positivism is known as the 'scientific' philosophy and has been used with much success by natural scientists and by some social scientists. Developed by Comte (and to a lesser extent by Hume and Bacon, in the Seventeenth century) this technique relies on recognising only facts and observation as valid data. Positivists consider value statements to be descriptive and not objective, therefore they can not form part of the 'real world' (Johnson, 1986). The second approach is a more interpretative paradigm. Phenomenology as developed by Husserl (1859-1938) asserts that the world of reality is not objective and exterior but socially constructed and given its meaning by people. It focuses primarily on what meaning an individual gives to the system under analysis (Storey, 1992). Figure 4.1 summarises the two paradigms.

Figure 4.1 A Summary of the Positivist and Phenomenological Paradigms

The research design should use methods appropriate to the philosophical base of the investigation and be relevant to the research question posed. For example in a

---

2 This diagram was developed from a table entitled 'Key features of Positivist & Phenomenological Paradigms' Easterby-Smith et al.
positivistic design you would expect to see large sets of data generated from experimental work. The hypotheses would have been developed prior to data collection and the results would be used to verify the hypothesis. In a phenomenological design theories follow data and the sample size need not be large. The results would be used to falsify the hypotheses. A hypotheses is an idea concerning as event and its possible explanation. Popper argued that the merit of a hypothesis lies in its ability to make testable predictions.

In reality research is a compromise between these two rather idealised concepts. Critical realism recognises that all observation is fallible and has error and that all theory is revisable. In other words the realist is critical of the ability to know reality with certainty. Therefore as all measurement is fallible, it is important to use multiple measures and observations. Although each represents a different kind of error, the triangulation across multiple sources enables a more accurate picture of reality to be found (William M K Trochim, 1997).

Other authors who support the mixing of methods include Attwell and Rule (1991); Strauss and Corbin (1990); Sykes and Warren (1991) and Creswell (1994).

In addition Brownell (1988) in his review of the research in the behavioural accounting field recommended the use of more qualitative methods to research the influence of accounting metrics and business control systems to gain a richer understanding of their effect.

To summarise, research design is basically a way of organising the investigation so that data is collected in a way that will achieve the aims of the research. The research plan for this investigation must draw on the strengths of both the major philosophical approaches. This balance will ensure that the descriptive (and perceptual) data collected about organisations is kept within an objective framework of analysis and is triangulated to obtain greater validity.
The choice of research methods

Yin (1989) proposed that the choice between case study, experiment, survey etc. should be determined by three factors:

1. Type of research question proposed
2. Extent of control an investigator has over actual behavioural events
3. Degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events

Table 4.2 below displays these three conditions and illustrates how each of these is related to the five possible research strategies available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Form of research question</th>
<th>Requires control over behavioural events?</th>
<th>Focuses on contemporary events?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experiment</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival analysis</td>
<td>Who, what, where, how many, how much</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study</td>
<td>How, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each technique is particularly useful in certain circumstances. For example, the experimental approach provides a distinct advantage when asking a why (or how) question about a contemporary set of events where the researcher has control over behavioural events. The various strategies are not mutually exclusive and any number can be combined in one investigation. Quantity though, will not necessarily provide clarity.

It can be advantageous though to use several different methods in the same study. Every method of research has strengths and weaknesses; combining different techniques can offset these. This approach is advocated by Abrahamson and is termed triangulation. There are four different ways triangulation can be introduced to a design:

1. Triangulation of theories where models are borrowed from one discipline
and used to explain situations in others.
2. Data triangulation refers to research where data is collected over different time frames or sources.
3. Triangulation by investigators where different people collect data on the same situation and the results are compared.
4. Methodological triangulation where quantitative and qualitative data was collected.

In this investigation the research plan must determine how situational variables influence the behaviour found in an organisation. To some extent it must also illustrate which variables are associated with certain responses and why those variables have the impact that they do. According to table 4.2 one of the most appropriate research methods available is a case study. This method is chosen over the other available techniques as it facilitates the incorporation of a variety of qualitative techniques. This is an important factor because as pointed out in the literature review, nearly all investigations in this field use quantitative techniques. Brownell (1988) has also recommended using these techniques. The design will incorporate both quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques.

Behavioural Research: The Typical Structure

Behavioural research has a long history and it does have a classical structure. There are three levels of enquiry (Rosenthal et al, 1984) and they may be used sequentially or independently. These are outlined below:

1. Descriptive enquiry
   This provides an explanation of a complex behavioural or organisational structure. It establishes the boundaries of the research problem and raises the ideas that can be tested in a relational and/or experimental study

2. Relational enquiry
   This uncovers the relationship amongst variables and allows the search for long term patterns which suggest future trends. It also shows how social, political and economic conditions can influence behaviour over
3. Experimental enquiry

Experimental research investigates the characteristics and behaviour of a group to be understood and accounted for. In behavioural research a quasi-experimental design is adopted because of the lack of a ‘captive’ population under the sole control of a researcher.

In this investigation the research plan is composed of both descriptive and relational enquiry. The literature review was the descriptive enquiry element and the case study work will form a relational enquiry.

4.3 The Proposed Research Design

In summary the study of research methods produced the following guidelines:

1. To adopt the approach of a critical realist, that is to remain objective and use multiple methods to verify the research propositions
2. To use a case study strategy incorporating qualitative techniques

Traditionally qualitative methods are considered an array of interpretative techniques that seek to describe, decode, translate and otherwise come to terms with the meaning, not the frequency of certain more or less naturally occurring phenomena in the world (Van Maan, 1983). This approach seems particularly appropriate as data can be collected to:

1. Verify the model through assessing the attributes specified in the model but also by
2. To understand what individuals perceive as significant in the workplace and how they give meaning to their environment.

The product of the literature survey was the reference model that in turn produced the consequences chart which maps the relationship between:

1. Performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards.
2. Situational attributes
3. Behaviour

As a result the focus of the research design must be to verify the chart is a realistic
interpretation of the impact of organisational variables and investigate what effect the various misalignments can have.

After much deliberation the researcher decided to use the existing case studies found in the literature, motivation theory and the research reference model to build a series of consequences charts. Each chart would detail a possible misalignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems and a predicted response (in terms of the Workstyle and defensive behaviours). The predictions were based upon documented evidence found in the literature and the resultant charts were called library profiles. In total sixteen profiles were developed, four profiles for each of the Harrison (1972)/Handy (1985) culture classifications. In each set of four, three will detail the expected responses to misalignment between goals, performance measures and reward systems and one will detail the response when they are in alignment.

The aim of the case study data is to find empirical evidence that corroborates the accuracy of the library profiles. The data collection process can then be summarised as:

1. go into case study site
2. assess the variables and attributes of the organisation
3. note the OJBs present
4. check reality against predictions

4.4 The Data Collection Plan
The case study will be in a local heavy engineering company, Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd. The site has approximately 400 employees. Data will be collected in four stages and each stage will be completed and reviewed before proceeding to the next.

Stage One
This stage is familiarisation with the case study organisation. The aim of this exercise will be to gain an understanding of the manufacturing process, the internal organisation and politics of the firm, the recent history and the financial and competitive pressures it is under. This stage was completed early in the research process through several plant tours, reading marketing material, reading internal reports, observing in meetings and
finally by informal interviews with key managers.

Stage Two
The second stage of the case study is to test the consequences chart to see if it is composed of the correct attributes and variables. To this end the best division in the firm (in terms of their financial performance and the behaviours other managers would like their members to emulate) was selected as a control group. The manager, team leader and team members were interviewed to check of their situation matched that of the consequences chart. The interview format was semi-structured and its purpose was:

1. to evaluate the attributes on the chart
2. to assess what components of the working environment were having an impact
3. to determine what attributes were the most significant

Although the main aim of was to check the content of the chart, the results were also compared against the predictions made in the library profiles.

Stage Three
The third stage of the case study is to interview several divisions within the case study site repeating the techniques practised in stage two. In each division several teams will be interviewed and a consequences chart completed. The results will be then compared against the predictions made in the library profiles. The results of this process will enable the library of profiles to be either verified or dismissed.

Stage Four
In addition to the case study further data will be collected via a small survey. Identical data will be collected using a questionnaire composed of the same questions used in the case study interviews. The results will also be analysed in the same way e.g.

1. assess the variables and attributes of the organisation
2. note the OJBs present
3. check reality against predictions

Statistically this will not add a great deal of external validity to the work but it is not its purpose. The role of the survey is to introduce a second medium with which to explore
the library profiles and add an element of triangulation to the research design. In addition, the results can be cross-referenced with those of the case study and a correlation between misalignment and behavioural responses can be looked for. The goal of stage four is to gather as much evidence as possible to either verify or dismiss the predictions made in the library of profiles.

4.5 Limitations of the Research Design

One of the most obvious limitations of the design is the small size of the sample. In its favour, the access to the firm was relatively easy and participation high due to the close relationship between the university and the case study company. This approach provided much opportunity for insights into the way people respond to change and increased the validity of the research but unfortunately meant that the results can only be generalised within strict parameters. The other disadvantage of the design is that only one researcher gathers data. It would be advantageous to know whether similar observations would be made by different researchers on different occasions in the company. This would test the reliability of the research tools and the objectivity of the interviewer/researcher.

The survey will be based on companies selected from the Kompass directory and as such is solely based on UK companies. This means that any inferences drawn should only be applied to British companies.

4.6 Summary

This chapter described what aspects of the reference model the thesis plans to examine. It introduces the idea of organisational alignment between performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards; and the belief that if these are not aligned and mutually reinforcing the organisation will operate in a dysfunctional manner. It is also proposed the various misalignments possible between performance measures; organisational purpose/goals and rewards will produce different behavioural responses. It also described the theory behind research design and the need for complimentary research methods to be applied. The actual experimental plan was discussed and the goal of qualitatively verifying the reference model and consequences chart set. The next chapter presents the sixteen library profiles. It explains how they were developed and references the supporting evidence in the literature.
Chapter Five

The Library of Profiles

Overview

In the last chapter it was determined that the next phase of the research was the development of a series of consequences charts. This chapter details the derivation of the theoretical consequences charts, it explains their origin and documents the evidence supporting their structure. These charts use existing evidence in the literature to predict what OJBs would occur when organisational variables on the consequences chart are missing or poorly defined.

The theoretical consequences charts form a library of profiles. Each profile focuses on slightly different variable results and predicts their impact. The library of profiles has been developed to gain an understanding about how different sets of variables in the chart influence behaviour.

The library of profiles will be compared against the case study results and together with other experimental work this will enable the hypotheses to be explored. This chapter presents evidence from the literature which supports

1. the logic of creating a library of profiles
2. the assumptions on which the profiles are based
3. the predictions made

Diagram 5.1 on the following page illustrates the chapter structure:-
5.1 The need for developing library profiles and confirmation of approach

The following evidence details the support for the premise that organisational variables exert a greater influence on organisational behaviour (OJBs) than personality. This evidence is important as it supports the concept that OJBs can be accurately predicted using a consequences chart.
Congruence between organisational variables exerts a greater influence on organisational behaviour than personality:

Evidence that congruence between organisational variables is important

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical or theoretical evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The change process theory supports the concept behind the consequences chart</td>
<td>Porras &amp; Robertson, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired behaviours are more likely to be exhibited when a variety of elements in the work setting deliver congruent messages as to which behaviours are desired</td>
<td>Porras, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desired behaviours are more likely to be exhibited when a variety of elements in the work setting deliver congruent messages as to which behaviours are desired</td>
<td>Beer &amp; Huse, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The diagnostic model of organisational behaviour focuses on a key set of organisational components and their relationships as the primary determinants of behaviour. The greater the consistency or fit between the components the more effective organisational behaviour.</td>
<td>Nadler and Tushman, 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sociotechnical system is one that aims to optimise the relationship between the social/human systems of the organisation and the technology used by the organisation to produce output.</td>
<td>Pasmore and Sherwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information asymmetry appears to lessen dysfunctional behaviour.</td>
<td>Jaworski and Young, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One approach to designing systems that will generate predictable and constructive participative behaviours and attitudes is environmental structuring - where factors that an organisation can directly influence are used to define and reinforce appropriate behaviour.</td>
<td>Pierce, Dunham &amp; Cummings, 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance orientated work practices only work if introduced in an internally consistent manner and it is crucial that such practices are congruent with the overall strategy of the organisation in which they are sited.</td>
<td>Whitfield and Poole, 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anecdotal evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anecdotal evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faced with a plethora of contradictory messages, employees look at the behaviours that are rewarded, what skills are promoted and who is developed. It is these messages not corporate rhetoric that steer how to behave</td>
<td>The art of managing people: Mastering Management 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should be recognised that specific actions are rarely the result of a single motive or factor</td>
<td>Locke and Henne, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When examining behavioural ramifications it is often not the measures that are the problem but the way that they are used.</td>
<td>Mackintosh, 1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence that personality is only one of many factors that can influence behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical or theoretical evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- An individual’s behaviour is guided by the feedback they receive, their needs, interests, abilities, the resources available and time.</td>
<td>Klein, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are four main factors that shape and guide behaviour of people on the job: organising arrangements, social factors, physical setting and technology</td>
<td>Porras &amp; Robertson, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Structure, Systems, Leadership, Group Membership, Perception, Abilities, Motives and power all combine to influence behaviour in the workplace.</td>
<td>Hunt, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staff are influenced by Structures, Strategy, Systems, Style (culture &amp; management), Skills and Super-ordinate Goals</td>
<td>McKinsey’s 7-S Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organisational behaviour is determined by personal characteristics and organisational characteristics such as leadership, climate, job design, structure and reward systems</td>
<td>Robey, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- It is concluded that the extreme variability found within and among organisations renders the one-sided normative theories less useful in understanding organisational behaviour than models that recognise situational contingencies.</td>
<td>Lichtman and Hunt, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Individual difference measures (e.g. personality) are generally not consistently related to goal setting effectiveness, especially when goals are assigned rather than self set.</td>
<td>Locke and Henne, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Only accepted goals to have an impact on performance. Although acceptance is needed it does not necessarily lead to high performance. Performance depends on how individuals respond to feedback showing performance is below expectations</td>
<td>Latham &amp; Locke, 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The reliance on accounting performance measures and their relationship to tension was a function of task uncertainty.</td>
<td>Hirst, 1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anecdotal</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Goals have powerful effects on directing behaviour</td>
<td>Porter &amp; Rosenweig, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There are many theories of personality but the relationship between them and organisational behaviour (performance) is difficult to establish despite the numerous personality trait tests on the market and their huge data banks.</td>
<td>Hunt, 1992.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence that the organisation must do more than set a goal to improve performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical or theoretical evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If there is feedback but no clear goal, there will be no clear impact on motivation</td>
<td>Lord and Hanges, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to behavioural modification theory, people will most likely engage in a behaviour if they are rewarded for it</td>
<td>Babb and Kopp, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two important purposes of goals in organisations are to guide the behaviour of individuals and motivate them to perform at higher levels of effectiveness.</td>
<td>Richards, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback increases motivation and levels of performance.</td>
<td>Tubbs, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The acceptance of goals and improved performance is facilitated by: the attitude of a supervisor; incentives and the intrinsic motivation associated with the task</td>
<td>Latham &amp; Yuhl, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More specific the goals the greater the possibility of achieving them.</td>
<td>Tubbs, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two factors have been found to influence the goal/ performance relationship: goal commitment and self-efficacy.</td>
<td>Hollenbeck, Williams and Klein, 1989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anecdotal</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People/workers must accept goals used as standards or targets. They must selectively attend to existing feedback, they must accurately process this feedback and interpret it, and they must maintain commitment to targets/goals over multiple cycles of task activity and performance feedback.</td>
<td>Lord and Kernan, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effectiveness of a goal is the extent to which the goals or interests of all participants are at least partially satisfied.</td>
<td>Robey, 1986</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caveats and warnings regarding a highly focused relationship between goals, measures (or targets) and rewards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Discrepancy between goals and feedback will not always be responded to. If it can be</td>
<td>Lord and Hanges, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distorted or discounted the discrepancy will be ignored and have no impact on behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If there is a discrepancy between goals and feedback, any aspect of the goals for which</td>
<td>Lord and Hanges, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is no specific feedback will eventually become under emphasised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quantitative performance measurements - whether single, multiple or composite are seen</td>
<td>Ridgeway, 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to have undesirable consequences for overall organisational performance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anecdotal</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The goals of the reporting (or measurement system) may rival or even overshadow the</td>
<td>Duerr, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goals which would best promote the company’s interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Those being controlled by targets will attempt to improve their performance against</td>
<td>Draper, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those targets at the expense of other activities in which they might reasonably engage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 The assumptions on which the predictions will be based

The reference model on which the consequences chart is based indicates that organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems have direct impact on OJBs. If the remaining variables on the consequences chart are considered, what are the ones which exert the greatest influence? The evidence in the literature suggests that it is organisational culture and management style.

Organisational culture can be described as 'a way of running things' (Handy, 1985) and therefore can give an indication of both an organisation's structure and management style. The classification selected for culture on the consequences chart are founded on Harrison's (1972) typology. He identified four types of culture found in organisations as power culture, role culture, support culture and achievement culture. Handy (1985) was influenced by this work and proposed four types of culture related to an organisation's structure. Power and role cultures that followed Harrison's definition, a people culture that was very similar (and for the purpose of this work considered identical) and a task culture. The task culture is where self-managing teams successfully complete tasks. The support culture was replaced by Handy's interpretation in the chart because it better represented the cellular nature of manufacturing today. Each culture definition encompasses more than the organisation's climate; it also describes the management style in the chart that naturally would occur with it.

The following evidence shows that

1. Organisational culture and management style are linked
2. Organisational culture influences behaviour
3. Management style influences behaviour
Culture and management style by their nature are linked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Other authors have proposed a relationship between culture and management style. A typology of enterprises and roles has been proposed.</td>
<td>Kostera, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management style helps to determine and or create organisational culture</td>
<td>Schein, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empirical results have shown that national culture can affect manager behaviour within a work setting.</td>
<td>Pidney and Whitehead, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial performance is higher when management practices are congruent with the national culture.</td>
<td>Newman and Nollen, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>štoek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anecdotal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The impact of accounting controls is bound by culture</td>
<td>Chow, Kato &amp; Merchant, 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organisational culture is a powerful mechanism through which managers communicate their priorities to employees.</td>
<td>Schneider, Gunnarson, &amp; Niles-Jolly, 1994.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organisational culture has an impact on behaviour and therefore on performance.

### Supporting Evidence

- Behaviour is influenced by social factors, one of which is organisational culture.
- The relationship between organisational behaviour and motivation theory is a reflection of culture.
- There is a definite relationship between the sub-culture of a department and a specific work-group behaviour.
- A relationship has been found between organisational culture and budget-related behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porras and Robertson, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hofstede, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsa, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddard, 1997</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anecdotal

- Inattention to social systems in organisations has led researchers to underestimate the importance of culture.
- The accuracy and usefulness of motivational theories is limited to the culture in which they originated.
- The most successful organisations were characterised by a dominant and homogenous culture.
- Organisational behaviour is almost predetermined by patterns of basic assumptions existing in the organisation, i.e. the organisational culture.
- Two conclusions can be drawn from the literature available on organisational culture. First that organisational culture varies between companies and second that it influences performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schein, 1996.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters and Waterman, 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ott, 1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenna, 1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management style has an impact on the behaviour of subordinates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The situational theory of management propose a relationship between management style and task behaviour and extends the concept to produce four appropriate styles.</td>
<td>Hersey and Blanchard, 1982.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The path-goal theory of management explains the relationship between the behaviour of a manager and expectations of subordinates.</td>
<td>House, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managers tend to consistently distort information that they pass on to superiors. This is moderated by trust.</td>
<td>Read, 1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A misdirected response can be considered as arising from 3 underlying factors: the measurement system, the reward system and the management style.</td>
<td>Duerr, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Empirical research has shown employees tend to model their behaviour after that of their manager.</td>
<td>Robertson 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When accounting systems are used as punitive control managers cause adverse motivational effects.</td>
<td>Rosen and Shreck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Perceptions about how managers use measures are important in determining responses to a control system.</td>
<td>Hopwood, Emmanuel et al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a direct relationship between leadership style, group atmosphere and individual behaviour.</td>
<td>Lewin et al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership style has been shown to influence subordinate satisfaction, motivation and performance.</td>
<td>Preston and Heinzt, 1949, Katz and Kahn; Stogdill, 1974; Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anecdotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• When large numbers of people behave in undesirable ways, you look at the managers actions and the organisational rules to determine the reasons.</td>
<td>Duerr, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is not the function of a manager to pass value judgements, but to ensure that his behaviour and those aspects of the company’s systems that he has control over, give people a positive incentive</td>
<td>Duerr, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Managers have a key impact on behaviour and decision making.</td>
<td>Porras &amp; Robertson, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is of key importance for line to be managers responsible for measuring and rewarding.</td>
<td>Watmore, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Management style may be important in developing a better understanding of the influence of control systems over individual behaviour.</td>
<td>Otley and Pierce, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The productivity of individuals and groups at work is generally assumed to be due in part to the quality of the supervision and leadership style they receive.</td>
<td>Lawson and Callahan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Predictions

The predictions made with respect to behaviour on the theoretical charts are based upon the value of the variables the evidence suggests are the most important. These are:

- Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems
- Organisational culture
- Management style

Each chart focuses on slightly different variable results. These are:

**Power culture/Telling management style**

1. Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems in alignment
2. The organisational purpose and performance measures in alignment but the reward system focuses elsewhere
3. The organisation’s goals and reward system are in alignment but the performance measures focus elsewhere
4. The organisations reward system and performance measures are in alignment but they are not aligned to the organisation’s goals

**Achievement culture/Delegating management style**

5. Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems in alignment
6. The organisational purpose and performance measures in alignment but the reward system focuses elsewhere
7. The organisation’s goals and reward system are in alignment but the performance measures focus elsewhere
8. The organisations reward system and performance measures are in alignment but they are not aligned to the organisation’s goals

**Team culture/Participative management style**

9. Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems in alignment
10. The organisational purpose and performance measures in alignment but the reward system focuses elsewhere
11. The organisation’s goals and reward system are in alignment but the performance measures focus elsewhere
12. The organisations reward system and performance measures are in alignment...
alignment but they are not aligned to the organisation’s goals

**Role culture/Selling management style**

13. Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems in alignment
14. The organisational purpose and performance measures in alignment but the reward system focuses elsewhere
15. The organisation’s goals and reward system are in alignment but the performance measures focus elsewhere
16. The organisations reward system and performance measures are in alignment but they are not aligned to the organisation’s goals

For the purpose of this investigation it has been assumed that each organisational culture will pair a specific management style.

Table 5.2 summarises the predictions made and in the pages that follow the supporting evidence is detailed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Result</th>
<th>Prediction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are in alignment</td>
<td>Workstyle behaviours present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisational purpose and performance measures in alignment but the reward system focuses elsewhere</td>
<td>Behaviours to actively avoid action will be present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation’s goals and reward system are in alignment but the performance measures focus elsewhere</td>
<td>Behaviours to actively avoid blame will be present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The organisation’s reward system and performance measures are in alignment but they are not aligned to the organisation’s goals</td>
<td>Behaviours reflecting a resistance to change will be present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power culture with a telling management style</td>
<td>The following Workstyle behaviours would be found: open communication, collaboration, maintaining a shared vision, role flexibility and respecting/supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement culture with delegating management style</td>
<td>The following Workstyle behaviours would be found: taking responsibility, role flexibility, solving problems effectively, inquiring, experimenting and respecting/supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team culture with a participative management style</td>
<td>The following Workstyle behaviours would be found: open communication, collaboration, taking responsibility, solving problems effectively and respecting/supporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role culture with a selling management style</td>
<td>The following Workstyle behaviours would be found: open communication, collaboration, maintaining a shared vision, solving problems effectively and respecting/supporting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 The Predictions
**Situation:** Performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards are in alignment.

**Response:** Workstyle behaviours will be present. That is behaviours associated with positive organisational outcomes will be present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The theoretical model of the dynamics of organisational change proposes that individual behaviour is influenced by organising arrangements, technology, physical setting and social factors.</td>
<td>Porras and Robertson, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In the absence of any system for relating work effort to organisation reward, the aspects of behaviour which people will likely concentrate on is fulfilment of personal goals. The application of mutually reinforcing organisational purpose/goals, supported by performance measures and rewarded by an incentive system increases the congruence between organisational goals and personal goals. Therefore although behaviours concentrated on will be those which have positive outcomes for the individual, they will also have positive outcomes for the organisation.</td>
<td>Hopwood, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• According to behavioural modification theory, people will most likely engage in a behaviour if they are rewarded for it</td>
<td>Babb and Kopp, 1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anecdotal</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Initial observations in the case study company showed that where a simple and congruent target and reward system could be employed, organisational performance was increased. For example in one division a monthly target was set and if it was achieved a bonus was given. The teams had adapted well to the system to the extent that meeting the team goal was a personal goal for the majority of team members. It was a matter of personal pride and satisfaction to try for the targets which were very challenging. The monetary rewards were very much appreciated but achievement was valued as well. The system had generated both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.</td>
<td>Hanna, 1998.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Situation: Performance measures, and organisational purpose/goals in alignment but rewards focusing elsewhere

Response: The misalignment will encourage behaviour to avoid action. Some Workstyle behaviours will be found.

Supporting Evidence

- According to expectancy theory an action that is not rewarded will not be repeated.
- According to Porras variables such as motivation, knowledge and attitudes, social factors and information can moderate the effect of organisational features or structure. Some of the impact of misalignment can be offset and you would expect to see some Workstyle behaviours.

Source

Porter and Lawler, 1968
Porras and Robertson, 1992

Anecdotal

- Defensive behaviours are a reaction to a perceived threat. In this case the threat is the misalignment between the three key variables performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards. The natural reaction against actions which are not rewarded is to mind those that are.

Source

Ashforth and Lee, 1990
Situation: Performance measures and rewards in alignment but organisational purpose/targets are unclear

Response: Resistance to change is the common defensive response, as people already work to targets and are rewarded for meeting them. Some Workstyle behaviours will be found. The lack of an overall goal will lead to sub-optimisation to give maximum rewards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Expectancy theory concepts would say that as people are currently measured and rewarded there would be little motivation to change a satisfactory situation.</td>
<td>Lord and Hanges, 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If there is feedback but no clear goal (target), there will be no clear impact on motivation</td>
<td>Tubbs, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More specific the goals (targets) the greater the possibility of achieving them.</td>
<td>Porras and Robertson, 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• According to Porras variables such as motivation, knowledge and attitudes, social factors and information can moderate the effect of organisational features or structure. Some of the misalignment would therefore be offset and you would expect to see Workstyle behaviours.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anecdotal

• The reporting may rival or even overshadow the goals which would best promote the company’s interests. Duerr, 1974

• Defensive behaviours are a reaction to a perceived threat. In this case any change to a satisfactory working environment would be perceived as a threat and therefore people would protect themselves from change. Ashforth and Lee, 1990
**Situation:** Organisational purpose/goals and rewards in alignment but performance measures are focused elsewhere.

**Response:** As performance measures are misaligned when compared against the organisation’s purpose or goals and the formal reward system, poor results could be logically predicted. As a consequence people will be actively avoiding blame for the poor measure results. Some Workstyle behaviours will be present.

### Supporting Evidence

- Both expectancy and goal theory would dictate that people behave to achieve the organisations goals and as a consequence be rewarded.
- According to Porras variables such as motivation, knowledge and attitudes, social factors and information can moderate the effect of organisational features or structure. Some of the misalignment can therefore be offset and you would expect to see Workstyle behaviours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Porter and Lawler, 1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latham &amp; Locke, 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porras and Robertson, 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anecdotal

- Some of the dysfunctional consequences that occur with accounting measures of performance may not be due to any inadequacy of the performance measures but may result from the way in which they are used.
- Defensive behaviours are a reaction to a perceived threat. In this case people would respond to the anxiety if poor results by actively avoiding blame for those results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drury, 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashforth and Lee, 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Situation: A power culture

Response: A telling management style will be most common (but is not necessarily present).

Supporting Evidence

- In a power culture people with power strive to maintain absolute control over subordinates.
- In a power culture people are judged by results and influence is derived from resource power and to a certain extent personal power. Characteristically this culture is found in small firms or divisions where a speed of decision is vital.
- A 'telling' managing style defines roles and tells people how/when to complete tasks.

Source

Harrison, 1972

Handy, 1985

Hersey-Blanchard, 1982

Prediction

This is a closed culture with a directive management approach. As a consequence it is unlikely that people would:
1. take responsibility
2. independently solve problems
3. have an inquiring approach to the company and its environment
   or
4. have an experimental approach to problems.

By process of elimination therefore, it is predicted the following Workstyle behaviours would be found:
1. communicating openly
2. collaborating
3. maintaining a shared vision
4. respecting/supporting
5. role flexibility
Situation: A role culture

Response: A selling management style where the manager explains decisions and provides opportunities for clarification will be most effective (but is not necessarily present.) This style would suit the norms of such an organisation, any need for change will need to be sold for it to be accepted.

Supporting Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handy, 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey-Blanchard, 1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• In a role culture there is strong emphasis on hierarchy, status and order. Correctness is valued over effectiveness and predictability of behaviour is high.
• This culture embraces security and predictability and is slow to perceive a need for change. The focus is on method as opposed to results.
• A 'selling' managing style will accept peoples role but give some direction and support to people.

Prediction

This culture is based on stability and order. The focus on perceived/actual roles is very strong. The selling management style that accompanies it, both reinforces roles and takes any additional decision-making responsibility away from individuals. Therefore you would not expect people to:

1. take responsibility
2. have a great deal of role flexibility
3. be inquiring or
4. have an experimental approach to problem solving

By process of elimination therefore, it is predicted the following Workstyle behaviours would be found:

1. communicating openly
2. collaborating
3. maintaining a shared vision
4. solving problems effectively
5. respecting/supporting
**Situation:** A team culture

**Response:** A participative management style where decision making is facilitated by the manager rather than carried out will be very effective (but not necessarily present.) This style would suit the norms of such a culture.

**Supporting Evidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Source</strong></th>
<th><strong>Supporting Evidence</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, 1972</td>
<td>• In a task or team culture achievement of the superordinate goal is of highest value. Ones contribution is evaluated in terms of achieving targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handy, 1985</td>
<td>• In a team culture influence is derived from expertise. Probably because teams are formed to complete tasks and the emphasis is on getting the job done. The teams have very little or no hierarchy and could be considered groups of peers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hersey-Blanchard, 1982</td>
<td>• A participative management style would not compromise the self-managing nature of these teams.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prediction:**

In a team culture with a ‘participative’ leadership style the manager is a facilitator and a communicator. As the teams are self-managing and are focused on completing tasks it is unlikely that there will be:

1. a strong sense of shared vision outside the goals of the team
2. a great deal of role flexibility.
3. an experimental approach to work not directly related to the task or
4. inquiring attitude to work not directly related to the task

By process of elimination therefore, it is predicted the following Workstyle behaviours would be found:

1. communicating openly.
2. collaborating
3. taking responsibility
4. solving problems effectively
5. respecting/supporting
Situation:  An achievement culture
Response:  A ‘delegating’ leadership style the manager provides little direction or support would suit the norms of this culture well.

Supporting Evidence
- In the person culture the organisation is thereto serve the needs of its members and consensus decision-making is preferred.
- In this achievement culture the individual is the central point. The organisation exists to facilitate the development and work of individuals. Control and management practices are impossible unless it is by consent.
- A delegating management style where responsibility is turned over to individuals would not comprise the focus of this culture.

Source
Harrison, 1972
Handy, 1985
Hersey-Blanchard, 1982

Prediction
The independent and rather disparate nature of this culture is only found rarely, for example in a partnership of architects or small group of consultants. Its rather individual focus means that:

1. it is unlikely that people would have a strong sense of shared vision
2. take part in a great deal of collaboration
   Or
3. communicate openly

By process of elimination therefore, it is predicted the following Workstyle behaviours would be found:

1. taking responsibility
2. solving problems effectively
3. respecting/supporting
4. role flexibility
5. inquiring
6. experimenting
5.4 **Presentation of the library of profiles**

A consistent and objective technique was designed to develop each profile. This process is described below in figure 5.3.

**Step One**

Determine the degree of alignment between performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards. Selecting one from:

i. Alignment between organisational goals, rewards and performance measures
ii. Alignment between goals and rewards only
iii. Alignment between goals and measures only
iv. Alignment between measures and rewards only

**Step Two**

Determine the organisational culture, selecting one from:

i. Power culture
Where senior managers exert considerable influence and power within the organisation. The managers are likely to manage in an autocratic way,

ii. Role culture
Where positions within the organisation are the focal point of attention. The demands of bureaucracy (e.g. compliance with rules) are prominent.

iii. Team culture
Where the organisation integrates people within teams and promotes successful completion of projects by self-managing teams.

iv. Achievement culture
Values success and personal growth. The culture encourages people to exercise initiative in conditions of high levels of autonomy.

**Step Three**

Select the appropriate management style for the organisational culture chosen

i. A telling management style is associated with a power culture
ii. A selling management style is associated with a role culture
iii. A participative management style is associated with a team culture
iv. A delegating management style is associated with an achievement culture

**Step Four**

Predict the behavioural consequences for that situation, using Table 5.2

---

**Figure 5.3 The technique to create a library profile**

On the following pages the sixteen library profiles are presented.
## CONSEQUENCES CHART

### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFILE 1

The organisations goals, performance measures and reward system are in alignment.

There is no defensive response as there is no misalignment.

### Response Choice

- **Yes** Feedback is not as expected
  - Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
  - Change behaviour to meet target

- **No** Feedback is as expected
  - Feedback re-enforces behaviour
  - Behaviour Continues

- **Error?**
  - New Situation
  - Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
  - Familiar Situation
  - Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
  - Either

### Worksite Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defensive behaviours</th>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid action:</td>
<td>To avoid blame:</td>
<td>To avoid change:</td>
<td>Over-conforming</td>
<td>Bulling</td>
<td>Playing the blame card</td>
<td>Playing blame</td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over-conforming</td>
<td>Bulling</td>
<td>Playing the blame card</td>
<td>Playing blame</td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>Depersonalizing</td>
<td>Smoothing &amp; Swaying</td>
<td>Stalling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing the buck</td>
<td>Playing the blame card</td>
<td>Playing blame</td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>Depersonalizing</td>
<td>Smoothing &amp; Swaying</td>
<td>Stalling</td>
<td>Explaining Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>Depersonalizing</td>
<td>Smoothing &amp; Swaying</td>
<td>Stalling</td>
<td>Explaining Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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CONSEQUENCES CHART

Strategic & Operational Variables

Organisational purpose
System of rewards
Performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

Control over performance | Clarity of role | Ability & knowledge | Motivation factors | Hygiene factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

Task variety | Task identity | Task significance | Autonomy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

Recognition for performance | Schedules for poor performance | Performance feedback is rapid | Feedback from task | Feedback from peers or manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Variables

Management Style | Organisational Culture | Sub-Culture
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Sharing</td>
<td>Achieving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFILE 2
The organisations goals & performance measures are in alignment. However the reward system focuses elsewhere

Team

Profile diagram

Workplace behaviors

Communicating openly | Collaborating | Taking responsibility | Maintaining a shared vision | Solving problems effectively | Role flexibility | Inquiring | Experimenting | Respecting & supporting
|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|------------------------|

Defensive behaviors

To avoid failure: Bullying | Over-conforming | Passing the buck | Playing dumb | Depersonalising | Smoothing & smoothing | Smiling |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change: Resisting change</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Separating</td>
<td>Misrepresenting</td>
<td>Exchanging Commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONSEQUENCES CHART

**Strategic & Operational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned with organisational goals</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Variety</th>
<th>Task Identity</th>
<th>Task Significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile 3**

The organisation’s goals & reward system are in alignment. However, the performance measures focus elsewhere.

**Workplace Behaviours**

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Motivating & leading
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

**Defensive Behaviours**

- To avoid failure: Suffering, Playing safe, Justifying
- To avoid change: Reacting, Protecting turf
**CONSEQUENCES CHART**

### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisations goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Variables</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task variety</td>
<td>Task identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profile 4

The organisations reward system & performance measures are in alignment. However they are not focused on the organisations goals.

**Profile 4 Diagram**

- **Goal or target**
- **Behaviour to meet goal**
- **Performance**
- **Feedback**
- **Comparison**
- **Exhibit**

- **New Situation**
  - **Attribution Search**
  - **Either**
    - **Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done**
      - **Change behaviour to meet target**
    - **Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target**
      - **Reject or change goal or target**
  - **Feedback is not as expected**
    - **Unconscious Scripted Response**
  - **Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response**
    - **Familiar Situation**

**Workplace Behaviours**

- **Communicating openly**
- **Collaborating**
- **Taking responsibility**
- **Maintaining a shared vision**
- **Solving problems effectively**
- **Role flexibility**
- **Inspiring**
- **Experiencing**
- **Respecting & supporting**

**Defensive Behaviours**

- **To avoid action**
- **Over-complying**
- **Passing the buck**
- **Playing dumb**
- **Depersonalising**
- **Smoothing & squeezing**
- **Stalling**

**To avoid blame**

- **Bullying**
- **Playing safe**
- **Justifying**
- **Smearing**
- **Misrepresenting**
- **Escalating & Crucifying**
CONSEQUENCES CHART

**Strategic & Operational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisations goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait of Variability</th>
<th>Performance Control</th>
<th>Clarity of Role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; Knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation Factors</th>
<th>Hygiene Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Variety</th>
<th>Task Identity</th>
<th>Task Significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Delegating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response Choice**

**PROFILE 5**

The organisations goals, performance measures and reward system are in alignment.

There is no defensive response as there is no misalignment.
## CONSEQUENCES CHART

### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goal</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td></td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Choice

PROFILE 6

The organisation's goals & performance measures are in alignment. However, the reward system focuses elsewhere.

1. **Goal or target**
2. **Behaviour to meet goal or target**
3. **Performance**
4. **Feedback**
5. **Consequence**

**Feedback**

- Feedback is as expected
- Feedback re-reinforces behaviour
- Behaviour continues

**New Situation**

- Familiar situation
- Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
- Unconscious scripted response

**Either**

- Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
- Change behaviour to meet target

**Stretching Commitment**

### Inductive Behaviours

- To avoid action:
  - Over-committal
  - Pacing the track
  - Playing devil
  - Personalising
  - Smoothing & stretching
  - Stalling
- To avoid blame:
  - Bullying
  - Playing safe
  - Justifying
  - Scoping
  - Misrepresenting
  - Shafting
- To avoid change:
  - Resisting change
  - Protecting turf

### Deductive Behaviours

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting
CONSEQUENCES CHART

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organizational goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Variables</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control over performance</td>
<td>Recognition for performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of role</td>
<td>Sanctions for poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability &amp; knowledge</td>
<td>Performance feedback is rapid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation factors</td>
<td>Feedback from task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis factors</td>
<td>Feedback from peers or manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Variables</th>
<th>Organisation Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task variety</td>
<td>Measurement style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>Selling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Culture</th>
<th>Organisational culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Organisational Culture</td>
<td>Telling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROFILE 7**
The organisation’s goals & reward system are in alignment. However, the performance measures focus elsewhere.

Response Choice

- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Comparison

Feedback is as expected

- New Situation
  - Behaviour continues
  - Feedback generates an unconscious scripted response

Feedback is not as expected

- Familiar Situation
  - Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
  - Change behaviour to meet target

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

- Unconscious Scripted Response
  - Reject or change goal or target

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

- Defensive Behaviours
  - To avoid action:
    - Blaming
    - Escalating
  - To avoid blame:
    - Bouncing
    - Escalating

- Protecting turf:
  - De-personalising
  - Executing
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**Strategic & Operational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td></td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
<td>Rewards given</td>
<td>Measures supported by performance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedsback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Propane Choice**

**PROFILE 8**
The organisations reward system & performance measures are in alignment. However they are not focused on the organisations goals

**Variable behaviours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experiencing</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Defiant behaviours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action</th>
<th>Over-coming</th>
<th>Pacing the task</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Smearing &amp; Speciesing</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoid blame</td>
<td></td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Avoiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSEQUENCES CHART

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisation goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFILE 9

The organisation's goals, performance measures and reward system are in alignment.

There is no defensive response as there is no misalignment.

Defensive behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action</th>
<th>Over-conforming</th>
<th>Failing the task</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalizing</th>
<th>Smothing &amp; Stretching</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Screwuping</td>
<td>Micromanaging</td>
<td>Blaming Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

No Feedback is as expected

Feedback reinforces behaviour

Behaviour Continues

Yes Feedback is not as expected

New Situation

Familiar Situation

Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response

Unconscious Scripted Response

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Reject or change goal or target

Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done

Change behaviour to meet target

Mechanic behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

Task Variables

- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

- Recognition for performance
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

Individual & Organisational Variables

- Decision
- Choice
- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Comparison
- New Situation
- Attribution Search
- Either
- Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
- Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
- Reject or change goal or target
- Change behaviour to meet target

Profile 10

The organisation’s goals & performance measures are in alignment. However, the reward system focuses elsewhere.

Profile 10

The organisation's goals & performance measures are in alignment. However, the reward system focuses elsewhere.

Behavioural Behaviours

- To avoid action
- Over-complying
- Playing the role
- Depersonalising
- Siding
- To avoid blame
- Denying
- Playing safe
- Justifying
- Manipulating
- Enabling
- To avoid change
- Resisting change
- Protecting turf

FeedbackBehaviours

- To avoid action
- Over-complying
- Playing the role
- Depersonalising
- Siding
- To avoid blame
- Denying
- Playing safe
- Justifying
- Manipulating
- Enabling
- To avoid change
- Resisting change
- Protecting turf
**CONSEQUENCES CHART**

### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement style</th>
<th>Organisational culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profile 11

The organisation's goals & reward system are in alignment. However, the performance measures focus elsewhere.

### Response Choice

- **No Feedback is as expected**
  - Feedback re-enforces behaviour
  - Behaviour continues

- **Yes Feedback is not as expected**
  - New situation
  - Attribution search
  - Either
  - Feedback leads to change in the way things are done
  - Change behavior to meet target

### Workstyle Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication openness</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Rolf flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Priority Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid blame</th>
<th>To avoid change</th>
<th>Over-conforming</th>
<th>Playing the back</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Smoothing &amp; Stroking</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Separating</td>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td>Escalating</td>
<td>Constraining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Profile 12

The organisations reward system & performance measures are in alignment. However they are not focused on the organisations goals.

#### Feedback

- Yes: Feedback is as expected.
- Non: Feedback is not as expected.

#### Behaviour Choices

- New Situation
  - Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
  - Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
- Familiar Situation
  - Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
  - Unconscious Scripted Response

#### Workbehaviours

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Showing shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibly
- Inquiry
- Experimenting
- Responding & supporting

#### Defensive Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action</th>
<th>Over-conforming</th>
<th>Pacing the back</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Degeneralizing</th>
<th>Smoothing &amp; stretching</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Buffering</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scoping setting</td>
<td>Misrepresenting</td>
<td>Escalating Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Resigning</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Variables</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
<td>Measures supported by rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Variables</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task variety</td>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
<td>Measures supported by rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resistance Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal or target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour to meet goal or target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Profile 13

The organisation's goals, performance measures and reward system are in alignment.

There is no defensive response as there is no misalignment.

#### No feedback is as expected

- Feedback re-enforces behaviour
- Behaviour continues

#### Yes feedback is not as expected

- New situation
- Attribution search
- Risk

- Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
- Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done

#### Resistance choices

- Familiar situation
- Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
- Unconscious scripted response

#### Defensiveness Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defensiveness Behaviours</th>
<th>To avoid action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over-conforming</td>
<td>Over-conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid failure</td>
<td>To avoid failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>To avoid change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

####andy 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defence Behaviours</th>
<th>To avoid action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over-conforming</td>
<td>Over-conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid failure</td>
<td>To avoid failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>To avoid change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organizational goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

Individual Variables

- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

Task Variables

Feedback

- Recognition for performance
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

Organisational Variables

Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telling</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Selling</th>
<th>Delegating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sub-Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Response Choice

PROFILE 14
The organisation's goals & performance measures are in alignment. However, the reward system focuses elsewhere.

No Feedback is as expected

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Yes Feedback is not as expected

New Situation

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Behaviour continues

Feedback leads to change in the way things are done

Either

Familiar Situation

Unconscious Scripted Response

Workstyle behaviours

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Supporting

Pretexting behaviours

- To avoid action
- Over-conforming
- Putting the boot back
- Playing dumb
- De-personalising
- Smoothing & deflecting
- Declining

To avoid blame

- Bullying
- Playing safe
- Justifying
- Scaping
- Managing
- Backing out

To avoid change

- Resisting change
- Protecting turf
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**Strategic & Operational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Management Role</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Selling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Variables**

PROFILE 15

The organisations goals & reward system are in alignment. However the performance measures focuses elsewhere.

![Feedback Flowchart]

**Response Choice**

- No Feedback as expected
  - Feedback re-enforces behaviour
    - Behaviour Continues

- Yes Feedback is not as expected
  - New Situation
    - Familiar Situation
      - Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
    - Unconscious Scripted Response
      - Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
        - Reject or change goal or target
        - Change behaviour to meet target

**Workstyle Behaviours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining shared values</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Impacting</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Defensive Behaviours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action:</th>
<th>Over-compensating</th>
<th>Passing the buck</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Smoothing &amp; Squeezing</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>Unpersuasive</td>
<td>Avoiding/Committing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Reacting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation's Purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisation goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurement Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Talking</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Sailing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROFILE 16

The organisation's reward system & performance measures are in alignment. However they are not focused on the organisation's goals.

Response Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal or target</th>
<th>Behaviour to meet goal or target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Compression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Feedback is not as expected</td>
<td>New Situation</td>
<td>Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Feedback re-enforces behaviour</td>
<td>Behaviour continues</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>Feedback reduees the importance of the goal or target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reject or change goal or target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Change behaviour to meet target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Resisting &amp; stonning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Defensive Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action</th>
<th>Over-conforming</th>
<th>Passing the buck</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Smoothing &amp; Stretching</th>
<th>Sailing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>Micromanaging</td>
<td>Evasion Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Pretending to be right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 Limitations of profiles

Each profile has been developed from the generic consequences chart and operates under two constraints. Firstly that management style and organisational culture form naturally occurring pairs. For example a telling management style is normally found in a power culture. Although there is evidence advocating each of the four pairings presented, this decision curtails the number of profiles produced at this initial stage. However though many other pairings may naturally occur, the number that can be usefully explored through case study is not as great. Therefore it was logical to develop only the profiles which are most likely to be found in the workplace.

Secondly the situational attributes have not been varied. At this stage of the research it is not certain what specific impact these variables have. In addition if these variables were evaluated now far more profiles would be generated than could be analysed in the case study and survey.

5.7 Summary

This chapter presented the sixteen library profiles and outlined their derivation. The charts show the defensive response that misalignment between the operational variables generates and the impact of culture and management style on the Workstyle behaviours. The following chapter presents the results of the initial experimental work in Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd.
Chapter Six

Initial Data Collection

Chapter Overview

The data collection plan developed in chapter four can be summarised as follows:

Stage 1. Familiarisation with the case study organisation
Stage 2. Testing of the consequences chart
Stage 3. Case study work
Stage 4. Implementation of survey

This chapter presents the data for stages one and two.

The case study site is introduced and the selection of the control group to test the consequences chart is explained. The test results are presented and the subsequent changes made to the chart are also discussed. Finally, stages three and four of the experimental work are planned and the tools and techniques used in them are developed.

6.1 Introduction to the case study site

(Stage One of the experimental work: Familiarisation with the case study organisation)

Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd is located in Loughborough and has a long association with the town. It is no longer an independent company but is a subsidiary of a holding company. During the past 10 years it has changed hands several times and recently was sold again. The current organisational chart is illustrated in figure 6.1.

![Organisational chart](image)

Figure 6.1 Organisational chart

Morris Mechanical Inc. is the third largest material handler in the world and one of its
strategic objectives is to be the biggest. The Morris UK subsidiary is split into two main sectors. The standard product sector, which manufactures hoists and cranes and the engineered products sector which produces cranes for ports, steelworks and power stations. The latter division also undertakes crane servicing through ‘UK Crane Service’ and staff training through ‘The Morris Institute’. There is also a Parts Division that sells spare parts for both Morris’s and its competitors handling equipment.

The company is organised on a business process cell basis and is actively pursuing continuous improvement. The firm has also recently begun an ‘Investors in People’ initiative. The performance measurement system in place is the green area (GA) system that involves daily meetings to schedule the days work and discuss performance measures. The agenda will also include skills/training requirements, problems with work, group goals and continuous improvement issues. A green area typically can number between 6-15 people. When the numbers increase above this number, the group needs to be redesigned and if below they may need amalgamation with another team.

The green area system was imposed by the managing director of Morris and is obligatory throughout the workplace. It is based upon the Nissan production system. The argument for introducing this control system was that the firm overall had no consistent approach to business management. Although some work cells have adapted well to the green areas, it is clear that not all have and some parts of the firm only play lip service to the system.

The green area scheme has devolved into three main directives as illustrated below in figure 6.2.

![Figure 6.2 The 3 green area types](image)

The excellence GA focuses on continuous improvement whereas the others focus on operations and long term plans.
6.2 The selection of the control group

The aim of the control group exercise is to confirm that the working environment is composed of all the elements specified in the reference model. The exercise will verify if important variables have been missed or if spurious factors have been included.

The control group is a division within Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd., the main case study organisation. It was selected by asking a cross-section of managers to pick out the best team or division in Morris in terms of characteristics they would like their teams/division to imitate and their financial performance. Parts Division was chosen because it consists of three self-managing teams and contributes significantly to the profits of the organisation.

6.2.1 Parts Division

The manager and the team leaders were interviewed first. The team members were then interviewed on a volunteer basis after the project had been presented to them. This approach enabled over three-quarters of the division to be interviewed on a face-to-face basis. The interviews were carried out over two days and were recorded. The tapes were later converted into transcripts. The format was fairly standardised to reduce bias but there was plenty of opportunity for the views of the participants to become known. The questions asked were based upon a questionnaire that had been developed to test the consequences chart.

The discussions with the team leaders and the divisional head were semi-structured. The objective was to gather information on specific points but to let the discussion be as informal as possible to gain a broad spectrum of information about the division. The interviews with the team members were rather more structured and based on the information gained by the first round of interviews. The topic area discussed can be found in figure 6.3. Each interview began by talking about what good performance was, moved on to discussing organisational factors such as management style, culture etc. and finished with the more individual aspects of the job.
Appendix 6 contains the interview schedule and a brief summary of the steps taken to remove bias.

### 6.3 Control Group Results

Number of staff interviewed:

- Engineered Products Team = 3/6
- Standard Products Team = 3/6
- Specialist Products Team = 5/5
- Divisional manager = 1/1
- Marketing manager = 1/1

Possible interviewees = 17

No interviewed = 13

Response rate = 76.5%

These numbers exclude stores staff who did not take part in the exercise. There are in total 27 staff, 17 of who could have participated in the interviews if they were available.

The function of the Parts division is to sell spare parts for Morris cranes and automated systems. They also handle parts for other manufacturers. The structure of the division
consists of three small teams that are grouped around products. The teams are standard products, engineered products and specialist products. Performance targets (that are agreed by consultation between team members and their manager) are clearly displayed on the green area boards. When targets are achieved people are rewarded by receiving a bonus. The divisional targets are broken down into a series of targets pertinent to the product groupings. The advantage of this is everyone knows exactly what he or she must achieve in a given period. The targets were clearly displayed and were relatively easily understood by the researcher. The practice of putting up the results daily on a notice board re-enforces their importance and they have an impact on the day-to-day running of the teams. Each person interviewed commented on the targets and indicated it was better than the way they had worked before. On observation there appeared to be enthusiasm to achieve the targets amongst nearly all of the team members. The focus on customer service is strong and most of the team members interact directly with customers. During the interviews most of the team members considered they were successful in achieving the targets. The specialist team could more accurately be described as a peer group and there was no unity of purpose among the members. The divisional manager and the marketing manager were also part-time members of this team.

The data from the transcripts was sorted into the topic areas that the interview schedule discussed; topics that naturally emerged were also noted. This produced the perspectives on the division’s performance, management style, culture, measurement and rewards system, training, feedback and job design that are described below.

**Performance**

The majority of the division defined the performance of the division as good or very good. Two participants differed from the established view, one described performance as fair and the other as reasonable. Both were long serving employees of the organisation.

**Management Style**

The researcher would describe the management style of the divisional head as ‘selling’ and most of the team members also selected this definition. He has delegated a significant amount of power to the teams in terms of the day-to-day running of the
division however he still holds considerable authority. He determines the direction the division moves in strategically and sells his decisions to the teams.

**Culture**

Each participant described the division as a team culture. (They were given the four definitions of culture identified on the chart to choose from.) The overall culture of Morris was not agreed upon. If the participant had worked in another division they described Morris as a power culture but if they had little contact with people outside the division they described it as either a team or achievement culture. The different types of culture are defined earlier in the thesis on page seventy.

**Measurement & reward system**

The measurement system is composed mainly of financial measures. The two main measures are orders taken (input) and sales delivered (output). There are monthly targets for each measure. The inputs and outputs are measured on a daily basis and the results put on a notice board. The Engineered products and Standard products teams meet twice a week and discuss new ways to meet the targets. The specialist team meets only once a week. Their notice board has very little on it and not all of it is of relevance to the entire group. The targets are set by the parent company and are seen as difficult but not unachievable. The engineered products team also keep non-financial measures but they are only ancillary to the targets. When the teams achieve their monthly targets everybody in the team receives a bonus. The bonus is identical for each team member.

There is a second incentive scheme that rewards people with an extra days holiday if they are in on time for six months and attend their green area meetings on time. The scheme was not popular with either the manager or any of the three team leaders. In addition 40% of the staff disliked the scheme. The leaders said it was inappropriate and the members said it was unfair. Those that did like the system disliked the way it was operated. The system was unpopular as it did not recognise people who worked late and did not differentiate between lateness and being late for a meeting. This scheme generated a great deal of discussion when it was discussed independent of whether it was approved of or not.
Training
There is chart on the notice boards, which indicates the skill level people have and the training courses they have taken. If they want to undertake further training they can approach the team leader or the manager. The training was regarded as poor by all the participants except one. That individual felt the training had improved but was still unsatisfactory. The teams should have been proactive about training but the system had failed. The chart was not up to date and had the appearance of being forgotten.

Feedback
Feedback is received daily in terms of the input and output measures which are displayed on the board. The other main source of feedback was from the twice-weekly meetings to discuss the targets. The meetings discuss ideas for improving current work and new ways to increase sales.

The manager would only give them feedback if performance was dropping away from the target or if production problems arose. Other divisions within the organisation handle production.

Job Design
The teams work together very closely and all the participants felt they had high levels of autonomy and variety in their job. Although no one was responsible for a complete program of work they could each see how everyone contributed to a sale and therefore to meeting the targets. The level of motivation and enthusiasm for their work was generally high.

Note to reader
Before using this data to formulate a consequences chart that profiles the division, the results will be discussed more generally. (The Parts Division consequence chart and a discussion of its implications can be found in section 6.4.3).

6.4 A discussion of the Parts Division results
The aim of the control group exercise was to check if a successful team would have all the components of the consequences chart in alignment. For the results to be useful the
group selected must be a high achiever. Although Parts is perceived to be an excellent division by Morris, would an independent assessment agree? Therefore, before reviewing the results in respect of the consequences chart, the group will be assessed for excellence.

An American Consulting Company (McKinsey & Co.) has investigated a series of companies that they deem to be excellent. They also reviewed the literature on what factors made a company successful. The result of this work was the 7S framework that specified the important criteria for success. The Parts Division is very insulated from the rest of Morris and could be considered for the purpose of this test a separate company. The division is organised so that it could be transferred to another site, or to another county and it would not effect its operation.

The 7Ss that should be concentrated on to make organisations more effective are:

1. Strategy: plan or course of action involving the alteration of the firms resources
2. Structure: the type of organisational structure the firm has
3. Systems: the processes and procedures used within the firm
4. Staff: 'demographic' description of important groups within the firm
5. Style: the culture of the organisation as a whole and how key managers behave in order to achieve goals
6. Skills: distinctive capabilities of key personnel or the firm as a whole
7. Superordinate goals: the significant meanings or guiding concepts that the organisation uses

6.4.1 Parts Division: An examination of the 7S framework variables

Structure

How is it organised?

The company is split into divisions and subsequently into cells. The Parts division has grouped people into product teams.
Strategy

*What actions the company plans in response to, or in anticipation of changes in its external environment?*

It focuses on providing better value to customers but it has a short-term emphasis. The business operates on an 'urgent-basis', it is after all, supplying parts. The quick turnaround required leaves little time for deliberating more long-term issues. The manager is aware of the lack of vision and has taken steps to foster it through the creation of a team that concentrates on strategic issues. The team has been in place one year and has not developed to its full potential yet.

Systems

*What are the procedures (formal & informal) that make the division work?*

The parts computer systems are dated but effective. There is not a great deal of computerisation evident. The grouping of staff into teams means that they can quickly respond to customer needs.

Style

*Organisations may listen to what a manager says but believe what a manager does...*

The leadership style of the manager is selling but he has delegated a great deal of power to the teams. Also, the team leaders imitate his style. The culture he has fostered is definitely a team. The main Morris organisation could be described as a power culture and a fairly autocratic management style is prevalent. This difference in culture has probably increased the isolation of this division.

Staff

*How is staff development handled?*

Recruitment has definitely been to a type and the teams are very cohesive. The manager specifically recruited to increase the education level within the division and to reduce the average age. He is now recruiting to keep the balance right. The turnover of staff in this division is very low and the teams have been together for between 3-5 years.

Training is not at a high level. This is an area that is currently being examined as the system of handing over responsibility to the individual to ask for training is an initiative that has not worked.
Skills

What skills are important?
They value people being able to get close to customers. The sensitivity to customer needs is the key skill that this division trades on. They currently operate on a product focus but over the long term they have the ability to switch to a market focus.

Super-ordinate goal

What bonds the organisation together in pursuit of a common purpose?
What binds parts together is the strength of the commitment to meeting the team target. The customer service is the way they strive for the target.

6.4.2 Implications of the 7-S Framework results
The Parts Division manager emphasises all seven elements of the framework. Although some of the components are not as well developed as other there is no one that is very weak. Each element is geared towards the superordinate goal of meeting the needs of the customer. Therefore the division can be described as a high achiever because it meets its performance targets, generates a profit and its internal organisation meets the excellence criteria of the 7-S framework.

6.4.3 The Parts Division Consequences Chart
A completed consequences chart is shown in figure 6.4. The first part of the chart deals with the alignment of the strategic & operational variables. These variables are organisational goals or purpose, reward systems and performance measures. They should be aligned according to figure 6.5
Figure 6.4 The Parts Division consequences chart

**Strategic & Operational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivational factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No feedback is as expected</th>
<th>Feedback re-enforces behaviour</th>
<th>Behaviour continues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New situation</td>
<td>Attribution search</td>
<td>Either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback re-enforces the importance of the goal or target</td>
<td>Reject or change goal or target</td>
<td>Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response</td>
<td>Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response Choice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worker's behaviours</th>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborizing</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Defensive behaviours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action:</th>
<th>Overconforming</th>
<th>Overselling</th>
<th>Playing safe</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Smothering</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid failure:</td>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Escalating</td>
<td>Micromanaging</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change:</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Parts Division the alignment is as shown in figure 6.5. The goals of the division are financial targets that have been broken down into pertinent targets. The targets are measured daily and the teams work toward meeting a monthly target. If the target is reached everyone receives a bonus.

The next part of the chart assesses the working environment. All the variables identified in the model could be measured using the interview transcripts. However there were other features of the Parts Division, that contributed to its success but were not identified by the preliminary chart. The researcher considers the length of time the teams have worked with one another as important. The teams were cohesive and had a strong identity. Another factor that was important to the division was the structure of the division. The division has a very flat structure. Information flows from the manager to team leader and then to team members. There are meetings twice a week so there is very little lag between a decision being made and being implemented. The feedback is also two ways. The division also has a rather turbulent history and has gone from being a rather poor performer to one of the best. This legacy is perhaps why the team leaders and those team members who deal with the rest of the firm are rather sensitive to any criticisms made by other units within the company. The researcher perceived a 'them and us' attitude towards dealing with the rest of the company during the interviews. The isolation is also increased because of the position of the division within the organisational structure. It is autonomous of any other division of Morris and if necessary need not rely on the factory for manufacturing. The independence they have may be the reason why they focus on the performance of the division rather than the performance on the company as a whole.

The final section of the chart is called 'response choice.' It looks at people's responses
and attempts to categorise it. This section of the chart is subject to interpretation and is not as objective as the other sections. It attempts to assess how the situational factors impact behaviour. In Parts Division when they do not reach the target (i.e. the feedback is not as expected) they re-assess what they are doing and change the way things are done. For example if they miss targets or come close to missing them their weekly meetings focus on finding new ways to increase sales. In other words feedback will change their behaviour. However, the targets have been consistently met in recent months and in the opinion of the researcher they are still looking for new ways to increase sales. The targets are difficult to achieve in the opinion of the divisional manager and the teams and require a great deal of effort to attain. In this scenario the feedback has re-enforced their behaviour. The targets were discussed in every interview and seem to be immensely important to everyone in division. The Division’s performance is measured on the ability to make those targets and they are rewarded every time they hit those targets. Based on the observations of the researcher the measurement and reward system seems to have successfully focused the division on exactly what they must do to achieve their targets.

The behaviour patterns highlighted in the chart were drawn from impressions made at interview. Not all of the Workstyle behaviours are evident but only two of the defensive behaviours are. The defensiveness also reflects a very small minority of the division. If all of the information gathered to develop the consequences chart is considered the lack of role flexibility, experimenting and inquiring can be seen as result of two things. First the pressurised nature of the business, time is always of the essence, and the fact that the targets are extremely challenging and second anything that is not directly related to achieving them is not taken part in. There are steps being taken to overcome this. The purpose of this exercise is not to review the performance of Parts Division but the validity of the preliminary consequences chart, however a summary of the feedback given to the manager of the Parts Division can be found in appendix 6.

6.4.4 A comparison of the Parts Division results against the library of profiles.

The performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards in the Parts division are mutually reinforcing and the culture of the area under examination is team based. Therefore Profile 9 matches this situation best. It is not a perfect match because
it appears that a team culture is being led by a manager with a selling management style.

According to the profile and the literature a team culture would perform best with a participative management style. However these teams are perceived to be performing at their best. This anomaly can be explained by assessing the transcripts of the team leaders. Their style is clearly participative, with one of the team leaders specifically saying that she has no official ‘position of authority.’ It is interesting that she was elected to lead and she has the most expertise in her team.

The manager practices a policy of non-interference within the teams and sells his decisions to them. This is a rather anomalous situation but in a way the manager is a buffer against the power culture that exists in the rest of the company. He also provides the vision within the division; the teams are very focused on day-to-day tasks and have little interest in other issues.

Therefore if we still consider Profile-9 to be a fairly accurate representation of the division you would expect to see the following Workstyle behaviours: communicating openly, collaborating, taking responsibility, solving problems effectively and respecting and supporting. This prediction matches the circumstances found in Parts Division. In addition Parts showed a strong sense of shared vision. However this was limited to the goals of the team. Again this response was predicted by Profile-9.

However there was another important difference between Profile-9 and the Parts Division consequences chart. As the performance measures, organisational purpose/goals and rewards were mutually reinforcing no defensive responses would have been expected and two were found. There was a tendency to blame the manufacturing divisions in Morris for poor quality and missed delivery dates. There was also a reluctance to accept change by a small but significant proportion of the division. Significant because the division size is small and their impact is therefore magnified. The division has recently increased its team structure from two to three. Officially this is because this enables the teams to be more closely related to product groupings, an interesting side effect of this is that most resisters to change are now neatly grouped together. This new grouping has the divisional manager as a team member not leader. An interesting approach to fostering acceptance of change.
6.4.5 Implications of the results

The chart on the whole represents a great deal of information in a succinct format. It assesses the alignment of an organisation's strategic variables, it assesses the working environment and indicates the kind of responses people have to the situation. The first section of the chart is the most important for an organisation to get right as it impacts how people perceive the other factors. It is also an opportunity to ensure that people's personal goals are aligned to the organisations. This was definitely the case in the control group and it determined their response to all the other variables. The control group exercise aimed to determine if the working environment of high achievers is composed of all the elements specified in the reference model. The exercise did confirm the presence of those variables but it also showed some others had been missed. The situational variables will be increased in the next chart and include:

1. Structure - in terms of the numbers of hierarchy levels
2. Legacy - significant episodes from the firms past
3. Control over resources - dependence on uncontrollable forces
4. Time - length of time people have worked together

The latter section of the chart will be difficult to complete via questionnaire and is open to interpretation by the researcher. However once the research is completed it may be possible to predict response paths based on the case study results. The main case study methodology will have to control the subjectivity of this element of the chart.

The preliminary consequences chart has shown its potential and therefore has been modified to reflect the results of the control group exercise (as shown in figure 6.6). The experimental work will be based upon the verification of a series of theoretically derived consequences chart.
Figure 6.6 The modified consequences chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic &amp; Operational Variables</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisations goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Individual Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for performance</td>
<td>Control over performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions for poor performance</td>
<td>Clarity of role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance feedback is rapid</td>
<td>Ability &amp; knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from peers or manager</td>
<td>Motivation factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Variables</td>
<td>Hygiene factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situational Variables</th>
<th>Task Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat organizational structure</td>
<td>Task variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy - significant history</td>
<td>Task identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over resources</td>
<td>Task significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low staff turnover</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Variables</th>
<th>Management Skills</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Delegating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksite behaviours</th>
<th>Organisational behaviours</th>
<th>Worksite / Organisational dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicating openly</td>
<td>Collaborating</td>
<td>Taking responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensive behaviour</td>
<td>To avoid action</td>
<td>Overconforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 The next stage of experimental work

The overall purpose of the experimental work is to verify that one can predict the behaviour that will result in a business from the variables defined by the reference model. To this end the profiles were generated, the results of the case study should either confirm, or dismiss them. The experimental work so far is summarised in figure 6.7.

Figure 6.7 The initial experimental work

As described in chapter four the next phase of the experimental work will be the verification of the library of sixteen profiles. Four sets of theoretical charts have been produced, each set reflecting a different culture: power, achievement, role and team. Each set of charts consists of four profiles, three based on misalignment between goals, performance measures and rewards and based on responses when those three organisational variables are mutually reinforcing. The profiles reflect some of the hypotheses detailed in chapter four but not all.

Both the profiles and the hypotheses will be explored by collecting data at three different levels. The different techniques shown in figure 6.8 will enable some cross-referencing to take place and introduce an element of triangulation to the experimental design:
There is certain amount of triangulation of method in the research design. The case study data is collected through semi-structured interview and the survey uses a questionnaire based on the interview questions. The historical data is drawn from questionnaires. In addition when the case study data and historical data is united it profiles the same organisation in two different time frames.

6.5.1 The case study
The main study will be held at Morris and data collected by semi-structured interview. This section will provide the bulk of the data in respect of the hypotheses and will contribute to the verification of the profiles. The investigation will be at the strategic business unit (SBU) level. This is logical as the cells/teams are arranged into business process units. It also provides the maximum number of data sets that can then be converted into consequences charts. The main data collection exercise will be split into stages:

Step 1. Identification of goals, performance measures and rewards by business unit manager

*Data collection technique: interview*

Step 2. Identification of behaviours perceived to be in SBU by business unit manager or team leader

*Data collection technique: interview*

Step 3. Evaluation of consequence chart variables by business unit members

*Data collection technique: interview*

Step 4. Generation of consequences chart by researcher
The interviews and questionnaires were supplemented with personal observation and an interview with an independent observer.

The charts generated will be compared against the theoretical profiles derived and the predictive capability of the reference model determined. The data will also be examined with respect to the hypotheses. The development of the questionnaire and interview schedule is described later in the chapter in section 6.8.

### 6.5.2 Historical data analysis

Using data collected by other researchers who have completed studies within Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd. a number of consequences chart were developed. Information sources from which data will be drawn include questionnaires; research papers generated by the case study site; information produced from an ‘Investors in People’ exercise and company reports. The data elicited from this source material will be used to construct a consequences chart. The number produced will depend on the amount of historical material that can be found.

Once the charts have been agreed they will be used in a similar manner to those which were generated from the main case study exercise, in that the charts generated will be compared against the theoretical profiles and also examined with respect to the hypotheses.

### 6.5.3 The survey

Using the Kompass directory a number of local companies were approached to participate in the research. The selection was at random but controlled for size, locality and turnover.

The aim of the exercise is to both increase the sample size of the research and to test the predictive ability of the reference model through the verification of the library profiles. The survey is however limited in that no judgements can be made about the expected response choice that feedback produces.
The survey results will be cross-referenced with those of the case study. It is not the role of the survey to test specific propositions concerning the inter-relationship between variables in the consequence chart; its aim is to identify common relationships/patterns in the data and compare them to the predictions made in the library profiles. A copy of the questionnaire designed for this survey and the covering letter can be found in appendix five.

The survey will be analysed by examining the results for each culture in turn and determining the following:

1. The distribution of variables
2. The most common pattern of variables
3. The most common values for variables
4. The nature of the alignment between goals/targets, performance measures and reward systems.

The results for each culture will then be compared against each other, the theoretically derived profile and the case study results. The information produced will enable the hypotheses related to misalignment to be studied.

6.6 Development of data collection tools and techniques

The interview schedule used in the main case study exercise was based on the experience gained in Parts Division. The choice of questions was based purely upon those questions which would enable the completion of a consequences chart. The questionnaire was also developed from the control group interviews and trialed with other researchers and some independent participants. As a result of this testing stage some refinements to the format were made. The following guidelines were followed to develop and review the questionnaire:

1. Questions were checked for bias
2. Jargon was avoided
3. Plain English was used
4. Ambiguous statements were reworded
5. Questions were kept as short as possible
6. Questions were kept as simple as possible
7. Questions were kept specific
8. Questions with negatives in them were avoided
9. Hypothetical questions were avoided
10. Questions were kept within the respondents capabilities
11. Definitions were proved for necessary unfamiliar terms
12. The questionnaire was formatted to be easy to complete

In addition the following books were read to gain an appreciation of how to design and conduct interviews and effective questionnaires.


A copy of the questionnaire can be found in appendix 6.

The survey questionnaire was an extension of the questionnaire used at the case study sites. The form was designed to ensure that although the survey was small it was valid and reliable, reliable in that it was consistent and valid in that it was accurate.

This questionnaire was also trialed with researchers and independent participants and some minor changes made at their suggestion. The survey was then piloted with Leicestershire companies selected from the Kompass 1996 directory.

---

3 The guidelines were drawn from Questionnaire Design by Paul Hague.
The survey was enclosed with a covering letter that briefly explained the research project and its importance. Confidentiality was assured and all those taking part in the survey were promised an executive summary of the results entitled ‘How we are measured is how we behave....’ The sponsorship of the project was also explained as this has been shown to improve the response rate and a pre-paid reply envelope was enclosed.

The well-respected Dillman Total Design Method as well as the Sage publication ‘How to Design Surveys’ by Arlene Fink guided the whole process.

A copy of the survey questionnaire and covering letter can be found in appendix 6.

6.7 **Summary**

The control group exercise investigated the structure of the preliminary chart and ensured that no spurious factors had been included or any important variables missed. The result was a modified consequences chart. The exercise also determined the nature of the subsequent data collection. The experimental work will then validate the charts or dismiss them. The questions used in the control group exercise have been formulated into an interview schedule and questionnaire. The next section will present the case study and survey results.
Chapter Seven
Case Study and Survey Results with Subsequent Analysis

Overview
This chapter presents stages three and four of the experimental work. The consequences charts produced are organised into three sectors and following each sector is an analysis of the results with respect to the library of profiles.

The aim of this chapter is to establish the validity of the research propositions and to assess the consequences chart in terms of its usefulness as a management tool. Therefore, the final analysis discusses the relationship between the three variables: organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems and their impact on people’s behaviour. The consequences chart is also reviewed to see if it is a realistic interpretation of the many variables that influence behaviour (OJBs) in the organisation. The chapter ends with the presentation of the revised consequences chart.

A fuller discussion of the findings with respect to the research propositions outlined in chapter four is presented in chapter eight.

The data presented in each sector is outlined below:

Sector one: The case study
The data was collected in a number of departments within the case study company Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd. One of the departments formed a control group with which to test the theoretical consequences chart prior to significant data collection (these results were presented in chapter six). Subsequent data was collected by semi-structured interview, and the profile was completed directly from the respondents’ answers. Additional observations extraneous to the chart were also noted. Unlike the pilot study, interviews were not recorded. The company had recently undergone a redundancy exercise; job security was low and the atmosphere tense. Access was limited and the profile of the research was kept discrete. Discrete in that interviews were not recorded, and participation was gained by approaching individual areas within the firm rather than a large scale research exercise. Groups that had lost significant numbers of members via redundancy were approached with sensitivity. Each
cell/department that participated in the research is described and accompanied by a consequences chart that reflects their situation. The final element of this sector is a discussion of the case study results with respect to the library of profiles.

Sector two: The longitudinal study
The data for this sector was also drawn from the case study site, however it differs from the main case study as the data represents a single division of the company during two different time frames, 1993 and 1998. The first set of data was provided by a survey that investigated the impact of change in the business on people's attitudes. The director who implemented the survey was also interviewed. The raw data can be located in appendix 7.1 together with details of how the data was resolved into a retrospective consequences chart. The 1998 profiles were prepared using the same techniques as the main case study. The design, although not a perfect example of a longitudinal study, enabled the impact of events and time on a group of people to be explored. In particular the changes in alignment between organisational goals, performance measures and rewards, the alteration of situational variables and any differences in the OJBs recorded. It is hoped that the changes in the shape of the charts over the five year period will be able to explain the differences in performance and the OJBs recorded. The final element of this sector is a comparison of results against the library of profiles.

Sector three: The survey
Local companies provided the data for the survey. The names of the companies were located in Kompass and 49 were approached to participate in the study. The response rate was 39% and yielded 19 useful questionnaires. The survey data was transcribed directly on to charts. The purpose of this study was to provide extra data with which to demonstrate the use of the consequences chart as a management tool. The sample although small enabled additional testing of the library of profiles to take place. The raw data can be found in appendix 7.2 together with an example of how the data transcribes directly on to the consequences chart. The final element of this sector is a comparison of survey results against library profiles.

Discussion
Once all the results have been presented there is a comparison of case study and survey experimental work against one another. The impact of experimental results on
consequences chart is debated and a revised consequences chart produced. There is specific discussion of the findings with respect to research propositions in chapter eight.

7.1  Case study site description

Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd is essentially a niche player in the crane business. The primary drivers are price, the company's ability to customise, quality and trust. The most common reason for losing orders is price and they have difficulty in handling small orders effectively. The company's aim is to be the leader in their field. It has a written business plan that sets out all the business aims, goals and targets. This is reviewed once a year, in detail, and once a month at managers meetings. At team leader level there is a very strong awareness of departmental plans, aims and targets. The plan identifies broad development needs and specifies how they will be assessed and met. It also allocates resources. Information is given to all staff on the aims of the company, with a focus on team targets and objectives. There is also the suggestion that considerable effort is needed to improve morale based upon the results of the green area survey, especially in the light of the recent redundancy exercise.

The company does not have a formal training scheme at any level although there is significant training taking place, but the level of skills are monitored in every team. The costs of training are also monitored, but these are not analysed in terms of benefits as a result of investment. Employees at all levels are aware of the broad aims or vision of the organisation.

The company has recently assessed its internal organisation and systems against the Investors in People standard. The diagnostic report prepared by the consultants was made available to the researcher and the following bullet points summarise the findings. The report was quite critical in some areas but not all. The company scored particularly well on the business planning aspects and also resource allocation. However after the receipt of the diagnostic, senior management decided not to continue with the Investors in People project. They disagreed with the approach which was rather paternalistic whereas in the company the belief was that people should take high responsibility for their own training.
• The 'people planning/development' areas of the business planning process are not as clearly defined as the business goals and targets. The focus is more on team level plans rather than overall plans. The green area system is designed to facilitate training but it is limited to team level and is ad hoc rather than part of an overall strategy. However, the company is now addressing this. The green area, although a good system for identifying local needs, is not necessarily effective at planning the overall company development. Employees are also not always aware of development opportunities open to them throughout the company.

• Training and development needs are not regularly reviewed against business objectives. The skills matrix which forms part of the green area system is not an effective training review process neither is it effectively linked to the business review process. A commitment to developing people is not consistently communicated to, or perceived by employees. Responsibility for developing people is also not clearly and consistently identified through the company and management skills in this area are variable. Although managers are generally supportive of staff in their jobs, and do undertake training with staff, they are not necessarily actively involved in helping employees meet their training needs, or develop their job. There is recognition among managers that there is a need for more people management skills and leadership training.

• Employees should identify their own development needs; however employees do not always understand this. There are no targets set for development actions throughout the company and staff do not feel encouraged to achieve further qualifications. As the organisation is relatively flat, opportunities for progression are limited.

• The organisation does not effectively evaluate how its development of people is contributing to company goals nor does it consistently evaluate whether development actions have achieved their objectives.

Figure 7.1 shows the organisation's structure and the shaded boxes indicate which teams participated in the research.
7.2 Sector one: The case study

Three teams participated in the case study exercise. They were drawn from the Standard Products Division, which manufactures small hoists in volume. There is no engineer to order component in this division and the aim is to get the orders out the door in the shortest time possible. The three teams that participated were production teams, two from the main production area and one from materials preparation. Overall this division of Morris was considered to be well run and productive. Some teams have actively participated in improvement projects and achieved success in this area.

The case study results now follow. Each set of results consists of a table of background information; a consequences chart; a review of the information on the chart and some analysis of the results.

Group One  (A team from the main production area)

Consequences Chart CS1- Hoist 1

Background Information

Hoist 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of team (what do they do)</th>
<th>Assembly of wire rope hoists – some fitting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in team</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of data collection</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people who participated in data collection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill level of people</td>
<td>3 skilled craftsmen and 2 semi-skilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover of staff</td>
<td>Very low – one made redundant, one added last year from another division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other important information</td>
<td>Financial performance is not measured</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart CS1-Hoist 1 follows:
The Consequences Chart

CS1-Hoist 1 NB Stealing behaviour to get products despatched on time is common

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic &amp; Operational Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisations purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisation goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures supported by rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measures are known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core over performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability &amp; knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene factors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions for poor performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance feedback is rapid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from peers or manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control over resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low staff turnover</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

Feedback is as expected

- Behaviour continues
- Feedback reinforces behaviour

Feedback is not as expected

- New situation
- Attribution search
- Either

- Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
- Reject or change goal or target
- Change behaviour to meet target

Workplace Behaviours
- Communicating openly
- Collaborating effectively
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inquiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

Deficit behaviours
- To avoid action
- Overconforming
- Using the back
- Playing dumb
- Depersonalising
- Stretching & undermining
- Stalling
- To avoid blame
- Buffing
- Playing safe
- Justifying
- Scapegoating
- Escalating commitment
- Mens-representing
- To avoid change
- Resisting change
- Focusing turf
Review of the information on the consequences chart CSI-Hoist 1
The chart structure falls into four main components as illustrated below in figure 7.2

1 Operational & Strategic Variables
Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems

Fig. 7.2 The four main components of the consequences chart
Each component of chart CS1-Hoist 1 is discussed below:

1 Strategic & Organisational Variables
The team's rewards, performance measures and purpose (in terms of targets) are known and clear. Unfortunately a problem arises because during interviews it became clear that the organisation's purpose as perceived does not match the actual or true purpose. A new clearly defined purpose is needed.

2 Organisational Attributes
The chart indicates control over performance is seen as poor, but ability and knowledge; clarity of role and motivation are all high. The hygiene factors are positive. Recognition for performance is good when the job is completed but sanctions for work in progress are common. The feedback received is rapid both from the task at hand and from managers. In terms of job design task variety, identity, significance and autonomy are high. The management style of the organisation and this division is telling and the
culture is power orientated. There is significant emphasis on role within the teams though.

3 Response Choice
The feedback received reinforces current OJB Choices.

4 OJB Choice
There are no defensive behaviours observed within this team, and there was much collaboration and open communication. However the emphasis on candid discussion was limited to inside the team. There is one behaviour which is not covered on the chart which is endemic in both the team and division and that is ‘stealing,’ not in terms of theft but in taking components out of other products to complete products that are ready for despatch.

Further information
Senior management takes a strong interest in this division and failure to meet performance requirements leads to sanctions. Senior management do not consistently discourage ‘stealing’ as it gets products out the door and this practice has a long history. From observation of the division and interviews with members the researcher would describe this team (and the division as a whole) as operating on an organised chaos basis. There is low to medium association with the more general goals of the organisation.

Analysis
Overall this is a division that performs well, despite the unusual way it operates. The organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are aligned to one another and staff are motivated to achieve the targets. The ‘stealing’ is not stopped and it is seen by staff as the only way in which they can exert control over their performance. If the alignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems is considered, the response of the members can be explained. There is a strong motivation to meet the divisional targets as they perceive them, as they are measured and rewarded on this ability.
Comparison against Profile-1
The aim of the comparison is to check if the profile predicted the OJBs present accurately. The difficulty in this case is defining the 'stealing' as an OJB. Can it be described as a defensive behaviour pattern, when it is encouraged, rewarded and helps the company get the products despatched on time to customers? Yet ideally the firm would not like to continue this practice. Therefore because of this inconsistency the 'stealing' behaviour pattern will be ignored for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of the library profiles.

Overall the chart reflects a positive image of the production team and this is consistent with reality. It does meet performance targets and participate in improvement projects. Profile-1, which reflects a situation where the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are mutually reinforcing in a power culture, predicted the lack of defensive response although more Workstyle behaviours were anticipated, particularly a shared vision, role flexibility and respecting/supporting behaviours. The organisations power culture was matched by a telling management style as expected. In the team there was also an emphasis on roles, not unexpected considering the firm's history of being a traditional British engineering manufacturer. The teams are also made up of members with a particular 'role' or 'job' to fulfil.
**Group Two**  Based on interviews with production team leaders (charge hands)
**Consequences Chart CS2- Hoist 2**

*Background Information*

**Hoist 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of team (what do they do)</th>
<th>The team leads production and assembly functions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of people in team</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods of data collection</strong></td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of people who participated in data collection</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill level of people</strong></td>
<td>Skilled with 'City and Guild' qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover of staff</strong></td>
<td>Zero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other important information</strong></td>
<td>Financial performance is not measured.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart CS2-Hoist 2 follows:
The Consequences Chart

CS2-Hoist 2 Team Leaders

**Strategic & Operational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual variables</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Variables</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation variables</th>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from peers or manager</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response Choice**

- No Feedback is as expected
  - Feedback re-enforces behaviour
    - Behaviour continues
  - Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
    - Reject or change goal or target
  - Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
    - Change behaviour to meet target

**Classical Behaviours**

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Improving
- Experimenting
- Respecting

**Defensive Behaviours**

- To avoid action:
  - Overconforming
  - Passing the buck
  - Playing dumb
  - Depersonalising
  - Stretching & smoothing
  - Stalling

- To avoid blame:
  - Buffing
  - Playing safe
  - Denying
  - Escalating commitment
  - Mis-representing

- To avoid change:
  - Resisting change
  - Protecting turf
Review of the information on the consequences chart CS2-Hoist2

The chart results fall into four main components each of which is discussed below:

1 Strategic & Organisational Variables
The team’s rewards, performance measures and purpose (in terms of targets) are known and clear.

2 Organisational Attributes
Control over performance is seen as average, but ability and knowledge; clarity of role and motivation are all high. The hygiene factors are good. Recognition for performance is good when the job is completed but sanctions for work in progress are common. The feedback received is rapid both from the task at hand and from themselves. In terms of job design: task variety, identity, significance and autonomy are high. They see their management style as selling and the culture is team-role orientated. There is significant emphasis on the local culture being team based.

3 Response Choice
The feedback received reinforces current OJB Choices.

4 OJB Choice
The team leaders observe that there is a tendency for people to avoid blame but it is not an issue. The division traditionally has had problems with having the necessary stock to complete jobs (hence the origination of the ‘stealing’ phenomenon) and the scapegoating of suppliers was the norm. They also indicated that all the Workstyle OJBs were present with the exception of ‘shared vision’ and ‘experimenting.’

Analysis
The team leaders perceive the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems to be mutually reinforcing and organisational attributes score high. Their perception of the organisation is that it is role-team based. The role element is rooted in their traditional background, these team leaders still refer to themselves as ‘charge hands’ and the team element is a reflection of the way in which the working environment is now organised. The team members perceive themselves as being in a power-role culture which is a significant difference in perception. The team members also perceive themselves as being ‘told’ by management whereas management perceive
themselves as 'selling' decisions. Otherwise the charts based on team member perception and team leader perceptions are much the same.

Comparison against Profile-13
Overall the chart reflects a positive image of the division and this is true within limits. It does meet performance targets and participate in improvement projects. Profile-13, which reflects a situation where the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are mutually reinforcing in a role culture, predicted no defensive response. This however was not the case, although the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems were mutually reinforcing there was a tendency to scapegoat stock control for their problems in completing orders. This reaction was a result of 'stealing' being an approved response. Although 'stealing solves the problem of late order despatch it also creates it. In this case the perceived purpose of the division, to get orders despatched on time, was a rather narrow translation of the purpose of the division and had led to the creation of a dysfunctional behaviour which was both rewarded and encouraged. All the Workstyle behaviour with the exception of 'shared vision' and 'experimenting' were said to be present, this again does not correspond with what Profile-13 would have predicted.
Group Three Material Preparation (Prep Shop Team)

Consequences Chart CS3- Material Preparation

**Background Information**

**Materials Preparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of team (what do they do)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparation (cutting and cleaning) of sheet metal for all other parts of factory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Varies but generally 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people who participated in data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill level of people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 skilled fitter, 1 skilled burner, 1 apprentice and 2 semi-skilled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turnover of staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 lost through redundancy earlier in the year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other important information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial performance not relevant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart CS3-Mat Prep follows:
The Consequences Chart

CS3-Metal preparation (Metals preparation) Pacing to keep busy is evident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic &amp; Operational Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisations purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control over performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition for performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flat organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

Yes Feedback is not as expected

- Familiar Situation
- Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
- Unconscious Scripted Response

- New Situation
- Attribution Search
- Other

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

- Rejected or changed goal or target
- Change behaviour to meet target

Work ethic behaviours
- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inquiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

Definite behaviours
- To avoid action:
  - Overcommitting
  - Failing the back
  - Playing dumb
  - Depersonalising
  - Smiling & smooth talking
  - Sailing
- To avoid blame:
  - Buffing
  - Playing safe
  - Buttting
  - Scoping
  - Excluding commitment
  - Mis-representing

To avoid change:
- Resisting change
- Protecting turf
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Review of the information on the consequences chart CS3-Materials Preparation

The chart results fall into four main components each of which is discussed below:

1 Strategic & Organisational Variables

The team's rewards, performance measures and purpose (in terms of targets) are known and clear.

2 Organisational Attributes

Control over performance is low, as are the factors that motivate the team. However ability and knowledge; clarity of role and hygiene factors are good. There is no recognition for performance and sanctions for poor performance are common. The feedback is slow but they receive from it both the task and the managers. In terms of job design there is very little task variety, identity or significance. The team however does have a great deal of autonomy. Management style is telling and the culture inside the team and organisation is power based.

3 Response Choice

The feedback received reinforces current OJB Choices.

4 OJB Choice

None of the listed defensive OJBs were present within the team and there was evidence of open communication, collaboration, shared vision and also respecting/supporting. However there was one observable response that managers had detected in this area of the division, pacing. This is where the team sees that the work is dropping off, and they slow down the pace to ensure they are continually busy.

Analysis

Overall this is a team that performs well, despite the poor situational attributes. The organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are aligned to one another and this seems to be the over-riding factor. The team is very competent and values its autonomy. These situational attributes have offset the poor job design and the sanctions they receive for poor performance. The only anomaly was their 'pacing' response to certain situations. The firm's history of uncertainty in terms of work, ownership and job security had probably contributed to this effect.
Comparison against Profile-1

Overall the chart reflects a positive image of the team and this is true. It does meet performance targets and participates in improvement projects. Profile-1, which reflects a situation where the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are mutually reinforcing in a power culture, predicted no defensive response. This was not the case, although not all the Workstyle behaviours predicted were present, 80% were.

7.3 Sector one summary analysis

The chart as a management tool has proved useful so far. The one-page format summarises effectively disjointed information and enables links to be visualised between inputs (the situation) and outputs (people's responses). Unfortunately the three studies have had mixed results with respect to the library profiles.

Further exploration of the relationship between teams/groups working environment and OJBs will be required. Initial observations about the results indicates that it easier to begin with an OJB e.g. pacing or stealing, and work backwards through the chart towards the components of the situation that are initiating this response. Rather than attempting to find correlation between variables, attributes and OJBs. Tentatively, from these initial results it can be said that correctly aligned rewards, targets and purpose have a major effect upon behaviour.

7.4 Sector two: The longitudinal study

Resolving the retrospective survey data into profiles

The change surveys, were administered in early 1993 and provide a clear image of the situation in the Engineered Products Division (EPD) and people's opinion of and attitude to, reorganisation and change in the business. Two surveys were undertaken, the first was based on a five point Likert scale and contained ten questions relating to the new performance measurement system (green area system) and its impact on communication, contract control, performance, feedback etc. The second follow up survey was open answered and contained five questions regarding 'change' in the business.
These questionnaires provided a great deal of raw data about EPD and in conjunction with an interview with the director who administered both the surveys, consequences charts were drawn up to represent three departments. These include the Design Department, the Quality Department and also the Parts division (which handles spares for EPD). To develop the following consequences charts from the survey data a strict protocol was observed. The raw data and an example of the protocol can be found in appendix 7.1. Some elements of the chart can be directly marked from the answers to the survey questions. For example the survey that examines peoples attitude to and opinion of the performance measurement system (the green area system) provides information to mark the first section of the chart. The situational and organisational factors were evaluated by reading the answers to the open ended survey and by an interview with the director who implemented the survey and analysed the results at the time. The final component of the chart, which identifies common behaviour patterns that participants exhibit, was interpreted from people’s attitudes and opinions as represented in survey, and an interview with a director of the firm.

**Events between 1993-1998**

This section is based on an interview with a director of the company who has managed and implemented change projects within the firm for the last ten years. The description of events has been kept as factual as possible but opinions have been included when they add value to the discussion.

In the five years since the first charts were prepared the engineered products division has lost over 35 people to redundancy and more through increased staff turnover. The design team lost 20 designers in the last redundancy exercise. The Parts Division and Quality Department were relatively untouched by this turmoil.

EPD is reliant on a great deal of overseas orders and there have been no significant orders for a long time. Part of the reason for this is the strength of the pound but there are other reasons. The division has been merged with the more successful automation division and a new division ‘engineered equipment’ has been created. A number of staff moved to another division with this development and a great many left during the recent redundancy exercise. The design team was particularly hard hit. This combination of factors has led to additional staff leaving the organisation for posts with
more job security. A core group remains and have been described as 'possibly even more demoralised than they were five years ago.'

The management style of EPD as a whole has changed from an autocratic approach to a more people focused style. The fundamental problems of five years ago are unaltered though and people still complain of low recognition for their efforts. The skills and abilities of staff have significantly increased, as have the recognised qualifications. Those staff on part-time Masters courses have tended to remain with the company. There is also evidence that valued staff are protected, either by transfer to less vulnerable areas of the organisation or through promotion.

The charts selected for study
The charts developed in the longitudinal study were selected to present an array of teams working at different levels of effectiveness. All the teams were in need of development in the 1993 snapshot of the company but by 1998 the situation had changed. One group, the Spare Parts Division had completely turned round their performance, the Quality Department had too, although not to the extent of the former division. The design teams though had seen their membership reduce dramatically and their reputation within the firm decrease further. Their performance was adequate but in the opinion of the researcher this was because of professional pride.

Guide to data presented and discussed in this sector
The retrospective and current chart for each department is presented first and followed by a discussion of the situation the chart describes and the changes in the results over five years. The table below lists the charts and identifies them by code. At the end of this sector all the charts will be examined with respect to the library of profiles.
### Consequences Chart LS1 A & B- Quality Department

**Background Information**

**Quality**

**Function of team (what do they do)**

Responsible for quality inspection in business.

**Number of people in team**

There used to be eight people in the department and now there are four.

**Methods of data collection**

Now: Semi-structured interview  
Then: Two surveys

**Number of people who participated in data collection**

Now: 3  
Then: 8

**Skill level of people**

Generally skilled craftsmen promoted into an inspection position.

**Other important information**

The financial performance of this group is not measured directly.

Charts LS1 A & B-Quality follow:
The Consequences Chart
LS-1A Quality 1993

Individual Variables
- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

Task Variables
- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

Feedback
- Recognition for performance
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

Organisational Variables
- Flat organisation
- Legacy
- Control over resources
- Low staff turnover

Response Choice
- Goal as target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Attribution
- Either
- Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
- Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done

Worksite behaviours
- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inquiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

Defensive behaviours
- To avoid action:
  - Overconforming
  - Passing the buck
  - Playing dumb
  - Depersonalising
  - Stretching & expanding
  - Stalling
- To avoid blame:
  - Bulling
  - Playing safe
  - Justifying
  - Scapegoating
  - Escalating commitment
  - Misrepresenting
- To avoid change:
  - Resisting change
  - Protecting turf

Organisations purpose
System of rewards
Performance measures

Individual goals aligned to organisational goals
Goals are known
Rewards support goals
Measures support goals
Rewards given
Measures supported by rewards
Performance measures are known

True
False
True
False
True
False
True
False
True
False

Or an organisation
Goals are known
True
False
Rewards support goals
True
False
System of rewards
Measures supported
True
False
Performance measures
True
False
Goals are known
True
False
Rewards
True
False
System of rewards
Measures supported
True
False
Performance measures
True
False

Goals are
True
False
Rewards
True
False
System of rewards
Measures supported
True
False
Performance measures
True
False

Goals are
True
False
Rewards
True
False
System of rewards
Measures supported
True
False
Performance measures
True
False

Tasks variety
Task identity
Task significance
Autonomy

Feedback
Recognition
for performance
Sanctions
for poor performance
Feedback
from task
Feedback
from peers or
manager

Organisational Culture
Achievement
Role
Team
Power
Achievement
Role

Management Style
Telling
Selling
Participating
Delegating

Yes
Feedback is not as expected
Familiar situation
Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
Unconscious scripted response

No
Feedback as expected
Feedback re-enforces behaviour
Behaviour continues
New situation
Attribution search
Either

Reject or change goal or target
Change behaviour to meet target

Defensive behaviours
To avoid action:
- Overconforming
- Passing the buck
- Playing dumb
- Depersonalising
- Stretching & expanding
- Stalling

To avoid blame:
- Bulling
- Playing safe
- Justifying
- Scapegoating
- Escalating commitment
- Misrepresenting

To avoid change:
- Resisting change
- Protecting turf
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The Consequences Chart
LS-1B Quality 1998: Completed by interview with manager and two team members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic &amp; Operational Variables</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals perhaps not clearly specified

### Individual Variables
- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

### Task Variables
- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

### Feedback
- Recognition for performance
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

### Organisational Variables
- Flat organisation
- Legacy
- Control over resources
- Low staff turnover

### Response Choice
- No Feedback is as expected
- Feedback re-enforces behaviour

1. Behaviour continues
2. Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
3. Yes Feedback is not as expected
4. New situation
5. Attribution search
6. Either

- Feedback in familiar situation
- Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
- Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
- Change behaviour to meet target

### Workstyle Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defensive</th>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid acting</td>
<td>Overconforming</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Depersonalising</td>
<td>Stretching &amp; unrolling</td>
<td>Stalling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Suspending</td>
<td>Enabling commitment</td>
<td>Mis-representing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Quality Department: 1993

A review of the information consequences chart LSIA

1 Strategic and organisational variables

The goals or purpose of this division are known and it has a traditional role within the company as a whole. The new measures are not perceived to be supportive of the goals and no evaluation of the reward system was possible. The reward system within Morris as a whole is distant and disjointed. It is not perceived as directly related to performance.

2 Organisational Attributes

There was good control over performance but clarity of role and ability and knowledge were poor. Feedback is received from the manager but there is no recognition for performance. Task variety, identity, significance and autonomy all scored high. The department has a relatively flat organisational structure, due to recent reorganisation but staff turnover has increased due to perceived job insecurity. As a whole the department has strong control over its resources. The culture within the department is team based whereas the company as a whole is power based. The management style prevalent is ‘telling.’

3 Response Choice

Due to the nature of the source material no evaluation of this variable was possible.

4 OJB Choice

The department has very open communication systems and people are very supportive of one another both within the teams and in-between teams.

Analysis

The chart shows clearly a lack of alignment between the purpose of this department as perceived by its members and its purpose as perceived by those who set the performance measures. They do not relate to one another and working practices have not altered with the reorganisation. The unit is very tightly managed and there are sanctions for poor performance. This may be contributing to their tendency to avoid blame for problems and their reluctance to take on responsibility. The chart shows people tend to avoid blame, the department tends to play very safe and is not keen to alter its role within the firm to reflect more modern working practices. Although there
is no obvious resistance to change. In this respect there is also a certain amount of ‘stalling’ they co-operate with the new performance measurement system but it has very little impact on them. The department is very close knit and there is evidence of a very supportive attitude to one another and excellent communication.

The Quality Department: 1998
The quality team has changed its role within the company over the last five years and has developed it considerably since the first chart was prepared. The unit is still tightly managed but has changed its working practices. The team system is in place and the unit accepts a more participative style of management. The department has increased its profile within the firm and has a greater impact on the operation of the performance measurement system.

A review of the information consequences chart LS1B
1 Strategic and organisational variables
The organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are aligned within this department. Although in the opinion of the manager, the communication and specification of the goals/purpose of the division could be improved.

2 Organisational Attributes
The teams felt clarity of role needed to be developed but there was a feeling of good control over performance. Nearly all participants considered they could improve their ability and knowledge with further training and they were not highly motivated. The general conditions of employment were good (Herzberg Hygiene factors) and feedback within this division was improved compared to five years ago. There are sanctions for performance but there is also some recognition of achievement and feedback is regularly received. Job design also scored high and the staff turnover is low. The overall control of departmental performance is good and because of reorganisation the structure within the department is flat. The company culture could be described as power based but with within the department it is team based and there is a participative style of management.

3 Response Choice
This department performs to expectation and generally feedback is as expected and reinforces the OJBs present.
4 OJB Choice

There were positive OJBs to complete the work and meet targets. There are no obvious defensive OJBs.

Analysis

The communication in this department is high between and inside teams, which is unusual for the firm. Communication has extended to interacting with the rest of the company as a ‘quality trainer.’ Although the department membership is not particularly innovative, nor proactive in taking responsibility, it is perceived to be a good unit by other managers. There is a notable absence of any kind of negative OJBs in this department despite the fact that the manager thinks the goals/purpose of the division could be more clearly specified. The chart indicates that the teams have some confusion over their role and that more training to increase the department’s ability and knowledge would be valued. There are sanctions for poor performance in this department but they are balanced by recognition for performance. Feedback is regularly provided by both the manager and from the task. The teams do participate in continuous improvement activities but otherwise attract very little attention from the rest of the firm. The chart is positive overall for this department and has highlighted areas that could be improved to further advance the performance of this division.

Summary of 1993/98 Chart Differences

The charts from the two time bands have distinct similarities and differences. In terms of organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems the situation has changed significantly. They are perceived to be clear and aligned by team members. Although the manager has reservations about the emphasis on the goals. This resolution may have contributed to the reduction in defensive OJBs. In the teams there is still confusion over their role and they still perceive the need for more training. These two factors are related and probably connected to the fact that the purpose of the department could be better defined.

The management of the style of the division has altered from a telling style to a participative approach and there now is seen to be recognition for achievement. The department has aligned its organisational purpose, performance measures and reward
systems so they are mutually reinforcing and has slowly altered its situational attributes until they are nearly all positive. As a result the tendency for the department to play safe has been conquered and more positive OJBs have appeared. At the loss interestingly of the OJB described as respecting and supportive behaviour.
Consequences Chart LS2 A - F - Design Teams

**Background Information**

**Design Team**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of team (what do they do)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design a family of contracts (each team is responsible for contracts) for example one team is responsible for all quay cranes in China.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people in team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two resident engineers in each team and four other engineers. There were five teams in 1993 and there is one team now.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993: Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998: Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of people who participated in data collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998: 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill level of people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993: One degree, no institute qualifications, 60% of the staff ONC or HNC qualified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998: All trained to HND level. 10% of staff have institution qualifications and 10% have a masters or PhD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other important information

Charts LS2 A B C D E and F - Design follow:
The Consequences Chart
LS-2A A-Team

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisations goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Chart

- Goal not met
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Comparison
- Exert

Feedback

- Recognition for performance
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

Organisational Variables

- Flat organisation
- Legacy
- Control over resources
- Low staff turnover

Response Behaviours

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

Defensive behaviours

- To avoid action: Overworking, Passing the buck, Playing dumb
- To avoid blame: Defensiveness, Denial, Blame, Protecting turf
- To avoid change: Resisting change, Protesting turf

Responses

- Feedback is expected
- Feedback is not as expected
- New situation
- Attribution search
- Either
- Feedback leads to change in the way things are done
- Change behaviour to meet target

Feedback

- Feedback re-enforces behaviour
- Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Influence

- Familiar situation
- Unconscious habitual response
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LS-2B Midas Low participation in 2nd survey

Strategic & Operational Variables

Organisation's purpose
System of rewards
Performance measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisation goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by reward</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Individual Variables |

- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

| Task Variables |

- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

| Feedback |

- Recognition for performance
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

| Organisation Variables |

- Flat organisation
- Legacy
- Control over resources
- Low turnover

| Organisation Variables |

- Management Style
- Organisational Culture
- Sub-Culture

- Telling
- Selling
- Participating
- Delegating
- Power
- Achievement
- Rule
- Team
- Power
- Achievement
- Rule
- Team

Response Choice

- Goal of target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Compromise

- Feedback is as expected
- Feedback re-enforces behaviour
- Behaviour continues

- Feedback is not as expected
- New situation
- Feedback produces an unexpected scripted response

- Familiar situation
- Feedback leads to change in the way things are done

- Unconscious scripted response
- Feedback leads to change in the way things are done

- Change behaviour to meet target

Workplace Behaviours

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inquiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

Defensive behaviours

- To avoid action:
  - Overconforming
  - Playing the role
  - Depersonalising
  - Stretching & smoothing
  - Stalling
- To avoid blame:
  - Buffing
  - Playing safe
  - Scapegoating
  - Escalating communications
  - Misrepresenting
- To avoid change:
  - Resisting change
  - Protecting turf
The Consequences Chart

LS-2C Upper Limits Low participation in both survey, down on time-keeping

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organizational goals</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Savings for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is fair</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telling</th>
<th>Selling</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Delegating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pygmalion</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rescure Cycle

- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Correction
- Error?

Feedback is as expected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Feedback is not as expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback produces an awesomely scripted response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unconscious Scripted Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Situation</th>
<th>Attribution Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Either

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback leads to change in the way things are done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Reject or change goal or target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change behaviour to meet target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Variable Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Defensive Behaviours

- To avoid action: Overconforming, Filling the back, Playing safe, Deteriorating, Stretching & smoothing, Stalling
- To avoid blame: Buffing, Playing safe, Justifying, Steppeaging, Eliciting commitment, Mis-representing
- To avoid change: Rattling change, Protecting turf
The Consequences Chart

LS-2D  Brunel

Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Goals are known

| True | False |

Rewards support goals

| True | False |

Rewards given

| True | False |

Rewards supported by measures

| True | False |

Performance measures

| True | False |

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Controls over resources</th>
<th>Low turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for achievement</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

Goal or target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour to meet goal or target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No feedback is expected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback is not as expected</th>
<th>New Situation</th>
<th>Familiar Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target</th>
<th>Reject or change goal or target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done</th>
<th>Change behaviour to meet target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action</th>
<th>Overcomform to action</th>
<th>Fasting the boss</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Stretching &amp; exceeding</th>
<th>Slacking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Soapooing</td>
<td>Encouraging commitment</td>
<td>Misrepresenting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LS-2E Flexible

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Choice

- Goal off target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Comparison
- Error

- Feedback is as expected
  - Feedbacl feedback reinforces behaviour
  - Behaviour continues
- Feedback is not as expected
  - New situation
    - Familiar situation
    - Familiar situation
    - Feedback promotes an unconscious scripted response
    - Familiar situation
    - Familiar situation
  - Either
    - Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
    - Reject or change goal or target
    - Change behaviour to meet target

### Worldview Behaviours

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

### Defusing Behaviours

- To avoid action: Overconforming, Passing the buck, Playing dumb, Depersonalising, Stretching & smoothing, Sutling
- To avoid blame: Bulling, Playing safe, Justifying, Stepping on, Sacrificing, Mis-representing
- To avoid change: Resisting change, Protecting turf
The Consequences Chart
LS2F- Design Team Completed by interview with manager and 2 team members

### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
<td>Measures supported by rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
<td>Rewards given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: If management does not agree with above, they do not meet organisational goals. True performance measures are hidden.

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much autonomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Subject Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Choice

- **Feedback is as expected**
  - Feedback re-enforces behaviour
  - Behaviour continues

- **Feedback is not as expected**
  - Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
  - Reject or change goal or target

- **Feedback is not as expected**
  - Familiar situation
  - Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
  - Unconscious Erupted Response

- **Feedback is not as expected**
  - New situation
  - Attribution search
  - Either
  - Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
  - Change behaviour to meet target

### Workstyle Behaviours

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Respectful
- Adapting

### Defensive Behaviours

- To avoid action:
  - Overconforming
  - Following the buck
  - Playing dumb
  - Depersonalising
  - Stretching & smoothing
  - Stalling

- To avoid blame:
  - Buffing
  - Playing safe
  - Justifying
  - Soothing
  - Enhancing commitment
  - Misrepresenting

- To avoid change:
  - Withdrawing
  - Resisting change
  - Protecting turf

---

Note: The image contains a table and diagrams that are not fully visible or legible. The text provides a summary of the information that can be extracted from the image.
The Five Design Teams: 1993
A-Team, Midas, Upper Limits, Brunel and Flexible

**A review of the information on consequences charts LS 2A-E**

1 Strategic and organisational variables

All of the teams felt that their goals were clear and four of the five felt the measures were appropriate. The reward system the company operated was not clearly related to either of the other variables.

2 Organisational Attributes

In terms of the organisational attributes the charts, like the surveys do not reveal a great deal. There is a great deal of professional pride but the skills and abilities of the staff are not universally high. There is no recognition for performance (which is consistent with other charts prepared using the case study data) and feedback from the manager is not usual. The manager does not have a background in design. The staff turnover in the teams is not low but neither is it very high. The teams have control over their resources and the structure within the teams and the department as a whole is flat. The teams describe their culture as role based in three instances; a mixture of team and role in one and as team based in one. All of the teams describe the management style as ‘telling.’

3 Response Choice

Due to the nature of the source material no evaluation of this variable was possible.

4 OJB Choice

Despite the similarity of the situation of the five teams they each exhibited different types of OJBs. Consistently the teams tend to avoid blame. There was also a tendency to stall. The survey responses indicated that the new performance measurement system was not welcomed and participation in it was minimal. There was a strong resistance towards the acceptance of new ideas but this was a reaction to the way in which the ideas had been forced in. The surveys consistently reported the ‘resentment over the lack of consultation.’
The Design Team: 1998

Previously there had been five design teams, each responsible for the design of a family of similar engineered products. The teams had lost a number of staff through merging with another division and also through redundancy and staff turnover. Margins are now much tighter and prices have dropped 20% as well as lead times. The remaining staff formed a loose group and there was significant movement between projects. An individualised performance measurement system and work allocation system did not help to develop team identity. As a result one chart was produced for the remaining designers as there were no longer any distinct teams.

The design teams are considered professional but they are often late in the production of drawings and over-run on contracts. The perception of the design team was that they did not involve themselves in continuous improvement projects and had adopted a defensive - keep your head down - pattern of behaviour.

A review of the information on consequences charts LS 2F

1 Strategic and organisational variables

The people accepted that they were being tightly measured. All the members knew that the company had to meet customer requirements of timely delivery of high quality products. This meant that the designers had to work within time and cost constraints with a minimum of error. Time, cost and number of mistakes were all measured for each individual. However it was felt that rewards were not tightly coupled to the measures and overall there was only sanctions for poor performance. This implied rewards and measures were not directly aligned to one another, although the measures were perceived as being aligned to the company’s purpose or goals.

2 Organisational Attributes

The clarity of role was high although professional norms that were distinct and separate from organisational purpose were evident. There was a feeling of relatively poor control over performance, which was continually disturbed by emergency actions to correct warranty problems. Most people did consider that they had adequate ability and knowledge. The general conditions of employment were good and most people reported high levels of motivation to meet professional standards. The task variety, autonomy, significance and identity were high. However there was a shortage of feedback from managers who on the whole were not technically orientated. There was
perceived to be only sanctions for poor performance and no credit given for achievement. Criticism was frequent but recognition rare. There had been significant job loss and as consequence staff turnover was high and perceived job security low. There was seen to be relatively low control over the inputs to team tasks. The culture of both the organisation and the unit was power based and the style of management autocratic or telling.

3 Response Choice
There was definitely evidence of an automatic response to any kind of feedback; people tended to ‘play it safe’. The perceived low security levels reinforced this kind of response.

4 OJB Choice
There were positive OJBs to complete the work and meet targets. However here were also many examples of highly dysfunctional behaviour to avoid blame.

Analysis
When questioned the manager’s perceived some of the designers were risk averse and not contributing to the development of the business. The objectivity of these managers was suspect and there was some bias. Their attitude was exacerbating the response of the team members. There was evidence in most of the team members of dysfunctional OJBs but also combined with functional OJBs to meet internalised professional expectations. The chart also demonstrated that some of the organisational attributes were not supportive of more positive attitudes within the teams.

After completing the chart for the design team and observing in green area meetings it was the belief of the researcher that there is insecurity in the group due to lack of orders. There was little attempt by managers to overcome the morale problem. The managers said the ‘teams’ did not strive to achieve the organisation’s goals and had too much autonomy. It became evident during the process of completing the chart that the relationship between non-technical management and designers was polarised and it was difficult to see how the current deadlock between the two could be alleviated without a significant change in management approach.
Summary of 1993/98 Chart Differences
There have been no obvious changes in the organisational purpose, performance measures or reward systems. The ability and knowledge of the team has improved significantly and the clarity of role is also very clear. The other organisational attributes have not apparently changed a great deal. The management style has remained the same and the culture has shifted towards a power based one, which matches that of the organisation as a whole.

Consequences Chart LS3 A & B- Parts Division

Background Information

Parts Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of team (what do they do)</th>
<th>The sale of spare parts for cranes, gantries and automated systems designed and manufactured by Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people in team</td>
<td>There are six members in each team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of data collection</td>
<td>1993: Survey 1998: Semi-structured interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people who participated in data collection</td>
<td>1993: 12 1998: 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill level of people</td>
<td>Since 1993 the skills and qualifications of this division has steadily increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other important information</td>
<td>After the survey in 1993 significant reorganisation of the division took place including early retirement and redundancies. However since that time the staff have remained essentially the same with very few members leaving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Charts LS3 A & B follow:
The Consequences Chart

LS-3A Parts: 1993 (Based on interview with manager and retrospective questionnaires)

**Individual Variables**

- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

**Task Variables**

- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

**Feedback**

- Recognition
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

**Organisational Variables**

- Flat organisation
- Legacy
- Control over resources
- Low turnover
- Staff

**Management Style**

- Telling
- Selling
- Participating
- Delegating

**Organisational Culture**

- Power
- Achievement
- Role
- Team

**Sub-Culture**

- Power
- Achievement
- Role
- Team

**Response Chain**

- Yes
- Feedback is not as expected

- New Situation
- Attribution Search
- Either
- Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or reject

- Rejection or change goal or target

- Change behaviour to meet target

**Workplace Behaviours**

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & representing

**Defensive Behaviour**

- To avoid blame:
  - Overcompensating
  - Blaming others
  - Spreading the blame
  - Playing safe
  - Justifying
  - Escalating discontent
- To avoid change:
  - Raising change
  - Protecting turf
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The consequences chart
LS-3B Parts Division: 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations &amp; Operational Variables</th>
<th>Strategic &amp; Operational Variables</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organizational goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
<td>Rewards given</td>
<td>Measures supported by rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measures are known</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Variables</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Task Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control over performance</td>
<td>Clarity of role</td>
<td>Ability &amp; knowledg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational factors</td>
<td>Hygiene factors</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of performance</td>
<td>Sanctions for poor performance</td>
<td>Performance feedback is rapid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from task</td>
<td>Feedback from peers or manager</td>
<td>Task variety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Variables</th>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organizational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Delegating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

1. No Feedback is as expected
   - Feedback reinforces behaviour
   - Behaviour continues

2. Feedback is not as expected
   - New situation
   - Attribution search
   - Either
   - Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
   - Reject or change goal or target

   - Feedback leads to change in the way things are done
   - Change behaviour to meet target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protective techniques</th>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating effectively</th>
<th>Facing responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defensive behaviours</th>
<th>To avoid action:</th>
<th>Overcompensation</th>
<th>Passing the buck</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalizing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame:</td>
<td>Stuffing</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change:</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Spare Parts Division: 1993

A review of the information on consequences chart LS3A

1 Strategic and organisational variables

The goals of this division and the performance measures were in perfect alignment however there was a complete absence of any reward system that was relevant to them.

2 Organisational Attributes

There was a great deal of individual control over performance but very little clarity of role. The ability and knowledge scored low, although certain members of the departments were specialists in their area. A new manager had just taken over the department when the surveys were completed and he had initiated some changes immediately. He gave feedback and began moving staff around. The average length of service in the division was over twenty years and 65% of staff were in their fifties. The culture of the department was role based and that of the company as a whole, power based. The leadership style of the manager was telling.

3 Response Choice

Due to the nature of the source material no evaluation of this variable was possible.

4 OJB Choice

Members tended to avoid action by overconforming, passing the buck and playing dumb. There was also significant resistance to change and people avidly protected their own turf.

Analysis

The alignment between organisational purpose and performance measures was excellent but there was no reward system to complement it. This perhaps contributes to the several OJBs that were identified as ways in which members would avoid action. The skills base and job clarity was also low. The performance of this division was extremely poor and sales had dropped year on year since the mid-seventies. The division was role based and very traditional, the staff turnover was virtually non-existent and there had been no change in the operation on the division for over a decade.

The chart shows that changes were required to align the division's goals, performance measures and reward systems so that they were effective. There was also a need to introduce more knowledge and sales skills into the unit. The division scored low on recognition for
performance and there needed to be some examination of job design as that also had mixed scores.

Spare Parts Division: 1998
A cross-section of senior managers within the firm consider the spare parts teams to be highly effective at generating profit and to consistently meet their targets, despite the rather challenging nature of the measures. The spare parts division had three teams, with six to eight people in each team. The Part's Business was independent of the other business units and each of the teams was almost self-managing. There was a strong team spirit. In the researchers opinion the division manager was not autocratic but relationship focused. He was a highly respected people manager. Each team had very clear performance targets and pay was related to the achievement of those targets. In the interviews the members identified very clear performance targets which resulted in highly focused behaviour to meet the targets. The targets were so clear and demanding on every member that there were few behavioural alternatives to meeting the targets. The teams were extremely close knit and would possibly alienate anyone not participating fully.

A review of the information on consequences chart LS3B

1. Strategic and organisational variables
The people agreed the targets, they stated that they were extremely important and they focused their behaviour on meeting the targets. They strongly associated their intrinsic and extrinsic rewards with meeting the targets, and perceived that there was clear alignment between targets, rewards and the purpose in their division.

2. Organisational Attributes
The clarity of the role was very high, the teams had been together for a long time and the members were highly experienced. There was a feeling of good control over performance and nearly all participants considered they had adequate ability and knowledge. The general conditions of employment were good (Herzberg Hygiene factors) were satisfied and people reported high levels of motivation to achieve the targets. Task variety, autonomy, significance and identity were adequate and everyone indicated that their contribution to the team was important even if the job didn't seem significant. Feedback was clear and received from both the task and the team leader. There was perceived to be much recognition for good performance. There had been no significant job loss or team movement in the last five years
and staff turnover was extremely low. One person had been transferred into the team from outside. There was excellent control over the inputs and outputs of the teams. The company culture could be described as power based but with Parts Division it is firmly team based. The team leaders have a participative style of management whereas the divisional head has a selling management style.

3 Response Choice
Unexpected feedback with respect to the targets led to changes in behaviour to meet those targets. The teams could be described as single-minded but enthusiastic with respect to the performance targets they worked towards.

4 OJB Choice
Very little improvement or innovation behaviour, the people responded primarily to the performance targets. The only negative OJB was the tendency of the division to blame the stores staff for missed despatch dates.

Analysis
When the chart was completed it was found that the operation variables (organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems) were mutually reinforcing and supportive of positive behaviour patterns. As expected the team member's behaviour was considered to be good by the division itself and by management external to the division.

There was a perception by some managers outside the unit that there were low levels of innovation and improvement in the unit. This perception had lead to some criticisms of the division. There was something missing in the alignment, because certain positive behaviours that would be important to the long term performance of the division were not being encouraged, due in part to the rigidity of the targets. Targets that result in a narrow definition of functional behaviour. The results did show that good organisational attributes reinforce positive behaviour patterns but that care needed to be taken that targets are truly aligned to the purpose of the division.
Summary of 1993/98 Chart Differences

The difference in performance of the two divisions was acute. The division had gone from being a loss maker to one which made an important contribution to profits. The differences in terms of the chart are also significant. There was now complete alignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems. There were also positive responses for each of the situational attributes. The manager 'sold' his plans for the division to the members and delegated the reorganisation of the division to them. Support for a new performance measurement system to match the new structure was gained and he changed the reward system to match the new system. The staff turnover was still low but several staff had been transferred out of the division immediately after the 1993 surveys took place. The change in group membership had probably facilitated the change from role-based culture to team based and the change in management style from a telling style to a selling approach.

7.5 Sector two summary analysis: Profile Match

In this section the case study charts (formed by the interview data) are compared against the theoretical profiles that were developed in chapter four.

In total this section produced ten charts. Each chart was compared with the profile that matched it the best and the accuracy of the predictions made by the library of profiles. The profile is selected first by matching the alignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems, and then by selecting the appropriate sub-culture. The profiles assume at least two from the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are aligned to one another, hence some charts can not be compared against a profile.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>PROFILE</th>
<th>ACCURACY OF PREDICTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS-1A</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-1B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The management style matched the culture as expected and the defensive OJB were as expected. Only half of the Workstyle OJB were correctly predicted and one occurred that was not expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-2A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neither the management style nor the defensive response was as expected. Only one of the five OJB expected was present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-2B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The management style did not match the sub-culture as expected and only one of the predicted OJBs was present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-2C</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-2D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neither the management style nor defensive OJB were as expected. There was one unexpected OJB and only one of the five expected Workstyle OJBs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-2E</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The management style did not match the sub-culture as expected and only one of the predicted OJBs was present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-2F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neither the management style nor defensive OJB were as expected. There was one unexpected OJB and only one of the five expected Workstyle OJBs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-3A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The management style was not as expected but the defensive response was. Only one of the five predicted Workstyle OJBs was present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS-3B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The management style was not as expected but all over the predicted Workstyle OJB were present plus one extra. There was an unexpected defensive OJB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3 A comparison of the charts against the library profiles

Briefly what this means is that support for the theoretical predictions made in the library of profiles is not strong. The survey results in sector three will need to provide a much supportive evidence to verify the predictions or they will be dismissed.
7.6 Sector three: The Survey

Thirty-nine companies were approached to participate in the research using the Kompass directory as a source for contacts. The sample was randomly selected and controlled for staff greater than fifty and less than five hundred. Nine chose to participate giving a response rate of 23%. In addition companies that had shown interest in the project through publications and the project web-site were also contacted. This resource led to another ten companies being approached, all of whom chose to participate in the study.

A total number of forty-nine companies were approached regarding the survey and nineteen chose to participate giving a cumulative response rate of 39%. The production manager of each company was identified and the survey questionnaire mailed directly to him. There were no obvious differences between the people who responded and compared to those that did not. The resultant consequences charts generated by the survey questionnaires follow the data analysis of the survey results. As anonymity was promised to the participants the charts will be identified by codes, for example S1, S2, S3 etc. and this will not reflect the order in which they have been listed in table 7.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B &amp; S Ltd</th>
<th>Signalling Control Ltd.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HJ Banks</td>
<td>GEC Alsthom – Bulk Handling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coba Plastics Ltd</td>
<td>Viasystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTR Environmental</td>
<td>Premier Brands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaby Engineers Ltd</td>
<td>DAKS Simpson Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laporte Alpha-Gary</td>
<td>CEDG-ELEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mettler-Toledo Ltd</td>
<td>3-Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker Plant Ltd</td>
<td>Coflexip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsend Coates Ltd</td>
<td>Applied Materials (Motorola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &amp; Sharpe Ltd (Precision Measuring Instruments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.4 A list of the companies who participated in the demonstration study.

The purpose of the survey is to provide additional data with which the library of profiles can be dismissed or verified as a management tool and to trial the consequences chart. Through both this data collection medium and the case study work the research propositions outlined in chapter four will be tested. Specific findings with respect to the hypotheses can be found in chapter eight.
Results

The consequences chart can be split into four main components as shown in figure 7.5 below.

Figure 7.5 The four main components of the consequences chart

1 Operational & Strategic Variables
   Organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems

2 Situational Variables
   Individual attributes, feedback, task characteristics and organisational attributes

3 Response Choice
   Behaviour reinforced, behaviour changes or scripted response

4 OJB Choice
   Defensive or Workstyle OJBs recorded

In the survey one of the components could not be assessed accurately via survey, the response choice section. The subjectivity of this element of the chart resulted in its exclusion from the survey.

The operational and strategic variables

Seventeen useful charts were generated by the survey. Considering the results for the first component of the study, a clear pattern is evident in the data. All of the respondents indicated that performance measures were known and over 70% agreed the goals of their department were also clear and that the performance measures supported them. However although nearly everyone operated a reward system, in most cases it neither supports the performance measures nor the stated departmental goals. These results are depicted in figure 7.6.
Figure 7.6 Study results for the alignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems

There is a strong suggestion that for most companies there is a difficulty in getting the relationship between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems mutually reinforcing. (Three companies achieved this alignment in the study.)

The situational variables

Figure 7.7 Study results for the evaluation of the working situation

If the results for the situation variables (Figure 7.7) are examined further insight can be gained. Three attributes scored less than 40%: control over resources, task variety, and feedback from task. These are drawn from three different subsets on the chart: organisational attributes, task characteristics and feedback. There is no obvious significance in these results,
it is perhaps a reflection of the difficulty of introducing variety and feedback into task design and what seems to be a universal difficulty in small to medium manufacturing companies of exerting control over resources. Sanctions for poor performance also scored low but that implies that over 75% of firms do not employ sanctions against members if performance drops.

The individual attributes subset, which includes control over performance, clarity of role, ability and knowledge and Herzberg motivation and hygiene factors scored well overall. Although control over performance and motivating factors were poor in eight of the seventeen companies. The lack of control over performance may be related to department lack of control over resources. The poor motivation score related to the poor scores for task variety and feedback from task, or from other underlying issues that were not revealed by the survey.

The feedback subset, which includes recognition of performance, sanctions for poor performance, rapidity of feedback and feedback from managers had mixed results. Although retribution for poor performance is not common, neither is recognition for achieving increased performance. Also the feedback from managers was high, it did not score well for rapidity. The feedback available from the task was the weakest attribute.

The task characteristics scores were high with three attributes scored over 70% meaning that over two thirds of the companies that participated in the study had satisfactory task design. Autonomy scored in the high fifties but variety rated positive with only 35% of the participants. Overall though job design scored well in the study. The organisational variables subset also scored well with only control over resources being rated as poor in less than 70% of the participants.

The prevailing management style was a mixture of selling and participative style and both organisational culture and departmental or sub-cultures were typically team based.
Figure 7.8 The occurrence of management styles and cultures in the results

The OJBs Recorded

The OJBs found form two subsets, Workstyle OJBs that are positive for the organisation and defensive OJBs that are negative. Figure 7.9 illustrates their occurrence in the sample.

Figure 7.9a The OJBs In the sample
The Defensive OJBs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OJB</th>
<th>% of Companies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over Conforming</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passing the Buck</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalizing</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalling</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Safe</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapegoating Commitment</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misrepresenting</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resisting Change</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting Turf</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7.9b The OJBs In the sample

Results

Representing the OJB data in the above form illustrates the occurrence of the OJBs in the sample. Therefore the results will be converted into charts, classified with respect to culture and misalignment to enable a comparison to be made against the predictions made in the library of profiles. It is important to note that there were very few observations of negative OJBs by the survey respondents. This fact coupled with the knowledge that normally goals and performance measures are clearly specified, leads to the possibility that there is little opportunity for members to display the negative OJBs. Unfortunately it is not possible to judge whether negative attitudes have been transferred or displaced to other areas of work. For example, in the case study company some teams did not register many negative OJBs but there was a definite antipathy towards participation in improvement projects. Also upon visual examination of the consequences chart produced by the survey it was obvious that many companies pick just one or two negative OJBs but list many Workstyle OJBs. This also resembles the case study data; there was a focus on one pervading problem OJB rather than a whole list of faults.

However the purpose of assessing the OJBs in the sample was to see if there was a relationship between the extent of reinforcement between organisational purpose, performance measures and rewards and the OJBs recorded.
A comparison of the sample results against the library of profiles

The following consequences charts were developed from the survey results. They have been grouped into cultures and each chart has been compared against the best match from the library of profiles. As before each chart is examined to see if the predictions made in the profiles are confirmed. The complete library of profiles can be found in chapter four.

Team Culture

Chart 1, unfortunately there was no match to this chart as there was no alignment found between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems.

Chart 2, the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are mutually reinforcing and therefore Profile-9 is the best match. This profile predicted five of the Workstyle behaviours would be present, however all of them were found. It also predicted there would be no defensive responses, however ‘scapegoating’ was listed by the manager as an issue.

Chart 4, unfortunately there was no match to this chart as there was no alignment found between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems.

Chart 10, the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are mutually reinforcing and therefore Profile-9 is the best match. Again the actual results only partially matched what the profile predicted in terms of Workstyle OJBs. No defensive OJBs were predicted but again ‘scapegoating’ was highlighted as an issue.

Chart 11, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-10, though again the profile was ineffective at predicting the responses. All the nine Workstyle OJBs were listed as present when only five were predicted, and none of the predicted defensive OJBs were present. There was significant resistance to change was identified by the manager as an issue.

Chart 13, unfortunately there was no match to this chart as there was no alignment found between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems.

Chart 15, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-10. The Workstyle OJBs
predicted almost matched those found within the firm, with only one disagreement. However no defensive OJBs were present, which also was not predicted.

In 2 of the 7 cases the team culture was complemented by a participative management style but the most common management style was selling. One of the inferences in the chart was that a team culture would usually be accompanied by a participative management style, this concept has not gained much support from the survey work to date.

It is interesting to note that whereas many Workstyle behaviours are listed, only one defensive OJB is identified. This corresponds with the case study results, where one particular response is focused on as a problem.
The Consequences Chart

1 Brown & Sharpe

**Strategic & Operational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individual Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feedback**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Delegating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response Choice**

- Yes Feedback is as expected
  - Familiar Situation
    - Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
      - Unconscious Scripted Response
      - New Situation
        - Behaviour Continues
          - Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
            - Reject or change goal or target
              - Change behaviour to meet target

**Tactile & Coping**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defensive behaviour</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taming</th>
<th>Maintaining</th>
<th>Solving problems</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Initiating</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Defensive behaviour**

- To avoid action: Overt conforming, passing the buck, playing dumb, depressorising
- To avoid blame: Buffing, playing safe, justifying, scapegoating
- To avoid change: Resisting change, protecting turf
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2 Banks

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organizations goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telling</th>
<th>Selling</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Delegating</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Organizational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sub-Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Response Choice

- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Competition
- Error?

Workshop behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication openness</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Defensive behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action:</th>
<th>To avoid blame:</th>
<th>To avoid change:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overcomforming</td>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing the back</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Depersonalising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally numbing</td>
<td>Suppression of emotions</td>
<td>Stretching &amp; squeezing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disengaging</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Mis-representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidelining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4 3-Com

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisation goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
<td>Rewards given</td>
<td>Measures supported by rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance measures are known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Variables

Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telling</th>
<th>Telling</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Delegating</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Roles</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Organisational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fast organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sub-Culture

Response Choice

- Yes Feedback is not as expected
- New Situation
- Attribution Search
- Either
  - Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
  - Unknown

Defensive Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action</th>
<th>Overcoming obstacles</th>
<th>Putting the buck on others</th>
<th>Departing</th>
<th>Stretching &amp; smoothing</th>
<th>Sullenness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Resenting</td>
<td>Offending</td>
<td>Scolding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wasteful Behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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10 Townesend Coates

### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Choice

- **Goal or target**
- **Behaviour to meet goal or target**
- **Performance**
- **Feedback**
- **Compliance**

### Feedback

- **Feedback is as expected**
  - **Feedback re-enforces behaviour**
    - **Behaviour Continues**
  - **Feedback is not as expected**
    - **New situation**
      - **Attribution Search**
        - **Either**
          - **Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target**
            - **Reject or change goal or target**
          - **Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done**
            - **Change behaviour to meet target**

### Workaholic Behaviours

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting \\

### Defensive Behaviours

- To avoid action:
  - Overcontrolling
  - Pacing the work
  - Playing the dumb
  - Depersonalising
  - Squeezing & spreading
  - Sailing
- To avoid blame:
  - Blaming
  - Playing safe
  - Justifying
  - Scapegoating
  - Exciting commitment
  - Mis-representing
- To avoid change:
  - Resisting change
  - Protecting turf

---
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11 Coba

Individual Variables

- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

Task Variables

- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

Organisational Variables

- Flat organisation
- Legacy
- Control over resources
- Low staff turnover

Response Choice

- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Composition
- Error?

Yes

No

Feedback is as expected

Feedback re-enforces behaviour

Behaviour Continues

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Reject or change goal or target

New Situation

Attribution Search

Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done

Change behaviour to meet target

Change behaioir to meet target

Unconscious Scripted Response

Feedback produces an awareness of implied response

Expectations are not met

Familiar Situation

Feedback from peers or manager

Feedback from task

Performance feedback is rapid

Rewards for poor performance Sanctions for poor performance Recognition for performance

Control over -

Task variety Task identity Task significance Autonomy

Task

Management Style

Organisational Culture

Sub-Culture

Telling Telling Participating Delegating Power Achievement Role Team Power Achievement Role Team
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13 Kaby

Strategic & Operational Variables

Individual Variables

- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

Task Variables

- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

Feedback

- Recognition for performance
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

Organizational Variables

- Flat organization
- Legacy
- Control over resources
- Low staff turnover

Organizational Culture

Management Style

- Telling
- Selling
- Participating
- Delegating

- Power
- Achievement
- Role
- Team

Response Choice

- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Correction

- Feedback is as expected
- Feedback reinforces behaviour
- Behavior continues

- Feedback is not as expected
- New situation
- Attribution search
- Either

- Feedback leads to change in the way things are done
- Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target
- Reject or change goal or target

- Change behaviour to meet target

Workplace behaviors

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inspiring
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

Defensive behaviours

- To avoid change
- Overconforming
- Passing the buck
- Playing dumb
- Depersonalizing
- Stretching & smoothing
- Stalling
- To avoid blame
- Buffing
- Playing safe
- Justifying
- Scoping out
- Excusing
- Mis-representing
- To avoid change
- Resisting change
- Protecting turf
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### 15 Premier Brands

#### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisational goals</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
<td>Measures support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards given</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures supported by rewards</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Individual Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Task Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Organisation Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Response Choice

- **Yes** Feedback is as expected
- **No** Feedback is not as expected
- Behaviour continues
- New Situation
- Attribution Search
- Either
- Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
- Reject or change goal or target
- Change behaviour to meet target

### Workstyle Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; Supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Overcomformity</td>
<td>Peacocking the back</td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>Depersonalising</td>
<td>Stretching &amp; smoothing</td>
<td>Stalling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid action</td>
<td>Bulling</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Escalating</td>
<td>Dispiriting</td>
<td>Mis-representing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Restructuring</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chart 3, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-14. The role culture was complemented by a selling management style. In terms of predictions, there were mixed results. Two of the five Workstyle behaviours predicted were present. The profile also predicted behaviour to avoid action and this was confirmed. However there was also a tendency for people to avoid blame.

Chart 9, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-14. The results for this chart are confusing. The sub-culture was described as 'role based' but the firm overall is 'power based' and the management style identified as participative. The situational variables were also contradictory, feedback was rapid for example but it comes neither from the task nor the manager. The profile did predict the two of the Workstyle OJ Bs and the defensive response 'to avoid action' but there were also OJ Bs to avoid blame and change. The mixed nature of the results may be a result of the blunt nature of the survey tool or it could be a reflection of a department in turmoil or undergoing rapid change.

Chart 12, unfortunately there was no match to this chart as there was no alignment found between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems.

In two of the three companies the management style was participative, in the other it was selling. The experimental data so far has not revealed any relationship between the type of culture identified and the management style you would expect to see.
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3 B & S Ltd - Precision measuring instruments

### Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
<td>Measures supported by rewards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>From task</th>
<th>From peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Response Choice

- No
  - Feedback is as expected
  - Behaviour continues

- Yes
  - Feedback is not as expected
  - New situation
  - Familiar situation
  - Attribution search
  - Either
    - Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response
    - Unconscious scripted response
  - Feedback leads to change in the way things are done
  - Reject or change goal or target
  - Change behaviour to meet target

### Workaholic

- Communicating openly
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining a shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Inquirying
- Experimenting
- Respecting & supporting

### Defensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>To avoid action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defensiveness</td>
<td>Overcomforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pouting the tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depersonalising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stretching &amp; smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S『ning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>To avoid response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Consequences Chart

9 Parker Plant Ltd

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measures supported</td>
<td>Measures are known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals aligned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

- Control over performance
- Clarity of role
- Ability & knowledge
- Motivation factors
- Hygiene factors

Task Variables

- Task variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy

Organisation Variables

- Flat organisation
- Legacy
- Control over resources
- Low turnover
- Staff turnover

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td>Norms</td>
<td>Transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Correction
- Error

Feedback

- Recognition for performance
- Sanctions for poor performance
- Performance feedback is rapid
- Feedback from task
- Feedback from peers or manager

Behavioural Strategies

- Communication
- Collaborating
- Taking responsibility
- Maintaining shared vision
- Solving problems effectively
- Role flexibility
- Improving
- Experimenting
- Respecting

Defensive Behaviours

- To avoid emotion: Overconforming, Playing the role, Depersonalising, Stalling
- To avoid blame: Blending, Playing safe, Solving problems effectively, Enacting, Mis-representing
- To avoid change: Resisting change, Protecting turf, Stalling
The Consequences Chart

12 GEC

Strategic & Operational Variables

Organisations purpose
System of rewards
Performance measures

Individual goals aligned to organisations goals
Goals are known
Rewards support goals
Measures support goals
Rewards given
Measures supported by rewards
Performance measures are known
True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False True False

Individual Variables

Control over performance
Clarity of goals
Ability & knowledge
Motivation factors
Hygiene factors

Feedback

Recognition for performance
Sanctions for poor performance
Performance feedback is rapid
Feedback from task
Feedback from peers or manager

Organisational Variables

Flat organisation
Legacy
Control over resources
Low staff turnover

Management Style
Organisational Culture
Sub-Culture
Telling Selling Participating Delegating Power Achievements Role Team Power Achievement Role Team

Response Choice

No Feedback is as expected
Feedback re-enforces behaviour
Behaviour Continues
New Situation
Character Search
Either
Change behaviour to meet target
Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done

Workstyle behaviours

Communicating
Collaborating
Taking responsibility
Maintaining a shared vision
Solving problems effectively
Role flexibility
Inquiring
Experimenting
Respecting & supporting

Defensive behaviours

To avoid error
Overcomforming
Putting the back
Playing dumb
Depersonalising
Scratching & smoothing
Stalling

To avoid blame
Blaming
Playing safe
Justifying
Supporting
Encouraging commitment
More representing

To avoid change
Resisting change
Protecting turf

- 
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Achievement Culture

Chart 5, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-6. The predictions were not supported by the chart results. All of the Workstyle behaviours were highlighted as opposed to a selection. Also the defensive response was not to avoid action but to avoid change.

Chart 6 the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-6. The predictions were not supported by the chart results. The Workstyle behaviours highlighted did not correspond to those predicted and there was no defensive response.

Chart 8, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-6. The predictions were not supported by the chart results. The Workstyle behaviours highlighted did not correspond to those predicted and there was no defensive response.

Chart 14, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-5. The predictions were not supported. The Workstyle behaviours found did not correspond to those predicted and there was a defensive response to avoid blame where none was anticipated.

Chart 16, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-6. The predictions were not supported by the chart results. The Workstyle behaviours highlighted did not correspond to those predicted and there was no defensive response.

Like the experimental data so far there is no support for any direct relationship between the culture found and the management style to expect.
The Consequences Chart

14 Applied Materials (Motorola)

**Strategic & Operational Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisation goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**System of rewards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Performance measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Individual Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task - variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Attributes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Management Style**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telling</th>
<th>Selling</th>
<th>Participating</th>
<th>Delegating</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Organisational Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Sub-Culture**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Response Choice**

- **Yes** Feedback is not as expected
  - Familiar Situation
  - Unconscious Scripted Response
- **No** Feedback is as expected
  - New Situation
  - Attribution Search
  - Either
  - Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done
    - Reject or change goal or target
    - Change behaviour to meet target

**Workshop behaviour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Face responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Defensive behaviour**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action:</th>
<th>Overconforming</th>
<th>Faking the back</th>
<th>Playing the dumb</th>
<th>Depression telling</th>
<th>Stretching &amp; smoothing</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame:</td>
<td>Buffing</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Securing</td>
<td>Excusing</td>
<td>Mis-representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Ranting change</td>
<td>Pretending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Consequences Chart

5 Signalling Control Ltd.

Strategic & Operational Variables

Organisations purpose

System of rewards

Performance measures

Individual goals aligned to organisational goals

Goals are known

Rewards support goals

Measures support goals

Rewards given

Measures supported by rewards

Performance measures are known

True False True True True False False True False True False

Individual Variables

Control over performance

Clarity of role

Ability & knowledge

Motivation factors

Hygiene factors

True False True True True True False False True False True False

Task Variables

Task variety

Task identity

Task significance

Autonomy

True False True True True True False False True False True False

Feedback

Recognition for performance

Sanctions for poor performance

Performance feedback is rapid

Feedback from task

Feedback from peers or manager

True False True True True True False False True False True False

Organisational Variables

Flat organisation

Legacy

Control over resources

Low staff turnover

True False True True True True False False True False True False

Response Choice

Yes Feedback is as expected

No Feedback is not as expected

Familiar situation

Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response

Unconscious Scripted Response

New Situation

Attribution Search

Either

Feedback leads to change in the way things are done

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Reject or change goal or target

Change behaviour to meet target

Yes Feedback is not as expected

Familiar situation

Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response

Unconscious Scripted Response

New Situation

Attribution Search

Either

Feedback leads to change in the way things are done

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Reject or change goal or target

Change behaviour to meet target

Yes Feedback is not as expected

Familiar situation

Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response

Unconscious Scripted Response

New Situation

Attribution Search

Either

Feedback leads to change in the way things are done

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Reject or change goal or target

Change behaviour to meet target

Negative individuals

Communicating openly

Collaborating

Taking responsibility

Monitoring shared vision

Solving problems effectively

Role flexibility

Inspiring

Experimenting

Respecting & supporting

Defensive behaviours

To avoid action:

Overcomforming

Passing the buck

Depersonalising

Smoothing & smoothing

Stalling

To avoid blame:

Bullying

Playing safe

Justifying

Snagging

Escalating

Mis-representing

To avoid change:

Resisting change

Protecting turf
The Consequences Chart

6  Coflexip

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Variables</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Organisation Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control over performance</td>
<td>Recognition for</td>
<td>Flat organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of role</td>
<td>Sanctions for</td>
<td>Legacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability &amp; knowledge</td>
<td>poor performance</td>
<td>Contact over resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation factors</td>
<td>Performance feedback is</td>
<td>Low turnover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene factors</td>
<td>rapid</td>
<td>staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Variables</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task variety</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Variables</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management Style</td>
<td>Organisational Culture</td>
<td>Sub-Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

- Goal or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Competition

No

Feedback is as expected

Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target

Behaviour Continues

Yes

Feedback is not as expected

New Situation

Attribution Search

Feedback leads to change in the way things are done

Either

Familiar Situation

Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response

Unconscious Scripted Response

Reject or change goal or target

Change behaviour to meet target

Weakness Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openness</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inspiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Defensive Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid success</th>
<th>Overcomforming</th>
<th>Passing the buck</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Stretching &amp; smoothing</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Shifting</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>Endowing</td>
<td>Mis-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>representing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8 BTR Environmental Variables

Strategic and Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Purpose</th>
<th>System of Rewards</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual goals aligned to organisation goals</td>
<td>Goals are known</td>
<td>Rewards support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal or target</th>
<th>Behaviour to meet goal or target</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Attribution Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Feedback is not as expected</td>
<td>Feedback produces an unconscious scripted response</td>
<td>New Situation</td>
<td>Unconscious Scripted Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Feedback reduces the importance of the goal or target</td>
<td>Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done</td>
<td>Either</td>
<td>Change behaviour to meet target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Feedback is as expected</td>
<td>Feedback reinforces behaviour</td>
<td>Behaviour Continues</td>
<td>Reject or change goal or target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workshop behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Defensive behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action:</th>
<th>Overconforming</th>
<th>Passing the buck</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Stretching &amp; smoothing</th>
<th>Stalling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid blame:</td>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scapegoating</td>
<td>Encapsulating &amp; blaming</td>
<td>Mis-representing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid change:</td>
<td>Resisting change</td>
<td>Protecting turf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Consequences Chart

Daks-Simpson Ltd.

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisation goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards given</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from task</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisation Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organization</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low staff turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

- Goal met or target
- Behaviour to meet goal or target
- Performance
- Feedback
- Complain
- Error?

No
Feedback is as expected

Feedback re-confirms behaviour

Behaviour continues

Yes
Feedback is not as expected

New situation

Attribution search

Either

Feedback leads to changes in the way things are done

Reject or change goal or target

Change behaviour to meet target

Workshop Behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; supporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To avoid action</td>
<td>To avoid blame</td>
<td>Overconforming</td>
<td>Passing the buck</td>
<td>Playing dumb</td>
<td>De-personalising</td>
<td>Stretching &amp; encouraging</td>
<td>Stalling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuffling</td>
<td>Playing safe</td>
<td>Justifying</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
<td>Executing</td>
<td>Misrepresenting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Power Culture**

Chart 17, the stated goals and performance measures reinforce one another but the reward system focuses elsewhere. The best match is therefore Profile-1. The predictions were not supported by the chart results. The Workstyle behaviours highlighted did not correspond to those predicted and there were two kinds of defensive response when none was predicted. The power culture was however accompanied by a telling management style as anticipated.
The Consequences Chart

17 Viasystems.

Strategic & Operational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisations purpose</th>
<th>System of rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual goals aligned to organisations goals</th>
<th>Goals are known</th>
<th>Rewards support goals</th>
<th>Measures support goals</th>
<th>Rewards given</th>
<th>Measures supported by rewards</th>
<th>Performance measures are known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are unspoken goals about trying to cut down on cross team wastage, but they are not facilitated by current mgmt style and norms.

Individual Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control over performance</th>
<th>Clarity of role</th>
<th>Ability &amp; knowledge</th>
<th>Motivation factors</th>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Task Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task variety</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task significance</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recognition for performance</th>
<th>Sanctions for poor performance</th>
<th>Performance feedback is rapid</th>
<th>Feedback from team</th>
<th>Feedback from peers or manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisation Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flat organisation</th>
<th>Legacy</th>
<th>Control over resources</th>
<th>Low turnover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>True</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>True</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management Style</th>
<th>Organisational Culture</th>
<th>Sub-Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>Selling</td>
<td>Participating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Feedback is as expected</th>
<th>Feedback is not as expected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Familiar Situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Workable behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicating openly</th>
<th>Collaborating</th>
<th>Taking responsibility</th>
<th>Maintaining a shared vision</th>
<th>Solving problems effectively</th>
<th>Role flexibility</th>
<th>Inquiring</th>
<th>Experimenting</th>
<th>Respecting &amp; appreciating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Defensive behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid action</th>
<th>Overcomforming</th>
<th>Playing the role</th>
<th>Playing dumb</th>
<th>Depersonalising</th>
<th>Scratching &amp; smoothing</th>
<th>Stalking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To avoid blame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid blame</th>
<th>Shaming</th>
<th>Playing safe</th>
<th>Justifying</th>
<th>Scapegoating</th>
<th>Enabling</th>
<th>Micromanaging</th>
<th>Resigning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To avoid change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To avoid change</th>
<th>Resisting change</th>
<th>Reasserting</th>
<th>Protecting turf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.7 Discussion

In chapter four the guidelines for data collection were defined. The aim of the experimental work was to use a case study strategy combined with the philosophical constraints of a critical realist to test the reference model and the consequences chart that was subsequently developed. The verb 'to test' in this case was defined as a verification process. The data will be used to verify whether or not

1. The chart is a realistic interpretation of the impact of organisational variables

2. Distinct responses (i.e. OJBs) can be linked to misalignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems.

To facilitate the above investigation, the library of profiles was developed. The discussion of results will determine if OJBs can be predicted accurately using the theoretically derived profiles, if all the important organisational variables are represented on the chart and if organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are as important as the reference model has implied. The discussion of the results in this chapter had focused on the consequences chart. A specific discussion of the findings with respect to the hypotheses drawn from the reference model is presented in chapter seven.

Are OJBs accurately predicted using theoretically derived profiles?

The evidence gathered from the case study site and the companies that participated in the demonstration study was not supportive of the predictions made by the theoretically derived profiles.

Three key assumptions formed the basis of the profiles. Firstly, that misalignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems would lead to a defensive response from people. Although in six of the charts produced by the case study company no misalignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems was identified, there were still defensive OJBs recorded. However where there was misalignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems, there was a defensive response. However different types of misalignment were not associated with particular types of defensive response.
The survey results did not correspond with those of the case study though. In five of the participants the organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems were not mutually reinforcing and there were no defensive OJBs recorded. This difference may be due to the inadequacy of survey tools in this area of research. For a good response rate a survey must be relatively simple, however in streamlining responses the whole picture may not be told.

Secondly that organisational cultures would typically be accompanied by an appropriate management style. For example, a telling management style is incongruous in a truly delegating culture. Four predictions were made based on the following pairs

- Telling management style in a power culture
- Selling management style in a role culture
- Participative management style in a team culture
- Delegating management style in an achievement culture

However the matched pairs were not often found in either the case study or the survey. Therefore when selecting a theoretical profile to compare against an experimental chart: match first for the same type of misalignment between the operational variables and secondly for the same sub-culture.

Finally, it was assumed that organisational culture and management style would dictate (to some extent) the Workstyle behaviours that would be found in a sample. It is impossible to assess the predictions realistically because there are not enough examples in the data set where the management style and culture or sub-culture corresponded as expected. The experimental charts were compared against the theoretical profiles by selecting a profile based on misalignment and sub-culture, however the predictions were still not confirmed.

Overall there was support for the concept of a mapping tool to plot the relationship between organisational variables and behaviour. However the derivation of the theoretical library of profiles was flawed and OJBs were not consistently predicted using them as a template. Based on the evidence collected so far, there is little support for the concept that behaviour can be predicted with any kind of accuracy from the variables selected. Organisational variables do influence behaviour but their relationship to people’s response is complex and the consequences chart is too
simplistic a tool to measure this relationship. Behaviour is idiosyncratic and to some extent so are companies. It is difficult to see what tool would correctly predict even an aggregate response in different firms. However the mapping technique did prove to be an excellent way of illustrating organisation structure and possible problems to managers. It also proved useful as a tool to collect relatively unbiased information about departments and the way they operate. It proved particularly useful at Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd. in illustrating the difficulties in the design teams. It also has potential as a case study tool. The before and after profiles that the longitudinal studies produced could perhaps be developed to illustrate the advantages of setting organisational variables in a certain way and the impact that changes to organisational design can have.

The attributes or variables in the consequences chart
The Hopwood measurement-reward process model defines the operational variables. Further situational variables were defined by looking at a cross-section of work from the organisational design field.

The organisational purpose or goals, performance measures and reward systems are extremely visual variables within the workplace. In the case study site they were subject to a great deal of scrutiny by the members and provided a point of reference for the evaluation of other variables. For example, feedback was linked to the achievement of targets or goals and the reward system was based upon the value of performance measures with respect to divisional targets. It was more difficult to evaluate the importance of these variables from the survey work. The correspondents were required to describe these variables and each was very clear about their definition, even if it was to say that these variables were not clearly defined.

The relative importance of the situation variables on the chart is a moot point. The circumstances in each sample vary and some variable subsets may be more important than others in different situations. An assessment of the relative importance of the variables is not an issue though; the literature describes them all as important. The results should reveal whether good performing teams, groups or departments have managed to get all these variables/attributes/characteristics to score positively. Let’s consider the case study charts. Parts Division (1998) was organised so that its structure
scored positively on all the variables listed. It was also a strong performer. Similar results were also recorded for the quality department (1998) which was also a good performer.

Hoist 1, also performed well but there was endemic ‘stealing’ to get products despatched. This was a direct reflection of the lack of control over resources, the consequential lack of control over performance and the intense scrutiny by senior management which increased the pressure to despatch on time. When the team leaders were interviewed the same chart (in terms of variable scores) revealed tendency for the team leaders to avoid blame for missed due dates. The hoist charts both scored positive on nearly all of the variables, the poor scores for control over resources and performance could be related directly to the problems the division had. An important factor in this area was the scrutiny they were subjected to by senior management. This exacerbated their responses and this variable is not listed on the chart. The interviews and observations revealed this important variable which would have been unaccounted for in a survey.

The design team (1998) also scores high on the majority of variables yet there was complete demoralisation within the department and performance was satisfactory within professional norms rather than what the company expected. The benefit of the chart in this situation was it provided a template on which the whole situation could be examined rather than just the polarised viewpoints of the manager or the designers. In a survey the chart would have not revealed the depth of antipathy felt in the department and would have been biased by the attitude of the individual who completed.

It is clear although the chart includes many important variables that influence behaviour within companies, it does not include them all. However to include all the important variables is impossible as they seem to change with each example. The chart provides a starting point with which to examine an organisation, by its completion many things can be interpreted about an organisation that are not directly measured on the chart. Perhaps a new section entitled ‘observations’ could be added which records other important information or variables. This reveals a weakness in the chart that is also in part its strength. It is facilitator dependent and does currently require, to a certain extent, interpretation by an expert. Completing the chart using a survey tool means a great deal of the ‘richness’ of data is lost and useful of chart as a profile tool is reduced.
The survey although it did not add a great deal to the development of the chart did enable the dismissal of the library of theoretical profiles as a possible way in which to develop the research. Within the parameters of this investigation and level of analysis the number of variables assessed is satisfactory. However it is clearly an advantage to gather as much information as possible.

7.8 Impact of experimental results on consequences chart

The chart has been tested using two different mediums and has been used repeatedly. This experimental work has had a strong impact on the researcher's attitude towards the prediction of OJBs using the chart and on how the chart can be used to best effect. In terms of the content of the chart in essentials it should remain the same however there are some fundamental changes that could be made to OJB choice section. The chart could also benefit from a new layout.

With further experimental work it is likely that the number of variables present on the chart will increase. Although this means the chart will evolve from a one-page representation to something more complex. Also the larger volume of data requiring assessment would probably be better illustrated using an expert system. The chart variables have so far focused on social factors such as individual characteristics and management style. The number of attributes assessed could be expanded to include group membership, attitude and goal commitment/acceptance. While realising the importance of these types of characteristics other authors have also suggested a broader assessment of the factors that may influence on-the-job behaviour (Porras and Robertson (1992), Hunt (1992)). Recommending an examination of the level of technology applied, the workflow, the formal organisational structure, ownership and physical setting.

Despite Lichtman and Hunt’s (1971) finding, that models which examine situational contingencies rather than personality are more effective in examining organisations. And though a relationship between personality traits and organisational behaviour has not yet been found. It may also be necessary to include an assessment of more personality based issues such as motives, perception and power. Although this is beyond the scope of the research project at present.
It was observed that predicting behaviour was not possible using the chart. However it was a useful tool and did group together linked characteristics within the organisation. Particularly the need to make organisational purpose or goals, performance measures and rewards systems mutually reinforcing. The other important fact that emerged from the experimental work was that teams or groups tended to have a characteristic response or trait. Very few teams showed several defensive responses, more often one particular response was identified whose roots could be traced back through the chart. This leads to the concept that although the chart may not be a predictive tool it could be a diagnostic tool. The chart could begin with behaviour and map backward towards the origin of the response in the situational and operational variables. There is also the need to incorporate a section that deals with observations incidental to the chart. The complete inversion of the chart may mean that organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are seen as reduced in importance as they are at the foot of the chart. Therefore a more balanced design was developed which attempted to show the inter-relationship between variables. The revised consequences chart is presented in schematic form in figure 7.10.
Figure 7.10 A schematic of the revised consequences chart
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Chapter Eight

Findings

Overview

This chapter describes the knowledge gained from the study and presents the evidence found to support the research propositions. The limitations of the methodology are detailed and the usefulness of the consequences chart as a management tool is assessed.

8.1 Evidence found with respect to the hypotheses

The development of a reference model provided the early stages of the research with structure and was the mechanism by which the full complexity of organisational behaviour was understood. It also provided a stage from which further knowledge could be added to the field. The following documents the evidence that was found to support the propositions that the reference model generated.

The main proposition of the research

The performance of individuals, teams or groups will be above average when performance measures, organisational goals or targets are mutually reinforcing.

The null hypothesis associated with this proposition is that when performance measures, organisational goals and rewards are not mutually reinforcing performance will either be average or poor.

Evidence

This is a complex point to prove. The basis of this hypothesis is that when the key variables are mutually reinforcing the Workstyle behaviours that have been linked to above average performance (Porras and Hoffer, 1986) will dominate. Several charts registered that the team or group under investigation had organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems that were mutually reinforcing. These include in the case study work:

CS1-Hoist 1 showing open communication and collaborating OJBs
CS2-Hoist 2 showing open communication, collaborating, taking responsibility, solving problems, role flexibility, inquiring and respecting and supporting OJBs. Also OJBs to avoid blame.

CS3-Materials Preparation showing open communication, collaborating, shared vision and respecting and supporting OJBs.

LS-1B-Quality showing open communication, collaboration, shared vision and role flexibility.

LS-2F-Design Respecting and supporting OJBs but also behaviour to avoid blame and change.

LS-3B-Parts showing open communication, collaborating, taking responsibility, shared vision, problem solving and respecting and supporting OJBs.

With the exception of the design team the performance of these groups in the firm was strong, with some, for example Parts, having exceptional performance. The ability of these groups to meet or exceed targets was high. In the case of Hoists though this ability was dependant on 'firefighting' and their tendency to 'steal' from kit further back down the line. It was also evident that strong performers do not necessarily have all the Workstyle OJBs present. This may be because not all of the Workstyle OJBs are required to excel at that job. The results also reveal that a group may be performing well and have many Workstyle OJBs, but this doesn't preclude them from having defensive OJBs. It was perhaps naïve to think defensive behaviours were a response to misalignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems. Behaviour is too complex an issue to have such a simple cause and effect relationship.

The design team provides a great deal of insight into the power of situational variables. In this case they have offset or nullified the advantage of alignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems. The situational variables are not supportive, and the only change in the department has been the loss of staff. The legacy of the department has overwhelmed all other factors, the history in this case being a poor relationship with management and dissatisfaction with working practices.

It seems that mutually reinforcing organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems are a characteristic of strong performing groups but they can also be
present when groups are not performing well. Perhaps certain situation variables, for example legacy, can sometimes have more influence.

In the survey four charts showed mutual reinforcement:

- **S2** showing all the Workstyle OJBs but also scapegoating to avoid blame.
- **S10** showing open communication, collaborating, inquiring, experimenting and respecting and supporting OJBs and also scapegoating to avoid blame. It is possible that
- **S14** showing open communication, collaborating, taking responsibility, shared vision, problem solving, inquiring and experimenting OJBs. Also behaviour to avoid change and blame.
- **S17** showing collaboration, responsibility and experimenting OJBs but also several OJBs to avoid blame and pacing to smooth the workflow.

Without exception the groups all showed a mixture of Workstyle behaviours accompanied by a distinctive defensive response. This data would be more useful if an assessment of the level of performance of the group could be made. The detached nature of the data collection means that the only finding that can be drawn from this information is that mutually reinforcing organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems do not prevent the occurrence of defensive OJBs.

Overall in this study, above average performance was only found where organisational purpose, performance measures and reward systems were mutually reinforcing. However, aligned variables do not guarantee above average performance. One group was found to have poor performance levels despite alignment between the key variables.

**Second proposition**

Examination of the reference model and consequences chart also leads to another proposition.

It is suggested that the various misalignments possible between performance measures, organisational goals and rewards will produce different behavioural responses.
Specifically do certain kinds of misalignment typically generate particular defensive behaviors?

**Evidence**

When the profiles were developed it was theorised that different kinds of misalignment would generate different defensive responses. Briefly:

1. If goals and performance measures are aligned but rewards are not, there will be OJBs found associated with avoiding action.
2. If goals and rewards are aligned but performance measures are not, there will be OJBs found associated with avoiding blame.
3. If performance measures and rewards are aligned but the goals are not related, there will be OJBs found associated with avoiding change.

These assumptions were not supported. If we considered the survey results, the majority of charts recorded that goals and measures were related but that the reward system focused elsewhere (Charts S11, S15, S3, S9, S5, S6, S16 and S17). All of the possible defensive behaviours were found, but usually only one type would be present on a chart, for example behaviours to avoid blame. On occasions all categories registered an OJB and on three occasions no defensive response was recorded. As a result of the lack of evidence it is judged that this hypothesis is flawed and as a consequence it is dismissed as invalid.

**Assumptions to be explored**

The following points are inherent to the reference model and should be explored

1. From an individual's perspective it is important that there is congruence between most of the variables in the reference model.
2. From an organisation's perspective it is important that there is congruence between performance measures, organisational goals and rewards.
Evidence

There is a difference between what is beneficial for an individual and for an organisation. Why is there this difference? For the organisation it is important to measure their approach to the targets that have been set, and also to reward achievement of those targets, as it is important to reinforce their importance and not create confusion by rewarding other outcomes.

From an individual's perspective alignment between organisational goals, measures and rewards is important. The groups where the three key variables were aligned were those which performed the best and received the most financial rewards from the company. However the results also showed that these were not only the only factors which influenced people. Poor performance and morale (for example the design team) occurred where the three key variables were aligned. Therefore although it is crucial for an organisation to develop some alignment between:

1. the targets or goals specified
2. the measures they use
3. and the rewards they give

and it is crucial for the individual that the situational variables are congruent as well.

If the key variables are aligned but no feedback is provided or the job design is unsatisfactory (based on chart results) the performance will not reach its full potential. As for example in the chart that illustrated the design team. The Parts Division contains three teams, each supported by appropriate targets, measures and rewards and situational variables scored high on the consequences chart, their performance was exceptional. It is true their attention to projects aside from those which met short-term goals was poor, however based on the reference model it was not unexpected. This is because no goals were stated with respect to continuous improvement, no measure examined participation in these projects and no explicit reward was attached.
Inferences to be explored
From the investigation into the impact of misalignment on an organisation it may also be possible to infer:

1. The impact of a performance measure is reduced if it is not supported by a reward system, where behaviour is defined as a pattern of actions.
2. The impact of a performance measure on behaviour is reduced if it does not support a clear target or purpose, where behaviour is defined as a pattern of actions.

Evidence
There is no definite evidence that supports these inferences. However when the three key variables are explicit and mutually reinforcing, Workstyle OJBs are present. For example the charts that represent the quality department, the Parts Division and the Hoist teams in the case study company. Despite the hopes of the researcher, the data does not provide any further insight. This is disappointing and reveals a failure in the research design that was not anticipated. However, as this aspect of the relationship between organisational goals or targets, measures and rewards was not the main focus of the study it does not detract too much from the overall value of the findings.

8.2 Limitations of the methodology
This section is a critique of the research methodology employed and the review is completed on three levels.

1. Primary level: general structure and framework
2. Secondary level: interpretation considerations
3. Tertiary level: appraisal of tools employed

Primary level review
The research strategy was based on a case study as recommended by Yin (1994). The format of the study also corresponds with traditional behavioural research. That is a descriptive enquiry (the literature review), a relational enquiry (the development of a reference model) and an experimental enquiry (the case study). The basic framework of the research reflects the importance of incorporating qualitative methods into the study. Several authors recommended this approach as it brings richness to the data that is
particularly necessary when evaluating a behavioural research project. Quantitative methods were not rejected completely but they were not appropriate in an exploratory study. The questions asked by this research were not specific enough to truly benefit from these techniques. The point of the study was to develop an 'interpretative understanding of human action' and therefore it was important to understand the viewpoint of the subjects in the case study. To give the study some structure however a series of propositions, assumptions and inferences were defined, the results of the case study were used to explore them and ensure some conclusions could be drawn. Otherwise there may be danger that meanings as understood by the participants were missed, or possibly forced, to ensure a connection could be theorised (Strauss, 1963).

Overall the framework has achieved its objectives. The approach was rigorous and controlled and this enabled qualitative techniques to be incorporated into the study and not detract from its objectivity. However this approach will need to be further refined before more research is carried out using the reference model and the associated consequences chart.

**Secondary level review**

Not only the tools used in the research need to be reviewed but also the effect of the researcher. The interpretative effect, is where the evaluator's interpretation of the experimental data is biased or erroneous in some way. The evaluation of situational variables and people responses has plenty of potential for the introduction of bias or opinion. However there is little motivation in this research to manipulate data or introduce further subjectivity. The research design provided several propositions to be either verified or dismissed, the data was collected for this purpose and there was no need to force any theories from the data set.

The main problem that arose through the use of the survey was that a genuine understanding of the social situation and cultural background for the research was not attained. However, the level of interpretation required to analyse the survey was not significant as the questions were presented in a highly structured format with binary answers specified where possible.

In behavioural research three types of interaction effects have been defined:
1. Biosocial effects: difference in subject response due to the sex, age or race of the researcher.

2. Psychological effects: differences in subject response due to the personality/characteristics or social/hierarchical status of the researcher

3. Situational effects: differences in subject response due to the experience of the researcher, the degree of familiarity with the subjects etc.

In terms of biosocial effects it is not possible to verify that there were no effects in subject response. To do so would require identical research projects to be carried out by other researchers of the same and differing social types. Steps were however taken to reduce any impact the researcher might have had on participants and a consistent and unintrusive approach was maintained. In terms of psychological effects the researcher is unsure of the impact she may have had. However no status was attached to participation in the project and researchers are relatively common place within the firm because of its strong ties to the university and the manufacturing engineering department in particular. The impact of situational effects is clearer. The participants in the study were unfamiliar with the researcher and interaction only occurred through interview, and through observation. The impact of this factor could not have been significant.

Tertiary level review
Data was collected by semi-structured interview, observation and by survey. The interview method was used twice in the investigation, in the initial control group exercise and in the main case study. In both cases the consequences chart was completed by the participants answering a series of specific questions. However there was also the possibility of widening the discussion to subjects the interviewee wished to discuss. This technique was used repeatedly and found to be an effective procedure for gathering information. The researcher took several steps to remove bias from the process (as described earlier in the thesis) and if the research project was repeated, would recommend this technique as the most appropriate. A small amount of observation was also used in the study, when the researcher sat in on morning meetings and visited the factory. This mode of data collection added much to the research indirectly and a great deal was gained by watching, listening and talking with team members. This information although not specifically recorded in the thesis contributed
much to the analysis of the results and probably why this version of the consequences chart has to be examined to some extent by an experienced analyst.

The survey utilised a short questionnaire. The questions were kept straightforward and a mixture of the binary responses and open-ended responses was required. Initial questions were kept deliberately brief and the later questions required more thought. The response rate was above average and therefore the design of the questionnaire can be seen as competent.

One of the most obvious drawbacks of this research is the limited sample size. It is particularly difficult to persuade companies to participate in organisational research and those who participated in this study, did so on the basis that they would receive a free executive summary in return. However to derive more meaningful conclusions about the relationship between organisational variables and task related behaviour it would be preferable to increase the sample size. This would enable further case studies to be collated and provide enough data to attempt some statistical analysis. This type of analysis would enable the results to be tested for clusters and provide a new avenue of investigation. However the researcher would be reluctant to use detached methods (e.g. survey) as the type of data being collected requires careful interpretation if it is to be compatible across different cases.

There is another weakness that limits the whole concept of the consequences chart and the tools that were used to populate it. The situational variables were only assessed for their presence - yes or no answers, to check if the attribute was satisfactory or unsatisfactory - made this chart manageable, but also made it simplistic. This area of the chart might be improved by the introduction of a larger scale. This would provide additional data for a more sophisticated analysis, although it may not add to the quality of the results.

8.3 The consequences chart as a management tool.
The question considered when assessing the consequences chart as a management tool is: does the chart provide any further insight in situations, more and above what any consultant or external manager would quickly observe? When existing managers are biased, it can aid a truly objective diagnosis and provide insight to a situation. In the
case of the design team the chart demonstrated that some of the influencing variables were not supportive of more positive OJBs. The chart gave a comparatively independent and impartial way of assessing the business unit. As a diagnostic tool it does not provide solutions to problems but it does highlight attributes that need to be changed.

The results should really be considered as the start of an experimental process although there is no further possibility in this research of extending the data collection process, it is an area that could be developed for future work. The testing should determine if the consequences chart is an accurate representation of the variables as defined by the various models and other variables should be included. At present the chart acts rather like a checklist for helping the analyst to answer questions about an organisation and specific situations. In conclusion the chart is proving to be useful, although it needs an experienced analyst to use it to best effect.

Although, can a business ever really achieve true alignment or harmony of behaviourally influencing situational variables? There are many stakeholders each wanting something different from the company. For example, shareholders, employees, investors, auditors, customers, owners and those in power in the organisation. All of these will have a different interpretation of the business situation and they may well value different business results. Luckily many of these stakeholders have the same needs - usually expressed financially. Unless the business has a very clear priority about what is important and other issues have less importance then there is always some likelihood of conflicting systems of control. Perhaps the way forward is to recognise the differing requirements and design a 'harmonious' and flexible system to cope with it.
Chapter Nine

Conclusions

Overview

*This chapter presents the conclusions that can be drawn from the research and a clear statement of the contribution of this work.*

A number of very important conclusions can be drawn from this research. The work revolved around the attempt to verify the research propositions derived from the reference model using a case study approach. The scepticism, often felt towards the case study in management research, relies upon the view that generalising the results from one study is impossible. As a result this case study has been evaluated in terms of the adequacy of the theoretical influences generated. It is important to remember that the findings from a sample cannot be inferred about a population. The aim has been to look for patterns and linkages of theoretical importance. Therefore in this study, attention has been paid to the degree of logical inference that it is possible to draw from the results.

The main research hypothesis, the assumptions inherent in the reference model and the related inferences were all investigated and from the results it has been concluded that:

- Correctly aligned organisational purpose, performance measures and rewards had a major effect upon OJBs and strongly focused the direction and magnitude of behaviour. If there is alignment between organisational purpose, performance measures and rewards then they produce a consistent message about what the organisation values.

- The importance of performance measures is increased if they are attached to a clear target

- Where there are strong demanding targets, there is little opportunity for displaying functional OJBs other than those that meet the short term goals.
• When there are strong targets there is little opportunity to display the dysfunctional OJBs. However dysfunctional behaviour can easily be displaced to other time periods.

Also, it is also possible to infer that job insecurity and management style can influence the attitudes of people. The history of an organisation also has a great deal of influence on people's reaction and consequent behaviour. The chart takes this into account through its assessment of legacy. If the legacy is significant then the individual will have certain expectations and behaviour based upon their beliefs and they will not be highly influenced by the current situation. Most of the variables on the chart could be interpreted as historic value systems aggregated together, although some terms such as ability and knowledge relate to the present.

Overall the main contribution of this research has been the development of the consequences chart. Although it is clear from the results that the prediction of task related behaviour using a chart is not feasible, the chart still has potential as a mapping tool which can determine the origin of dysfunctional OJBs. The chart could be also be an effective management tool as it can start with a typical behaviour, and plot its cause by examining the variables on the consequences chart.
Chapter Ten
Suggestions for future research

The exploratory nature of this research means that it has in effect raised more questions than it has answered. By reviewing the findings and conclusions it is possible to highlight a number of avenues available to future researchers.

One of the limitations mentioned earlier was the size of the sample. Much more could be learned if the research was repeated with a larger sample. This would enable a far more detailed and thorough consideration of the relationships between the variables identified in the consequences chart in different contexts. There is also potential for the consequences chart to be developed as a diagnostic tool for specific behavioural issues. This possibility was first raised in the discussion of the results, as currently, as a management tool, the chart is not effective. The original chart relied upon theoretical profiles to compare the results against and to set variables for maximum performance. This approach was not completely effective. The chart may be more useful with a series of illustrative case studies to accompany it and in a new format so it focuses on one specific OJB. For example why is 'pacing' a problem in certain production teams in the case study company but not others. This new approach to using the chart may be able to answer that question.

The increased sample size should also enable a library of illustrative case studies to be collected. A library of profiles based upon empirical data collected for the purpose, may prove to be a more accurate basis for predicting behaviour than the theoretical ones. Although the researcher doubts that OJBs could effectively be predicted in this way it would make an interesting research problem and may settle the question of whether task-related behaviour can be predicted from an evaluation of the situational variables and operational variables within an organisation. The operational variables being defined as the goals or targets, the performance measures and the reward system for the purpose of the study.

One aspect of the reference model and consequences chart that would benefit from further testing is the choice of situational variables. The greater sample size would
enable the variables to be empirically tested. Their relative importance could be established and further variables added as required.

A great deal could be learnt about the impact of misalignment between organisational goals, performance measures and rewards on organisations and the people who work in them if they were investigated over a longer time period. This would enable the impact of change to be more fully tested. The semi-longitudinal study developed for this research showed that this approach has potential and a proper study would enable the inter-relationships between the different variables on the chart to be assessed and improve our understanding of the influence of both operational variables (i.e. measures, goals, rewards) and situational variables. It would also be useful to examine the consequences chart in functions other than production areas and to perhaps incorporate an assessment of the personalities within the teams or groups under assessment. Although there may not be any advantage to testing for individual differences. The methodological design of research has been shown to yield more reliable results when based upon long term case studies than those based upon experiment (Tubbs, 1986). The other possibility that could explored is the development of a quasi-experimental research design. This technique could be used as part of the longitudinal study.

Another possible way in which to develop the research would be to conduct a small survey to explore the possibility of correlation between the value of organisational attributes and the OJBs recorded. Although a more sophisticated questionnaire would need to be developed together with appropriate statistical analysis techniques. In this study the researcher felt more benefit was gained from interview and observation than from questionnaire. This may be because of the very structured nature of the survey. To gain meaningful insights into behaviour in the workplace a more open approach is required. The use of a mixture of quantitative and qualitative techniques in behavioural research has been shown by the researcher to be beneficial.

Finally, research into performance measures and human factors is relatively scarce, especially considering that the number of research projects focusing on performance measurement has increased rapidly over the last fifteen years. This thesis has successfully united an engineering approach with behavioural science issues to complete an investigation into the behavioural aspects of performance measurement. The result of which is a first version of an innovative management tool and a review of
the impact of performance measures (and goals and rewards) on task-related behaviour (OJB).
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Appendix
Appendix Two

The following table outlines the research into performance measures currently being undertaken in Universities around the world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Adelaide</th>
<th>Helen Thorne</th>
<th>Helen Thorne is currently involved in two main performance measurement related projects. Developing a performance measurement system for the Information Systems Division of a major motor vehicle manufacturer. This involves a balanced scorecard, multidimensional approach using the dimensions identified by Fitzgerald, et al. The interesting feature of this project is our attempt to deal with the behavioural facets, using a discovery technique to build up commitment to the new measures. The team includes two management accounting academics and a management psychology academic. Developing a performance measurement system using a balanced scorecard approach. The focus is on the front end of the supply chain for an appliance manufacturer rather than for the whole organisation. This project has two interesting features: the attempt to look at performance measures for the extended value chain and a simulation component. The simulation model will attempt to identify performance measures that include a business process perspective. In addition to these 2 projects she has also applied to TNT Australia to replicate the study done by Moon and Fitzgerald of the performance measurement system of TNT (UK) overnight parcel service.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglia Polytechnic University</td>
<td>Claire Stone</td>
<td>Claire Stone is at the Total Quality and Innovation Management Centre at Anglia Polytechnic University. She is involved in a project which is evaluating the facilitators and inhibitors of 'soft' performance measurement practice, specifically those relating to the use of employee-related measures, such as employee satisfaction, commitment, and morale. The learnings of UK based 'Top 500' organisations exhibiting 'best practice' are being examined, alongside those involved with 'basic' use of the measures. This is enabling an understanding of how and why progress in this field is being achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge Business Performance Research Group (BPRG)</td>
<td>Mohammed Al-Najjar, Mike Bourne, Mike Kennerley, Lanna Luangarpa,</td>
<td>The BPRG is a collaborative venture between the University's Manufacturing Engineering Group and the Judge Institute of Management Studies. Members of the group are involved in various research and consulting projects with organisations interested in business performance and business performance measurement. Current projects include: The design of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Complexity as a performance measure. Complexity is recognised as a fundamental issue for manufacturing. Work at Cambridge shows that it has a profound effect on other aspects both of how the operation is structured and how it performs. Loosely speaking the more complex the operation the longer the lead times, the less reliable the process, the greater the chance of bottlenecks, etc. Structurally increasing the number of products and processes usually increases complexity. However, in general, adding more processes has the greater impact of the two. The research has lead to a measure being developed along with a model of how to carry out the measurement. It is this latter that predicted the behaviour described above. Complexity, in this model, has two facets. The potential that variety brings for things to go wrong, and what actually goes wrong. The former is associated with the structure of the plant and process and is called Static complexity. The latter is associated with the day to day operation and is called Dynamic complexity. The costs of the former are the raw material and labour costs. The cost of the latter are all the non-added value costs of the operation. These can be attacked either through simplification (looking at the structure) or by trying to exercise greater control (looking at the operation). Measurements have been taken in factories in the UK, US, and Germany and identified valuable savings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cambridge</td>
<td>Environmental reporting and Indices. Work on environmental reporting and environmental indices has shown the need for better and more timely quantitative information in environmental policy making. The feasibility of producing a regular environmental index using a mix of scientific information and public opinion was demonstrated in a series of papers published between 1990 and 1995. Much important research still remains to be done on the potential of environmental indices to contribute to sustainable development. The definition, composition and presentation of the indices all need further work to enable the indices to become useful policy tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University, USA.</td>
<td>Joseph Sarkis' research interests that relate to performance measurement focus on the development of performance metrics for benchmarking and agility. Additional work includes the use of data envelopment analysis for performance measurement, at both the organisational and operational levels. The use of performance measurement for enterprise improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
through the use of "business case" tools is another focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cranfield University</th>
<th>Alastair Johnson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson is at the CIM Institute, Cranfield University where he is working on an IMI funded project entitled COGENT which is supported by Nissan's European Technology Centre (NETC). The project has the aim of &quot;...rapidly improving the Co-development capability of many UK automotive suppliers to a position of near-world-class and to instil a process for continuous improvement thereafter.&quot; He is investigating performance measurement principles in supplier Co-development. Alastair is participating as a third party in the design and implementation of a Co-development Performance Measurement System at NETC. The next phase of his work is to observe the system in operation and thereby identify which general principles of performance measurement are important in co-development and, more significantly, how these principles should be applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of London, Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine</th>
<th>Ebrahim Mohamed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebrahim Mohamed research interest is in the area of Activity-based costing and manufacturing performance measurement. The project is concerned with the development of a costing tool to work in conjunction with existing production planning and scheduling software. The conceptual model relies on an Activity-based costing approach. The aim is to make more congruent, financial and engineering performance measures, whilst developing a consistent means of dialogue between higher and lower levels of manufacturing organisations; a financial discourse which is derived from technical performance. The methodology involves modelling the costs of the manufacturing process at the cell level, and subsequent aggregation to form a hierarchical manufacturing environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ENAPS Partners: SINTEF Production Engineering, Norway. CIMRU, University College Galway, Ireland. BIBA, University of Bremen. TUE, Eindhoven, The Netherlands. GRAI/LAP, Bordeaux, France. | The objective of ENAPS is to establish and test a permanent European network for advanced business process performance studies in European industry. ENAPS is intended to be a network established by leading industry and academic partners and agents covering almost all of the countries in the European Union and the European Economic Area. ENAPS is developing a benchmarking database with a set of measures which is based on a process view of the manufacturing business. The database will be used by a network of small consultancy agencies (known as agents in the ENAPS project) throughout Europe. Each agent will both contribute data to the database and use the data for benchmarking exercises with their customers. ENAPS has established a network of agents and a lot of work has gone into developing a set of generic business processes and associated measures. Pilot studies, which |
are testing the applicability of these in industry, are currently being performed. The results of the pilot studies should help validate, or invalidate, the approach. Once a valid approach has been developed a full blown set of ENAPS demonstration cases will be performed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Metropolitan University</td>
<td>Richard Greatbanks</td>
<td>Richard Greatbanks is within the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Design and Manufacture at Manchester Metropolitan University. He has been researching performance measurement within manufacturing for the past three years. His primary interest is how SME's can develop their performance measurement techniques to drive towards world-class manufacturing levels of performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nottingham</td>
<td>Dr Kul Pawar</td>
<td>Main research and teaching interests lie in Concurrent Engineering, the design/manufacturing interface, performance measurement, logistics/ supply chain management and service industry management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nottingham</td>
<td>Helen Driva</td>
<td>Helen is currently working on the Brite-Euram PACE Project - A Practical Approach to Concurrent Engineering. The main aim of this research is to address the question 'how do companies know that they are making effective use of their product design and development function?' Although tools that measure the product development process are bound to exist, to our knowledge, there is no specification or tool to measure performance during the concept stage of product development, taking into account the special demands of concurrent engineering. The resulting tool will be paper-based and intended for companies to use themselves, without the need for an external consultant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Business School</td>
<td>Cathy Cassell, Phil Johnson, Joanne Duberley and Paul Close</td>
<td>The Sheffield team are currently working on a three year research project entitled &quot;The Analysis of Performance Evaluation and Control in Manufacturing&quot;, funded by the Control, Design and Production Group of EPSRC. Using in-depth case studies, the aims of the project are: To investigate and review current practices regarding performance evaluation and control To investigate if and how those performance evaluation and control practices are monitored and evaluated with the objective of assessing their strategic commensurability To develop a methodology for appraising and adapting current practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Sunderland</td>
<td>Julie Wales</td>
<td>Julie Wales is at University of Sunderland working on a project aimed at incorporating social performance indicators into existing financial accounting systems. The project, a collaboration between the University of Sunderland and Quality Software Products plc, aims to produce the first intelligent information system to offer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such a broad view of an organisation’s performance. All the necessary financial information will still be there as before, but what will be available will be new perspectives, and a picture of the organisation’s long-term health in terms of non-financial measures. The company will thus be measurable with respect to its performance in ethical, social and environmental terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Researcher(s)</th>
<th>Research Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strathclyde University</td>
<td>Dr. Alan Wilson</td>
<td>‘Performance Measurement in the Services Sector’. The research is aimed at examining how different performance measures, e.g. customer satisfaction and mystery shopping, can be used effectively, and if there is value in combining such measures to provide managers with a comprehensive view of an organisation's service delivery performance. Unlike conventional accounting measures, which report on the past, an integrated measure could provide a forward-looking view based on lead indicators of long-term profitability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Umit S Bititci</td>
<td>Integrated Performance Measurement Systems. This is a collaborative research with Universities of Liverpool and Loughborough. The objectives of the collaborative research is to provide UK manufacturing industries with an approach to auditing their performance measurement systems to ensure consistency and to provide reference models against which such measurement systems can be benchmarked and designed. The research at University of Strathclyde focuses on the structure and integrity of the performance measurement system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asea Brown Boveri Ab, Sweden</td>
<td>Per Ewing and Lennart Lundahl</td>
<td>The EVITA project, The aim is to produce a performance measurement based control system for all organisational levels. A concept and model has been developed inspired by and with close resemblance to Kaplan and Nortons &quot;the Balanced Scorecard&quot;. The model and concept have then been applied in three pilot units. Also an IT-based Presentation Support System has been developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Udine</td>
<td>Performance Measurement Research Group</td>
<td>The research interests are manufacturing strategy and performance; performance measurement systems; supply chain performance and time-based competition. Alberto De Toni and Stefano Tonchia are involved in the first large scale empirical research regarding Performance Measurement Systems (PMS) in Italian firms. A survey of the top 400 Italian manufacturing firms has been conducted: 115 firms participated to the project. The survey was made by mail questionnaires, with about 500 question items (both numerical and Likert scales). Two directions of research are developed at the present moment: - the normalisation of the results of the above survey; - a supplementary analysis regarding the links between the (PMS) and strategical and organisational variables.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix Seven
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7.4 Survey: Questionnaire with a review of its design and a copy of the covering letter
Appendix 7.1
Control Group: Exercise Interview schedule

Interview Design
A summary of the steps taken to avoid bias

The purpose of the interviews was made very clear at the outset and the interviewer sort to minimise the intrusion on people’s working day. The divisional head, a very popular manager also openly supported the project. These steps may not have reduced bias but they did increase interest in the project. Each of the questions was reviewed prior to the interviews and reworded to ensure:

1. They were clear and simple
2. They were jargon free
3. They were kept as impersonal as possible considering the nature of the research

Questions regarding management style or culture were accompanied with cards that defined the terms discussed. All the interviews took place in the same room, and tea/coffee was available to keep the atmosphere informal. The researcher maintained a consistent approach with everyone and completed all of the 30 minute interviews over a period of two days.

Team Leaders and Divisional Head
Performance
What would you describe as good performance?
How would you describe the performance of your division?
What is important when you are trying to improve performance?
What is it that makes your division’s performance ________?

Performance Measures
What performance measures are applied?
Where do they come from?

Divisional Targets
What are the targets for your division in terms of goals?
Do you see them as achievable?
Are they seen as achievable by the division?
Where do the targets come from?
What impact does the budgetary process have on performance?
Are financial targets of paramount importance?
What reward systems or incentives support the targets?

Feedback
Who do you give feedback to?
How often?
What kind of feedback do you give?

Miscellaneous
How would describe the culture in this division?
Is it different in the rest of Morris?
How would you describe your management style?

Team members
Performance measurement system
How would you describe the performance of your team?
What is it about your team that makes it succeed?
What kind of feedback do you get about the team’s performance, other than from the GA boards?
How does it effect day to day running of the team?
What are the targets for your team?
What other performance measures are applied?
Which of the two are most important?
The bonus system has been described to me; there is also extra leave for attending meetings on time. Do you see that as an incentive?
Can you explain to me how the GA system works in parts division?
Can you tell me how the GA system was changed to work in here?
Why were these changes necessary?
Can you tell the best thing about the system?
Can you tell me the worst thing about the system?
What would you change about the system if you could?
Do you think the system is good at motivating people?

General Questions
What do you do?
Is there a high degree of variety in your job?
Do you have responsibility for a complete program of work?
Do you have considerable autonomy in your work?
Do you see your job as significant in helping the company meet its goals
What do you think that the level of training in the division?
Feedback
Do you get sufficient feedback from the job itself? Do you know when you have done well?
Do you think good performance is clearly recognised and rewarded?
When does Ken give the teams feedback?
Management Style
The management style (this is the style of the person that judges your performance) is the following:
- Telling
- Selling
- Participate
- Delegating

Organisational Culture: Overall and sub-culture
The culture of the organisational overall is:
- Power
- Role
- Team/Task
- Person
PARTS DIVISION

The Green Area System

What works well?

The structure of the green area system is definitely important to its success. The teams are small and grouped around products. The targets are clear and relevant and when they are achieved everyone is rewarded, re-enforcing the teamwork ethos.

The divisional targets are broken down into a series of targets pertinent to the product groupings. The advantage of this is everyone knows exactly what they must achieve in a given period. The calculations are simple and understood by everyone member of the division. The practice of putting up the results daily re-enforces their importance and they have an impact on the day-to-day running of the teams. Every single person interviewed commented on the targets. Even people who did not like the green area system or approve it, appreciated the targets.

The two main product teams are not large and on the whole are keen to participate. The customer focus is sharp and there is very little ambiguity about what they have to do. The team members know the targets and during the interviews indicated their success was due to working as a team. The third green area team could more accurately described as a peer group and there is no unity. The green area board for this team had very little on it and not all of it was of relevance to the entire group.

The teams work within a GA system they have customised themselves to suit the needs of their tasks/role/job. They are scrupulous in keeping to their own rules and are totally focused on the task at hand so they can meet the targets.

What could work better?

The teams are completely focused on the targets and in some respects the GA system could be described as working too well. People are entirely focused on the short term issue of meeting a target. When questioned about performance measures other than targets in the division only three people knew of any. Of the three team leaders I interviewed only one referred to other
measures. The target system is extremely effective and morale is very high the division. If they start to consistently miss those targets, what will they fall back on?

It is interesting that Team Five which is suppose to focus on perhaps the more long-term or strategic issues is not force in the division. Few people discussed it and those that did were unclear on its function. Not all the participants of that team were enthusiastic about its role. This is area that definitely has potential but not in its current state.

Cross-team communication was also an area that seemed to need developing. Information on initiatives that were successful or failed was not necessarily shared. Figures regarding the performance of teams is readily available on the board though.

The other area that did not seem to be running to potential was the training matrix. The issue had definitely stagnated with very few changes being made to the chart on the board. Not one of the interviewees said the training was satisfactory although two indicated that it was improving. No blame was attached to this issue. The teams work hard to meet the targets and the impression given was there wasn't time for training but if anyone really needed training they would get it. The process behind asking for and receiving training could be better articulated, as could who is responsible for it.

How well is the green area running?
The green area system has worked well in the division and many positive things have come out of it. None of the issues I outlined as needing development are insurmountable.

Overall the teams are self managing and focused. They take responsibility for problems and experiment to solve them. The amount of power they have is very important to them.

There was one contentious issue in the interviews that never failed to raise much discussion, the gold days you can earn. Each team leader disliked the scheme, as did approximately 40% of the team members. Even those that considered it an incentive disliked the way the scheme operated. It was castigated for not reflecting the extra hours that people put in and for penalising people who got in early but were late for the meeting.
Finally, the teams are driven by the targets. All the ideas and innovation they generate are to achieve those targets. The environment they work in as a consequence is very narrow and they have very little perception about the rest of Morris. They are completely isolated, for better or for worse.
Questionnaire

There are definitions for some of the terms used below on the reverse

---

1. The goals of the organisation are well known to me

2. I know that rewards are given for meeting the organisation's goals

3. The performance measures in use help the organisation achieve its goals

4. My personal goals are compatible with the organisation's goals

5. I know rewards will be given if I meet the performance measures

6. The tasks I am involved in have a high degree of variety

7. I have responsibility for a complete program of work

8. I think the tasks I perform are significant in helping the company meet its goals

9. Feedback is given by management or peers that helps me to improve my performance

10. Good performance is clearly recognised and rewarded

11. Only criticism of poor performance is recognised

12. I get sufficient feedback from the task itself / I know when I have done well

13. The feedback from others is rapid and closely follows the event being measured

14. I have considerable autonomy in completing tasks.

15. The terms & conditions of my job are reasonable e.g. pay, working conditions

16. I have sufficient knowledge and skills to complete tasks as well as expected, or to meet the requirements of the role I am in

17. This organisation is good at motivating people

18. I feel I can control my own performance and it is not controlled by the organisation in some way

19. I clearly understand the requirements of my job as defined by the organisation

---

20. The management style (this is the style of the person that judges your performance) is the following:

   a) Telling
   b) Selling
   c) Participate
   d) Delegating

   Please circle the most appropriate

21. The organisational culture is:

   a) Power
   b) Role
   c) Team/Task
   d) Person

   Please circle the most appropriate

22. The sub-culture I am in is:

   a) Power
   b) Role
   c) Team/Task
   d) Person

   Please circle the most appropriate

---

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE
The following guide explains some of the terms used in the questionnaire

Questions 1-5
We are trying to determine if the organisation's purpose or goals, the reward system and the performance measurement system support one another.

Questions 6-14
These questions refer to the design of your job and the amount of feedback you receive regarding your performance.

Questions 15-19
These questions refer to the nature of the environment you work in and your current post.

Question 20 refers to management style:
The style of the person who judges your performance could be described as
_Telling_ - a directive approach, specific instructions are provided.
_Selling_ - Your line manager explains decisions and provides opportunities for clarification
_Participative:_ Decision making is facilitated by the manager rather than carried out
_Delegating:_ Responsibility is turned over to you

Question 21 refers to the overall organisational culture
_Power culture_ is found where senior managers exert considerable influence and power within the organisation. The managers are likely to manage in an autocratic way.
_Role culture_ relates to situations where positions within the organisations are the focal point of attention. The demands of bureaucracy (e.g. compliance with rules) are prominent.
_Team culture_ applies where the organisation has values & mechanisms to integrate people within teams. It promotes successful completion of projects by teams managing projects.
_Achievement culture_ values success and personal growth. The climate encourages people to exercise initiative in conditions of high levels of autonomy

Question 22 refers to the immediate culture that you work in.
11 November 1997

Dear Manager

_The PRISM research project under Prof. Neil Burns is examining the impact of performance measurement systems in manufacturing companies. We will be investigating how people respond to the way they are measured and what factors effect their performance. The engineering research council funds the project._

Enclosed is a brief questionnaire that has been sent to a number of manufacturing companies. Once response data has been entered on to the database all links between respondents and replies will be removed. No company names will be revealed in any publication.

We hope you will want to collaborate in this investigation. An executive summary entitled 'how we are measured is how we behave...' will be sent to everyone who takes part in the study when the findings are published (planned for April 1998).

If you are able to give us the benefit of your views by returning the completed questionnaire in the next few days, please accept our thanks. A pre-paid envelope is also enclosed for your convenience.

Yours sincerely

Victoria Hanna
Research Associate

PRISM

*Integrated Performance Measurement Systems*
HOW WE ARE MEASURED IS HOW WE BEHAVE...

NAME: ..........................................................

POSITION: ..............................................DEPARTMENT: ..........................................................

COMPANY: ..........................................................................................................................................

• PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENTS PERFORMANCE?
e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery

.............................................................................................................................................................

• DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? ..........YES/NO.

• ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? ........................................YES/NO...

• WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?

.............................................................................................................................................................

• PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
(e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)

.............................................................................................................................................................

• ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS? ..........YES/NO...

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

.............................................................................................................................................................

• IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? ......YES/NO...

• HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? .............YES/NO...

• HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? ........YES/NO...

• COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY? ................................................YES/NO...

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (✓)

• LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?

POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.

ROLE CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.

TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY SELF-MANAGING TEAMS.

ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.

WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL? .................................................

NAME: .................................................................................................................................................................... .

POSmON: ..........................................................

DEPARTMENT: ..........................................................................................................................................

COMPANY: ..............................................................................................................................................
WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS

TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.

SOLDING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION

PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT

DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (√) OR FALSE (✗).

THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:

...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS

...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED

...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS

...ARE WELL MOTIVATED

...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?

GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED

ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND IS CRITICISED

THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY Follows THE EVENT BEING MEASURED

SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED

FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:

THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY

PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK

THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS

THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

DO PEOPLE:

TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS? YES/NO

TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES? YES/NO

TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE? YES/NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

........................................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................................

........................................................................................................................................................................................

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (√) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

COMMUNICATING OPENLY BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE

COLLABORATING BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS

MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS

SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

RESPECTING/SUPPORTING BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS

ROLE FLEXIBILITY BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

INQUIRING BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

EXPERIMENTING BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS
Appendix Eight

8.1 Longitudinal Survey – Raw Data
8.2 Survey - Raw Data
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- I am not against the changes but I've not been asked to contribute to them in any way.
- I've been at Morigs for more than 22 years and would have expected to have been involved!

**************************************************************************

2/12/92

CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: PETER BUCKERIDGE  -  1/1-93

GREEN AREA: THE MIDAS TOUCH  THE A TEAM
(MOVED 6/1-93)

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business? - THE BUSINESS IN CRANE MANUFACTURE REMAINS THE SAME -
   - Control of projects has improved.
   - Design detail has not improved.
   - Costs are being monitored better.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   - The changes have not necessarily improved the end product or our ability to sell more cranes.
   - Tendering has not been improved.
   - Moving people from one team to another will not help to generate a "team spirit"

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   - Product development - Improving existing designs.
   - Tender & sales to get more orders.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   - Poor training on the Triton system - I've only spent 3 days on the system to date with only 1/2 day training.
   - The ability to work with the Triton system will be
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- I try to get awareness from the people to the changing process and motivate
- Where I am involved with the change, I try to make it work (e.g., training)

Some other ideas are enclosed in my report dated 06/01/93.
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS

A SURVEY

The five questions below are about change in the business. How effective it is and where we can improve. For each of the five questions could you provide a response in the space provided.

NAME: Isabel Viccin

GREEN AREA: No. A 11111111

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- It has been covering the main issues that were:
- All the committee in the business changed it:
- The structure that seemed involved in communication
- It is the only way to have some issues.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- People should be aware of the process of change
- They should participate
- People must be committed involved and have confidence
- Ability (I) - some of our employees will have a sense of concern if
- What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
  Evaluation the changes implemented
  - To human manager about their skill and role
  - Women Training to improve their skills (underlines)
  - Development a model (sent of family about never more)
  - Procedures and rules involved in the change (underlines)

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
- Team if you have any input and targets I don't
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME  B. HEDDITT
GREEN AREA  A TEAM.

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
* IMPROVED OUR ABILITY TO ORGANISE THE WORK LOAD, TOGETHER WITH
* CLOSER CONTACT WITH WORK TO ACTION ANY PROBLEMS.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
* DONE

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
* FEED BACK TO GREEN TEAMS OF VALUE ENGINEERING DECISIONS RECOMMENDATIONS

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
* RELATING TO QUESTION 3 WE ARE CONSTANTLY HAVING PROBLEMS WITH B.S. LIMITS & FITS.
   ALSO SCOPE OF MACHINE SHOP EQUIPMENT. THIS EULATES MINOR REVISION OF BOOKE TO SUIT.
   ALSO A CENTRAL LIBRARY OF UP TO DATE CATALOGUES WOULD BE ADVANTAGEOUS.
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- Government action
- Green area implementation
- Brain management system
- Skills/infrastructure system
- General area design and Cit requirements.

I also consider a conclusion to be: A requirement of why the changes are necessary and a commitment to making these changes work.

\\
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS

A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: J. Money

GREEN AREA: In turn

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?

- The changes have overall been better Green C EO
- Altered to the present contracts. This is positive
- No changes would generally be thought to benefit (e.g., cost)

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?

- Communication is still a problem, in fact a loss in communication
- Missed information from the memory management
- Minutes remain corporate company status, mingle with general meetings

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?

- The complaint in question 2 stops any here

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
3. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- Provided big sheets to greens areas during %
- Completion and paper status - for greater awareness.
- Suggest graphical representation of targets/achievements
- With more feedback - visually more effective.
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME BRIAN AXTEN
GREEN AREA FLEXIBLE

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?

- Brought the cost of services, equipment etc. down to the
- Front of people minds. Provided a better opportunity
- For achieving these services on work and/or required
- Make people more responsible for their actions.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?

- Green Area implementation - none - plenty if
- Information and follow-up. Changes in the manifesting
- Facility - poor - limited information provided or idea not solicited.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?

- Sales and Marketing/Publicity. Very limited number
in this to pursue/generate enquiries and following if
no one intent on generating new overseas markets and
still serve the U.K. Publicity - where?

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.

- None

-
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- Written distribution of sales perceptions of initial needs.
- Made detailed reform of sales activities.

************************************************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: R. Green

GREEN AREA: SALES

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   - Tight cost control to each contract.
   - Faster decision response by everyone, making sub-contracting faster.
   - Focus on responsibilities.
   - Starting to redevelop team spirit.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   - Green areas to be introduced.
   - Customer service - speed.
   - Works reorganisation, should include provision for largest scope of manufacturing, projects in future.
   - Setting up PCAN implementation is urgent as benefits not accessible.
   - Not all teams can communicate effectively, lack of knowledge of other areas.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   - Company strategy followed by marketing plan.
   - Commercial support for teams.
   - Continuous development & encouragement of team spirit.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   - Shortage of innovative competitive design.
   - Method to determine priorities acceptable to all.
   - Training is needed.

Return to
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: M. R. HULLINSON
GREEN AREA: FLEXIBLE

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   * CUT COSTS
   * IMPROVED COMMUNICATION WITHIN THE DIVISION
   * TIME KEEPING

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   * DELAY IN DELIVERY DUE TO NON-DELIVERY
   * NEED FOR ADDITIONAL FIRE-SAFE-CABINET TO STORE 35mm ARCHIVAL CARDS
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5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
* Worked on costing new
* Standards for our costs

CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE.
FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME_ A. WHERE IT?

GREEN AREA_ Flexible

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   * With little new added (i.e., orders)
   * Hard to get

2. If any, what criticism do you have of changes and their implementation?
   * None (but see answer to 1)

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   * Resources

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   * Computer knowledge
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5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
- Our assistance makes the system work
- Although I think it is still unsatisfactory.

************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: J. Sturkey
GREEN AREA: Flexible Team

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- The authority given to contract managers and the control exercised on contracts should improve profitability

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- Teams have over-riding responsibility for their main project and any other job they are asked to perform is treated as 'second best'

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
- Sales, Enquiries, Tender proposals
- Lack of coordination, Order Policy

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
- Tender preparations not carried out to company standards
- Explanations are required across company re works changes, new machines, future policy.
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
* The practicality of blending them with problem solving and the requirements of customers traveled on experience.
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY
THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.
NAME: D ALLTREE
GREEN AREA: FLEXIBLE TEAM

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
* Increased individuals responsibility for his own performance within the Team structure, and made people aware of the overall position of a contract on a day to day basis.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
* The emphasis on the importance of punctuality should be coupled with the visual recognition of additional hours worked by individuals particularly those who are not paid for overtime.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
* The Marketing strategy within the new division.
  * Durum needs to be strengthened, with much more "on the road" search for new business.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
* The over rapid implementation of Totsin.
* The overall business plan.
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D Allen
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME T. TEMPLEMAN
GREEN AREA FLEXIBLE TEAM.

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   * Better central & co-ordination within
   * The given contracts.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   * Poor global information which was previously available in the "Team Brief".
   *

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   * Centralisation of tender design facilities.
   * Records & control
   * The independent team: I feel should be co-ordinated singly before too much independence occurs.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   * The new tender business system is creating many problems.
   * It is still in the initial stage & appears to be improving in some areas already.
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
- I am now producing weekly reports to each team leader to put on his board, providing information on budgets and completion dates.

CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: MARK SELBY
GREEN AREA: FLEXIBLE

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- IMPROVED COST CONTROL (work to budgets).
- IMPROVED COMMUNICATION.
- IMPROVED TIME KEEPING.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- I HAVE NO REAL CRITICISM, HOWEVER, I FEEL THAT THE TENDERING SIDE IS NOT WORKING IN THE PRESENT SET-UP. ALSO, THERE IS TOO MUCH TEXT ON THE GREEN BOARDS, THESE SHOULD BE REPLACED BY PIE CHARTS, BAR CHARTS ETC, FOR CLARITY.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
- THE TENDERING DEPARTMENT SEEMS TO BE STRUGGLING.
- REGARDING MANPOWER, IF WE ARE TO SUCCEED MORE EFFORT SHOULD BE MADE IN THIS AREA. PERHAPS HAVE A SEPARATE TENDERING DEPARTMENT.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
- FOR THE PAST 3 YEARS, I HAVE REQUESTED THE USE OF A DECK TOP PUBLISHING MACHINE TO IMPROVE QUALITY AND MENT OF OUR DOCUMENTS.
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5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

* Energy / Drive / Innovation / Team Spirit

* *

* *

********************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS

A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: A. GADD

GREEN AREA: NIMAS TOUCH

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?

* Given people personal & team objectives to focus on.
* Lifted people out of the "sloom" phase (people have stopped talking about how they are going to save their redundancies).

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?

* Not a criticism - an observation
  * It took a long time to realise that we were not working to a rigid, fixed scheme that we had
  * A significant input, it is now clearer.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?

* We need a service department!
* Disruption caused by on site warranty
* Problems at times causes chaos
* Teams need full time electrical presence

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.

* See 3

* *

* *
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- I HAVE WRITTEN A REPORT TO B. MURDOCH
- RE- WORLD CLASS MANUFACTURING / STANDARDIZATION

********************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME A.,BRITISH

GREEN AREA: FLEXIBLE

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   - INCREASED A SENSE OF COMMERCIAL AWARENESS
   - TIGHTENED FINANCIAL CONTROLS
   - PUT MORE AHD ON INDIVIDUALS TO OBTAIN RESULTS

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   - THE ORIGIONAL PLAN HAS NOT ALWAYS BEEN IMPLEMENTED WITHOUT CHANGES, WHilst THESE ARE NECESSARY, I FEEL LACK OF COMMUNICATION CAN CAUSE CONFUSION

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   - MORE EMPHASIS PLACED ON SALES / MARKETING
   - WE NEED TO LOOK AT MORE ORGANIZATION OF PRODUCT TO PROVIDE THE MARKET WITH A TOTAL PACKAGE

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   - TOO MUCH OVERLAPPING OF RESOURCES - SOME INSTANCES WHERE I HAVE CARRIED OUT TASKS CARRIED OUT
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
* A possible area to consider is dedicated channels for some
* If not all the technical trials terminate, some of the units
  currently under trials are unable resolved, non-villain, unable slowed
  Are those considered to exist? If a new technical custom was used
  it would ease a technical process to do more technical work.

***********************************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE
BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE.
FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A
RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME __________________________
GREEN AREA ___________________

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
* Indicators we that the control on the customer costs
  will settle, but unless the current must are timely executed
  * IS NECESSARY TO WANT TO TASTE

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
* Resource and technical design mechanical seems to be a minimum
  * Particularly we must support the same area from the investigation
  * Support that minimum ward by technical mechanical is
    often delayed

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
* AS 2 MERGE

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
* AS 2 MERGE

*
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- I have not been requested to contribute to
- To implementation. New Ideas & Previous
- Problems are taken on board when
- Designing New Products.

Change in the Business
A Survey

The five questions below are about change in the business. How effective it is and where he can improve. For each of the five questions could you provide a response in the space provided.

Name: C. Greenley
Green Area: Midos

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   * Increased commitment to achieving delivery
   * Times.
   *
   *

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   * Times allowed are very stringent and do not allow for 'thinking time'. This could lead to errors and uneconomical designs.
   *

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   * Value Engineering appears to be limited
   * To the Design Review Team. Information & Design
   * Principles decided do not pass to production.

4. State any specific things that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   * Lack of training, CAD, CAD etc.
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- Regular input at Green Team Meetings

----------------------------------------
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

The five questions below are about change in the business, how effective it is and where we can improve. For each of the five questions could you provide a response in the space provided.

NAME: J. Sharples
GREEN AREA: Upper limits

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   - Contract control appears to be better organised

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   - It appears to have created extra work within the D/O, at a time when reduced D/O times are required to make us more competitive

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   - As above
   - DEDICATE OPERATORS FOR EACH TEAM ARE REQUIRED (Non Technical).
   - Many items cost pence but pounds to input

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   - Training, lack of it

5. Is there anything else you would like to contribute?
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: [REPLACE WITH NAME]
GREEN AREA THE [REPLACE WITH AREA] TEAM.

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   - Provided_sufficient_time_in_the
   - Company_to_comment_on_this_aspect.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   - None.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   - Tendering_processes_should_be_improved.
   - Responsibilities_should_be_defineddepending_on
   - Most_tender_specialist_engineers_should_be
   - Allocation_for_each_task.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   - Software_run_without_significant_analysis
   - Act_DU _urgently.
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: DAVID HORST
GREEN AREA: UPPER LIMITS

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   * IMPROVED AWARENESS FOR TEAM MEMBERS / LEADERS.
   * 
   * 
   * 

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   * TOO GREAT A REDUCTION IN HOURS ALLOWED AT THE DESIGN STAGE MAY RESULT IN HIGHER COSTS AT THE END OF THE DAY DUE TO SITE RECTIFICATION.
   * 
   * 
   * 

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   * 
   * 
   * 
   * 

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   * TRAINING ON SPECIFIC CONTROL EQUIPMENT WOULD HELP.
   * 
   * 

5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
   * GREEN MEETING INPUT.
   * TRITON INVOLVEMENT.
   * 
   * 
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5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
* Motivation
* Contribution to skills matrix
* Team understanding
* Motivation
* Implementation

****************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: M. TAYLOR

GREEN AREA (UPPER LIMITS)

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
* Overall very good as you might appear to be
* More focused on realities etc.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
* The green areas have a small coming in the reward system
* E.g. A fellow could be 1 mini late on one occasion in 6 months but when occasionally late hours I not be awarded
* Whole is reviewed. There should be mountains for total hours.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
* Tender design: although some areas have been carried out it is taking longer to calculate much awards. Thus emphasizing the financial tender.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
* Teller. Much can be dismissed as going through the learning curve. Needed some ugly work.
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME S. Dixon

GREEN AREA Brown

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   * Helped people meet their goals and objectives
   * Increased awareness of certain processes
   * Reduced costs and associated overhead

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   * Not made aware of certain changes
   * Feedback on certain changes too late

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   * Streamlining of standard procedures
   * Updating to new computer programs

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   * None

5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
   * Contributing to ideas
   * Implementing new ideas
   * Not contributing to ideas, at present
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5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
- I have attempted to respond to the demands of the new systems/methods inc. Green team participation.
- Triton utilization, electrical, tendering function,

********************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: R. Burton
GREEN AREA UPPER LIMITS

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- Focused individual's attention more on the company's performance.
- Given a greater insight into areas in which have and to a degree still incur excessive costs.
- Thus tighter contract control seems to have resulted.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- Too great an emphasis placed on 08.30 start time, with too great a penalty placed on say a single example of lateness over a month period.
- Increased D.O. Systems/Methods causing vital contract time to be used.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
- Provision of Clerks/Non-technical resource for D.O. Production areas (or say Tech Apprentices which worked well in the past) to assist in many relatively simple but time consuming tasks which currently have to be performed by engineers, e.g., drawing.
- Registers, correspondence registers, receipt registers, fax transmission, general

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting your performance.
- See 2 & 3
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

* Worked extensively on TRITON system
* Helped train others

********************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME B. MANLEY
GREEN AREA BRUNEL

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
* Increased awareness for all employees on
* How the contracts are proceeding

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
* People become specialised in one area of business
* I.e. PMIC/QUA/CRANES etc.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
* What is happening to CAD/Area?
* No tendering section - people used from green teams, pushing creating time scheduling problems

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
* Amount of time on TRITON restricts drawing and design work.

*********
3. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
   - We all have to make the new ideas work as well as possible.

CHANG IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME ______________________
GREEN AREA ________________

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   - There is very little formal change.
   - In the very technical work is approached so far.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   - The best of the actual person in general.
   - Areas of technical work in the division remain.
   - Problems are not necessarily directed to the next inside one.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   - Valuable experience and capabilities in the company.
   - Role of team leader's have been lost before.
   - Problems attention are proven to be effective.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   - Relation to working within one team.
   - Restrict the variety of
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
* After final meeting on team format the new format of the business contracts with many revised audit areas
* For a new regime of Directors / Managing Team, eliminating or adding to existing staff, base efficiency could be found.
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I would like to play a greater part in restoring 'A' grade and I feel I can do my work properly with this job in hand. I have received the support and encouragement for this purpose.

CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS

A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME D. COWELL

GREEN AREA Blockchain

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
* To concentrate funds and generally reduce a process
* Of doing that was set in to the system and
* Operation of the company

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
* It is necessary that employees work efficiently.
* The current situation of the company may be improved.
* There are many not be done. Everything is central. There is necessary to remove the feelings of notional.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
* The Symphony of a coordinating system was needed
* Provide valuable feedback on the effectiveness of technical solutions and demonstrate our product to the client
* In a professional manner!

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
* Internal systems are disjointed. Fragmented and cannot
* Be relied on and used to be built. Reduce into a series of separate tactical solutions, with focus and
* Increased difficulty observed

RETURN TO NED BUNN
The five questions below are about change in the business. How effective it is and where we can improve. For each of the five questions could you provide a response in the space provided.

NAME: [European Telco]

GREEN AREA BURLINGTON TELECOMMUNICATIONS

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   * In terms of reducing our whole costs, despite the total system being worthwhile.
   * The customer complaint handling process still requires improvement.
   * The need for better communication.
   * Only small increase in orders from the technical side.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   * None so far.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   * Better control inspection of outside suppliers and the quality of the materials delivered to site. Either from works or directly from suppliers works.
   * Quality - suppliers. Contact from electrical structural engineers.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   * The lack of support.
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
- INTRODUCTION AND PROMOTION OF GREEN AREA
- MEETINGS IN THE QUALITY FUNCTION
- FULL CO-OPERATION IN IMPLEMENTING THE CHANGES
- * SO FAR INTRODUCED.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2/12/92

CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: A. PLATER

GREEN AREA QUALITY

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- HAVE FOCUSED ATTENTION ON IMPORTANT ISSUES
- LEADING TO IMPROVEMENTS IN CONTRACTING AND DESIGN FUNCTIONS
- HAVE RESULTED IN GREATER INVOLVEMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN THE RUNNING OF THE BUSINESS

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- GREEN AREAS SHOULD HAVE BEEN SET UP IN ALL EDP AREAS AT THE SAME TIME, OR AT LEAST WITHIN A FEW WEEKS OF INCEPTION
- SLOWNESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE TRAINING AND SKILLS PROGRAMME
- *

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
- SALES TEAM IS (INADEQUATELY RESOURCED) LEADING TO SLOW RESPONSE TO ENQUIRIES AND LACK OF FAST CONTACT
- *

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
- QUALITY DEPT IS THE ONLY FUNCTION WITHIN EDP WITH RESPONSIBILITIES ACROSS THE BOARD FOR ALL OTHER DIVISIONS AND THIS HAS AN UNSETTLING EFFECT ON MY PERCEIVED FULL COMMITMENT TO EDP.
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
- Disciplines in dealing with subcontractors - current

********************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: Peter女
DATE: 14.1.93
GREEN AREA: Reuben

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- As I was not a member of R&D when the changes I cannot comment here but would note the following:
  a) Green area concept ignores communication discipline of the dedicated project team.
  b) There appears to be a more focused attitude to the projects now.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- Not really able to respond here except that certain key members of staff I have been laid off at critical times
  a) Gown working in railway right team.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
- Select commissioning of electrical info into project teams
- Training needs to be more flexible
- Inability diagnosis & matching of skills for site build - this is a very inefficient operation currently.
- Ad hoc allocation of tenders to project teams

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
- Understanding or Tolson system (swi is mainly in my court on this item)
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
- Nothing with regards to the new ideas but I have participated in the Green Area meetings.

NOTE:
As yet only the Green Area meetings have affected me, so my answers are brief.
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

The five questions below are about change in the business. How effective it is and where we can improve. For each of the five questions could you provide a response in the space provided.

NAME: Philip Light.

GREEN AREA: Q.A.

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- The green meetings have helped to solve problems quicker.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- None

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
- A monthly newsletter maybe a good idea to be distributed throughout the company so to keep everyone well informed of company policies and contracts, and so to eliminate any rumours.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
- Sometimes mistakes which are found whilst inspecting are reported verbally but are forgotten about and not corrected. This maybe solved if an in house rectification book was introduced. Then mistakes can be reported
3. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
- Fully contributed to the success of the Green Area Meetings

5. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
- Inter-divisional trading (subcontracting) procedures need to be clarified. We should not forget that although another division can be our customer, the satisfaction of the Morris customer is paramount.

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- The formation of project teams has encouraged staff to accept responsibility for the project.
- The design review meetings should result in standard designs that will lead to practices in all areas being standardised.
- The Green Area meetings have resulted in improved communication and cross fertilisation of ideas within the team.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- The pace of change has been slow, for instance the Green Area meetings are still not held in all areas of the division.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
- Inter-divisional trading (subcontracting) procedures need to be clarified. We should not forget that although another division can be our customer, the satisfaction of the Morris customer is paramount.

4. State any specific things that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
- We are not always informed of policy changes in other divisions even though the changes may affect
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME Glyn Isaac
GREEN AREA ___ QUALITY

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   - Green area meetings have vastly improved
   - Communications with management and shopfloor workers

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   - None as yet, will know better when implementation of machine shop movement is completed.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   - See above

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   - After inspecting work, continued amendment/changes causes repeat checking or work.
   - Why are amendments not found by design at an earlier date. This thus eliminating above.
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- By making total commitment to Green Area
- Teams to the betterment of the Company, and
- Improving my own work standards.

CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: M. Cooper
GREEN AREA E.P.D. Quality

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?

- Green Area meetings have helped immensely in communication between management and workers, and made individuals aware of efforts being made for orders and the difficulties in obtaining these amongst other things.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?

- Have no criticism as we shop lay out has not yet been implemented.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?

- I feel Green Area meetings should cover all areas of work.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.

- I cannot comment at the moment until movement has taken place.
5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?

- Being involved in creating assignment sequence processes for orders 
  from First Order to Final Finished Article.
- This will create tighter control on all aspects and involve
  contract managers at finalisation.
- Being involved in design discussion team, that being able to put
  ideas across and be involved in more detailed discussion on these areas.

***********************************************************************
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CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS
A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME: R. E. Cooper.

GREEN AREA: EDI Quality Dept.

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
- Teams have now been formed for each project, and leaders
  is now accountable for all aspects. This means closer
  liaison between all and also more interaction and input is obtained.
  Green Area Scheduling has been attended by the same team. This
  will help to identify any quality problems and effect improvements.

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
- Tension System is supposed to be a time saver, this may be so
  but why is a simple operation like time booking, which on
  our system was good, now have to be done as
  quickly by managers and supervisors, stressful and a great
cost to the company.

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not
   already been addressed?
- Buyer Control system or over-riding seems to be obsolete
  and is continually breaking down, this needs reasoning
  with a more reliable system, and more basic for
  everyday use.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting
   or adversely affecting your performance.
- Continuous arguments to dealings, causing delays on
  it is supposedly finished, this wasting time and money
  to scramble resources and people are losing moral and
doing in fitting and machine shop areas.
- Review limits and fit on spare parts etc. To prevent
  having to remaking at additional cost.

NAME: R. E. Cooper.

GREEN AREA: EDI Quality Dept.

2/12/92
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS

A SURVEY

THE FIVE QUESTIONS BELOW ARE ABOUT CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS. HOW EFFECTIVE IT IS AND WHERE WE CAN IMPROVE. FOR EACH OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS COULD YOU PROVIDE A RESPONSE IN THE SPACE PROVIDED.

NAME _______________________

GREEN AREA ____________

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   • Formation of project teams has helped people to take direct responsibility
   • Better standardisation of designs, working, manufacturing practices
   • Cost manufacturing reaurns will help end to learn as previously
   • Mistakes and evolve more effective designs & manufacturing processes

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   • We are not kept abreast of daily changes, e.g., we were all
     formally told at the EPC meeting that shop 45 have not
     been told that this is not now going to happen. This leads to
     rumours instead of facts being circulated

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   • Interpersonal training. It can be improved in some instances to
     treat other divisions as customers/businesses. Some of our clients will
     be manufactured to perform poorly as a result of learning areas now it
     should be transferred to the learning areas which is an initiative to continue

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   • Lack of information on effects of training on our area, e.g.
   • Will we have a terminal?

5. What have you contributed to the new ideas and their implementation?
   • Participation through the Green area meetings
   •
   •
   •
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Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any Other Comments

Could you identify the team that you are in?
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments

Could you identify the team that you are in? 

---
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

**Green Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

**Any Other Comments**

---

**Any Other Comments**

---

Could you identify the team that you are in **THE MIDAS TOUCH**.

---

Could you identify the team that you are in **MIDAS TOUCH**. 
CHANGE IN ENGINEERED PRODUCTS
GREEN AREAS

Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
5 4 3 2 1

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
   5 4 3 2 1

2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
   5 4 3 2 1

3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
   5 4 3 2 1

4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
   5 4 3 2 1

5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
   5 4 3 2 1

6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
   5 4 3 2 1

7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
   5 4 3 2 1

8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
   5 4 3 2 1

9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
   5 4 3 2 1

10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.
    5 4 3 2 1

Any Other Comments:

Any Other Comments: I don't attend that many meetings anymore now that I've moved to the US. I feel a bit out of the loop at a Green Mall such as this! However, I see a lot more green initiatives on a day by day basis now.

Could you identify the team that you are in Filing?

A. Branchford
**GREEN AREAS**

Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments: ____________________________

Could you identify the team that you are in: ________________

---

**CHANGE IN ENGINEERED PRODUCTS**

Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments: ____________________________

Could you identify the team that you are in: ________________

---

**MIDAS PERFORMANCE WOULD BE INCREASED IF WE HAD SOME DECKS TO PUT DECK ON WE NEED MORE THAN THE FLOOR!**

Could you identify the team that you are in: ________________

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments: LACK OF MMS TYPE COMMUNICATION.

Any Other Comments: IT IS DIFFICULT FOR ME TO ASSESS THE VALUE OF GREEN AREAS AS I HAVE NO PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE WITH OR MEMBERS OF THE TEAM. Could you identify the team that you are in? Yes.
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.

2. The green areas have improved team spirit.

3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.

4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.

5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.

6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.

7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.

8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.

9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.

10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments: 

Could you identify the team that you are in **Upper Limits**
CHANGE IN ENGINEERED PRODUCTS
GREEN AREAS

Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments-----------------------------

Could you identify the team that you are in?
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments

Could you identify the team that you are in: "Brunel Team."
**CHANGE IN ENGINEERED PRODUCTS**

**GREEN AREAS**

Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control. 5 (4) 3 2 1
2. The green areas have improved team spirit. 5 (4) 3 2 1
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team. 5 (4) 3 2 1
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams. 5 (4) 3 2 1
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general. 5 (4) 3 2 1
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured. 5 (4) 3 2 1
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas. 5 (4) 3 2 1
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business. 5 (4) 3 2 1
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs. 5 (4) 3 2 1
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management. 5 (4) 3 2 1

Any Other Comments: Initial management constructive momentum all evening lecture attempt to have roughly ended.

Could you identify the team that you are in? Brower Team.

Any Other Comments: I have tuned company can't judge if others have improved or not.
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

**Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neutral** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
---|---|---|---|---
5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments

Could you identify the team that you are in **A Team**.
CHANGE IN THE BUSINESS

A SURVEY

The five questions below are about change in the business. How effective it is and where we can improve. For each of the five questions could you provide a response in the space provided.

NAME: J & S Day

Green Area: A Team

1. What do you think the changes have done for the business?
   - Customer view is consistent with set out in terms.
   - I have greater awareness of events with 24 hour reporting system
   - Less time assuring commercial input on 0/0 decision
   - Easier to develop stronger level of team spirit/contract

2. If any, what criticisms do you have of the changes and their implementation?
   - Not a standard course in rapid reporting details
   - Too much discussion too much discussion that never went anywhere

3. What do you think needs urgent attention and has not already been addressed?
   - No. 2.

4. State any specific thing that you feel is restricting or adversely affecting your performance.
   - My core team member being extensively involved in travelling.

5. Could you fill this form in quite quickly by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Engineered Products</th>
<th>Green Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
   - 5 4 3 2 1

10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management
    - 5 4 3 2 1

Any Other Comments: ________________________________

Any Other Comments: ________________________________

Could you identify the team that...
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

Strongly Agree  Agree  Neutral  Disagree  Strongly Disagree
 5 4 3 2 1

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
   5 4 3 2 1

2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
   5 4 3 2 1

3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
   5 4 3 2 1

4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
   5 4 3 2 1

5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
   5 4 3 2 1

6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
   5 4 3 2 1

7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
   5 4 3 2 1

8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
   5 4 3 2 1

9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs.
   5 4 3 2 1

10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.
    5 4 3 2 1

Any Other Comments

Could you identify the team that you are in: [ ] TEAM
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments: ____________________________________________

Could you identify the team that you are in? [TEAM]
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments

Could you identify the team that you are in EPD
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments--------------------------------- ________________________________ 

Could you identify the team that you are in? Please identifier.
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

**Strongly Agree** | **Agree** | **Neutral** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree**
---|---|---|---|---
5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management

Any Other Comments-----------------------------------------------
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Could you identify the team that you are in?
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments-------------------------------

Could you identify the team that you are in: _____________________________

CHANGE IN ENGINEERED PRODUCTS
GREEN AREAS

CHANGE IN ENGINEERED PRODUCTS
GREEN AREAS
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments: 
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________
____________________________________________________

Could you identify the team that you are in STANDARD PRODUCTS?
CHANGE IN ENGINEERED PRODUCTS
GREEN AREAS

Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments

Could you identify the team that you are in Standard Product??
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

The scoring grid is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have improved team spirit.  
2. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.  
3. The green areas have improved communication between teams.  
4. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.  
5. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.  
6. The approach adopted by Morris to quality monitoring, assurance and control is excellent.  
7. The green areas are helping to improve the operation of the quality department.  
8. The Quality of the Morris Products are very good.  
9. The green areas will greatly improve training.  
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

ANY FURTHER COMMENTS---
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

The scoring grid is as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have improved team spirit.
2. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
3. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
4. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
5. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
6. The approach adopted by Morris to quality monitoring, assurance and control is excellent.
7. The green areas are helping to improve the operation of the quality department.
8. The green areas are helping to improve the feedback from management.
9. The green areas will greatly improve training.
10. The Quality of the Morris Products are very good.
11. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

ANY FURTHER COMMENTS---

Significantly more are than EDP gaps (between teams communication)
Feedback = neutral
Heavy - neutral with Morris train
Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

The scoring grid is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have significantly improved contract control.
2. The green areas have improved team spirit.
3. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
4. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
5. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
6. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
7. The technical skill base has been improved by the adoption of green areas.
8. The green areas have improved the overall performance of the business.
9. The green areas will greatly improve the assessment of training needs assessment.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

Any Other Comments

Could you identify the team that you are in? Sales

Green Areas in the Quality Department

Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

The scoring grid is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have improved team spirit.
2. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
3. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
4. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
5. The green areas have improved feedback from management.

Any Further Comments

Significantly more than EPD groups (higher perception communication)
GREEN AREAS IN THE QUALITY DEPARTMENT

Could you fill this form in, quite quickly, by putting a circle around the value that matches your opinion. The scoring grid is shown below. When you have finished return the form to N Burns.

The scoring grid is as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The green areas have improved team spirit.
2. The green areas have improved communication inside the team.
3. The green areas have improved communication between teams.
4. The green areas have improved communication about the business in general.
5. The green areas have enabled local team performance to be clearly identified and measured.
6. The approach adopted by Morris to quality monitoring, assurance and control is excellent.
7. The green areas are helping to improve the operation of the quality department.
8. The Quality of the Morris Products are very good.
9. The green areas will greatly improve training.
10. The green areas have improved the feedback from management.

ANY FURTHER COMMENTS---
DOES YOUR ORGANISATION MEASURE UP?

NAME: MARK COLE

POSITION AND DEPARTMENT: MANUFACTURING PROJECT ENGINEER

COMPANY: Bcoma Europe Ltd.

• PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GUAGE YOUR DEPARTMENTS PERFORMANCE?
  e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery

• DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? YES/NO

• ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? YES/NO

• WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?

• PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
  (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)

• IS RECEIPT OF THESE REWARDS CONDITIONAL UPON A CERTAIN LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE? YES/NO

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

• IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? YES/NO

• HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? YES/NO

• HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? YES/NO

• COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY AND CLEAR COMMUNICATION LINES? YES/NO

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

• LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR COMPANY OVERALL?

i. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.

ii. ROLE CULTURE: RELATES TO SITUATIONS WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.

iii. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY TEAMS MANAGING PROJECTS.

iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.
WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR DEPARTMENT?  TEAM...... (BIG.STYLE)

WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS

V. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.
vi. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION.
Vii. PARTICIPATIVE, DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT.
Viii. DELEGATING, RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU.

PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (√) OR FALSE (×).

THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:

i. FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR OWN PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT CONTROLLED BY THE ORGANISATION.
ii. CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS AS DEFINED BY THE ORGANISATION.
iii. HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED.
iv. ARE WELL MOTIVATED.
v. HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS.

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?

i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED.
ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND CRITICISED.
iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED.
iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED.
v. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE.

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:

i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY.
ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK.
iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS.
iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS.

WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

DO PEOPLE:

TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS?
TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES?
TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE?

YES/NO
YES/NO
YES/NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (√) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

COMMUNICATING OPENLY

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE.

COLLABORATING

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS.

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS.

MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS.

SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES.

RESPECTING/SUPPORTING

BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS.

ROLE FLEXIBILITY / FACILITATING

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE.

INQUIRING

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT.

EXPERIMENTING

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS.
NAME: Stephen Dicks

POSITION AND DEPARTMENT: PA TECHNICAL TO OPS DIRECTOR (NORTH)

COMPANY: SIGNALING CONTROL VIN. LTD

- PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENTS PERFORMANCE? e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery

- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? YES/NO...

- ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? YES/NO...

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?

- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
  (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)

- IS RECEIPT OF THESE REWARDS CONDITIONAL UPON A CERTAIN LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE? YES/NO...

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

- IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? YES/NO...

- HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? YES/NO...

- HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? YES/NO...

- COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY AND CLEAR COMMUNICATION LINES? YES/NO...

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR COMPANY OVERALL?

  i. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.

  ii. ROLE CULTURE: RELATES TO SITUATIONS WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.

  iii. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY TEAMS MANAGING PROJECTS.

  iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.
- WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR DEPARTMENT?

- WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  
  V. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.
  VI. SELLING - YOU EXPLAINS DECISIONS AND PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION.
  VII. PARTICIPATIVE: DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY THE YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT.
  VIII. DELEGATING: RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU.

- PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (√) OR FALSE (X).

  THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. ...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR OWN PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT CONTROLLED BY THE ORGANISATION.
  ii. ...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS AS DEFINED BY THE ORGANISATION.
  iii. ...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED.
  IV. ...ARE WELL MOTIVATED.
  V. ...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS.

  THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED.
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND IS CRITICISED.
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED.
  IV. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED.
  V. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE.

  THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY.
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK.
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS.
  IV. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS.

- WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

  DO PEOPLE:
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS?
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES?
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE?

  YES/NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

- FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (√) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

  COMMUNICATING OPENLY
  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE.

  COLLABORATING
  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS.

  TAKING RESPONSIBILITY
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS.

  MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS.

  SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES.

  RESPECTING/SUPPORTING ROLE FLEXIBILITY / FACILITATING INQUIRING
  BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS.

  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE.

  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT.

  EXPERIMENTING
  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS.
DOES YOUR ORGANISATION MEASURE UP?

NAME: John McCallum

POSITION AND DEPARTMENT: Design Engineer - Offshore Engineering Dept.

COMPANY: Coplexip Stena Offshore Ltd.

1. PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENTS PERFORMANCE?
   e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery

2. DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? 
   YES/NO

3. ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? 
   YES/NO

4. WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?

5. PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
   e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave

6. IS RECEIPT OF THESE REWARDS CONDITIONAL UPON A CERTAIN LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE? 
   YES/NO

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

7. IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? 
   YES/NO

8. HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? 
   YES/NO

9. HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? 
   YES/NO

10. COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY AND CLEAR COMMUNICATION LINES? 
    YES/NO

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR COMPANY OVERALL?

i. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.

ii. ROLE CULTURE: RELATES TO SITUATIONS WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.

iii. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY TEAMS MANAGING PROJECTS.

iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.
WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR DEPARTMENT?

WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS

• TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED
• TELLING - YOU EXPLAINS DECISIONS AND PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION
• PARTICIPATIVE: DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY THE YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT
• DELEGATING: RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU

PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (✗).

THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:

• FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR OWN PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT CONTROLLED BY THE ORGANISATION
• CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS AS DEFINED BY THE ORGANISATION
• HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED
• ARE WELL MOTIVATED
• HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?

• GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED
• ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND IS CRITICISED
• THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY Follows THE EVENT BEING MEASURED
• SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED
• FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:

• THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY
• PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK
• THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS
• THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS

WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

DO PEOPLE:

• TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS?
• TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES?
• TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE?

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (✓) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

COMMUNICATING OPENLY

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE

COLLABORATING

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS

MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS

SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

RESPECTING/SUPPORTING ROLE FLEXIBILITY

BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS

FACILITATING INQUIRING

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

EXPERIMENTING

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS
NAME: T. J. Brown

COMPANY: Laporte Alpha Gay Ltd

• PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?
e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery

- Panary IM's speed on business case
- Finance
- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED?

- ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED?

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?

A 'trip is acceptable (not serious) only if

The context of underlying company implement

- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
(e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)

- ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS?

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

- IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL?

- HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS?

- HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS?

- COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY?

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?

  i. Power culture: found where senior managers exert considerable influence and power within the organisation. The managers are likely to manage in an autocratic way.

  ii. Role culture: applies where positions within the organisations are the focal point of attention. The demands of bureaucracy (e.g. compliance with rules) are prominent.

  iii. Team culture: applies where the organisation has values and mechanisms to integrate people within teams. It promotes successful completion of projects by self-managing teams.

  iv. Achievement culture: values success and personal growth. The climate encourages people to exercise initiative in conditions of high levels of autonomy.

WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL?  (i - iv)
• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  i. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.
  ii. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION
  iii. PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT
  iv. DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO STAFF

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (✗).
  THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. ...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS
  ii. ...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED
  iii. ...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS
  iv. ...ARE WELL MOTIVATED
  v. ...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND IS CRITICISED
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED
  iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED
  v. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS
  iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?
  DO PEOPLE:
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS? YES/NO
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES? YES/NO
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE? YES/NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (✓) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

  COMMUNICATING OPENLY  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE
  COLLABORATING  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS
  TAKING RESPONSIBILITY  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS
  MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS
  SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES
  RESPECTING/SUPPORTING ROLE FLEXIBILITY / FACILITATING INQUIRING  BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT
  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS

EXPERIMENTING
HOW WE ARE MEASURED IS HOW WE BEHAVE...

NAME: Steven J. Patterson
POSITION: Chief Development & Environment (Due Ltd)
COMPANY: BTR Environment (Due Ltd)

• PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?
  e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery
  Number of projects handled
  No. of customer complaints processed
  No. of support & production tasks performed

• DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? YES/NO

• ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? YES/NO

• WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?
  Discussion of problem areas, encouragement & improved

• PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
  e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave
  Bonus payments - direct production operators only
  Commission - sales & engineers only
  Profit related pay

• ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS? YES/NO

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

• IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? YES/NO

• HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? YES/NO

• HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? YES/NO

• COULD YOUR DEPARTMENT'S STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY? YES/NO

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

• LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?

  i. Power culture: found where senior managers exert considerable influence and power within the organisation. the managers are likely to manage in an autocratic way. ☐
  ii. Role culture: applies where positions within the organisations are the focal point of attention. the demands of bureaucracy (e.g. compliance with rules) are prominent. ☐
  iii. Team culture: applies where the organisation has values and mechanisms to integrate people within teams. it promotes successful completion of projects by self-managing teams. ☑
  iv. Achievement culture: values success and personal growth. the climate encourages people to exercise initiative in conditions of high levels of autonomy. ☐

 WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL? ☑ Team culture
• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS  
  i. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED  
  
  ii. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION  
  
  iii. PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT  
  
  iv. DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU  

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (√) OR FALSE (×).  
  THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:  
  i. ...CAREFULLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS  
  
  ii. ...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED  
  
  iii. ...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS  
  
  iv. ...ARE WELL MOTIVATED  
  
  v. ...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS  

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?  
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED  
  
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND CRITICISED  
  
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED  
  
  iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED  
  
  v. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE  

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:  
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY  
  
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK  
  
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS  
  
  iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS  

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?  
  DO PEOPLE:  
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS?  
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES?  
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE?  

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:  

---------------------------------------------------------------  
---------------------------------------------------------------  
---------------------------------------------------------------  
---------------------------------------------------------------  

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (√) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:  

COMMUNICATING OPENLY  
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE.  

COLLABORATING  
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS.  

TAking RESPONSIBILITY  
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS.  

MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION  
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS.  

SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY  
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES.  

RESPECTING/SupportING  
BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS.  

ROLE FLEXIBILITY / Facilitating  
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE.  

INQUIRING  
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT.  

EXPERIMENTING  
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS.
### HOW WE ARE MEASURED IS HOW WE BEHAVE...

**NAME:** Mr Tony Ford  
**POSITION:** Quality Manager  
**DEPARTMENT:** Quality Dept  
**COMPANY:** Truworths Casters Ltd - Leicester

- **PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?**  
  - e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery  
  - Acceptance/Completion - Billings is Value of Shipment  
  - Sales - Bookings is Not Order Value Received

- **DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED?**  
  - Yes/No

- **ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED?**  
  - Yes/No

- **WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?**  
  - Departmental Bonus, Not Rewards

- **PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:**  
  - (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)  
  - **Departmental Bonus** Scheme

- **ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS?**  
  - Yes/No

**IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:**  
**Performance set on a 7% increase on previous months**

- **IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL?**  
  - Yes/No

- **HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS?**  
  - Yes/No

- **HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS?**  
  - Yes/No

- **COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY?**  
  - Yes/No

- **PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (✓)**

- **LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?**
  
  i. **Power Culture:** Found where senior managers exert considerable influence and power within the organisation. The managers are likely to manage in an autocratic way.  
  
  ii. **Role Culture:** Applies where positions within the organisation are the focal point of attention. The demands of bureaucracy (e.g., compliance with rules) are prominent.  
  
  iii. **Team Culture:** Applies where the organisation has values and mechanisms to integrate people within teams. It promotes successful completion of projects by self-managing teams.  
  
  iv. **Achievement Culture:** Values success and personal growth. The climate encourages people to exercise initiative in conditions of high levels of autonomy.

**Which type of culture best describes your company overall?**

- Culture No. iv
• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  i. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.
  ii. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION
  iii. PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT
  iv. DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (✗).

THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. ...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS
  ii. ...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED
  iii. ...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS
  iv. ...ARE WELL MOTIVATED

V: ...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND CRITICISED
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED
  iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED
  v. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS
  iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?
  DO PEOPLE:
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS? ✓
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES? ✓
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE? ✓

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (✓) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

  COMMUNICATING OPENLY BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE
  COLLABORATING BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOVLEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS
  TAKING RESPONSIBILITY BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS
  MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS
  SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES
  RESPECTING/SUPPORTING BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS
  ROLE FLEXIBILITY/FACILITATING BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE
  INQUIRING BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT
  EXPERIMENTING BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS
HOW WE ARE MEASURED IS HOW WE BEHAVE...

NAME: F. G. Wills

POSITION: DEPUTY MD

COMPANY: CORM RASTICS LTD, LOUGHBOROUGH DISTRICT TECHNICAL, LEICs, LE6 9BW

• PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?
  (e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery)

1. NON-COMPLIANCE INTERNEAL AND CUSTOMER BASED AROUND THE TARGET
   PPM FIGURE (1000). THIS FIGURE IS SET ANNUALLY.

2. PRODUCTION EFFICIENCIES

• DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? YES/NO

• ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? YES/NO

• WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?
  PPMs, PLAN AND PRODUCTION EFFICIENCIES ABSURDNESS TRAINING NEEDS ARE ALL DISCUSSED AT REGULAR CELL MEETINGS. AREAS OF PRO CEMARY ARE HIGHLIGHTED, THEN A CORRECTIVE ACTION PLAN RAISED

• PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
  (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)
  
  COMPANY PRP SCHEME, SALES BONUS SCHEME, SUGGESTION SCHEME, PAY INCENTIVE FOR... TVRS

• ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS? YES/NO

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

  COMPANY TARGETS AND GOALS ARE... SET ANNUALLY... EACH DEPARTMENT AND AREA WORKS UNDER IT, HUGS TEAM TO ACHIEVE. THIS IS GIVEN IN A PRESENTATION TO THE WHOLE ORGANISATION

• IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? YES/NO

• HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? YES/NO

• HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? YES/NO

• COULD YOUR DEPARTMENT'S STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY? YES/NO

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

• LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?

  i. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.
  □

  ii. ROLE CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.
  □

  iii. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY SELF-MANAGING TEAMS.
  □

  iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.
  □

  WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL?...

  [Cell working...]
• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  i. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.
  ii. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION
  iii. PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT
  iv. DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (✗).

  THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. ...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS
  ii. ...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED
  iii. ...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS
  iv. ...ARE WELL MOTIVATED
  v. ...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND Rewarded
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND IS CRITICISED
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED
  iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED
  v. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS
  iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

  DO PEOPLE:
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS?
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES?
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE?

  IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

  ..............................................................................................................................................................................

  ..............................................................................................................................................................................

  ..............................................................................................................................................................................

  ..............................................................................................................................................................................

  ..............................................................................................................................................................................

  ..............................................................................................................................................................................

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (✓) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

  COMMUNICATING OPENLY
  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE

  COLLABORATING
  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS

  TAKING RESPONSIBILITY
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS

  MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS

  SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

  RESPECTING/SUPPORTING
  BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS

  ROLE FLEXIBILITY / FACILITATING INQUIRING
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

  EXPERIMENTING
  BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS
Victoria Hanna & Prof. Neil Burns Department of Manufacturing Engineering Loughborough University Leics. LE11 3TU

HOW WE ARE MEASURED IS HOW WE BEHAVE...

NAME: John Coursey-Hall
POSITION: Q.A. Manager
DEPARTMENT: Quality Inspection
COMPANY: Koby Engineers Ltd

- PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?
  e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery
  
  Customer Returns, In-house Defects, Supplier Rejects.

- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? YES/NO?

- ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? YES/NO?

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?

- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
  (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)
  Weekly, Merlin Bonus.

- ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS? YES/NO.

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

- IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? YES/NO.

- HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? YES/NO.

- HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? YES/NO.

- COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY? YES/NO.

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?
  i. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.
  ii. ROLE CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.
  iii. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY SELF-MANAGING TEAMS.
  iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE 'CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.

WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL? As Above.
• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  i. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED. □
  ii. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION □
  iii. PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT □
  iv. DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU □

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (×).

  THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. ...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS ✓
  ii. ...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED ✓
  iii. ...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS □
  iv. ...ARE WELL MOTIVATED ✓
  v. ...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS □

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED ✓
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND IS CRITICISED □
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY follows THE EVENT being MEASURED ✓
  iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED □
  v. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE □

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY □
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK □
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS □
  iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS □

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?
  DO PEOPLE:
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS? YES/NO
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES? YES/NO
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE? YES/NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:


• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (✓) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

  COMMUNICATING OPENLY
  BEHAVIOURS PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE ✓

  COLLABORATING
  BEHAVIOURS PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE IN卷VOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS ✓

  TAKING RESPONSIBILITY
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS ✓

  MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS ✓

  SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES ✓

  RESPECTING/SUPPORTING
  BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS ✓

  ROLE FLEXIBILITY /
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE ✓

  FACILITATING
  BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT ✓

  EXPLORING
  BEHAVIOURS PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS
DOES YOUR ORGANISATION MEASURE UP?

NAME: DEAN

POSITION AND DEPARTMENT: CONTROL ENGINEER / BULK HANDLING

COMPANY: GE-ENGINEERING SYSTEMS

- PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?
  e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery

- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? YES/NO

- ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? YES/NO

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?

- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
  (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)

- IS RECEIPT OF THESE REWARDS CONDITIONAL UPON A CERTAIN LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE? YES/NO

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

- IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? YES/NO

- HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? YES/NO

- HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? YES/NO

- COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY AND CLEAR COMMUNICATION LINES? YES/NO

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR COMPANY CULTURE?

  i. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.
  ii. ROLE CULTURE: RELATES TO ORGANISATIONS WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.
  iii. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY TEAMS MANAGING PROJECTS.
  iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.
• WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR DEPARTMENT?  

• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  I. TELLING
  II. SELLING
  III. PARTICIPATIVE
  IV. DELEGATING:

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (✗).

  THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. ...feel they can control their own performance, it is not controlled by the organisation
  ii. ...clearly understand the requirements of their jobs as defined by the organisation
  iii. ...have sufficient knowledge and skills to complete tasks as well as expected
  iv. ...are well motivated
  v. ...have good terms & conditions e.g. fair pay, reasonable working conditions

  THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. Good performance is clearly recognised and rewarded
  ii. Only poor performance is recognised and is criticised
  iii. The feedback from me is rapid and closely follows the event being measured
  iv. Sufficient feedback is received from the work itself no more is required
  v. Feedback is given by myself or peers that helps improve performance

  THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. The tasks people are involved in have a high degree of variety
  ii. People have responsibility for a complete program of work
  iii. The tasks they perform are significant in helping the company meet its goals
  iv. They have considerable autonomy in completing tasks

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

DO PEOPLE:
  Try to avoid doing things?  YES/NO
  Try to avoid blame for mistakes?  YES/NO
  Try to avoid any part in change?  YES/NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (✓) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

  Communicating Openly
  Collaborating
  Taking Responsibility
  Maintaining a Shared Vision
  Solving Problems Effectively
  Respecting/Supporting Role Flexibility/Facilitating Inquiring Experimenting

  Behaviour promoting or reflecting the direct giving and receiving of information relevant to getting the job done
  Behaviour promoting or reflecting the involvement of relevant persons in the processes of identifying and solving problems
  Behaviours reflecting acceptance of responsibility and taking initiative in carrying out organisational tasks
  Behaviours reflecting a clear commitment to organisational philosophy, values and purposes and a commitment to high standards
  Behaviours reflecting a problem solving orientation to difficult organisational issues
  Behaviours demonstrating respect and support for others as worthwhile individuals
  Behaviours reflecting flexibility and the ability to change roles/tasks to improve performance
  Behaviours reflecting a probing, inquiring, diagnostic orientation to the organisation and its environment
  Behaviour promoting or reflecting an openness to trying new things
HOW WE ARE MEASURED IS HOW WE BEHAVE...

NAME: LIAM MCDONNELL
POSITION: CUSTOMER ENGINEER
COMPANY: APPLIED MATERIALS

- PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?
e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery

EQUIPMENT DOWNTIME, CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? YES/NO

- ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? THEY ARE COMMUNICATED? YES/NO

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?
Objective may be re-put in progress (e.g. back dates), the course will be examined & reasons established to prevent recurrence

- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
(e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)

performance related, promotion, pay rise, profit sharing

- ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS? YES/NO

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:
Achieve 100% customer satisfaction, increase revenue, reduce costs
End in general do everything better!

- IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? YES/NO

- HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? YES/NO

- HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? YES/NO

- COULD YOUR DEPARTMENT'S STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY? YES/NO

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?

i. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.

ii. ROLE CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.

iii. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY SELF-MANAGING TEAMS.

iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.

WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL? ACHIEVEMENT
• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  i. TELLING - A Directive APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED
  ii. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR clarification
  iii. PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT
  iv. DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO STAFF

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (√) OR FALSE (x).

THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. ...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS
  ii. ...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED
  iii. ...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS
  iv. ...ARE WELL MOTIVATED
  V. ...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND IS CRITICISED
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY Follows THE EVENT BEING MEASURED
  iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED
  V. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS
  iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?
DO PEOPLE:
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS? YES/NO
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES? YES/NO
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE? YES/NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

All people are motivated to change & will try to avoid blame

...that it will affect their promotion pay this @ 75% annual

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (√) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

COMMUNICATING OPENLY
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE

COLLABORATING
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS

MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS

SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

RESPECTING/SUPPORTING
BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS

ROLE FLEXIBILITY / FACILITATING
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

INQUIRING
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

EXPERIMENTING
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS
HOW WE ARE MEASURED IS HOW WE BEHAVE...

NAME: P. Utall

POSITION: MANUFACTURING MANAGER

COMPANY: REWU & SHARPES LTD.

- PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?
  e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery
  Depending on the nature of the work operation, individuals of the original department are monitored for; quality, grade, P.M.

  Any reason for results.

- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED?...YES/NO.

- ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED?...

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?
  Reasons for poor results are investigated. What happens depends on the situation. However, reasons are given to personnel concerned.

- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
  (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)

  Reward based on gifts. Long service bonus at Christmas, or employee of the year shield and cheque.

- ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS?...YES/NO.

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

NO STATED GOAL

IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL?...YES/NO.

HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS?...YES/NO.

HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS?...YES/NO.

COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY?...YES/NO.

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?

  i. POWER CULTURE: Found where senior managers exert considerable influence and power within the organisation. The managers are likely to manage in an authoritative way.

  ii. ROLE CULTURE: Applies where positions within the organisation are the focal point of attention. The demands of bureaucracy (e.g. compliance with rules) are prominent.

  iii. TEAM CULTURE: Applies where the organisation has values and mechanisms to integrate people within teams. It promotes successful completion of projects by self-managing teams.

  iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: Values success and personal growth. The climate encourages people to exercise initiative in conditions of high levels of autonomy.

WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL?...
WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS

I. TELLING - A Directive approach, specific instructions are provided.
II. SELLING - You explain decisions and provides opportunities for clarification.
III. PARTICIPATIVE: Decision making is facilitated by the you rather than carried out.
IV. DELEGATING: Responsibility is turned over to you.

PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (✗).

THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:

I. ...feel they can control their own performance, it is not controlled by the organisation.
II. ...clearly understand the requirements of their jobs as defined by the organisation.
III. ...have sufficient knowledge and skills to complete tasks as well as expected.
IV. ...are well motivated.
V. ...have good terms & conditions e.g. fair pay, reasonable working conditions.

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?

I. Good performance is clearly recognised and rewarded.
II. Only poor performance is recognised and is criticised.
III. The feedback from me is rapid and closely follows the event being measured.
IV. Sufficient feedback is received from the task itself / they know when they have done well.
V. Feedback is given by myself or peers that helps improve performance.

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:

I. The tasks people are involved in have a high degree of variety.
II. People have responsibility for a complete program of work.
III. The tasks they perform are significant in helping the company meet its goals.
IV. They have considerable autonomy in completing tasks.

WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

DO PEOPLE:

- Try to avoid doing things? YES NO
- Try to avoid blame for mistakes? YES NO
- Try to avoid any part in change? YES NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

- Communication... behaviour promoting or reflecting the direct giving and receiving of information relevant to getting the job done.
- Collaborating... behaviour promoting or reflecting the involvement of relevant persons in the processes of identifying and solving problems.
- Taking responsibility... behaviours reflecting acceptance of responsibility and taking initiative in carrying out organisational tasks.
- Maintaining a shared vision... behaviours reflecting a clear commitment to organisational philosophy, values and purposes and a commitment to high standards.
- Solving problems... behaviours reflecting a problem solving orientation to difficult organisational issues.
- Effectively... behaviours demonstrating respect and support for others as worthwhile individuals.
- Role flexibility... behaviours reflecting flexibility and the ability to change roles/tasks to improve performance.
- Facilitating... behaviours reflecting a probing, inquiring, diagnostic orientation to the organisation and its environment.
- Experimenting... behaviour promoting or reflecting an openness to trying new things.
Listed below are four types of organisational culture. Please indicate with a cross the one which is the most accurate description of your company overall:

i. **Power Culture**: Found where senior managers exert considerable influence and power within the organisation. The managers are likely to manage in an autocratic way.

ii. **Role Culture**: Relates to situations where positions within the organisations are the focal point of attention. The demands of bureaucracy (e.g., compliance with rules) are prominent.

iii. **Team Culture**: Applies where the organisation has values & mechanisms to integrate people within teams. It promotes successful completion of projects by teams managing projects.

iv. **Achievement Culture**: Values success and personal growth. The climate encourages people to exercise initiative in conditions of high levels of autonomy.

Which type of culture best describes your department? (not mutually exclusive)
WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS

TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.

SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION.

PARTICIPATIVE: DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY THE YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT.

DELEGATING: RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU.

PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (✗)

IN MY DEPARTMENT:

✓...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR OWN PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT CONTROLLED BY THE ORGANISATION.

✗...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS AS DEFINED BY THE ORGANISATION.

✓...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED.

✗...ARE WELL MOTIVATED.

✗...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS.

WHAT OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?

✓...GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED.

✗...ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND CRITICISED.

✓...THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED.

✓...SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE TASK ITSELF / THEY KNOW WHEN THEY HAVE DONE WELL.

✗...FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE.

WHAT ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:

✓...THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY.

✓...PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK.

✓...THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS.

✓...THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS.

WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

DO PEOPLE:

✓...TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS?

✗...TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES?

✗...TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE?

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

FINALLY CONSIDER THE CHARACTERISTICS DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WHICH ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

COMMUNICATING OPENLY

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING HIS JOB DONE.

COLLABORATING

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS.

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY

BEHAVIOURS REFL ecting ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS.

MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION

BEHAVIOURS REFL ecting A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS.

SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY

BEHAVIOURS REFL ecting A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES.

RESPECTING/SUPPORTING ROLE FLEXIBILITY/

BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS.

FACILITATING

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE.

INQUIRING

BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT.

EXPERIMENTING

BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS.
NAME: MR. D. BARLOW
POSITION: HEAD OF NAMAS LAB DEPARTMENT: INSPECTION
COMPANY: BROWN & SHARPE LTD (PRECISION MEASURING INSTRUMENTS)

- PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENTS PERFORMANCE?
e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery
  - GAUGES .. INSPECTED .. PER .. HOURS .. AUTOMATICALLY .. CALCULATED
  - LEAD .. TIMES .. FOR .. WORK .. TO .. PASS .. THROUGH .. INSPECTION .. MEASURED .. MEASU
  - EXTERNAL REJECTS .. MONITORED .. CLOSELY

- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? YES/NO

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?
  - COMPLAINATIONS .. ABOUT .. THE .. METHODS .. OF .. DATA .. COLLECTION .. POOR .. MORALE

- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES: (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)
  - BONUS .. SCHEME .. LINKED .. TO .. PROFITS .. AND .. PAID .. QUARTERLY .. EMPLOYEE'S .. OF .. THE .. YEAR .. 1ST .. AND .. 2ND .. PLACE .. WITH .. FINANCIAL .. REWARDS

- ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS? YES/NO

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:
  - TO .. ENSURE .. THAT .. THE .. PRODUCT .. REACHING .. THE .. CUSTOMER .. MEET THE .. SPECIFICATION .. REQUIRED .. IN .. 100% .. OF .. ORDERS .. ETC.

- IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? YES/NO

- HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? YES/NO

- HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? YES/NO

- COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY? YES/NO

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (\+)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?
  - POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.
  - ROLE CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.
  - TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY SELF-MANAGING TEAMS.
  - ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.

WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL? ROLE CULTURE
• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  i. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.
  ii. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION
  iii. PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT
  iv. DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TURNED OVER TO YOU

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (✓) OR FALSE (✗).

THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS
  ii. HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED
  iii. FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS
  iv. ARE WELL MOTIVATED
  v. HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND CRITICISED
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED
  iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED
  v. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS
  iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

DO PEOPLE:
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS? YES/NO
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES? YES/NO
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE? YES/NO

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

 WILL PUT OFF TASKS THAT COULD BE DONE TODAY UNTIL LATER AND THEN FORGET THEM

"BLAME" CULTURE APPEARS TO BE THE NORM AT MOST COMPANIES, WHY ACCEPT IT YOURSELF WHEN IT CAN BE SHIFTED?

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (✓) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

COMMUNICATING OPENLY BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE

COLLABORATING BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS

MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS

SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

RESPECTING/SUPPORTING BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHWHILE INDIVIDUALS

ROLE FLEXIBILITY/FACILITATING BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

INQUIRING BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBING, INQUIRING, DIAGNOSTIC ORIENTATION TO THE ORGANISATION AND ITS ENVIRONMENT

EXPERIMENTING BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS
NAME: MR. DAVID RICHARDSON

POSITION: SENIOR CHEMIST

DEPARTMENT: DEVELOPMENT

COMPANY: J. BOWES (ENGINEERING COMPANY)

- PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENT'S PERFORMANCE?
  e.g. Contract completions, time to market, number of non-conformances
  
  PERCENT OF WORK COMPLETED ON TARGET (PREVIOUS 12 MONTH PERIOD)
  
  PERCENT OF WORK COMPLETED ON TARGET (CUMULATING)

- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED?
  YES

- ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED?
  YES

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?

- ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN BASED DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS?
  YES

- ON THE PERFORMANCE OF THE COMPANY AS A WHOLE?
  IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:

- IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL?
  YES

- HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS?
  NO

- HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS?
  NO

- COULD YOUR DEPARTMENT'S STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY?
  YES

LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?

1. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY.

2. ROLE CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATION ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT.

3. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY SELF-MANAGING TEAMS.

4. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY.

WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL?

I. POWER

II. ROLE

III. TEAM

IV. ACHIEVEMENT

WITH HINT: I...
What would your management style be described as?

i. Telling - a directive approach, specific instructions are provided
ii. Selling - you explain decisions and provide opportunities for clarification
iii. Participative - decision making is facilitated by you rather than carried out
iv. Delegating - responsibility is turned over to staff

Think of the feedback that people receive about their performance?

i. Good performance is clearly recognised and rewarded
ii. Only poor performance is recognised and is criticised
iii. The feedback from me is rapid and closely follows the event being measured
iv. Sufficient feedback is received from the work itself, no more is required
v. Feedback is given by myself or peers that helps improve performance

Think about the jobs that people do:

i. The tasks people are involved in have a high degree of variety
ii. People have responsibility for a complete program of work
iii. The tasks they perform are significant in helping the company meet its goals
iv. They have considerable autonomy in completing tasks

What negative behaviour can be found in your department?

Do people:

Try to avoid doing things?
Try to avoid blame for mistakes?
Try to avoid any part in change?

If you said yes to any of the above please describe what they do:

Try to pass the blame onto someone else

Finally consider the responses described below and indicate with a tick (✓) any that are found in your department:

Communicating Openly

Behaviour promoting or reflecting the direct giving and receiving of information relevant to getting the job done

Collaborating

Behaviour promoting or reflecting the involvement of relevant persons in the processes of identifying and solving problems

Taking Responsibility

Behaviours reflecting acceptance of responsibility and taking initiative in carrying out organisational tasks

Maintaining a Shared Vision

Behaviours reflecting a clear commitment to organisational philosophy, values and purposes and a commitment to high standards

Solving Problems Effectively

Behaviours reflecting a problem-solving orientation to difficult organisational issues

Respecting/Supporting

Behaviours demonstrating respect and support for others as worthwhile individuals

Role Flexibility / Facilitating Inquiring

Behaviours reflecting flexibility and the ability to change roles/tasks to improve performance

Behaviours reflecting a probing, inquiring, diagnostic orientation to the organisation and its environment

Behaviour promoting or reflecting an openness to trying new things

The division is usually quite forward thinking in its approach but is sometimes

Thank you
NAME: P.J. WHITE

POSITION: TECHNICAL DIRECTOR...DEPARTMENT...ENGINEERING SERVICES

COMPANY: Pearce Rent L.T.D.

- PLEASE LIST THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE USED TO GAUGE YOUR DEPARTMENTS PERFORMANCE?
e.g. Contracts completed to time or cost, number of non-conformances or on-time delivery
   - Completion of contracts within timescale and budget
   - Satisfactory commissioning of plant

- DO YOUR STAFF UNDERSTAND HOW THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES ARE CALCULATED? .................... ✓ YES/NO ...

- ARE THE RESULTS OF THE PERFORMANCE MEASURES DISPLAYED? .......................................................... ✓ YES/NO ...

- WHAT HAPPENS WHEN THE RESULTS ARE POOR?
  Investigative meetings held usually with Senior Management to determine what went wrong, i.e., why the job took longer, late costs, why in the customer not totally satisfied, why are we delayed, from completion of works on site.

- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE REWARD SCHEMES THAT YOUR ORGANISATION OPERATES:
  (e.g. Bonus payments or additional leave)

- ARE THE REWARDS GIVEN DIRECTLY UPON PERFORMANCE MEASURE RESULTS? .................... ✓ YES/NO ...

IF YOUR DEPARTMENT HAS AN OVERALL GOAL OR TARGET PLEASE DETAIL IT BELOW:
To ensure that the...project...specified...by...the...customer...is...engineered...and...commissioned...to...meet...expectation...and...to...our...benefit...

- IS THE PERFORMANCE OF YOUR DEPARTMENT DEPENDANT ON FACTORS OUTSIDE ITS CONTROL? .................... ✓ YES/NO ...

- HAVE THE PEOPLE IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN TOGETHER LONGER THAN THREE YEARS? .................... ✓ YES/NO ...

- HAS YOUR DEPARTMENT UNDERGONE RE-ORGANISATION WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS? .................... ✓ YES/NO ...

- COULD YOUR DEPARTMENTS STRUCTURE BE DESCRIBED AS FLAT, THAT IS WITH THREE OR LESS LEVELS OF HIERARCHY? .................... ✓ YES/NO ...

PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER WITH A TICK (√)

- LISTED BELOW ARE FOUR TYPES OF ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE, WHICH IS THE MOST ACCURATE DESCRIPTION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT?

i. POWER CULTURE: FOUND WHERE SENIOR MANAGERS EXERT CONSIDERABLE INFLUENCE AND POWER WITHIN THE ORGANISATION. THE MANAGERS ARE LIKELY TO MANAGE IN AN AUTOCRATIC WAY. ☐

ii. ROLE CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE POSITIONS WITHIN THE ORGANISATIONS ARE THE FOCAL POINT OF ATTENTION. THE DEMANDS OF BUREAUCRACY (E.G. COMPLIANCE WITH RULES) ARE PROMINENT. ✓

iii. TEAM CULTURE: APPLIES WHERE THE ORGANISATION HAS VALUES AND MECHANISMS TO INTEGRATE PEOPLE WITHIN TEAMS. IT PROMOTES SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF PROJECTS BY SELF-MANAGING TEAMS. ☐

iv. ACHIEVEMENT CULTURE: VALUES SUCCESS AND PERSONAL GROWTH. THE CLIMATE ENCOURAGES PEOPLE TO EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN CONDITIONS OF HIGH LEVELS OF AUTONOMY. ☐

WHICH TYPE OF CULTURE BEST DESCRIBES YOUR COMPANY OVERALL? ¡ Yes culture
• WHAT WOULD YOUR MANAGEMENT STYLE BE DESCRIBED AS
  i. TELLING - A DIRECTIVE APPROACH, SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS ARE PROVIDED.
  ii. SELLING - YOU EXPLAIN DECISIONS AND PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR CLARIFICATION
  iii. PARTICIPATIVE - DECISION MAKING IS FACILITATED BY YOU RATHER THAN CARRIED OUT
  iv. DELEGATING - RESPONSIBILITY IS TurnED OVER TO YOU

• PLEASE READ THE STATEMENTS BELOW AND INDICATE WHETHER THEY ARE TRUE (√) OR FALSE (x).

THE PEOPLE IN MY DEPARTMENT:
  i. ...CLEARLY UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THEIR JOBS
  ii. ...HAVE SUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS TO COMPLETE TASKS AS WELL AS EXPECTED
  iii. ...FEEL THEY CAN CONTROL THEIR PERFORMANCE, IT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON OTHERS
  iv. ...ARE WELL MOTIVATED
  v. ...HAVE GOOD TERMS & CONDITIONS E.G. FAIR PAY, REASONABLE WORKING CONDITIONS

THINK OF THE FEEDBACK THAT PEOPLE RECEIVE ABOUT THEIR PERFORMANCE?
  i. GOOD PERFORMANCE IS CLEARLY RECOGNISED AND REWARDED
  ii. ONLY POOR PERFORMANCE IS RECOGNISED AND IS CRITICISED
  iii. THE FEEDBACK FROM ME IS RAPID AND CLOSELY FOLLOWS THE EVENT BEING MEASURED
  iv. SUFFICIENT FEEDBACK IS RECEIVED FROM THE WORK ITSELF NO MORE IS REQUIRED
  v. FEEDBACK IS GIVEN BY MYSELF OR PEERS THAT HELPS IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

THINK ABOUT THE JOBS THAT PEOPLE DO:
  i. THE TASKS PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN HAVE A HIGH DEGREE OF VARIETY
  ii. PEOPLE HAVE RESPONSIBILITY FOR A COMPLETE PROGRAM OF WORK
  iii. THE TASKS THEY PERFORM ARE SIGNIFICANT IN HELPING THE COMPANY MEET ITS GOALS
  iv. THEY HAVE CONSIDERABLE AUTONOMY IN COMPLETING TASKS

• WHAT NEGATIVE BEHAVIOUR CAN BE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT?
  DO PEOPLE:
  TRY TO AVOID DOING THINGS?
  TRY TO AVOID BLAME FOR MISTAKES?
  TRY TO AVOID ANY PART IN CHANGE?

IF YOU SAID YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE PLEASE DESCRIBE WHAT THEY DO:

TRY TO AVOID RESPONSIBILITY - THERE IS ALWAYS SOMEONE ELSE BETTER (OR TO DO THAT)
DO NOT ALWAYS COMMUNICATE WITH POSITIVE SUGGESTIONS
RESOLVE TO DO BY MY OWN PERSONS
UNWILLINGNESS TO SHOW PERSONAL INITIATIVES

• FINALLY CONSIDER THE RESPONSES DESCRIBED BELOW AND INDICATE WITH A TICK (√) ANY THAT ARE FOUND IN YOUR DEPARTMENT:

COMMUNICATING OPENLY
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE DIRECT GIVING AND RECEIVING OF INFORMATION RELEVANT TO GETTING THE JOB DONE

COLLABORATING
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING THE INVOLVEMENT OF RELEVANT PERSONS IN THE PROCESSES OF IDENTIFYING AND SOLVING PROBLEMS

TAKING RESPONSIBILITY
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING ACCEPTANCE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND TAKING INITIATIVE IN CARRYING OUT ORGANISATIONAL TASKS

MAINTAINING A SHARED VISION
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A CLEAR COMMITMENT TO ORGANISATIONAL PHILOSOPHY, VALUES AND PURPOSES AND A COMMITMENT TO HIGH STANDARDS

SOLVING PROBLEMS EFFECTIVELY
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTING A PROBLEM SOLVING ORIENTATION TO DIFFICULT ORGANISATIONAL ISSUES

RESPECTING/SUPPORTING ROLE FLEXIBILITY / FACILITATING INQUIRING
BEHAVIOURS DEMONSTRATING RESPECT AND SUPPORT FOR OTHERS AS WORTHwhile INDIVIDUALS

ROLE FLEXIBILITY / FACILITATING INQUIRING
BEHAVIOURS REFLECTION FLEXIBILITY AND THE ABILITY TO CHANGE ROLES/TASKS TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

EXPERIMENTING
BEHAVIOUR PROMOTING OR REFLECTING AN OPENNESS TO TRYING NEW THINGS
Case Study protocol

Some elements of the chart can be directly marked from the answers to the survey questions.

For example the survey that examines peoples attitude to and opinion of the performance measurement system (the green area system) provides information to mark the first section of the chart.

The situational and organisational factors below were evaluated by reading the answers to the open ended survey and by an interview with the director who implemented the survey and analysed to the results at the time.

The final component of the chart which identifies common behaviour patterns that participants exhibit was interpreted from peoples attitudes and opinions as represented in survey, and an interview with a director of the firm.
Addendum

The following is a list of publications generated by this research project.

How We Are Measured is How We Behave
V Hanna, ND Burns, CJ Backhouse

Beyond Performance Measures: A Better Understanding of their Behavioural Consequences in the Workplace
V Hanna, ND Burns
Proceedings 14th Annual International Conference of the International Association of Management, Toronto, Canada, August 2-6, 1996.

The behavioural implications of performance measures
V Hanna, ND Burns

Performance measurement systems: charting the consequences
V Hanna, ND Burns

The aligned performance measurement system
V Hanna, ND Burns, C Backhouse

Research into the behavioural aspects of performance measures
V Hanna, ND Burns, C Backhouse

Realigning organisation variables to support workplace behaviour

Behaviour in the workplace
Video produced in conjunction with Morris Mechanical Handling Ltd June 1998.