

■ CONSULTING-STYLE INVENTORY: A TOOL FOR CONSULTANTS AND OTHERS IN HELPING ROLES

Timothy M. Nolan

The process of serving as an effective consultant or helper to a person, a group, or an organization is a demanding one. It requires providing needed assistance to an appropriate degree and in a manner that is likely to be useful to the client.

The effective consultant must be flexible, able to adapt to changing client needs. Therefore, he or she must have a repertoire of behaviors as well as the willingness to shift behaviors to adjust to the needs of each client. Most people in the consulting/helping professions have styles or patterns of doing their work. However, when a particular consulting style becomes so pervasive that it excludes the use of certain behaviors, it limits the consultant's effectiveness.

Gordon Lippitt and Ronald Lippitt (1986) addressed this problem in their book *The Consulting Process in Action*. They developed a model that identifies eight roles that may be considered as consulting styles:¹

1. *Objective Observer*. This role consists of several activities that are intended to stimulate the client toward insights into growth, more effective methods, long-range change, and greater independence. This is the most nondirective of the eight roles. The consultant does not express personal beliefs or ideas and does not assume responsibility for the work or the result of that work. Instead, the consultant observes the client's behavior and provides feedback; the client alone is responsible for the direction that is ultimately chosen.

One important function of the objective observer is to ask questions that help the client to clarify and confront a problem and to make decisions. The consultant also may paraphrase the client's comments and may be empathic, sharing the client's experience of the blocks that led to the problem.

2. *Process Counselor*. This role consists of observing the client's problem-solving processes and offering suggestions for improvement. The consultant and the client jointly diagnose the client's process, and the consultant assists the client in acquiring whatever skills are necessary to continue diagnosing the process.

The focus of this role is on the interpersonal and intergroup dynamics that affect the problem-solving process. The consultant observes people in action, interviews management personnel to obtain facts, and reports the data to the client in order to improve relationships and processes.

¹ The following paragraphs have been adapted from Lippitt & Lippitt (1986).

3. *Fact Finder*. In this role the consultant serves as a researcher, collecting and interpreting information in areas of importance to the client. This function includes developing criteria and guidelines for collecting, analyzing, and synthesizing data.

The process of collecting can be accomplished through any of five methods: (1) interviewing, (2) administering a questionnaire, (3) observing, (4) analyzing records and documents, and (5) administering and analyzing appropriate tests or surveys. Fact finding enables the consultant to develop an understanding of the client's processes and performance; as a result of the insights gained, the consultant and the client can evaluate the effectiveness of a change process in terms of solving the client's problem.

4. *Identifier of Alternatives and Linker to Resources*. The consultant identifies alternative solutions to a problem; establishes criteria for evaluating each alternative; determines the likely consequences of each alternative; and then links the client with resources that may be able to help in solving the problem. However, the consultant does not assist in selecting the final solution.

5. *Joint Problem Solver*. The consultant works actively with the client to identify and solve the problem at hand, often taking a major role in defining the results. This function consists of stimulating interpretations of the problem, helping to maintain objectivity, isolating the causes of the problem, generating alternative solutions, evaluating alternatives, choosing a solution, and developing an action plan. The consultant also may function as a third-party mediator when conflict arises during the problem-solving process.

6. *Trainer/Educator*. The consultant provides instruction, information, or other kinds of directed learning opportunities for the client. The ability to train and educate is necessary in many helping situations, particularly when a specific learning process is essential if the client is to develop competence in certain areas. As a trainer/educator, the consultant must be able to assess training needs, write learning objectives, design learning experiences and educational events, employ a range of educational techniques and media, and function as a group facilitator.

7. *Information Specialist*. The consultant serves as content expert for the client, often defining "right" and "wrong" approaches to a problem. The client is primarily responsible for defining the problem and the objectives of the consultation, and the consultant plays a directive role until the client is comfortable with the approach that has been recommended. Although the needs of both the consultant and the client may encourage this consulting role, the consultant should not adhere to this behavior pattern exclusively. The client may become increasingly and also inappropriately dependent on the consultant; also, the dependence may lead to poor problem solving because of limited consideration of alternatives.

8. *Advocate*. The consultant consciously strives to have the client move in a direction desired by the consultant. In the most directive of the eight roles, the consultant uses power and influence to impose his or her ideas and values about either

content or process issues. As a content advocate, the consultant tries to influence the client's choice of goals and means; as a process advocate, the consultant tries to influence the methodology underlying the client's problem-solving behavior.

As a consultant moves from Objective Observer to Advocate, the locus for decision making moves from client centered to consultant centered. The author's work also makes it clear that each of the eight roles is appropriate if it meets the following conditions:

1. It is negotiated with the client and agreed to by the client; and
2. It is needed in the current situation that the consultant and the client share.

THE INSTRUMENT

The Consulting-Style Inventory was created to provide a tool that consultants and others in the helping professions could use to examine their styles as well as their ability to shift styles to adjust to changing client needs. It is based on the Lippitt and Lippitt (1986) model of consultant roles.

The inventory may be completed independently by a single person working alone or in a group setting by a number of people who wish to compare and discuss their styles. As a component of a training session, the inventory is useful for consultants, counselors, group facilitators, and others in professional helping roles.

Reliability and Validity

There are no reliability and validity data for the Consulting-Style Inventory. However, when the inventory is used to encourage introspection, discussion, and a focus on professional development, it has high face validity with a range of people in helping roles.

Administration

The process for administering the inventory is as follows:

1. Using the instructions printed on the instrument form, the consultant completes the Consulting-Style Inventory (either in a group setting or alone).
2. Using the Consulting-Style Inventory Scoring Sheet, the consultant scores the inventory and makes vertical bar-graph entries for each of the total scores from letter a through h.
3. The consultant reads the Consulting-Style Inventory Interpretation Sheet. For each role that represents a growth area, the consultant creates an action plan designed to help him or her to acquire the skills necessary for functioning in that role comfortably.

If the instrument is being used with a group, the facilitator leads a discussion designed to surface what has been observed and learned as well as some of the action

plans for acquiring desired skills. Before the total-group discussion, the facilitator may ask the respondents to form trios to consult with one another about proposed plans.

REFERENCE

Lippitt, G., & Lippitt, R. (1986). *The consulting process in action* (2nd ed.). San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.

CONSULTING-STYLE INVENTORY

Timothy M. Nolan

Instructions: In this inventory there are seven situations, each of which offers eight courses of action for a consultant to the group in question. For each of these situations, number the eight alternative actions from the one that you would *most likely take* (8) to the one that you would *least likely take* (1). To maximize the value of this inventory, respond on the basis of what you *typically* would do. Do not try to search for “correct” answers or assign numbers according to what you think you should do. Instead, read the statement and imagine what you *typically* would do as a consultant to the group in question.

Situation 1

You are working with a strategic planning team whose members are in the process of creating a vision of their ideal organization.

Number the eight following alternative actions from the one that you would *most likely take* (8) to the one that you would *least likely take* (1):

- _____ f. Do a training session on how to develop a vision.
- _____ h. Present them with an organizational vision that you find very useful.
- _____ b. Observe their process and make interventions when you feel that these might help the team.
- _____ d. Identify resource people who have developed organizational visions.
- _____ g. Lay out the six necessary components for an organizational vision.
- _____ a. Watch their progress as a team and provide feedback at the end of the session or when they ask for it.
- _____ c. Do an analysis of the organization and its marketplace and present the analysis to them.

This instrument first appeared as the “Making Choices Inventory” in *Applied Strategic Planning: The Consultant’s Kit* (pp. 64-67) by T.M. Nolan, L.D. Goodstein, and J.W. Pfeiffer, 1992, San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company. *The Consultant’s Kit* offers seventy-nine activities and numerous instruments that are useful in leading a planning team through the process of applied strategic planning.

Situation 2

You are working with a group whose members are attempting to define their values.

Number the eight following alternative actions from the one that you would *most likely take* (8) to the one that you would *least likely take* (1):

- _____ g. Provide them with two major alternative approaches that can be used to clarify values.
- _____ a. Watch their discussion closely, making notes to support a quality debriefing of the meeting.
- _____ c. Gather data by interviewing them about their values and preferences; then present them with these data.
- _____ e. Work with them to develop a group values statement.
- _____ f. Do a training session on values and appropriate approaches to values clarification.
- _____ h. Push them to adopt a values-clarification structure that you know will work well for them.
- _____ b. Observe them and intervene when doing so will improve interaction and clarity.
- _____ d. Help them to identify and make contact with an expert on values clarification.

Situation 3

You are working with a strategic planning team whose members are exploring how to respond to the competition that their organization is facing.

Number the eight following alternative actions from the one that you would *most likely take* (8) to the one that you would *least likely take* (1):

- _____ h. Present them with a complete set of tactics to meet the competition.
- _____ b. Focus on and observe group process; intervene when you feel that it would be helpful.
- _____ d. Help them to identify written or other resources on competitive environments.

- _____ f. Do a training session on sources of competition and how to meet these challenges.
- _____ g. Provide them with a clear framework that you have developed to enable them to define and respond to the competitive forces they face.
- _____ a. Observe them and give them feedback on their process when asked.
- _____ c. Do a competitor analysis and present the data to them.
- _____ e. Work directly with them to identify each competitive force and to develop responses to each.

Situation 4

You are working with a group whose members are preparing to make a presentation to top management.

Number the eight following alternative actions from the one that you would *most likely take (8)* to the one that you would *least likely take (1)*:

- _____ a. Observe their efforts and give feedback as requested.
- _____ c. Gather information about the interests of the top managers in the organization and present them with this information.
- _____ e. Work with them to develop a top quality presentation.
- _____ g. Personally provide the presentation-skills expertise that they need.
- _____ h. Ensure their success by advocating a particular mix of media and activities.
- _____ b. Observe their group process and make interventions when doing so appears helpful to them.
- _____ d. Match them up with a specialist on presentation skills.
- _____ f. Do a brief input session on the major components of a quality presentation.

Situation 5

You are working with a group whose members are developing a customer-service program for their organization.

Number the eight following alternative actions from the one that you would *most likely take* (8) to the one that you would *least likely take* (1):

- _____ b. Observe their group dynamics and intervene when appropriate.
- _____ d. Provide them with a quality videotape and good written materials on customer service.
- _____ f. Conduct a session for them on the major components of good customer service.
- _____ h. Redirect them from thinking about customer service; have them approach the topic from the standpoint of customer satisfaction.
- _____ a. Allow them to proceed on their own; give them feedback on their process when they ask for it.
- _____ c. Do an analysis of quality customer-service programs that they could use.
- _____ e. Work with them to develop the best customer-service program that you and they can come up with.
- _____ g. Share with them your insights regarding successful customer-service programs.

Situation 6

You are working with a group on the redesign of a major work process that will greatly reduce the time involved from the beginning to the completion of the work cycle.

Number the eight following alternative actions from the one that you would *most likely take* (8) to the one that you would *least likely take* (1):

- _____ c. Complete an analysis of the current work flow and present it to them.
- _____ e. Work with them to develop a greatly improved work flow.
- _____ g. Share with them two major ways of organizing work flow.
- _____ a. Do not interrupt them; observe and discuss your observations if asked.

- _____ b. Observe them and make suggestions about group process whenever appropriate.
- _____ d. Provide prework in the form of readings on work-flow design; identify an outside expert as a potential resource.
- _____ f. Do a training session on work-flow design and cycle time.
- _____ h. Encourage them to adopt a work-flow design that you believe will enable them to meet their goals.

Situation 7

You are working with a group whose members have been assigned the task of resolving recurrent problems with the quality of a line of products provided by their organization.


Number the eight following alternative actions from the one that you would *most likely take (8)* to the one that you would *least likely take (1)*:

- _____ d. Match them up with the best resources available regarding quality products of this type.
- _____ f. Do a carefully designed training session on quality.
- _____ h. Convince them that to be successful they should approach this task from the customer's point of view.
- _____ b. Concentrate on group process; make suggestions for improvement as they do their work.
- _____ c. Gather data on the current level of quality in this product line and give this information to them.
- _____ e. Work with them to develop the best possible approach to resolving lapses in quality.
- _____ g. Introduce them to a process that you have used successfully in the past to resolve comparable quality problems.
- _____ a. Observe how they approach this problem; if they ask for feedback on their group process, give it to them.

CONSULTING-STYLE INVENTORY SCORING SHEET

Instructions: Each of the eight alternative actions for each situation in the Consulting-Style Inventory has a lowercase letter next to it. For each situation, record the number you assigned to the “a” alternative, the number you assigned to the “b” alternative, the number you assigned to the “c” alternative, and so on. Then add the numbers in the vertical columns and record the totals where indicated.

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h
Situation 1	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Situation 2	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Situation 3	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Situation 4	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Situation 5	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Situation 6	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Situation 7	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Totals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____



Consulting-Styles Profile

CONSULTING-STYLE INVENTORY INTERPRETATION SHEET

The Consulting-Style Inventory employs the eight consulting roles discussed by Gordon Lippitt and Ronald Lippitt in their book titled *The Consulting Process in Action*. The chart on the following page, which appears in their book, explains these roles in terms of how directive or nondirective the consultant is in his or her relationship with the client. In other words, the consultant roles on the left of the chart reflect a heavy involvement of the client, whereas those on the right reflect a heavy involvement of the consultant.


The eight roles, as represented in the Consulting-Style Inventory, are as follows:

- a. Objective Observer
- b. Process Counselor (or Process Consultant)
- c. Fact Finder
- d. Resource Identifier or Linker
- e. Joint Problem Solver
- f. Trainer/Educator
- g. Information Specialist (or Content Expert)
- h. Advocate

To be able to function effectively as a consultant, you want to achieve comfort in each of these roles. Think about how you would answer the following questions:

1. Is your style more client centered or consultant centered?
2. How flexible are you in your use of consulting roles? Do you move easily from one to another as the situation demands?
3. Are there any roles that are particularly dominant for you? How do they serve your clients?
4. Are there any roles that you underutilize? How could the increased use of these roles benefit your clients?
5. What could you do to lessen your reliance on favorite roles and/or to utilize all of the options with equal ease?

MULTIPLE ROLES OF THE CONSULTANT



LEVEL OF CONSULTANT ACTIVITY IN PROBLEM SOLVING

Nondirective

Directive

	Observes problem- solving process		Identifies alternatives and resources for client and helps assess consequences	Offers alternatives and partici- pates in decisions	Trains client	Regards, links, and provides policy or practice decisions	Proposes guidelines, persuades, or directs in the problem- solving process
Raises questions for reflection	and raises issues mirroring feedback	Gathers data and stimulates thinking					

■ CRITICAL CONSULTING INCIDENTS INVENTORY (CCII)

John E. Jones and Anthony G. Banet, Jr.

Human relations consultants often intervene in situations that involve conflict, and the consulting process often is conflictive itself. This inventory is designed to (1) enable consultants to assess their own styles in response to critical incidents that sometimes occur in working with clients, (2) explore a theoretical rationale for making choices in conflict situations, and (3) provide a stimulus for individuals and groups of consultants to consider augmenting their styles.

The Critical Consulting Incidents Inventory (CCII) consists of twenty typical situations that can put pressure on consultants to take action in regard to client systems. The responses were constructed to be indicative of three major options available to consultants: (1) to provide emotional support, (2) to take charge of the situation in a directive manner, and (3) to promote problem solving. These options were extrapolated from Porter's Relationship Awareness Theory (Porter, 1976). Porter has extensively validated an instrument on this theory, entitled the Strength Deployment Inventory (SDI). It measures the gratifications that people seek in their interpersonal relationships in general. The SDI can be used in a wide array of development programs and can be used in conjunction with the CCII.

Uses of the CCII

The CCII is intended primarily as a "teaching" instrument rather than as a scientifically validated tool. Accordingly, it is best used in a consultant-training context in which individuals are guided in looking at themselves, at the theory, and at alternatives for increased effectiveness in coping with conflict situations in the consulting process.

Groups of consultants can use the CCII to study their styles, to look for possible "blind spots," and to explore ways to support each other in developing productive responses to critical situations. Co-consultants can use the inventory as a means of getting acquainted with each other. (See Pfeiffer & Jones, 1975.)

An individual consultant can use the instrument to study professional development over time by filing the responses and reconsidering them at a later date. In addition, the consultant may share scores on the CCII with key persons in client systems. Such sharing may be accompanied by a discussion of the consultant's ethical principles. (See Pfeiffer & Jones, 1977.)

SUGGESTED DESIGN FLOW

These are the steps suggested in using the CCII.

1. The CCII is introduced and the purposes of its administration are explained.
2. Participants complete the instrument independently, without discussion. They are instructed to respond according to the way they would *most likely* behave, rather than the way they think they should.
3. The CCII Scoring and Interpretation Sheet is distributed, and procedural questions about scoring are answered. Participants work independently and do not discuss their results with anyone at this point.
4. The facilitator provides a sample interpretation of his or her own CCII scores, displayed on newsprint.
5. Participants pair off and interpret each other's scores.
6. Learnings from these pairs are discussed in the total group.
7. The tallies to be recorded at the bottom of the Scoring and Interpretation Sheet are developed by a show of hands. "How many had Support as their highest score?" "As their second-highest score?" "As their lowest score?" And so on.
8. The group discusses the norms.
9. Three groups are formed according to lowest scores: Support, Direction, and Problem Solving. The groups are instructed to develop consensus on the advantages and potential disadvantages of their up-front style in conflict situations with clients.
10. The three groups briefly report and the facilitator leads a discussion of the points raised.
11. The pairs reassemble to explore implications for planning changes in their behavior in critical situations.
12. Reports of planned changes are solicited in a large-group sharing session.

REFERENCES

- Pfeiffer, J.W., & Jones, J.E. (1975). Co-facilitating. In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1975 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Pfeiffer, J.W., & Jones, J.E. (1977). Ethical considerations in consulting. In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1977 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Porter, E.H. (1976). On the development of relationship awareness theory: A personal note. *Group & Organization Studies: The International Journal for Group Facilitators*, 1(3), 302-309.

CRITICAL CONSULTING INCIDENTS INVENTORY (CCII)

John E. Jones and Anthony G. Banet, Jr.

Instructions: Following are twenty critical incidents with three alternative actions each that the consultant might consider. *Rank order the options in each item* to indicate what you would probably do in these situations. (Write “1” in front of your first choice, “2” for your second choice, and “3” for your least-preferred choice.) Do not omit any items.

1. You receive a telephone call that is a request for you to make a third-party intervention between the caller and another person. You say . . .
 - _____ a. “How do you feel about the situation?”
 - _____ b. That you should talk with the other person first.
 - _____ c. “Could you give me some background information?”
2. During a training event a participant interrupts by criticizing your “juvenile activity.” You say . . .
 - _____ a. “I’m concerned that you’re upset.”
 - _____ b. “Let me reiterate the goals of this activity.”
 - _____ c. “Let’s check it out with others and see what they think.”
3. Three hours before a training event that is expected to be difficult you meet your co-facilitator. You . . .
 - _____ a. Get acquainted on a personal level.
 - _____ b. Instruct the other person regarding your strategy.
 - _____ c. Share data and negotiate roles.
4. After hearing your academic and experiential credentials incorrectly represented, you . . .
 - _____ a. Let the incident go unnoticed to avoid embarrassment to the person(s) talking about you.
 - _____ b. Set the record straight.
 - _____ c. Analyze with the other person(s) later how the data about you were distorted.
5. Asked to work for a fee lower than your usual, you . . .
 - _____ a. Indicate your appreciation of your client’s financial problems.
 - _____ b. Quote your fee schedule, justify it, and offer to make a referral.
 - _____ c. Explore alternatives regarding how an acceptable remuneration can be negotiated.

6. In a sensing interview the boss discloses that a subordinate's job is in jeopardy. You . . .
 - _____ a. Explore the boss's dilemma and feelings.
 - _____ b. Test the boss's willingness to deal with the situation openly.
 - _____ c. Explore alternative actions the boss might consider.
7. You are coaching a manager to conduct a meeting in which personnel cuts are to be announced. The manager becomes anxious and considers canceling the meeting. You say . . .
 - _____ a. "I understand your reluctance to give bad news in public."
 - _____ b. "It is important for you to consider the possible long-term consequences for such a decision."
 - _____ c. "Let's look at some ways you might minimize the threat."
8. In planning your consulting activities for the coming year with your partner, you uncover a basic disagreement on priorities. You . . .
 - _____ a. Make certain that your partner's needs and feelings are acknowledged and carefully considered.
 - _____ b. Let your needs be known and propose a planning strategy.
 - _____ c. Approach the planning as an exercise in logical problem solving.
9. A boss calls you to ask your assessment of a subordinate who has recently attended one of your training sessions. You say . . .
 - _____ a. "I feel good about your taking an interest in your people."
 - _____ b. "You're talking to the wrong person."
 - _____ c. "Let's explore the implications of evaluating a person in this way."
10. Immediately prior to conducting a highly important consulting event, you experience a personally traumatic occurrence. You . . .
 - _____ a. Say to yourself, "The show must go on."
 - _____ b. Postpone the event.
 - _____ c. Consult with others to explore options.
11. You have spent a significant amount of effort in preparing a bid for an attractive consultation contract. Afterwards, you learn that the "winning" bidder had inside information that was not made available to you. You . . .
 - _____ a. Chastise yourself for your naïveté.
 - _____ b. Demand a full explanation.
 - _____ c. Reconstruct the bidding process to look for possible learnings for yourself.

12. You are discussing with a client contact person a proposed team-building session for an executive group. When pressed to specify the concrete outcomes that you can guarantee, you . . .
- _____ a. Affirm the person's concern that the event be productive.
 - _____ b. Indicate that you can *promise* no particular results.
 - _____ c. Work with the person on a statement of goals and a strategy for evaluation.
13. You have conducted sensing interviews with all the members of a work team, and each has voluntarily expressed negative feelings about the behavior of a certain colleague. In a team-building session, that person solicits feedback, but the others say nothing. You . . .
- _____ a. Reassure the other person in a light-hearted way that the silence could be positive.
 - _____ b. Confront the group with its collusion.
 - _____ c. Work with the person to make specific requests of individuals.
14. Between sessions of a personal growth group one of the members makes a sexual overture toward you. You . . .
- _____ a. Thank the person for the compliment and politely change the subject.
 - _____ b. Confront the need to explore the relationship within the group sessions.
 - _____ c. Solicit feedback on how you may have behaved to create such an interest.
15. In planning a training event, your co-facilitator argues strongly to incorporate a "favorite" experiential learning activity. You have serious reservations about it because the particular design involves deceiving the participants. You . . .
- _____ a. Agree to go along with it in spite of your concerns.
 - _____ b. Insist on the necessity of undoing the possible effects of the deception.
 - _____ c. Explore with your partner how the design furthers the goals of the event.
16. In a team-building session, the members are concentrating on one person, giving that person a lot of negative feedback. You say to the individual . . .
- _____ a. "You must be feeling under attack."
 - _____ b. "You don't have to be a target right now unless you want to."
 - _____ c. "What would be useful for you right now?"

17. In a problem-solving meeting of a group of managers, one member, whose department is far behind schedule, begins to cry. You . . .
- _____ a. Assure the person that it is understandable to be upset.
 - _____ b. Announce a break so that you can then work with the person individually.
 - _____ c. Explore with the entire group what can be done to improve the situation.
18. You have become increasingly concerned that your client organization is engaging in illegal practices in hiring employees. In a meeting of the executive group, sexist and racist attitudes are expressed. You . . .
- _____ a. Say nothing lest you be perceived as judgmental.
 - _____ b. Confront the group with your concerns about its policies.
 - _____ c. Suggest that the group discuss ways that the organization might ensure fairness in hiring.
19. In planning a team-building session, you become concerned that the manager's major motivation for having the event is to provide a basis for firing someone. You . . .
- _____ a. Reflect the manager's feelings of frustration about the person.
 - _____ b. State your misgivings and explain that you are unwilling to participate.
 - _____ c. Look for other ways to resolve the conflict.
20. You have coached an organization's president on conducting an all-management meeting to announce and explore new personnel policies. During the question-and-answer period the boss "puts down" one of the managers for asking a "stupid" question. You . . .
- _____ a. Attempt to salve the manager's feelings by making a joke of the situation.
 - _____ b. Confront the president's behavior as detrimental to any open inquiry.
 - _____ c. Help the manager rephrase the question in order to get useful information from the president.

CCII SCORING AND INTERPRETATION SHEET

Instructions: Sum the points you assigned to the alternative “a” for the twenty items, and then do the same for “b” and “c.” Enter these totals in the boxes below.

- a. Support
- b. Direction
- c. Problem Solving
- Total 120

Interpretation

The major options available to the consultant in response to critical situations can be classified as follows:

- *Support:* Being sensitive to the feelings of the client contact person(s).
- *Direction:* Controlling situations through confrontation and leadership.
- *Problem Solving:* Assisting others through exploring facts, options, and strategies.

Look at your lowest score. This is your most probable, or automatic response in difficult consulting situations. Your middle score represents your most likely back-up posture. Your highest score, of course, indicates your least-often-used strategy or posture. Although this rank ordering may be situation specific, it can give you an overall picture of your consulting style in conflict situations.

Consider the distances between your scores. These can be thought of as a crude index of the differences of your automatic and back-up responses. A large score gap can indicate that you will persist for some time before changing to the approaches represented by higher scores.

Go back into the CCII items to study ways that you might more effectively manage your strengths in critical consulting situations. You may wish to plan new behaviors when these types of conflicts arise in the future.

Group Norms. Enter a tally of your group’s results in the boxes below and compare them to your own.

	Most Probable	Second Most Probable	Least Probable
Support	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Direction	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Problem Solving	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

■ DIAGNOSING ORGANIZATION IDEOLOGY

Roger Harrison

This instrument was developed to help training participants compare their organization's values and their personal values with four different "cultures" or ideologies. It was originally used to provide some experiential input into lecture-discussions about organization ideology, using the conceptual framework presented in the author's paper "Understanding Your Organization's Character" (Harrison, 1972). Generally, the participants take the instrument before the conceptual material is presented, and score and discuss it afterwards.

No norms have been collected for the instrument, because they would not have furthered the learning objectives. The aim is to enable participants to clarify where their organization stands on a number of important value issues and to identify differences between the organization's ideology and their own. In this respect it is worth noting that many managers with whom the instrument has been used see their own position closer to the Task Orientation and Self Orientation ideologies, and the position of their organization closer to the Power Orientation and Role Orientation cultures.

After the participants have scored their own questionnaires, they are asked to indicate which set of statements had the lowest score for themselves and for their organizations.

The following matrix is then completed for the group.

	Power Orientation	Role Orientation	Task Orientation	Self Orientation
Self				
Organization				

For each orientation, the number of individuals in the group who gave their lowest score (sum of ranks) to that ideology is recorded. This gives an indication of the convergence or divergence of values within the group and of the extent to which the group's values as a whole conflict with those of members' organizations.

Participants are instructed to note and discuss the degree of their *commitment* to their preferred ideology, as indicated by how low the sum of ranks is for that orientation (a score of 15 would imply that the orientation is completely dominant).

The match between a person's own values and those he or she ascribes to the organization indicates the ease with which he or she can enter into a psychological contract with the organization. People deal with a "bad fit" between themselves and the

organization in various ways, such as by trying to change the organization, by limiting their involvement in it, or by attacking it in covert and overt ways.

If participants have a sufficiently high trust in one another, they may wish to share their experiences in dealing with incongruous values between themselves and the organization. They may try to discover ways of dealing with the conflict that are more promising than those they have attempted.

Sometimes there are value polarities within a group of participants. To highlight these, it may be useful to ask participants to group themselves according to their shared organization ideology. Each group may prepare a position statement to present to the others, supporting the values that the members share. Because it may be easier for the individual to “own” and to verbalize his or her values with the support of a group of similarly inclined members, this approach is useful in groups where members avoid open discussion of differences. The following questions are useful in stimulating people to own and support their organization’s ideology:

- How does this set of values equip the organization to deal with the environment? What strengths does it give the organization and its members against outside stresses?
- How does this ideology help in processing information, making decisions, and directing effective action?
- How does this ideology assist in resolving conflict within the organization so that a high proportion of the members’ energies is available for the work of the organization?
- With what kinds of people is this ideology effective in motivating effort and satisfying needs?
- For what kinds of tasks and in what sorts of business is this ideology particularly useful?

REFERENCE

Harrison, R. (1972). Understanding your organization’s character. In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1975 annual handbook for group facilitators* (pp. 199-209). San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.

DIAGNOSING ORGANIZATION IDEOLOGY

Roger Harrison

Organizations have patterns of behavior that put into action an ideology—a commonly held set of doctrines, myths, and symbols. An organization’s ideology has a profound impact on the effectiveness of the organization. It influences most important issues in organization life: how decisions are made, how human resources are used, and how people respond to the environment. Organization ideologies can be divided into four orientations: *Power* (a), *Role* (b), *Task* (c), and *Self* (d). The items below give the positions of the four orientations on a number of aspects of organization structure and functioning and on some attitudes and beliefs about human nature.

Instructions: For each of the following fifteen phrases, rank the four statements given in the order that best represents the dominant view in your organization. Give a “1” to the statement closest to your organization’s position, a “2” to the one next closest to your organization’s position, and so on through “3” and “4.” Then go back and again rank the statements “1” through “4,” this time according to *your* attitudes and beliefs.

Existing Organization Ideology	Participant’s Preferred Organization Ideology
--------------------------------------	---

1. A good supervisor is:

- ___ ___ a. strong, decisive and firm, but fair. He or she is protective, generous, and indulgent to loyal subordinates.
- ___ ___ b. impersonal and correct, avoiding the exercise of authority for his or her own advantage. The supervisor demands from subordinates only that which is required by the formal system.
- ___ ___ c. egalitarian and capable of being influenced in matters concerning the task. The supervisor uses his or her authority to obtain the resources needed to complete the job.
- ___ ___ d. concerned with and responsive to the personal needs and values of others. The supervisor uses his or her position to provide satisfying and growth-stimulating work opportunities for his or her subordinates.

2. A good subordinate is:

- ___ ___ a. compliant, hard working, and loyal to the interests of his or her supervisor.
- ___ ___ b. responsible and reliable, meeting the duties and responsibilities of the job and avoiding actions that surprise or embarrass his or her supervisor.

Existing Organization Ideology	Participant's Preferred Organization Ideology
--------------------------------------	---

- c. self-motivated to contribute his or her best to the task and is open with ideas and suggestions. He or she is nevertheless willing to give the lead to others when they show greater expertise or ability.
- d. vitally interested in the development of his or her own potentialities and is open to learning and to receiving help. He or she also respects the needs and values of others and is willing to help and contribute to their development.
3. A good member of the organization gives first priority to the:
- a. personal demands of the supervisor.
- b. duties, responsibilities, and requirements of his or her own role and to the customary standards of personal behavior.
- c. requirements of the task for skill, ability, energy, and material resources.
- d. personal needs of the individuals involved.
4. People who do well in the organization are:
- a. shrewd and competitive, with a strong drive for power.
- b. conscientious and responsible, with a strong sense of loyalty to the organization.
- c. technically effective and competent, with a strong commitment to getting the job done.
- d. effective and competent in personal relationships, with a strong commitment to the growth and development of people.
5. The organization treats the individual as:
- a. though his or her time and energy were at the disposal of people higher in the hierarchy.
- b. though his or her time and energy were available through a contract with rights and responsibilities for both sides.
- c. a coworker who has committed his or her skills and abilities to the common cause.
- d. interesting and worthwhile person in his or her own right.
6. People are controlled and influenced by the:
- a. personal exercise of economic and political power (rewards and punishments).
- b. impersonal exercise of economic and political power to enforce procedures and standards of performance.

Existing Organization Ideology	Participant's Preferred Organization Ideology
---	--

- c. communication and discussion of task requirements leading to appropriate action motivated by personal commitment to goal achievement.
- d. intrinsic interest and enjoyment to be found in their activities and/or by concern and caring for the needs of the other persons involved.

7. It is legitimate for one person to control another's activities if:

- a. he or she has more authority and power in the organization.
- b. his or her role prescribes responsibility for directing the other.
- c. he or she has more knowledge relevant to the task.
- d. the other accepts that the first person's help or instruction can contribute to his or her learning and growth.

8. The basis of task assignment is the:

- a. personal needs and judgment of those in authority.
- b. formal divisions of functions and responsibilities in the system.
- c. resource and expertise requirements of the job to be done.
- d. personal wishes and needs for learning and growth of individual organizational members.

9. Work is performed out of:

- a. hope of reward, fear of punishment, or personal loyalty toward a powerful individual.
- b. respect for contractual obligations backed up by sanctions and loyalty toward the organization or system.
- c. satisfaction in excellence of work and achievement and/or personal commitment to the task or goal.
- d. enjoyment of the activity for its own sake and concern and respect for the needs and values of the other persons involved.

10. People work together when:

- a. they are required to by higher authority or when they believe they can use each other for personal advantage.
- b. coordination and exchange are specified by the formal system.
- c. their joint contribution is needed to perform the task.
- d. the collaboration is personally satisfying, stimulating, or challenging to them.

Existing	Participant's
Organization	Preferred Organization
Ideology	Ideology

11. The purpose of competition is to:
- ___ ___ a. gain personal power and advantage.
 - ___ ___ b. gain high-status positions in the formal system.
 - ___ ___ c. increase the excellence of the contribution to the task.
 - ___ ___ d. draw attention to one's own personal needs.
12. Conflict is:
- ___ ___ a. controlled by the intervention of higher authorities and often fostered by them to maintain their own power.
 - ___ ___ b. suppressed by reference to rules, procedures, and definitions of responsibility.
 - ___ ___ c. resolved through full discussion of the merits of the work issues involved.
 - ___ ___ d. resolved by open and deep discussion of personal needs and values involved.
13. Decisions are made by the:
- ___ ___ a. person with the higher power and authority.
 - ___ ___ b. person whose job description carries the responsibility.
 - ___ ___ c. persons with the most knowledge and expertise about the particular problem.
 - ___ ___ d. persons most personally involved and affected by the outcome.
14. In an appropriate control and communication structure:
- ___ ___ a. command flows from the top down in a simple pyramid so that anyone who is higher in the pyramid has authority over anyone who is lower. Information flows up through the chain of command.
 - ___ ___ b. directives flow from the top down and information flows upward within functional pyramids which meet at the top. The authority and responsibility of a role is limited to the roles beneath it in its own pyramid. Cross-functional exchange is constricted.
 - ___ ___ c. information about task requirements and problems flows from the center of task activity upward and outward, with those closest to the task determining the resources and support needed from the rest of the organization. A coordinating function may set priorities and overall resource levels based on information from all task centers. The structure shifts with the nature and location of the tasks.

Existing	Participant's
Organization	Preferred Organization
Ideology	Ideology

___ ___ d. information and influence flow from person to person, based on voluntary relationships initiated for purposes of work, learning, mutual support and enjoyment, and shared values. A coordinating function may establish overall levels of contribution needed for the maintenance of the organization. These tasks are assigned by mutual agreement.

15. The environment is responded to as though it were:

___ ___ a. a competitive jungle in which everyone is against everyone else, and those who do not exploit others are themselves exploited.

___ ___ b. an orderly and rational system in which competition is limited by law, and there can be negotiation or compromise to resolve conflicts.

___ ___ c. a complex of imperfect forms and systems that are to be reshaped and improved by the achievements of the organization.

___ ___ d. a complex of potential threats and support. It is used and manipulated by the organization both as a means of self-nourishment and as a play-and-work space for the enjoyment and growth of organizational members.

INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP PROFILES

Sums of Ranks

	a. Power Orientation	b. Role Orientation	c. Task Orientation	d. Self Orientation
Existing Organization Ideology				
Participant's Preferred Organization Ideology				

Tally of Lowest Scores of the Group Members

	a. Power Orientation	b. Role Orientation	c. Task Orientation	d. Self Orientation
Existing Organization Ideology				
Participant's Preferred Organization Ideology				

■ EMPOWERMENT-READINESS SURVEY: FOUNDATIONS FOR TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT

April G. Henkel, Cheryl Repp-Bégin, and Judith F. Vogt

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Empowerment

In *The Silent Language*, Edward T. Hall (1959) notes that culture is a complex series of interrelated activities that largely govern how we act. Values, norms, and behaviors are taught without awareness in each society and in organizational settings; these translate into the ways in which things are done. Participative organizations focus on those behaviors, norms, and values that are empowering and that ensure movement toward effective change.

Empowered organizations, as described by Vogt and Murrell (1990), are characterized by participatory decision making. Members have a sense of responsibility for a shared mission and a belief in mutual values. Teamwork is fostered by the accessibility to and sharing of information and a high level of trust among employees and management. Empowered organizations value human resources and commit time and money to education, training, benefits, and recognition. The structure of empowered organizations spreads authority laterally rather than concentrating decision-making power at one level in the traditional, vertical line of authority. Organizational benefits of empowerment include innovative problem solving and an improved ability to anticipate, facilitate, and manage change in response to internal and external influences (Vogt & Murrell, 1990).

Change also is a key ingredient in empowered environments. To become empowered, an individual or organization must be willing to change; in empowered organizations, change is embraced rather than avoided or delayed. But change can be a painful experience—much like the feeling of loss—as old ways and patterns are replaced with new ways and patterns (Fossum, 1989; Scott & Jaffe, 1989). Resistance to change in organizations can take the form of mild skepticism, reluctance to contribute time or other resources to the process, and other behaviors that tend to delay or postpone involvement (Kanter, 1983). This resistance can be reduced through the exchange of information and feedback about the change, open and honest communication, understanding of the purpose for change, and a trusting and accepting environment (Vogt & Murrell, 1990).

To create and sustain an empowering environment in an organization, members of the organization must be committed to the change process and have a general propensity toward fundamental empowerment principles. Exploring the degree to which certain characteristics exist among an organization's members can help to determine the organization's overall level of readiness for empowerment. An assessment of organizational readiness can identify the existence of the characteristics that support the empowerment process and of those that hinder it.

Application to Total Quality Management

Total quality management (TQM) is a broad term that describes an organizational approach to implementing quality improvement, particularly of products and services. In TQM, the emphases are on planning, the development of innovative work teams, process improvement, measurement, relationships with customers and suppliers, and continuous improvement in all areas.

The focus on the tools, concepts, and philosophies of quality improvement was expanded when changes in organizational culture were recognized as fundamental to achieving quality (Jablonski, 1991). Any organization that is thinking about initiating TQM needs to establish an empowered culture beforehand, or the important TQM attributes of participation and employee contributions toward continuous improvement will not be realized. An organizational culture that encourages members to freely contribute ideas and to become actively involved in problem solving and decision making promotes TQM and forms the foundation for integrating the cultural and technical dimensions of TQM (Atkinson, 1990; Jablonski, 1991).

EMPOWERMENT-READINESS SURVEY

The Empowerment-Readiness Survey can be used to discover an organization's propensity toward empowerment principles and the degree to which a foundation for empowerment exists. This survey can be used for two purposes: (1) to determine the status of the organization prior to implementing empowerment strategies (where are we now?), and (2) to guide the initiation of organizational change (where do we go from here and what are the steps we need to take?). The survey focuses on the following dimensions of empowering organizations: communication, value of people, ambiguity, concepts about power, information, and learning.

Description of the Instrument

The Empowerment-Readiness Survey gathers descriptive information about an organization, organizational subunit, or individual in terms of existing support for empowerment. It helps to determine how much preparatory training is needed to build an empowering environment.

The survey consists of seventeen statements that address six dimensions of empowerment:

- Communication (nine questions: 2, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16);
- Value of people (thirteen questions: 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16);
- Ambiguity (four questions: 2, 12, 16, 17);
- Concepts about power (eight questions: 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13);
- Information (eight questions: 2, 6, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17); and
- Learning (eight questions: 3, 5, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17).

Respondents are asked to read each of the seventeen statements and to indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement with each, using a seven-point Likert scale. The scale uses letters rather than numbers to allow for both supportive and nonsupportive phrasing of the statements and to simplify scoring. For supportive statements, the letters run from A to G; for nonsupportive statements, they run from G to A.

Application (Suggested Uses)

Although this survey was originally developed for use by internal or external consultants to explore the overall empowerment readiness of organizations, it has multiple applications.

1. The instrument can be used solely as an information-gathering tool for an organization that is considering or planning an empowerment program.
2. The instrument can be used as part of an organizational or group training program on empowerment.
3. Because the instrument is participant-driven, individual results (overall percentage scores) can be aggregated for interpretation at several levels. The survey can be used to explore the empowerment readiness of the entire organization; of subunits such as divisions, departments, or work teams; of individuals; or of functional groups or particular positions (for example, first-line supervisors or vice presidents) within the organization.
4. The individual, group, or organizational score for each of the six dimensions can be determined.
5. An item analysis will provide another source of data (for example, for training purposes).

It should be noted that, although surveys can be returned to individual respondents for personal development and learning, the survey was not designed to identify specific members of an organization or group for punitive purposes.

ADMINISTERING THE INSTRUMENT

When it is to be used to explore overall organizational readiness, the survey should be made available to all members of the organization (or subunit). The actual administration of the instrument can be accomplished in various ways.

Introduction

If the administration of the instrument is not to be done in a training or large-group setting, with everyone taking the instrument at the same time, employees can be given the instrument, asked to complete it within a specified period of time, and told how to return it. If this is the case, a brief cover letter of explanation from the chief executive officer (or subunit equivalent) should accompany the instrument. This letter should include the following kinds of information:

1. The purpose of the survey;
2. The time required (the survey should take respondents no longer than fifteen minutes to complete);
3. The fact that survey responses will be confidential (if this is true);
4. The date that completed surveys are due and how surveys will be collected; and
5. When and how results will be shared.

If the instrument is to be administered with employees *in situ*, the previous points can be conveyed by cover letter and also announced by the senior manager present or by the administrator/facilitator.

Participants have a right to know how their data will be used. It is a good idea to make a distinction between confidentiality (no responses will be revealed, and no one except the scorers will see the responses) and anonymity (some responses may be revealed, but the respondents will remain anonymous). The stated purpose of the survey should include why the survey is being administered (for instance, what the organization hopes/needs to know) and how the results will be used (for informational purposes, to plan organizational changes, to plan training, and so on).

After the survey has been distributed, participants should be given clear, sequential instructions about how to respond to it.

Theory Input

If the instrument is administered as part of a training program, when everyone has finished responding to it, the administrator/facilitator should give the respondents theoretical background about the instrument (for example, the concept of empowerment, its purposes, and the six dimensions of empowerment).

Prediction

In a training design, it is a powerful intervention to ask participants to predict their individual scores and the group scores. This helps open up the group for a subsequent discussion of the members' views on empowerment. For the purposes of an organizational-survey, prediction provides another view of how things really are; that is, do the members of the organization believe that they are "ready," "somewhat ready," or "not ready" for empowerment?

Scoring

In a training program, individual respondents may score their own instruments in order to receive immediate information on which to build discussion and learning. In this case, scoring sheets must be distributed and instructions for scoring given clearly and sequentially.

If the instrument is to be used as an organizational survey, it may be scored by respondents and then turned in so that organizational scores can be derived, or the scoring may be done by a central person or functional unit. To obtain information about the entire organization, score each individual survey before combining results to obtain a total organizational score.

In an organizational (nontraining) context, if the instrument is to be used for individual feedback purposes, each respondent should be provided with a survey form, scoring instructions, and an opportunity to meet with an internal or external consultant to interpret the results.

If desired, the following additional scoring procedures can be followed:

- Scores can be examined across functional groups.
- An item analysis can be done if more specific data are required.
- Bar graphs can be created to display pertinent data.

Interpretation

The interpretation information that accompanies the Empowerment-Readiness Survey determines the respondent's degree of readiness for empowerment by percentage of Level A scores. The instrument administrator/facilitator will help the respondents to interpret their scores. Interpretative categories are "ready," "somewhat ready," and "not ready."

In a training design, actual scores are compared with predictions at this stage. After individual scores are examined, the group's overall readiness profile can be determined.

Scores can be examined across the six dimensions of empowering organizations (communication, value of people, ambiguity, concepts about power, information, and learning). The information that is derived from this study can help to determine which areas are in need of further development and training and which are not. For example,

scores may be high in communication, value of people, and learning, but low in ambiguity, concepts about power, and information.

Scores also can be checked across functional groups to find out which are supportive of empowerment and which are not. For example, top managers may be resistant to empowerment because they might perceive it as threatening to their traditional authority and power.

Processing

Discussion of the instrument in a training program can be focused in several ways, depending on the purpose of the session. Participants can examine their various views of the issue of empowerment. They then can discuss the overall organization's readiness for empowerment. If there is wide discrepancy between the scores of individuals or functional/positional groups, examination of the reasons for the differences may be appropriate. This could be followed by a discussion of organizational implications. A further extension of the discussion might be the suggestion of actions that could be taken to equalize and enhance the organization's overall readiness.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

The Empowerment-Readiness Survey has face validity in that the seventeen statements ask members of the organization to report their agreement or disagreement with fundamental empowerment principles stated in organizational and/or managerial terms. The statements are representative of empowerment dimensions that are key ingredients in creating and sustaining a supportive environment for total quality management. The final version of the survey is the result of feedback from a fourmember review panel and field tests in two organizational settings.

REFERENCES

- Atkinson, P.E. (1990). *Creating culture change: The key to successful total quality management*. United Kingdom: IFS Limited.
- Fossum, L. (1989). *Understanding organizational change: Converting theory to practice*. Los Altos, CA: Crisp Publications.
- Hall, E.T. (1959). *The silent language*. New York: Doubleday.
- Jablonski, J.R. (1991). *Implementing total quality management: An overview*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Kanter, R. (1983). *The change masters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Scott, C.D., & Jaffe, D.T. (1989). *Managing organizational change: A practical guide for managers*. Los Altos, CA: Crisp Publications.
- Vogt, J., & Murrell, K. (1990). *Empowerment in organizations: How to spark exceptional performance*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.

EMPOWERMENT-READINESS SURVEY

April G. Henkel, Cheryl L. Repp-Bégin, and Judith F. Vogt

Instructions: For each of the following statements, please indicate the degree to which you, as an individual, agree or disagree with the statement by circling one of the letters on the continuum line below the statement. If you strongly agree with the statement, circle the letter to the left of the continuum under “Strongly Agree.” If you feel neutral about the statement, circle the letter “D.” If you strongly disagree, circle the letter to the right of the continuum under “Strongly Disagree.”

1. Decision-making authority in an organization can be spread effectively to all levels.

Strongly Agree *Strongly Disagree*
A B C D E F G

2. Employees should be kept up-to-date about all organizational changes and decisions.

Strongly Agree *Strongly Disagree*
A B C D E F G

3. People are an organization’s most valuable resource.

Strongly Agree *Strongly Disagree*
A B C D E F G

4. Decisions should be made by people who have the highest positions in the organization.

Strongly Agree *Strongly Disagree*
A B C D E F G

5. The “bottom line” should be given the greatest priority in organizational decision making.

Strongly Agree *Strongly Disagree*
A B C D E F G

6. Input from front-line employees is valuable in organizational planning and decision making.

<i>Strongly</i> <i>Agree</i>						<i>Strongly</i> <i>Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G

7. The best way to increase productivity is to supervise employees closely.

<i>Strongly</i> <i>Agree</i>						<i>Strongly</i> <i>Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G

8. Decision making that involves employees is time consuming but results in better decisions.

<i>Strongly</i> <i>Agree</i>						<i>Strongly</i> <i>Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G

9. Only certain levels of employees should be given authority.

<i>Strongly</i> <i>Agree</i>						<i>Strongly</i> <i>Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G

10. If a decision is in the best interests of the organization, it probably is not in the best interests of the employees.

<i>Strongly</i> <i>Agree</i>						<i>Strongly</i> <i>Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G

11. A manager's time is best spent supporting employees by providing information and feedback that help employees to get the job done.

<i>Strongly</i> <i>Agree</i>						<i>Strongly</i> <i>Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G

12. When informed about organizational changes (for example, opening a new office or adding a new product or service), managers should let employees know as quickly as possible and give them an opportunity to ask questions.

<i>Strongly Agree</i>							<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

13. Decisions that directly affect employees should not be made without employee input.

<i>Strongly Agree</i>							<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

14. It is as important for an employee to understand the purpose/mission of the organization as it is to understand how to perform his or her specific job duties.

<i>Strongly Agree</i>							<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

15. Organizations should support employee participation in personal-growth opportunities, such as continuing education or fitness programs, by allowing flexible work schedules or other means.

<i>Strongly Agree</i>							<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

16. Organizations have a responsibility to consider the impacts of their decisions on the community (for example, expanding or relocating a production facility).

<i>Strongly Agree</i>							<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

17. It is better to continue as is, as long as the job gets done, than it is to make changes.

<i>Strongly Agree</i>							<i>Strongly Disagree</i>
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	

EMPOWERMENT-READINESS SURVEY SCORING SHEET

Instructions: For individual feedback purposes, complete steps one through three below; for group or organizational purposes, complete steps one through five.

Step One

For each individual survey, count the number of “A” and “B” answers circled (these letters indicate the two highest levels of agreement in support of empowerment principles).

Step Two

Use the following guide to determine the readiness level of the respondent:

- **Level A:** If the number of A and B responses equals 14 or more, the respondent generally is committed to empowerment principles, and there appears to be a foundation to support total quality management.
- **Level B:** If the number of A and B responses equals 10 to 13, the respondent needs more information about empowerment and the opportunity to discuss and to learn about empowerment principles before becoming involved in total quality management.
- **Level C:** If the number of A and B responses equals 9 or fewer, the respondent demonstrates lack of belief in and commitment to the empowerment principles necessary to effectively fuel the TQM process.

Step Three

Write the letter indicating the level of readiness (A, B, or C) in the upper right-hand corner of the first page of each individual survey for ease in counting the number of respondents at each level. Then organize the surveys by readiness level.

Step Four

Count the number of respondents at each readiness level and write the results on the appropriate lines below. Then total these numbers and write the result on the “total number participating in survey line.”

Level A _____

Level B _____

Level C _____

TOTAL NUMBER PARTICIPATING IN SURVEY: _____

Step Five

Compute the percentage of respondents at each readiness level (number at each level divided by total in survey):

$$\frac{\text{Number of Level A Responses}}{\text{Total Number}} = \text{(percentage of Level A's)}$$

$$\frac{\text{Number of Level B Responses}}{\text{Total Number}} = \text{(percentage of Level B's)}$$

$$\frac{\text{Number of Level C Responses}}{\text{Total Number}} = \text{(percentage of Level C's)}$$

EMPOWERMENT-READINESS SURVEY INTERPRETATION SHEET

Determine the degree to which the organization is ready for organizational empowerment by comparing the actual percentage of Level A scores with the percentages below:

- **Ready** (*percentage of Level A scores equals 80 percent or more*): The organization is generally committed to empowerment principles, and there appears to be a foundation to support total quality management.
- **Somewhat Ready** (*percentage of Level A scores equals 60 to 79 percent*): Organizational members need more information and the opportunity to discuss empowerment principles before going any further with the TQM process.
- **Not Ready** (*percentage of Level A scores equals 59 percent or less*): Organizational members appear to lack the belief in and commitment to empowerment principles necessary to effectively fuel the TQM process. The organization's leadership needs more extensive preparation before deciding whether or not to initiate TQM throughout the organization. Preparation should include training about empowerment principles versus traditional management practices, the changed role of managers, and information about TQM in other organizations.

■ EVALUATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Richard M. Wolf and W. Warner Burke

Training programs must be evaluated to determine both their effectiveness from a participant's point of view and their costs for an organization. No guarantee exists that any particular program will be useful to participants, and costs to put on a single four-or five-day program in a large corporation are high enough, even without including the salaries of personnel who are involved in the program. Even for smaller or less affluent organizations, the cost is significant. Expenditures of that magnitude require some systematic evaluation of results.

Evaluating a training program is difficult at best. Choices have to be made about *what* to assess and *how* to make the evaluation.

WHAT TO ASSESS

Program participants need to be assessed on the following five major classes of information:

1. *Initial status of those who attended the program* (i.e., who attended and how proficient they already were with respect to what they were supposed to learn). Demographic data such as age, sex, educational background, and work history can usually be gathered by questionnaire in a few minutes. Such information is useful for determining later whether the program works better for some people than for others. One cannot assess only the participants' proficiency at the *end* of the program because, if the participants are already proficient in the areas that are to be covered in the program, then it is a waste of time and money to include them and the results of post-questionnaires would be misleading.
2. *Status of managers with regard to what they were supposed to learn during the program* (e.g., knowledge, skills, particular techniques, enhanced motivation, or the acquisition of specific attitudes). It is important that something of value be gained by the participants.
3. *Information regarding the execution of the program* (i.e., the extent to which the designed program was carried out). Some discrepancy between the program designed and the program actually carried out always exists—sometimes for perfectly acceptable reasons—but it is important to find out what the discrepancies are because the program *as implemented* is being evaluated, not the program *as designed*.
4. *Costs* (whether direct or indirect). Ultimately, it must be determined whether the expenditure of resources for a training program was justified. Some costs, such as room

and board, are fairly clear and easy to calculate, but costs in personnel time for preparation and attendance are not as easy to compute. Clear guidelines must be devised to establish program costs.

5. *Supplemental information* (such as reactions of those involved, unanticipated learning, or unexpected side effects). Reactions of participants and of those who ran the program furnish invaluable information about how the program was received and perceived. Participants may have learned some things that were not explicitly stated goals of the program; for example, company loyalty or morale may have been affected. Possible side effects from training programs include the development of an informal group within an organization because of the intensity of the learning experience. The consequences could be positive in terms of closeness or negative in terms of participants' relationships with those who did not attend the program.

Information gathered must be analyzed and summarized for an overall judgment of any program's worth. Some procedures for doing this are presented in Wolf (1979).

HOW TO USE THE SURVEYS

The Survey of Program Participants and Follow-Up Survey of Program Participants are presented as means to gather data needed to make an evaluation of a program. The *worth* of a particular program can be assessed by means of such surveys. The surveys are not meant as *research* tools, although they do provide a means to collect data in a systematic fashion.

Various types of programs can be evaluated using the surveys. It is suggested that the follow-up survey be given approximately one month after the close of the program, or both surveys could be given at the end and again some time later. They also can be used at some point during a program if a change of direction seems necessary. The surveys are meant to help a trainer evaluate primarily the design and execution of the program—the class type of information described earlier. Proficiency or skill of either participant or trainer is not being assessed.

The following topics are examples of ones that can be evaluated using the surveys: management by objectives, management by exception, interpersonal relations, team building, performance assessment, time management, goal setting, problem solving, managing personal stress, and interviewing skills. *Topics from a specific program must be typed on the forms before they are given to participants.*

REFERENCE

Wolf, R.M. (1979). *Evaluation in education*. New York: Praeger.

SURVEY OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Richard M. Wolf and W. Warner Burke

Program Surveyed _____

Instructions: Respond to the items on the following pages on the basis of your reactions to the program you have just completed. There are no right or wrong answers. Your honest opinions about various aspects of the program are desired for future planning. Your answers will be confidential, but please fill in your name below so that your answers to this survey can be linked to your answers on the second survey you will receive later.

Your Name _____

I. CONTENT

A. Usefulness

List the topics covered in the program, and check the appropriate rating for each topic.

Topics	Of Little Use in My Work	Somewhat Useful	Definitely Useful	Of Great Use in My Work
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Now mark an "M" next to the topic you found most useful and an "L" next to the topic you found least useful.

B. Importance

List the topics covered in the program, and check the appropriate rating for each topic.

Topic	Very Important	Definitely Important	Somewhat Important	Of Little Importance
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Now mark an “M” next to the topic you felt was most important and an “L” next to the topic you felt was least important.

C. Effectiveness of Presentation

List the topics covered in the program, and check the appropriate rating for each topic.

Topics	Ineffective Presentation	Somewhat Effective Presentation	Definitely Effective Presentation	Highly Effective Presentation
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Topics	Ineffective Presentation	Somewhat Effective Presentation	Definitely Effective Presentation	Highly Effective Presentation
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Now mark an “M” next to the topic you feel was most effectively presented and an “L” next to the topic you feel was least effectively presented.

D. Satisfaction with What You Learned

List the topics covered in the program, and check the appropriate rating for each topic.

Topics	Highly Satisfied	Definitely Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Satisfied
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Now mark an “M” next to the topic you felt most satisfied with, and an “L” next to the topic you felt least satisfied with.

E. Suggestions for Improvement

List the topics covered in the program and beside each write *one* way in which the content or method of presentation of that topic could be improved.

Topics	Suggested Improvement
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>
<hr/>	<hr/>

II. METHODS USED

A. Effectiveness

Rate the effectiveness of each method of presentation by checking the appropriate space.

Types of Sessions	Rather Ineffective	Somewhat Effective	Definitely Effective	Highly Effective
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Now mark an “M” next to the type of session you felt was most effective and an “L” next to the type of session you felt was least effective.

B. Usefulness

Rate the usefulness of each type of session by checking the appropriate space.

Types of Sessions	Of Little Use	Somewhat Useful	Definitely Useful	Of Great Use
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Now mark an “M” next to the type of session you felt was most useful and an “L” next to the type of session you felt was least useful.

III. ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES

Rate each of the following aspects of the program by checking the appropriate space.

	Not Adequate	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Assuming that *one* change can be made in the program, what would you like to see changed?

How would you judge the *overall value* of this week's program to you? (Check one.)

Not Particularly Valuable	Of Some Value	Definitely Valuable	Extremely Valuable
_____	_____	_____	_____

IV. OVERALL PROGRAM

The following items refer to the *total program*. Answer them as thoughtfully as you can. Your views are important for planning future programs.

A. Length

The program was: _____ Too Short _____ About Right _____ Too Long

How many days should the program take (assuming the same goals as the present program)? _____ Days

B. Topics to Drop

List the topics covered and check any you feel should be dropped or could be dropped without hurting the overall quality of the program?

Topics	Should Be Dropped	Could Be Dropped
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Topics	Should Be Dropped	Could Be Dropped
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

C. Topics to Add

What topics, if any, should be added to the program?

D. Major Benefit

What is the major benefit you received from attending the program?

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Richard M. Wolf and W. Warner Burke

Program Surveyed _____

Instructions: Answer the questions on the following pages on the basis of your thoughts since your participation in the program. There are no right or wrong answers. Your honest opinions about various aspects of the program are of importance in planning future programs. Your answers will be confidential, but please fill in your name below so that your answers to this survey can be linked to your answers on the earlier survey.

Your Name _____

PART 1

A. Which of the topics that were covered during the program have you worked on since?

B. Describe what you did with regard to the topic(s) you selected.

C. How successful do you think you were?

Very
Successful

Definitely
Successful

Somewhat
Successful

Not Very
Successful

D. Why do you think that this was true?

E. Did you receive assistance from someone in working on the topic(s) you selected?

F. In what ways was this person helpful to you?

G. In retrospect, how useful was your work on the topic(s) during the program itself?

H. Describe the *one* thing you have learned about the topic(s) you chose to work on that you have found most useful to you.

I. Describe the *one* thing you learned about the topic(s) you chose to work on that you have found least useful to you.

PART 2

A. List all topics covered by the program and rate them in terms of their usefulness to you in your work.

Topics	Of Little Use in My Work	Somewhat Useful	Definitely Useful	Of Great Use in My Work
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Mark an “M” next to the topic you found most useful and an “L” next to the topic you found least useful.

B. What were the *two* most important benefits that you feel you received from the program?

■ THE HRD CLIMATE SURVEY¹

T. Venkateswara Rao and E. Abraham

Dynamic and growth-oriented organizations emphasize the development of human resources. Every organization can foster this development through proper selection of employees and through nurturing their talents and other competencies. People must be helped to acquire the capabilities to perform the new roles, functions, and tasks that arise in the process of organizational growth and change. As human resource development (HRD) mechanisms (such as performance appraisal, coaching, organization development, employee-potential appraisal, and job enrichment) are introduced in an organization, a certain positive level of development climate is essential for their success. Such a level is characterized by the following values:

1. Treating employees as the most important resource;
2. Perceiving that developing employee competencies is the job of every manager/supervisor;
3. Believing in the capability of employees to change and to acquire new competencies at any stage of life;
4. Communicating openly;
5. Encouraging risk taking and experimentation;
6. Helping employees to recognize their strengths and weaknesses through feedback;
7. Promoting a general climate of trust;
8. Encouraging employees to be helpful and to collaborate with one another;
9. Fostering team spirit;
10. Discouraging stereotypes and favoritism;
11. Promoting supportive personnel policies; and
12. Advocating HRD practices, including performance appraisal, training, reward management, potential development, job rotation, career planning, and so on.

Organizations differ in the extent to which they exhibit these tendencies and can be profiled based on these tendencies.

¹ Adapted from a paper presented at the XLRI-L&T Joint National Seminar on HRD, Bombay, India, February 1985. Used with permission.

THE HRD CLIMATE SURVEY

The HRD Climate Survey was developed by the Center for HRD at Xavier Labour Relations Institute (XLRI) to measure development climate. Its thirty-eight items can be grouped into three categories: general climate, OCTAPAC culture, and human resource development.

General climate items deal with the importance given to human resource development by the organization. Climate reflects the attitudes of top management, the commitment of line management, personnel policies, and the organization's overall approach toward development.

OCTAPAC items deal with the extent to which the following characteristics are valued and promoted in the organization:

- *Openness* exists when employees feel free to discuss their ideas, activities, and feelings with one another.
- *Confrontation* brings problems and issues into the open for solution, rather than hiding them for fear of hurting or getting hurt.
- *Trust* emphasizes taking people at face value and believing what they say.
- *Autonomy* allows people to work independently with responsibility.
- *Proactivity* encourages employees to take initiative and risks.
- *Authenticity* reflects the tendency for people to do what they say they will do.
- *Collaboration* recognizes interdependencies and the value of teamwork.

Human resource development items reflect the extent to which HRD mechanisms are implemented seriously. Successful implementation involves an integrated look at HRD as well as efforts to use as many HRD mechanisms as possible. These mechanisms might include performance appraisal, employee-potential appraisal, career planning, performance rewards, feedback and counseling, training, employee welfare (quality of work life), job rotation, and others.

Methodology

The HRD Climate Survey was planned to collect data and to provide feedback to organizations about their HRD climates. The survey was administered to 1,614 respondents from forty-one different organizations that responded to XLRI's offer to survey and to provide feedback. Included in the forty-one were several units of two large organizations with a very decentralized structure. These units were treated as separate organizations. In each organization about fifty to one hundred surveys were distributed; however, in some cases very few were returned. Surveys were administered with the help of HRD and personnel managers and were collected by trained investigators who visited these companies. The investigators, who were post-graduate students of XLRI in

the Personnel Management and Industrial Relations Program, underwent an eight-day training session before starting their investigatory procedures.

Administration

The HRD Climate Survey is administered by having respondents complete the thirty-eight item instrument. Although individual responses should remain anonymous, an organization may choose to code responses by department or by work unit. Responses from all participants are then compiled and arrayed in a format similar to that shown in Figure 1, which displays the number of respondents who gave each possible score to a particular survey item. The mean, standard deviation, and percentage equivalent for each item can be calculated for ease of comparison.

Number of Respondents Answering

Item Number	Almost Always True (5)	Mostly True (4)	Sometimes True (3)	Rarely True (2)	Not at All True (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage Equivalent
1								
2								
3								
• • •								
38								
Totals								

Figure 1. Sample Array for Results from the HRD Climate Survey

Reliability and Validity

Coefficients of correlation computed between the thirty-eight items revealed high inter-item coefficients of correlation, indicating high internal consistency among the items. Factor analysis indicated that one general factor reflected in all items explained about 36 percent of the variance. The rest of the factors accounted for less than 5-percent variance each. A cluster analysis of the items using Cronbach’s alpha, which measures

homogeneity of items, indicated that all the items belong to the same cluster and that dropping any item would not improve that one cluster.²

Development Climate Data

Because the survey used a five-point scale, average scores around 3.0 indicate the existence of a moderate degree of that dimension within the organization. Scores around 4.0 indicate the existence of a fairly high degree of that dimension within the organization. For ease of interpretation, the mean scores were converted into percentage scores using the following formula:

$$\text{Percentage score} = (\text{Mean Score} - 1.0) \times 25$$

This was done assuming that a score of 1.0 represents 0 percent, a score of 2.0 represents 25 percent, a score of 3.0 represents 50 percent, a score of 4.0 represents 75 percent, and a score of 5.0 represents 100 percent. Thus, percentage scores indicate the degree to which the particular dimension exists in that company out of the ideal 100 percent.

The means, standard deviations, and percentage equivalents of individual item scores of the sample organizations are presented in the interpretation table following the survey itself.

Interpretation

The mean scores for each item theoretically could range from 1.0 to 5.0, with 1.0 indicating an extremely poor HRD climate and 5.0 indicating an extraordinarily good HRD climate on that dimension. However, scores of 1.0 or 5.0 are almost never obtained by any company. Scores around 3.0 indicate an average HRD climate on a particular dimension; scores around 2.0 indicate a poor HRD climate; and scores around 4.0 indicate a good HRD climate. Mean scores around 4.0 are indicative of an HRD climate at a desirable level. The same interpretation could be offered for the overall mean score across all items (computed by adding mean scores on all items for that company and dividing by thirty-eight). Similar interpretations could be offered for percentage scores. A mean score of 1.0 (on each item or overall) corresponds to 0 percent, 2.0 corresponds to 25 percent, 3.0 corresponds to 50 percent, 4.0 corresponds to 75 percent, and 5.0 corresponds to 100 percent. It is desirable for organizations to have percentage scores above 50 on each item as well as overall. Percentage scores above 60 are indicative of companies with a reasonably good development climate. In the survey conducted by XLRI, only eight companies scored above 60 percent on their overall (general or total) HRD climate scores. Another eight companies scored less than 50 percent, but none scored as high as 75 percent.

² Computer analysis was conducted with the assistance of Mike Vanjour of Xavier Labour Relations Institute and T.P. Rama Rao of the Indian Institute of Management.

Summary of Trends

The following trends in HRD climate were observed in the organizations surveyed:

1. The general HRD climate appeared to be at average level (percentage score = 54), leaving substantial scope for improvement.
2. The most important factor contributing to low scores seems to be employees' general indifference to their own development, in terms of making efforts to recognize their strengths and weaknesses (item 23).
3. In general, top management is perceived as maintaining the status quo and not going out of its way to improve the quality of the work environment. This may reflect intellectual positivism with regard to HRD (item 2) but no emotional investment in it (item 1).
4. Other impediments seem to be the lack of support for employees returning from training programs to implement what they have learned (item 25) and the lack of support for career development (item 35).
5. On the positive side, employees seem to take training more seriously than their sponsors (item 24).
6. Other dimensions on which the organizations scored well (that is, achieved a percentage score above 60) included the following:
 - Top management's belief about the importance of human resources (item 2);
 - The generally helpful nature of employees (item 9);
 - Mainly objective performance appraisals and promotion decisions (items 17 and 14); and
 - Tolerance for mistakes (item 20).

CONCLUSION

An organization could use the HRD Climate Survey to assess its progress in building a climate conducive to human resource development. Management might wish to look at conditions that detract from the success of interventions; note differences between work units or departments; or use the results as a basis for problem-solving sessions. Because the instrument measures the importance given to HRD, the values of the organization, and the extent to which HRD mechanisms are implemented seriously, it also could be useful on an annual basis for comparisons and for charting progress.

THE HRD CLIMATE SURVEY

T. Venkateswara Rao and E. Abraham

Instructions: This survey's purpose is to determine the extent to which a developmental HRD climate exists in your organization. Responses from several employees will be combined to prepare profiles of developmental climate, which may form the basis of changes in your organization's HRD practices. The statements below describe HRD climate. Please rate how true each statement is for your organization by choosing the appropriate number from the following five-point scale:

5 = Almost always true

4 = Mostly true

3 = Sometimes true

2 = Rarely true

1 = Not at all true

- _____ 1. The *top management* of this organization *goes out of its way* to ensure that employees enjoy their work.
- _____ 2. *Top management believes* that people are an extremely important resource and that they must be treated well.
- _____ 3. Managers and supervisors see the development of subordinates as *an important part of their jobs*.
- _____ 4. *Personnel policies facilitate* employee development.
- _____ 5. *Top management is willing to invest* considerable time and other resources to ensure the development of employees.
- _____ 6. Managers and supervisors in this organization take an *active interest* in their subordinates and help them *to learn their jobs*.
- _____ 7. Employees lacking *skills* are *helped to acquire* competence, rather than left unattended.
- _____ 8. Managers *believe* that employee behavior can be *changed* and that people can be developed at any stage of life.
- _____ 9. People in this organization are *helpful* to one another.
- _____ 10. Employees do not hesitate to discuss *personal problems with their supervisors*.
- _____ 11. The *psychological climate* is very *conducive* to acquiring new knowledge and skills.
- _____ 12. Managers and supervisors guide their subordinates and prepare them for future *responsibilities/roles*.
- _____ 13. Top management makes efforts *to identify and to utilize employee potential*.

5 = Almost always true
4 = Mostly true
3 = Sometimes true
2 = Rarely true
1 = Not at all true

- _____ 14. Promotion decisions are based on the *suitability* of the candidates rather than on favoritism.
- _____ 15. *Mechanisms* in this organization reward good work and contributions made by employees.
- _____ 16. When an employee does good work, his or her *supervisor* takes special care to *appreciate* it.
- _____ 17. *Performance-appraisal* reports are based on *objective assessment* and *adequate information*, not on favoritism.
- _____ 18. People in this organization do not have any *fixed mental impressions* about one another.
- _____ 19. Employees are *encouraged* to *experiment* with new methods and to try out creative ideas.
- _____ 20. When any employee makes a *mistake*, the supervisor treats it with understanding and *helps the person to learn* from it, rather than punishing or discouraging the person.
- _____ 21. Weaknesses of employees are *communicated* to them in a *nonthreatening* way.
- _____ 22. Employees take behavioral feedback *seriously* and then *use it for development*.
- _____ 23. Employees *take pains to find out* their strengths and weaknesses from their supervisors or colleagues.
- _____ 24. When employees are sponsored for training, they take it *seriously* and try to learn from the programs they attend.
- _____ 25. Employees returning from training programs are *given opportunities* to experiment with what they have learned.
- _____ 26. Employees are *sponsored* for training programs on the basis of *genuine training needs*.
- _____ 27. People *trust* one another in this organization.
- _____ 28. Employees are not afraid to express or to discuss their *feelings* with their *supervisors*.
- _____ 29. Managers and supervisors are not afraid to express or discuss their *feelings* with their *subordinates*.

5 = Almost always true
4 = Mostly true
3 = Sometimes true
2 = Rarely true
1 = Not at all true

- _____ 30. Employees are encouraged to take *initiative* and to do things on their own without *waiting* for instructions from supervisors.
- _____ 31. Delegation of authority is quite common; subordinates are encouraged to *develop skills to handle greater responsibilities*.
- _____ 32. When managers and supervisors delegate authority to subordinates, the subordinates use it as an *opportunity* for development.
- _____ 33. There is a high degree of *team spirit* in this organization.
- _____ 34. People *discuss* problems *openly* and try to solve them, rather than gossiping and accusing one another.
- _____ 35. *Career opportunities* are pointed out to subordinates by managers and supervisors in the organization.
- _____ 36. *Future plans* are *made known* to the managerial staff to help them to develop and prepare their subordinates.
- _____ 37. This organization ensures *employee welfare* to the extent that the employees can use most of their mental energy for work purposes.
- _____ 38. *Job rotation* in this organization *facilitates* employee development.

THE HRD CLIMATE SURVEY INTERPRETATION TABLE

Item Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Percentage Equivalent
1	2.70	1.10	42
2	3.51	1.06	63
3	3.29	1.03	57
4	3.11	1.06	53
5	3.09	1.07	52
6	3.11	1.00	53
7	2.95	0.98	49
8	3.10	1.06	52
9	3.59	0.94	65
10	3.32	1.02	58
11	3.30	1.04	58
12	3.15	1.01	54
13	3.13	1.07	55
14	3.42	1.12	61
15	2.96	1.18	49
16	3.29	0.97	57
17	3.47	1.02	62
18	3.00	0.97	50
19	3.06	1.12	51
20	3.44	1.00	61
21	3.33	1.07	58
22	2.95	0.93	49
23	2.64	0.97	41
24	3.44	0.96	61
25	2.86	1.03	46
26	3.15	1.10	54
27	3.39	1.05	60
28	3.38	1.05	60
29	3.29	0.99	57
30	3.11	1.04	53
31	3.21	1.00	55
32	3.41	0.88	60
33	3.21	1.04	55
34	3.08	1.00	52
35	2.85	1.10	46
36	3.01	1.16	50
37	3.00	1.11	50
38	2.91	1.16	48

Overall Mean = 3.16 = 54%

■ ORGANIZATIONAL DIAGNOSIS QUESTIONNAIRE (ODQ)

Robert C. Preziosi

Both internal and external organization development (OD) consultants at some point in the consulting process must address the question of diagnosis. The need for two levels of diagnosis, preliminary and intensive, was addressed (Lippitt & Lippitt, 1978). The purpose of the Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire (ODQ) is to provide survey-feedback data for intensive diagnostic efforts. Use of the questionnaire either by itself or in conjunction with other information-collecting techniques (such as direct observation or interviewing) will provide the data needed for identifying strengths and weaknesses in the functioning of an organization and/or its subparts. The questionnaire produces data relative to informal activity.

A meaningful diagnostic effort must be based on a theory or model of organizational functioning. This makes action research possible as it facilitates problem identification, which is essential to organization development. One of the more significant models in existence is Weisbord's (1976) Six-Box Organizational Model (Figure 1). Weisbord's model establishes a systematic approach for analyzing relationships among variables that influence how an organization is managed. It provides for assessment in six areas of formal and informal activity: purposes, structure, relationships, rewards, leadership, and helpful mechanisms. The outer circle in Figure 1 determines an organizational boundary for diagnosis. This boundary clarifies the functioning of the internal environment, which is to be analyzed to the exclusion of the external environment.

THE INSTRUMENT

The Organizational Diagnosis Questionnaire is based on Weisbord's practitioner-oriented theory. The ODQ generates data in each of Weisbord's suggested six areas as well as in a seventh, attitude toward change. This item was added as a helpful mechanism for the person involved in organizational diagnosis. In attempting any planned-change effort in an organization it is wise to know how changeable an organization is. Such knowledge helps the change agent understand how to direct his or her efforts.

The ODQ is composed of thirty-five items, five in each of the seven variables. Respondents are asked to indicate their current views of their organization on a scale of 1 to 7, with a score of 4 representing a neutral point.




Figure 1. The Six-Box Organizational Model¹

USES OF THE ODQ

The ODQ can be administered to a work unit, an entire organization, or a random sample of each. It might also be used to analyze staff or line functioning as well as to assess the thinking of different levels of management or supervision. It should be administered by the consultant or process facilitator in order to insure that an adequate explanation of the questionnaire and its use will be given. The consultant could also train others to administer the questionnaire.

Administration and Scoring

The administrator of the questionnaire must emphasize to the respondents that they be open and honest. If they are not, data that yield an inaccurate assessment of the

¹ Reproduced from M.R. Weisbord, 1976, Organizational diagnosis: Six places to look for trouble with or without a theory, *Group & Organization Studies*, 1(4), 430-447, by permission of the publisher and the author.

organization on any or all of the seven variables may be produced. All ODQ statements are positive and can easily be discerned as such, which may influence the manner in which the respondents react to the questionnaire.

Scoring the questionnaire may be done in more than one way. Aggregate data will be most useful; an individual's set of responses is not significant. A self-scoring sheet is provided for each individual. Individual scoring sheets could then be tabulated by the consultant, an assistant, or, for large-scale studies, a computer.

Processing the Data

Once aggregate data have been collected, they must be processed. The first task is to prepare a bar or line graph (or any similar technique) to present the data so that they can be readily understood. The consultant/facilitator should present the data first to the organization's president or the work unit's supervisor (whichever is applicable) to establish understanding, commitment, and support.

Next, a meeting with the work group is essential. During this meeting the consultant/facilitator must weave a delicate balance between task and maintenance issues in order to be productive. During this meeting a number of things take place: information is presented (feedback); information is objectively discussed; group problem solving is encouraged; brainstorming for solutions is facilitated; alternative solutions are evaluated against criteria; a solution is chosen; an action plan is developed; and a plan for future evaluation is determined. This process is presented in detail in Hausser, Pecorella, and Wissler (1977).

The ODQ produces information about the informal system. As Weisbord suggested, the formal system must be considered also. A consultant/facilitator may review an organization's charter, operations manual, personnel policies, etc. Gaps between the two systems lead to a diagnosis of what is not happening that should be happening, or vice versa.

The ODQ is useful for diagnostic efforts insofar as it provides data about people's perceptions of their organization. It is an instrument that may be used separate from or in addition to other information-collecting techniques.

REFERENCES

- Hausser, D.L., Pecorella, P.A., & Wissler, A.L. (1977). *Survey-guided development: A manual for consultants*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Lippitt, G., & Lippitt, R. (1978). *The consulting process in action*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Weisbord, M.R. (1976). Organizational diagnosis: Six places to look for trouble with or without a theory. *Group & Organization Studies*, 1(4), 430-447.

ORGANIZATIONAL DIAGNOSIS QUESTIONNAIRE

Robert C. Preziosi

From time to time organizations consider it important to analyze themselves. It is necessary to find out from the people who work in the organization what they think if the analysis is going to be of value. This questionnaire will help the organization that you work for to analyze itself.

Instructions: Do not put your name on this questionnaire. Please answer all thirty-five questions. *Be open and honest.* Rate how true each of the thirty-five statements is for your organization by choosing the appropriate number from the following seven-point scale:

- 1—Agree Strongly
- 2—Agree
- 3—Agree Slightly
- 4—Neutral
- 5—Disagree Slightly
- 6—Disagree
- 7—Disagree Strongly

- _____ 1. The goals of this organization are clearly stated.
- _____ 2. The division of labor of this organization is flexible.
- _____ 3. My immediate supervisor is supportive of my efforts.
- _____ 4. My relationship with my supervisor is a harmonious one.
- _____ 5. My job offers me the opportunity to grow as a person.
- _____ 6. My immediate supervisor has ideas that are helpful to me and my work group.
- _____ 7. This organization is not resistant to change.
- _____ 8. I am in agreement with the stated goals of my work unit.
- _____ 9. The division of labor in this organization is intended to help it reach its goals.
- _____ 10. The leadership norms of this organization help its progress.
- _____ 11. I can always talk with someone at work if I have a work-related problem.
- _____ 12. The pay scale and benefits of this organization treat each employee equitably.
- _____ 13. I have the information that I need to do a good job.
- _____ 14. This organization introduces enough new policies and procedures.
- _____ 15. I understand the purpose of this organization.

- 1—Agree Strongly
- 2—Agree
- 3—Agree Slightly
- 4—Neutral
- 5—Disagree Slightly
- 6—Disagree
- 7—Disagree Strongly

- _____ 16. The manner in which work tasks are divided is a logical one.
- _____ 17. This organization's leadership efforts result in the organization's fulfillment of its purposes.
- _____ 18. My relationships with members of my work group are friendly as well as professional.
- _____ 19. The opportunity for promotion exists in this organization.
- _____ 20. This organization has adequate mechanisms for binding itself together.
- _____ 21. This organization favors change.
- _____ 22. The priorities of this organization are understood by its employees.
- _____ 23. The structure of my work unit is well designed.
- _____ 24. It is clear to me whenever my supervisor is attempting to guide my work efforts.
- _____ 25. I have established the relationships that I need to do my job properly.
- _____ 26. The salary that I receive is commensurate with the job that I perform.
- _____ 27. Other work units are helpful to my work unit whenever assistance is requested.
- _____ 28. Occasionally I like to change things about my job.
- _____ 29. I have enough input in deciding my work-unit goals.
- _____ 30. The division of labor in this organization actually helps it to reach its goals.
- _____ 31. I understand my supervisor's efforts to influence me and the other members of the work unit.
- _____ 32. There is no evidence of unresolved conflict in this organization.
- _____ 33. All tasks to be accomplished are associated with incentives.
- _____ 34. This organization's planning and control efforts are helpful to its growth and development.
- _____ 35. This organization has the ability to change.

ODQ SCORING SHEET


Instructions: Transfer the numbers you entered on the questionnaire to the blanks below, add each column, and divide each sum by five. This will give you comparable scores for each of the seven areas.

Purposes	Structure	Leadership	Relationships
	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____
	8 ____	9 ____	10 ____
	15 ____	16 ____	17 ____
	22 ____	23 ____	24 ____
	29 ____	30 ____	31 ____
Total	____	Total ____	Total ____
Average	____	Average ____	Average ____

Rewards	Helpful Mechanisms	Attitude Toward Change
5 ____	6 ____	7 ____
12 ____	13 ____	14 ____
19 ____	20 ____	21 ____
26 ____	27 ____	28 ____
33 ____	34 ____	35 ____
Total	Total ____	Total ____
Average	Average ____	Average ____

ODQ PROFILE AND INTERPRETATION SHEET

Instructions: Transfer your average scores from the ODQ Scoring Sheet to the appropriate boxes in the figure below. Then study the back ground information and interpretation suggestions that follow.



BACKGROUND

The ODQ is a survey-feedback instrument designed to collect data on organizational functioning. It measures the perceptions of persons in an organization or work unit to determine areas of activity that would benefit from an organization development effort. It can be used as the sole data-collection technique or in conjunction with other techniques (interview, observation, etc.).

Weisbord's Six-Box Organizational Model (1976) is the basis for the questionnaire, which measures seven variables: purposes, structure, relationships, rewards, leadership, helpful mechanisms, and attitude toward change. The first six areas are from Weisbord's

model, while the last one was added to provide the consultant/facilitator with input on readiness for change.

The instrument and the model reflect a systematic approach for analyzing relationships among variables that influence how an organization is managed. The ODQ measures the informal aspects of the system. It may be necessary for the consultant/facilitator also to gather information on the formal aspects and to examine the gaps between the two.

Using the ODQ is the first step in determining appropriate interventions for organizational change efforts. Its use as a diagnostic tool can be the first step in improving an organization's or work unit's capability to serve its clientele.

INTERPRETATION AND DIAGNOSIS

A crucial consideration is the diagnosis based on data interpretation. The simplest diagnosis would be to assess the amount of variance for each of the seven variables in relation to a score of 4, which is the neutral point. Scores above 4 would indicate a problem with organizational functioning. The closer the score is to 7 the more severe the problem would be. Scores below 4 indicate the lack of a problem, with a score of 1 indicating optimum functioning.

Another diagnostic approach follows the same guidelines of assessment in relation to the neutral point, a score of 4. The score of each of the thirty-five items on the questionnaire can be reviewed to produce more exacting information on problematic areas. Thus diagnosis would be more precise. For example, let us suppose that the average score on item number 8 is 6.4. This would indicate not only a problem in organizational purpose, but also a more specific problem in that there is a gap between organizational and individual goals. This more precise diagnostic effort is likely to lead to a more appropriate intervention in the organization than the generalized diagnostic approach that was described in the preceding paragraph.

Appropriate diagnosis must address the relationships between the boxes in order to determine the interconnectedness of problems. For example, if there is a problem with relationships, could it be that the reward system does not reward relationship behavior? This might be the case if the average score on item 33 was well above 4 (5.5 or higher) and all the items on relationships (4, 11, 18, 25, 32) averaged above 5.5.

■ THE ORGANIZATIONAL-HEALTH SURVEY

Will Phillips

DIMENSIONS OF ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH

In examining organizational health, certain key questions should be addressed in seven dimensions:

1. *Strategic position.* Strategic position is a measure of how well the organization is situated in relation to its external world. A well-positioned organization supplies a growing market; high barriers prevent competitors from entering the market; supplies are plentiful; and there are no threats of changes in legislation, economy, technology, or social climate. How well has the organization designed itself to respond to its market in the current external environment? Is the external environment helping or hindering?

2. *Purpose.* A well-defined purpose directs all of the organization's resources and energy toward achieving a goal. Purpose focuses on meeting the needs of five entities: the customers, the business (cash, profit, and growth), the owners, the employees, and the community. A healthy organizational purpose is clear, and everyone in the organization agrees to it. The most successful purposes add meaning to each individual's work by integrating the organization's purpose with the individual's purpose. How well is the organization focused on its direction, and how well do the key people and employees understand and adhere to the direction and priorities?

3. *Alignment.* A well-aligned organization is very powerful and efficient. It does not waste human energy. The organization's purpose is used to align, evaluate, and refocus every other organizational decision. How well do the organization's strategic support factors (such as culture, plans, structure, systems, and incentives) actually support the purpose of the organization?

4. *Stretching versus coasting.* People stretch when four conditions exist: they are challenged; they feel that they can make a difference in the outcome; they are rewarded rather than punished for stretching; and they are trusted. Is the organization challenging itself and its people? Is there too much challenge (causing strain), too little challenge (resulting in coasting), or just the right amount for maximum productivity?

5. *Control versus responsiveness.* An organization that is over controlled will not allow for flexibility, change, and creativity. What is the balance between control and responsiveness in the organization? A well-controlled organization is rarely surprised. A responsive organization is able to innovate and adapt to changes quickly.

6. *Growth versus profit.* When an organization is in a fast-growth mode, there is a high likelihood that growth may become its downfall. On the other hand, an organization that is spinning off very high amounts of cash and is not growing will also undermine itself. What is the balance between these two goals? Is there enough profit to sustain growth? Is there enough growth to challenge people and to provide opportunities for individual growth?

7. *Individual versus organization.* Every successful organization must find an appropriate balance between serving the needs of the individuals and the needs of the organization. One measure of an organization's focus on individual needs is its ability to attract, develop, and keep talented people. When organizations do not respond to individual needs for challenge, promotion, and increased income, those individuals move or transfer, and the organization loses. What is the balance needed for the organization to meet its own goals and needs along with the goals and needs of individuals in the organization?

THE INSTRUMENTS

The Organizational-Health Survey (Short Form) and The Organizational-Health Survey (Long Form) both measure an organization's health along these seven dimensions. The short form consists of seven scales along which participants are asked to position the organization. Although this placement is highly individual, strong agreement exists within the same level in an organization. Scoring of the instrument is done subjectively by the participants.

The long form consists of forty-five questions, each with a five-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." Questions are asked relating to each of the seven dimensions of organizational health. Scoring is objective; participants can score their own instruments, or the facilitator can do all the scoring.

The short form of the instrument saves time in administration and scoring. However, a lecturette on the seven dimensions must be presented before using the instrument. The short form is especially useful in companies with a history of open and honest communication. Perhaps the best use of the short form is as a discussion starter and agenda builder for management groups.

The long form does not require a lecturette on the seven dimensions. In fact, if a lecturette is given, it should follow the administration of the instrument in order to avoid biased responses. Long forms can be administered individually in advance and scored before a group meeting.

Although no controlled research compares the two forms, experience shows the short form will yield a diagnosis that essentially matches that of the long form. The latter does hold certain advantages, including (1) more depth, (2) more specific input for use in action planning, and (3) more power for eliciting results that motivate organizations to change constructively.

Purpose of the Instruments

These instruments address the following purposes:

1. To provide a structure through which an organization can broadly assess its current health and its potential for future success;
2. To provide diagnostic output that can be used to build an action plan for organizational improvement;
3. To encourage consultants and managers to use a broader range of data in understanding and evaluating an organization's health;
4. To provide a tool to motivate and energize key organizational members to engage in constructive change; and
5. To define more clearly the goal of organizational and individual development efforts in an organization.

Validity and Reliability

The instruments and the seven dimensions of organizational health have been presented to approximately three hundred company presidents in one-half to one-day sessions. They have also been used for in-depth workshops with the top-management teams of approximately two dozen organizations. In each case the dimensions and the results of the instruments found a high degree of acceptance.

Agreement on ratings among members of an organization is quite uniform (less than 10-percent variation) when the organization is characterized as having open and honest communication. When this is not the norm, variation may go up to 30 percent on some items. Most variations occur between levels in an organization; that is, the president usually scores the organization as healthier on all dimensions than does the next level of managers. Lowest-level scores come from the lowest hierarchical level. The more unhealthy the organization, the more dramatic the differences between levels.

Whom To Survey

Regardless of how well the executive director, president, or CEO knows an organization, that person has a strong tendency to see the organization as he or she wants it to be rather than as it is. Additional opinions should be sought from others, such as members of the management team, employees, customers, board members, and vendors.

One of the more effective and efficient ways of getting valuable opinions on the health of the organization is to administer the instruments with members of some or all of these groups plus the CEO in a single meeting. Interaction between the members will lead to more depth, more learning, and eventually more commitment and energy for making improvements and changes in the organization's health.

Certain dangers must be considered before bringing a group of people together to do this, including the following:

- The process will not work if the norm in the organization is not to speak openly and frankly.
- Without adequate structure and appropriate control, the process can degenerate into a gripe session, which is nonproductive.
- It is possible to generate too much data and to be locked into a state of paralysis by overanalysis.

When the survey is used in an organization with a closed culture where communication is guarded and criticism is not accepted well, a good deal of time must be devoted to discussing results. The benefits of team diagnosing can be gained and dangers avoided if a competent outside facilitator with experience in diagnosis conducts the session. The facilitator must have established clear expectations with the CEO, division manager, owner, and others about how the closed culture will be opened before leading a team discussion on the results.

INTERPRETATION OF SCORES

In interpreting scores, it is important to realize that all of the dimensions share a dynamic relationship with one another. Increasing one often decreases another. The skill is to balance them correctly. A discussion of the results should not be sidetracked to the instruments and their accuracy. The best use of the instruments is to open discussions among key people and launch an improvement process.

The following statements offer an overview of how scores on the instruments can be interpreted.

- High strategic position scores are a cause for celebration. However, medium and low scores need quick attention; if not corrected, they will make little difference in how well the organization is managed internally, but future failure is likely. Strategic planning and management are the recommended treatments, in an effort to unfreeze and reorient the organization's focus.
- High purpose scores reflect a very proactive organization. When purpose scores are medium or low, inefficiency and frustration begin to build. Strategic planning and strategic management are the key treatments to improving the organization's purpose. Thorough communication of the purpose throughout the organization then must follow.
- Once the purpose is clear, focused, and agreed on, the rest of the organization can be aligned. Long-term improvements in culture, structure, systems, or incentives depend on a clear purpose to provide healthy guidelines for design.

- When purpose and alignment scores are high, the organization will naturally be stretched. In addition, stretch can be facilitated by a management team skilled in delegation, listening, performance appraisal, and holding people accountable.
- Low control scores are often a precursor to going out of control, particularly in cash management, hiring, acquisitions, or legal suits. Immediate short-term controls should be instituted to provide time to build effective control systems. These systems should also be aligned with the organization's desired purpose, culture, structure, and systems.
- High control and low flexibility scores indicate great barriers to making any significant changes in the organization. The key treatment in this case is in-depth unfreezing of the organization so that a new culture can be designed and commitment to changes can be made with integrity. A long-term follow-up system will be needed to ensure results. Well-led strategic planning can be the vehicle for this unfreezing, but it requires significant participation by key people in a cathartic diagnosis and planning activity.
- Lack of balance in growth and profit may lead to immediate problems. This is especially true when growth exceeds the organization's ability to generate cash, train qualified people, and make good decisions. Rapid growth often creates a sense of invincibility, which is a sure precursor to problems. Treatment consists of recognizing the dangers of growth; having the humility to accept the need to change; and taking specific actions to increase control and build good foundations for growth in the areas of strategy, money, and people. Revitalization of growth must be initiated by a commitment from the top plus in-depth strategic planning.
- High-profit/low-growth organizations have severe problems, but the impact is long term. An organization with low growth will not attract and keep high performers because they see little future for personal growth. Such an organization tends to be managed by good stewards at best and bureaucrats at worst.
- In most cases, organizations pay more attention to organizational needs than to those of individuals. Low ratings on the organizational area are best treated by a clear and agreed-on purpose with an increase in the control areas. Low individual scores may be superficially treated with an increase in personnel or human resource management activities. More significant changes usually require an accompanying change in the culture.

SUMMARY

These two instruments are the result of extensive work with company presidents and their executive teams. They were developed to help executives and managers to

understand better the purpose of organizational and individual development efforts. The instruments are based on a model of organization health that centers around seven essential dimensions. These seven dimensions seek to maximize strategic position, purpose, and alignment, while balancing stretching and coasting; control and responsiveness; growth and profit; and needs of the individual and the organization.

Either of the instruments may be used any time that management is willing to spend a half a day or more to gain better insight about the organization, its current health, and its potential for future success. The impact of either instrument is significantly enhanced if the top management team is also fully involved.

Although the instruments should not be overused with the same people, they are very useful on an annual basis for comparisons and as measures of progress. One practical and effective use of the instruments is as structure for all or part of an organizational retreat. In most cases, a two-day retreat is spent first learning about the dimensions and rating them and then assessing what should be done about changing them in the organization. The output of the session is an agreed-on action plan detailing who will do what by when over the next year to make changes in the seven dimensions.

THE SHORT FORM

Administration

The following steps are suggested for administering the short form:

1. Deliver a lecturette on the seven dimensions of organizational health, using the questions posed earlier in this article as guides.
2. Have participants rate the organization on the seven dimensions using a scale of one to ten, indicating the organization's present position on each continuum with an "X."
3. Have participants draw arrows to indicate any trends of movement to the right or left along the continua.
4. Have participants draw circles to indicate where they believe the organization should be on the continua in order to be healthy.

Using the Data from the Short Form

Information obtained from more than one person can be summarized on a blank form. A simple mathematical average can hide valuable information; therefore, it is more useful to plot each X, circle, and arrow on a master short form. A different color for each person may add clarity. As an alternative presentation, the short form can be drawn on a flip chart or overhead transparency; each participant then publicly expresses his or her data. Each type of information (X's, circles, and arrows) can be discussed separately. The facilitator might use the following procedure:

1. Decide whether or not the master score summary accurately represents the organization. If not, discuss and agree on changes to the summary.
2. Select the two or three dimensions that would be most beneficial to improve.
3. Identify specifics of these dimensions. Avoid involved discussions of what is or is not true, or what is and is not improvable.
4. Design tasks to address improvement in these dimensions.
5. Assign people and deadlines.
6. Decide how to monitor progress.

THE LONG FORM

Administration

Suggestions for administering the long form include the following:

1. Select participants as outlined in “Whom To Survey.”
2. Schedule a meeting of one-half to one and one-half days so that the participants can interpret the data and build an action plan.
3. Have the participants complete the long form.
4. Decide if the facilitator will score the instruments or if the participants will score their own.
5. Combine the individual score summaries before the meeting and prepare a master score summary.

Using the Data from the Long Form

Begin the meeting with the lecturette or an expanded presentation based on the material in this article. Lead a discussion that focuses on the following:

1. Decide whether or not the master score summary accurately represents the organization. If not, discuss and agree on changes to the summary.
2. Select the two or three dimensions that would be most beneficial to improve.
3. Identify specifics of these dimensions. Avoid involved discussions of what is or is not true, or what is and is not improvable.
4. Design tasks to address these areas.
5. Assign people and deadlines.
6. Decide how to monitor progress.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL-HEALTH SURVEY (SHORT FORM)

Will Phillips

Name _____

Instructions: The following items were chosen to assess seven major dimensions of organizational functioning. Taken together they will give an overall indication of the state of health of the organization. Respond to each question to the best of your experience even though you may not have complete background knowledge.

Rate the organization on each of the following seven dimensions using a scale of one to ten, indicating the organization's position on each continuum with an "X." Next, draw arrows to indicate any trends of movement to the right or to the left along the continua. Finally, draw circles to indicate where you believe the organization should be in order to be healthy.

1. Strong Strategic Position Weak
10 - - 9 - - 8 - - 7 - - 6 - - 5 - - 4 - - 3 - - 2 - - 1
2. Purposeful Unfocused
10 - - 9 - - 8 - - 7 - - 6 - - 5 - - 4 - - 3 - - 2 - - 1
3. Aligned Unaligned
10 - - 9 - - 8 - - 7 - - 6 - - 5 - - 4 - - 3 - - 2 - - 1
4. Strained Stretched Coasting
10 - - 9 - - 8 - - 7 - - 6 - - 5 - - 4 - - 3 - - 2 - - 1
5. Control Flexibility
Continuity Change
Stability Creativity
10 - - 9 - - 8 - - 7 - - 6 - - 5 - - 4 - - 3 - - 2 - - 1
6. Profit Growth
10 - - 9 - - 8 - - 7 - - 6 - - 5 - - 4 - - 3 - - 2 - - 1
7. Individual Organizational
Needs Met Needs Met
10 - - 9 - - 8 - - 7 - - 6 - - 5 - - 4 - - 3 - - 2 - - 1

THE ORGANIZATIONAL-HEALTH SURVEY (LONG FORM)

Will Phillips

Name _____

Instructions: The items starting on the next page were chosen to assess the major dimensions of organizational functioning (represented in the instrument by sections SP, P, A, S, C, F, PR, G, I, and O). Taken together they will give an overall indication of the state of health of the organization. Respond to each question to the best of your experience even though you may not have complete background knowledge.

Circle the response following each question that corresponds to one of the following:

SA = Strongly Agree

A = Inclined to Agree

U = Unsure

D = Disagree

SD = Strongly Disagree

Respond to all forty-five items first; then go back through the instrument and complete the scoring for each section

.

SECTION SP

1. Our market is growing.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. There is a steady demand for our products/services.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. In the eyes of our customers, we are clearly distinguished from our competitors.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. It is very difficult and/or costly to enter our line of business.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. We are not overly dependent on suppliers of materials, information, or labor.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. We are not overly dependent on a small number of customers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. There are no products or services that are likely to replace ours in the near future.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. There are few threats to our organization from changes in technology, laws, demography, the economy, or social attitudes.	SA	A	U	D	SD

SP SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	___	___	___	___	___
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×10	×8	×0	×-10	×-20
Compute the total: =	___	+___	+___	+___	+___
				=	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
					SP Total

SECTION P

9. I clearly understand the direction in which our organization is heading.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. We listen to our customers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. I know how my work contributes to the overall organization.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. I am proud of our company.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. We have clear priorities.	SA	A	U	D	SD

P SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	___	___	___	___	___
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×16	×13	×0	×-15	×-30
Compute the total: =	___	+___	+___	+___	+___
				=	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>
					SP Total

SECTION A

14. We have a strong sense of teamwork and cooperation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. The people who work here trust and respect one another.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. The way our jobs are divided is clear and makes sense.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. I get accurate and timely information that helps me do my job.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. Our resources (people, money, time, equipment, and so on) are focused to produce the best results.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. There are incentives to encourage us to do what is important.	SA	A	U	D	SD

A SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	—	—	—	—	—
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×13	×12	×0	×-10	×-20
Compute the total: =	—	+__	+__	+__	+__
				=	<input style="width: 40px; height: 30px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>
					A Total

SECTION S

20. The work I do is very challenging	SA	A	U	D	SD
21. The people I work with try to do their best.	SA	A	U	D	SD
22. We are not overworked or overstressed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
23. We are not spread too thin.	SA	A	U	D	SD

S SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	—	—	—	—	—
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×20	×15	×0	×-15	×-20
Compute the total: =	—	+__	+__	+__	+__
				=	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
					S Total

SECTION C

24. Our actual sales, cost, or profit figures rarely surprise us.	SA	A	U	D	SD
25. We are in compliance with all laws and with agreements we have made.	SA	A	U	D	SD
26. We have accurate, useful, and timely reports on key performance areas.	SA	A	U	D	SD
27. We regularly measure customer satisfaction.	SA	A	U	D	SD
28. We regularly measure employee satisfaction.	SA	A	U	D	SD

C SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	—	—	—	—	—
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×16	×13	×0	×-15	×-30
Compute the total: =	—	+__	+__	+__	+__
				=	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>
					S Total

SECTION F

29. We respond to changes in the outside world that may affect our organization.	SA	A	U	D	SD
30. We regularly seek and use ideas and comments from our customers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
31. Everyone is encouraged to think of ways of doing things better.	SA	A	U	D	SD
32. We regularly fine tune or make improvements in how we do things in all departments.	SA	A	U	D	SD
33. We have a high readiness to make changes if needed.	SA	A	U	D	SD

F SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	—	—	—	—	—
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×16	×13	×0	×-15	×-30
Compute the total: =	—	+—	+—	+—	+—
				=	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
					F Total

SECTION PR

34. We produce enough profit to regularly invest it in people, our facility, or improving our products and services.	SA	A	U	D	SD
35. We have an ample gross margin that does not erode during production or delivery.	SA	A	U	D	SD
36. We have ample cash available.	SA	A	U	D	SD

PR SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	___	___	___	___	___
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×27	×22	×0	×-30	×-50
Compute the total: =	___	+___	+___	+___	+___
					= <input type="text"/>
					PR Total

SECTION G

37. Our market share is growing significantly.	SA	A	U	D	SD
38. Our sales are increasing at over 25 percent per year.	SA	A	U	D	SD
39. We are not growing too fast.	SA	A	U	D	SD

G SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	___	___	___	___	___
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×27	×22	×0	×-30	×-50
Compute the total: =	___	+___	+___	+___	+___
					= <input type="text"/>
					G Total

SECTION I

40. There is a real opportunity for employees to grow and develop here.	SA	A	U	D	SD
41. We have little undesired.	SA	A	U	D	SD
42. The organization cares for its employees.	SA	A	U	D	SD

I SCORING

	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	___	___	___	___	___
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×27	×22	×0	×-30	×-50
Compute the total: =	___	+___	+___	+___	+___
				=	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px;" type="text"/>
					I Total

SECTION O

43. People are held accountable for their performance.	SA	A	U	D	SD
44. People will give a lot to help our organization.	SA	A	U	D	SD
45. Our organization demands a lot from everyone.	SA	A	U	D	SD

O SCORING


	SA	A	U	D	SD
Number of circles in each column:	___	___	___	___	___
Multiply column total by the weighting factor shown:	×27	×22	×0	×-30	×-50
Compute the total: =	___	+___	+___	+___	+___
				=	<input style="width: 50px; height: 30px;" type="text"/>
					O Total

THE ORGANIZATIONAL-HEALTH SURVEY SCORING AND INTERPRETATION SHEET

Instructions: Transfer the score from each section of the long form to this score summary.

- | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|--|
| 1. | SP = Strategic Position Score | |
| 2. | P = Purpose Score | |
| 3. | A = Alignment Score | |
| 4. | S = Stretch Score | |
| 5. | C = Control Score | |
| | F = Flexibility Score | |
| 6. | PR = Profit Score | |
| | G = Growth Score | |
| 7. | I = Individual Score | |
| | O = Organization Score | |

Transfer the scores to the following graph by indicating the score on the vertical line. For dimension 5, plot the control score on the left of line 5, and plot the flexibility score on the right-hand side. Plot the scores for 6 and 7 in the same manner.



INTERPRETATION

Scores that fall in the shaded area (60-80) indicate health. Other scores indicate “not sick” if it feels good or “sick” if it feels bad. In many organizations, the employees will

score less than 60 yet not feel as if anything is wrong with the organization. This is exactly what “not sick” feels like. Weightings for the scores are quite harsh. “Disagree” and “Strongly Disagree” responses will drop scores significantly. This is intentional in order to surface areas that “feel good” now but can lead to disaster in the future (for example the well-performing organization that depends 100 percent on a single customer). If the stretch score is below 60, individual questions should be examined to determine if there is too much or too little tension.

■ ORGANIZATIONAL-LEARNING DIAGNOSTICS (OLD): ASSESSING AND DEVELOPING ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING

Udai Pareek

The concept of learning has traditionally been used in the context of individuals. This concept has been extended to organizations, with a distinction being made between organizational learning (OL) and individual learning (Argyris & Schon, 1978; Etheredge, 1981, 1983; Jangard, 1975). Learning has generally been defined in empirical terms of change (for example, Hilgard & Bower, 1975) or in normative terms of the advancement of humanitarian concerns (for example, Botkin, et al., 1979).

WHAT IS ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING?

Argyris and Schon (1978)—using Argyris’s theory-of-action concept, which was originally developed for individuals—define OL as follows:

Organizational learning occurs when: members of the organization act as learning agents for the organization, responding to changes in the internal and external environments of the organization by detecting and correcting errors in organizational theory-in-use, and embedding the results of their inquiry in private images and shared maps of organization. (p. 29)

David Kolb’s model of individual learning—which postulates a repetitive cycle of concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation—has been applied to OL with some modification (Carlsson, Keane, & Martin, 1976). Etheredge defines government learning in terms of “increased intelligence and sophistication of thought and, linked to it, increased effectiveness of behavior” (Etheredge & Short, 1983, p. 42; also see Etheredge, 1983).

Nonaka and Johansson (1985) proposed and studied four tenets of OL (level of shared knowledge, integration, on-the-job training, and continual education) and have asserted that OL accounts for the way in which Japanese firms’ hard skills have equaled and sometimes surpassed those of Western firms, despite the limited professional education of Japanese managers.

Elements of Organizational Learning

This article proposes a normative concept of OL as a continuum from no learning (insensitive or closed to experiences and realities) to full learning (effective use of experiences for action) and it also proposes mechanisms that are helpful in diagnosing OL systems and intervening to make them more effective. Furthermore, this article

defines OL as “the process by which an organization *acquires, retains, and uses* inputs for its development, and the process results in an enhanced capacity for continued *self-learning and self-renewal*.” This definition OL has five main elements:

1. Organizational learning is a process—a continual series of interlinked activities producing several changes. It is not seen as a product, although OL *results* in the product.
2. One of the three main subsystems of OL is the process of acquiring an input and examining it. Examples of new inputs include new structures, new technology, or any change introduced in the organization. This subsystem corresponds to the innovation phase of OL.
3. The second subsystem of OL is concerned with retaining the acquired input. Retention of an input depends on how well it is integrated in the organization, and OL will be effective only if the new input becomes integrated with the existing practices. This subsystem corresponds to the implementation phase of OL.
4. The third subsystem, which corresponds to the stabilization phase of OL, is concerned with using the new input whenever it is needed. Use also involves adapting the new input in light of the experience gained in its use.
5. Learning will result in an increased capability of an organization to learn more on its own. Self-learning does not necessarily involve an outside stimulus or input. An organization may develop mechanisms for examining its experiences, retaining functional ways, and discontinuing dysfunctional ways of dealing with issues. This self-learning leads to self-renewal.

This concept of OL is similar to the concept of Argyris’s Model II learning system, the underlying aims of which are “to help people produce valid information, make informed choices, and develop an internal commitment to those choices” (Argyris, 1977, p. 122).

MECHANISMS FOR ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING

The mechanisms for OL suggested in this section are divided into five general areas. They provide a few examples of the many specific actions that an organization can take to achieve its purposes.

Experimentation and Flexibility

An organization needs to develop flexibility and a positive attitude toward experimentation, trying out new ways to deal with issues and problems. The following mechanisms can be used to promote these attitudes:

1. Invite experts and experienced and creative practitioners to share their ideas and experiences with selected members of the organization.

2. Encourage employees to try out new ways of dealing with problems, even if these may not always succeed.
3. Reward new approaches that are successful in solving a problem.
4. Hold periodic meetings to share objectives, designs, and experiences of innovations and the results of experiments.
5. Organize employee seminars on new developments.

Mutuality and Teamwork

Organizational learning requires mutual support, mutual respect, learning from one another, collaborative work, and effective teams to solve problems. Without teamwork, OL cannot be effective. In addition to some of the mechanisms already mentioned (items 1, 4, and 5 in the previous section), the following are examples of those that promote teamwork and mutuality:

1. Share experiences, concerns, and ideas with other organizations.
2. Set up task forces for implementing and monitoring new projects or experiments, for examining common elements between old practices and innovations, and for following up on experiments.
3. Hold periodic review meetings chaired by senior or top management. These meetings will not only enhance the importance of the innovation, but will also produce collaborative relationships between top management and those responsible for implementing the change. The top managers' ideals and support play a critical role in OL by both promoting learning and preventing unlearning (Nystrom & Starbuck, 1984).

Contingency and Incremental Planning

The OL continuum varies from certitude and rigidity on one end to tentativeness and flexibility on the other. A blueprint type of planning would appear on the rigid end, and an incremental mode of planning would appear on the flexible end. The incremental or contingency approach to planning promotes OL, and the following mechanisms reflect this type of approach:

1. Prepare a detailed plan that reflects the contingency approach. Time-bound commitments may be prepared, but they should include alternative actions. Contingency planning helps the organization to recognize possible difficulties and to take steps (a) to prevent the difficulties and (b) to take alternative actions if they occur.
2. Link new proposed practices with known ones. Learning is faster if the new inputs are seen as related to some existing practices or ideas. If the new system is building on—rather than supplanting—the old system, threats to the members of the organization will be reduced.

3. Maintain records of experiences. Effective planning requires continual review of and learning from experiences.
4. Encourage various groups to prepare alternative forms of implementation. Modify the implementation plan if required by the experience.
5. As in the first two general areas, invite experts and practitioners to share their ideas, arrange for employees to share their experiences, and create task forces.

Temporary Systems

Temporary systems—such as task groups or task forces, project groups, and problem-identification teams—are effective mechanisms to generate ideas and take quick action. Previously mentioned mechanisms work well in this area: creating task forces for implementing the new input, for monitoring new projects and experiments, and for examining common elements between old and new practices; and arranging review meetings chaired by top or senior management.

There are a number of advantages of temporary systems, including the following:

1. Members of interfunctional, interdepartmental, and interregional groups have diverse points of view.
2. More people are exposed to members of other departments, regions, functional areas, and so forth.
3. The work is done faster because of the time-bound nature of the temporary system.
4. The temporary groups provide more objective views of problems.
5. More risks can be taken, because the members of a temporary system do not have vested interests.
6. There is more flexibility, because temporary systems are not part of the organizational structure and can be created and dissolved according to the needs.

Competency Building

To make OL effective, the organization must build resources that can be used when needed. Competencies are the primary resources that need to be built. Several mechanisms appropriate for competency building have already been mentioned: inviting experts to share ideas, arranging for employees to share experiences, and organizing employee seminars. Listed below are two other examples of competency-building mechanisms:

1. Encourage employees to attend external training programs.
2. Utilize relevant, existing skills for the implementation of change. The more that existing skills are utilized, the more that such competencies develop. Underutilized competencies become atrophied; they also discourage employees

from acquiring new competencies, because it is highly frustrating not to be able to use one's strengths.

DIAGNOSING ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING

Many organizations are interested in knowing about the level of their learning potential and discovering which dimensions are strong and weak so that they can take remedial action. The Organizational-Learning Diagnostics (OLD) instrument has been designed to help organizations to accomplish these goals.

The Instrument

Two dimensions are assessed by the OLD: organizational-learning subsystems or phases and OL mechanisms. The instrument asks managers to rate twenty-three mechanisms on a five-point scale. The more frequently these mechanisms are used, the stronger the organizational learning. These mechanisms are grouped into three subsystems: acquiring and examining (the innovation phase), retaining and integrating (the implementation phase), and using and adapting (the stabilization phase). These are subsystems of OL in the sense that they are present in an organization in varying degrees and are interrelated with a feedback loop; they are phases in the sense that for one particular innovation, they appear in an order—one preceding the other. The OLD contains eight, seven, and eight mechanisms, respectively, for the three subsystems or phases.

Furthermore, all twenty-three items can be grouped into five categories of OL mechanisms: experimentation and flexibility, mutuality and teamwork, contingency and incremental planning, temporary systems, and competency building.

Administration of the Instrument

The OLD should be administered to a fairly large number of managers in an organization. The total organization or a subdivision (such as a department) or both can be rated on the OLD. It can be administered in a group, or individuals can be asked to respond to the instrument.

Scoring and Interpretation

The scoring sheet, which is self-explanatory, is used to score an individual's responses. The twenty-three items are grouped first in three columns representing the three subsystems. Then five other columns, which represent five categories of OL mechanisms, include the items that relate to the specific categories. The score for each item is written on the scoring sheet in the blank adjacent to the number of the item. In the first three columns, each item appears only once. In the other five columns, the item may appear more than once.

The scores in each column are totaled, and each total is written on the "Total" line. Then each total is multiplied by 25, and the product is written in the appropriate blank.

Each product is then divided by the number that is printed beneath it, and the quotient is written on the “POLI” (Potential for Organizational Learning Index) line. Multiplying by the fraction will make the scores comparable for all columns, and each column score will range from zero to one hundred. This system will allow the scores of all respondents to be averaged, with a resulting range of zero to one hundred. The higher the score, the higher the potential of the organization for OL on that dimension.

Use of the OLD

The POLI will provide a diagnostic insight into the OL processes of an organization. The scores on the OLD can be used by top management to diagnose the organization’s strengths and weaknesses. The instrument can also be used for remedial purposes—to take steps to improve the dimensions that are weak. Since each item relates to a specific mechanism, it may be easy to decide what to do. For example, if the total mean score on “temporary systems” is thirty-five, members of the organization can then look at the individual items that received very low scores to discuss and determine the specific mechanisms to use to raise the score.

If developing OL systems is a direction that an organization has accepted, it needs to develop action guidelines or policies to facilitate the process. Focusing on the following concerns has been helpful to some organizations as they develop the policies:

1. *Enhancing functional autonomy with accountability.* The policies should promote autonomy (within defined limits) of a subsystem (for example, a department or unit) and emphasize accountability for the tasks that the subsystem agrees to undertake. Without functional autonomy a system cannot be innovative.

2. *Availability of support and resources.* Implementing change requires resources, and accountability is possible when needed resources are provided. Providing resources also shows an interest in the employees and the system and indicates high expectations for them.

3. *Competency building.* Organizational policies should promote and upgrade competencies needed for the objectives of the organization.

4. *Networking.* Various subsystems involved in a particular area of work need to learn from one another, and they can collaborate in many areas. The development of a network of experts, groups, and organizations enhances learning. Organizational policies need to promote such networking.

REFERENCES

- Argyris, C. (1977). Double loop learning in organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 55(5), 115-125.
- Argyris, C., & Schon, D.A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Botkin, J., et al. (1979). *No limits to learning: Bridging the human gap: The Club of Rome report*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.

- Carlsson, B., Keane, P., & Martin, J.B. (1976). R&D organizations as learning systems. *Sloan Management Review*, 17(3), 1-15.
- Etheredge, L.S. (1981). Government learning: An overview. In S. Long (Ed.), *Handbook of political behavior* (Vol. 2, pp. 73-161). New York: Plenum Press.
- Etheredge, L.S. (1983). *Government learning*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Etheredge, L.S., & Short, J. (1983). Thinking about government learning. *Journal of Management Studies*, 20(1), 41-58.
- Hilgard, G., & Bower, G. (1975). *Theories of learning*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jangard, H. (1975). Organizational learning in the education system. *Nordisk Psykologi*, 27(3), 174-183.
- Nonaka, I., & Johansson, J.K. (1985). Japanese management: What about the "hard skills"? *Academy of Management Review*, 10(2), 181-191.
- Nystrom, P.C., & Starbuck, W.H. (1984). To avoid organizational crises, unlearn. *Organizational Dynamics*, 12(4), 53-65.

ORGANIZATIONAL-LEARNING DIAGNOSTICS (OLD)

Udai Pareek

Instructions: Rate how true each of the twenty-three statements is by choosing the appropriate number from the following five-point scale:

- 4** = The practice is very highly valued and/or is always or very frequently done in your organization.
- 3** = The practice is highly valued and/or is frequently done in your organization.
- 2** = The practice is valued and/or is sometimes done in your organization.
- 1** = The practice has low value and/or is occasionally done in your organization.
- 0** = The practice has very low or no value and/or is seldom or never done in your organization.

- _____ 1. Experts and experienced creative practitioners are invited to share their ideas with members of the organization.
- _____ 2. Employees are encouraged to attend external programs.
- _____ 3. Experiences and concerns of the organization are shared with other organizations.
- _____ 4. Employees are encouraged to experiment.
- _____ 5. Innovations are rewarded.
- _____ 6. Periodic meetings are held for sharing results of experiments.
- _____ 7. Periodic meetings are held for sharing ongoing experiments.
- _____ 8. Employee seminars on new developments are organized.
- _____ 9. Task groups are created for implementing and monitoring new projects and experiments.
- _____ 10. Detailed plans reflecting contingency approaches are prepared.
- _____ 11. Task groups are created to examine common elements between old practices and innovations.
- _____ 12. Newly proposed practices are linked with known practices.
- _____ 13. Records of experiences are maintained.
- _____ 14. Periodic meetings chaired by top or senior management are held to review innovations.
- _____ 15. Relevant existing skills are utilized in implementing change.
- _____ 16. Task groups are created for data-based critiquing of the innovations.
- _____ 17. Periodic meetings are held to review and share experiences.

- 4** = The practice is very highly valued and/or is always or very frequently done in your organization.
- 3** = The practice is highly valued and/or is frequently done in your organization.
- 2** = The practice is valued and/or is sometimes done in your organization.
- 1** = The practice has low value and/or is occasionally done in your organization.
- 0** = The practice has very low or no value and/or is seldom or never done in your organization.
- _____ 18. Task groups are created to evaluate and report on plus-and-minus aspects of innovations.
- _____ 19. Task groups are created to follow up on experiments.
- _____ 20. Widespread debates are held on experiences of implementation.
- _____ 21. Realistic appraisals are made of the support needed for continued use of innovations.
- _____ 22. Implementation plans are modified when experience indicates that modification is needed.
- _____ 23. Various groups are encouraged to prepare some alternative forms of implementation.

ORGANIZATIONAL-LEARNING DIAGNOSTICS (OLD) SCORING SHEET

Instructions: (Note: This instrument is designed to be completed by managers.) Record in the appropriate blanks on the next page (under “Item No.”) the numbers you assigned to the twenty-three statements. In the first three columns (under “PHASES”), each of your answers will be recorded only once. In the next five columns (under “MECHANISMS”), some of your answers will be recorded more than once. For example, you must record your rating for statement 1 in three of those columns (“Experimentation,” “Mutuality,” and “Competency Building”).

After you have entered in your answers, total the numbers you have entered in each column on the “Total” line. Then multiply each total by 25 and write the product on the next line. Now divide each of the products by the number printed beneath it and write the quotient on the “POLI” line.

ORGANIZATIONAL-LEARNING DIAGNOSTICS (OLD) INTERPRETATION SHEET

The POLI (Potential for Organizational Learning Index) will range from zero to one hundred for each respondent on each dimension. When all the respondents' POLI scores from each column are added together and a mean value is calculated for that column, the mean value will also range from zero to one hundred. The higher the score for any dimension, the greater the amount of attention that is being paid to organizational learning in that dimension. The lower the score, the more that attention is lacking in that dimension.

The first three columns relate to phases. Organizational learning is a continuous evolutionary or growth process and involves three phases: innovation, implementation, and stabilization. Innovation is concerned with exposure of the organization to a new idea or practice, acquiring the new input, and reflecting on its costs and benefits. The second phase is related to how the organization integrates the new input and retains it. The third phase is concerned with the continued use and adaptations of the innovation.

The last five columns relate to the types of mechanisms that can be used for organizational learning. A mechanism is a specific action that an organization can take to achieve a purpose. The five categories of mechanisms that are used for this instrument are the following:

1. *Experimentation and flexibility.* An organization needs to develop flexibility and a positive attitude toward experimentation and to try out new ways to deal with issues and problems.

2. *Mutuality and teamwork.* Organizational learning requires mutual support, mutual respect, learning from one another, collaboration, and effective teams to solve problems.

3. *Contingency and incremental planning.* Organizational learning is enhanced by an attitude of learning rather than by an attitude of certitude. The planning process can vary on a continuum, with certitude and rigidity on one end and tentativeness and flexibility on the other. The incremental mode of planning is on the flexible end; it is based on the assumptions that a plan can be prepared with the known variables, that these may undergo changes that require some change in the plan, that a better plan should incorporate this learning, and that different parts of the organization may require variations of the plan.

4. *Temporary systems.* Temporary systems are effective mechanisms to generate ideas and take quick action. Examples of temporary systems include task groups or task forces, special committees, project groups, and problem-identification teams.

5. *Competency building.* To make organizational learning effective, resources that the organization can use when needed must be built. Competencies are the primary resources that need to be built.

If developing organizational-learning systems is a direction that your organization decides or has decided to take, the mechanisms that rated low should be examined as possible ways to change the present situation. However, it is recommended that the organization first develop policies or action guidelines to facilitate the process.

■ ORGANIZATIONAL NORMS OPINIONNAIRE

Mark Alexander

In any organization various norms of behavior influence the effectiveness and job satisfaction of the employees. Norms can be positive (by supporting the organization's goals and objectives) or negative (by promoting behavior that works against organizational goals).

This opinionnaire is designed to identify these organizational norms and to divide them into the following ten categories:

1. organizational/personal pride
2. performance/excellence
3. teamwork/communication
4. leadership/supervision
5. profitability/cost effectiveness
6. colleague/associate relations
7. customer/client relations
8. innovation/creativity
9. training/development
10. candor/openness

Suggested Uses

The opinionnaire can be used for several purposes: team building, management development, and organization assessment and diagnosis. For team-building purposes, group profiles can be developed through a consensus-finding process and used to identify problems. Similarly, a study of the norms and their effects on individual motivation and behavior is helpful in management development.

An especially valuable use is for organizational assessment and diagnosis. By measuring norms in each of the ten categories to see whether they are positive or negative, an organization can develop its own "normative profile." In effect, this normative profile is a statement of the strengths and weaknesses of the organization on a behavioral level. Thus, the organization can use the Organizational Norms Opinionnaire as a basis for initiating changes in work-group norms and behavior.

Although the items in the opinionnaire are phrased to be as generally useful as possible, the facilitator should feel free to adapt them to fit a particular situation.

BACKGROUND READING

Alexander, M. (1977). Organizational norms. In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1977 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.

ORGANIZATIONAL NORMS OPINIONNAIRE

Mark Alexander

Instructions: This opinionnaire is designed to help you determine the norms that are operating in your organization. The opinionnaire asks you to assess what the reaction of most people in your organization *would be* if another person said a particular thing or behaved in a particular manner. For example, the first item reads:

“If an employee in your organization were to criticize the organization and the people in it . . . most other employees would . . .”

To complete this statement, choose one of the following five alternatives:

- A. Strongly agree with or encourage it
- B. Agree with or encourage it
- C. Consider it not important
- D. Disagree with or discourage it
- E. Strongly disagree with or discourage it

Choose the alternative that you think would be the most common response to the action or behavior stated and place the letter corresponding to that alternative in the blank space following each item. Complete all forty-two statements in the same manner, being as honest as possible.

If an employee in your organization were to . . .

**Most Other
Employees
Would:**

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. criticize the organization and the people in it . . . | _____ |
| 2. try to improve things even though the operation is running smoothly . . . | _____ |
| 3. listen to others and try to get their opinions . . . | _____ |
| 4. think of going to a supervisor with a problem . . . | _____ |
| 5. look at himself or herself as being responsible for reducing costs . . . | _____ |
| 6. take advantage of a fellow employee . . . | _____ |
| 7. keep a customer or client waiting in order to look after matters of personal convenience . . . | _____ |
| 8. suggest a new idea or approach for doing things . . . | _____ |
| 9. actively look for ways to expan his or her knowledge in order to be able to do a better job . . . | _____ |

- A. Strongly agree with or encourage it
 - B. Agree with or encourage it
 - C. Consider it not important
 - D. Disagree with or discourage it
 - E. Strongly disagree with or discourage it
10. talk freely and openly about the organization and its problems . . . _____
 11. show genuine concern for the problems that face the organization and make suggestions about solving them . . . _____
 12. suggest that employees should do only enough to get by . . . _____
 13. go out of his or her way to help other members of the work group . . . _____
 14. look at the supervisor as a source of help and development . . . _____
 15. purposely misuse equipment or privileges . . . _____
 16. express concern for the well-being of other members of the organization . . . _____
 17. attempt to find new and better ways to serve the customer or client . . . _____
 18. attempt to experiment in order to do things better in the work situation . . . _____
 19. show enthusiasm for going to an organization-sponsored training and development program . . . _____
 20. suggest confronting the supervisor about a mistake or something in the supervisor's style that is creating problems . . . _____
 21. look at the job as being merely eight hours and the major reward as the paycheck . . . _____
 22. say that there is no point in trying harder, as no one else does . . . _____
 23. work on his or her own rather than work with others to try to get things done . . . _____
 24. look at the supervisor as someone to talk openly and freely to . . . _____
 25. look at making a profit as someone else's problem . . . _____
 26. make an effort to get to know the people he or she works with . . . _____
 27. sometimes see the customer or client as a burden or obstruction to getting the job done . . . _____
 28. criticize a fellow employee who is trying to improve things in the work situation . . . _____

- A. Strongly agree with or encourage it
- B. Agree with or encourage
- C. Consider it not important
- D. Disagree with or discourage it
- E. Strongly disagree with or discourage it

- 29. mention that he or she is planning to attend a recently announced organizational training program . . . _____
- 30. talk openly about problems facing the work group, including personalities or interpersonal problems . . . _____
- 31. talk about work with satisfaction . . . _____
- 32. set very high personal standards of performance . . . _____
- 33. try to make the work group operate more like a team when dealing with issues or problems . . . _____
- 34. look at the supervisor as the one who sets the standards of performance or goals for the work group . . . _____
- 35. evaluate expenditures in terms of the benefits they will provide for the organization . . . _____
- 36. always try to treat the customer or client as well as possible . . . _____
- 37. think of going to the supervisor with an idea or suggestion . . . _____
- 38. go to the supervisor to talk about what training he or she should get in order to do a better job . . . _____
- 39. be perfectly honest in answering this questionnaire . . . _____
- 40. work harder than what is considered the normal pace . . . _____
- 41. look after himself or herself before the other members of the work group . . . _____
- 42. do his or her job even when the supervisor is not around . . . _____

ORGANIZATIONAL NORMS OPINIONNAIRE SCORE SHEET

Instructions: On the ten scales below, circle the value that corresponds to the response you gave for that item on the questionnaire. Total your score for each of the ten categories and follow the indicated mathematical formula for each. The result is your final percentage score.

I. Organizational/Personal Pride

<i>Item</i>	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
1	-2	-1	0	-1	+2
11	+2	+1	0	+1	-2
21	-2	-1	0	-1	+2
31	+2	+1	0	+1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
$\div 8 \times 100 =$ <input style="width: 80px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>					%

II. Performance/Excellence

<i>Item</i>	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
2	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
12	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
22	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
32	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
40	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
$\div 10 \times 100 =$ <input style="width: 80px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>					%

III. Teamwork/Communication

<i>Item</i>	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
3	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
13	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
23	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
33	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
41	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
Total Score _____					Final Score
$\div 10 \times 100 =$ <input style="width: 80px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>					%

IV. Leadership/Supervision

Item	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
4	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
14	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
24	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
34	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
42	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
_____ ÷ 10 × 100 =					<input type="text"/>
					%

V. Profitability/Cost Effectiveness

Item	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
5	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
15	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
25	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
35	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
_____ ÷ 8 × 100 =					<input type="text"/>
					%

VI. Colleague/Associate Relations

Item	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
6	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
16	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
26	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
_____ ÷ 6 × 100 =					<input type="text"/>
					%

VII. Customer/Client Relations

Item	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
7	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
17	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
27	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
36	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
_____ ÷ 8 × 100 =					<input type="text"/>
					%

VIII. Innovation/Creativity

<i>Item</i>	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
8	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
18	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
28	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
37	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
_____ ÷ 8 × 100 = <input type="text"/> %					

IX. Training/Development

<i>Item</i>	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
9	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
19	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
29	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
38	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
_____ ÷ 8 × 100 = <input type="text"/> %					

X. Candor/Openness

<i>Item</i>	Response				
	A	B	C	D	E
10	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
20	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
30	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
38	+2	+1	0	-1	-2
Total Score _____					Final Score
_____ ÷ 8 × 100 = <input type="text"/> %					

ORGANIZATIONAL NORMS OPINIONNAIRE PROFILE SHEET

Instructions: For each of the ten scales, enter your final percentage score from the score sheet and then plot that percentage by placing an “X” on the graph at the appropriate point. (Negative percentages are plotted to the left of the center line and positive percentages are plotted to the right.) Next, connect the “X”s you have plotted with straight lines. The result is your Organizational Norms profile.

Scale	Final Score	-100%	-50%	0%	+50%	+100%
I. Organizational/Personal Pride	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
II. Performance/Excellence	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
III. Teamwork/Communication	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
IV. Leadership/Supervision	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
V. Profitability/Cost Effectiveness	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
VI. Colleague/Associate Relations	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
VII. Customer/Client Relations	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
VIII. Innovation/Creativity	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
IX. Training/Development	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					
X. Candor/Openness	<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>					

■ POWER AND OD INTERVENTION ANALYSIS (PODIA)

Marshall Sashkin and John E. Jones

In the past few years OD practitioners have begun to downplay the “truth and love” model of change that Bennis, writing more than a decade ago, identified as generally ineffective. What is more, there has come to be an increased focus on the uses and dynamics of power, issues that Bennis listed (in 1969) as roundly ignored by change agents.

While OD practitioners were treading softly, generally unwilling to disturb the current management of an organization, more academically oriented people were just as quietly, but carefully, examining the dynamics of power and influence in organizations. There are at least two major streams of academic research on power and influence.

The first research area developed out of Likert’s (1961) ideas about participative management. One of these is that everyone in an organization can get more influence, that influence is not like a pie, to be cut up with only so much to go around; rather, it can be seen as an expandable pie. This concept was based on the work of various social psychologists and developed by Tannenbaum (1969). Tannenbaum and his coworkers carried out a long series of research studies that provide some fairly strong evidence for the “expandable pie” theory of influence.

The second area of research centers on the issue of scarce and “strategic” resources. Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) developed the concept that organizations can be rated as to their effectiveness by looking at how well environmental resources are used or “exploited.” This idea leads to that of power within the organization as control over such internal resources. The concept of power as being attached to control over “strategic resources” was first detailed by Hickson et al. (1971), but has been most clearly defined by Salancik and Pfeffer (1977).

Many people are familiar with French and Raven’s (1959) analysis of social power. However, behavioral science treatments of power have moved away from that early formulation.¹ This is not to deny the correctness of the French and Raven formulation, but only to note that their theory is incomplete and, to some extent, not easily usable. That is, it is evident that having “reward power” increases one’s social power in an organization. But how does one obtain reward power? And what *exactly* does reward power mean? We think it means that one has control over the distribution of certain scarce resources that others want. To get reward power, one must analyze the

¹ One exception would be French and Raven’s “expert power,” since expertise is often a strategic resource. Similarly, “information power,” a sixth power base (in addition to legitimate, reward, punishment, expert, and referent) that was later added to the French and Raven theory could also be a strategic resource.

organizational system, define its “strategic” resources (those limited or scarce resources desired by many), determine who presently controls these resources, and determine how to obtain such control.

Our analysis and instrument are not intended to be “Machiavellian”; we do not expect that the user will be able to wrest control of the corporation from those presently in power. Our intent is, first, to provide a framework for analyzing the “total influence” in an organization (recalling the expandable pie concept) and the relative distribution of influence across hierarchical levels. This helps in identifying *who* holds power. The next step consists of figuring out what that power is based on—what the power holders’ strategic resources are. With these data, an OD consultant has increased his or her own informational power and can better plan OD interventions that will have the impact desired. That is, OD interventions should have a strong power base and should not generate unanticipated resistances from power holders. There are specific, useful tactics for increasing one’s power (Kanter, 1977; McClelland & Burnham, 1976), but no action is likely to be effective without a clear understanding of the sources and distribution of power in the organization.

USES OF THE INSTRUMENT

The primary functions of Power and OD Intervention Analysis (PODIA) are to facilitate (1) the understanding of power dynamics, distribution, and sources and (2) the development of strategies and tactics for increasing the power of OD interventions. More specifically, PODIA can be used to develop an OD intervention strategy that increases intervention impact through greater use of strategic resource power bases. PODIA can be used to determine the most appropriate organizational level or entry point for an OD effort; using PODIA the OD practitioner can locate more clearly strategic resources and who controls them and can plan to obtain the support of critical individuals. Internal/external consulting pairs or teams can effectively use PODIA to share information about power in the system and to make sure that the perceptions of one party are congruent with those of the other. This provides efficient background preparation as well as an accurate structural analysis of the power system. An internal OD group can also use PODIA to good advantage in this way, with a particular focus on the strategic resources controlled by (or the “political position” of) the OD group itself.

OD consultants may find that an analysis of their own power-related styles is useful for determining strategy on the basis of a PODIA analysis. Jones and Banet’s (1978) CCII or Christie’s (1978) Mach V are useful adjunct instruments for such an analysis.

PODIA can, finally, be helpful for documenting organizational changes over time, since power shifts will stand out in Part I and Part II of the instrument.

REFERENCES

- Bennis, W.G. (1959). *Organization development: Its nature, origins, and prospects*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Christie, R. (1978). Mach V attitude inventory. In J.W. Pfeiffer & J.E. Jones (Eds.), *The 1978 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- French, J.R.P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan.
- Hickson, D.J., Hinings, C.R., Lee, C.A., Schneck, R.E., & Pennings, J.M. (1971). A strategic contingencies theory of intraorganizational power. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 216-229.
- Jones, J.E., & Banet, A.G., Jr. (1978). Critical consulting incidents inventory. In J.W. Pfeiffer & J.E. Jones (Eds.), *The 1978 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977). Power games in the corporation. *Psychology Today*, 11(2), 48-53ff.
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McClelland, D.C., & Burnham, D.H. (1976) Power is the great motivator. *Harvard Business Review*, 54(2), 100-110.
- Salancik, G.R., & Pfeffer, J. (1977). Who gets power—and how they hold on to it: A strategic contingency model of power. *Organizational Dynamics*, 5(3), 2-21.
- Tannenbaum, A.S. (Ed.), (1969). *Control in organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tannenbaum, A.S., et al. (1974). *Hierarchy in organizations: An international comparison*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yuchtman, E., & Seashore, S.E. (1967). A system resource approach to organizational effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 891-903.

POWER AND OD INTERVENTION ANALYSIS (PODIA)

Marshall Sashkin and John E. Jones

This instrument is intended to help define more clearly the significant aspects of power dynamics in an organization and to devise OD activities to make better use of power. The focus is on an *organization*, not a group or department, although a large and relatively independent subsystem (such as a decentralized division) can be examined using this instrument. It is important that users be familiar with both the behavioral patterns of organizational members and the technical work-flow process (although familiarity with the work flow is not as important as a knowledge of typical behavioral patterns).

PART I

1. Estimate the amount of influence that people at each level in the organization have over their work. Work is defined loosely as “the things that go on around here.” Circle a number on the scale below for each of the levels. Do each level independently of all the others; the task is not to divide up some fixed quantity of influence but, rather, to evaluate the amount of influence at *each* level on an “absolute” scale.

	<i>Amount of Influence</i> -----▶						
<i>Level</i>	Almost none	Very little	Little	Some	Moderate	Quite a bit	Very much
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Chief executive or president	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Top management	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Mid-level management	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Lower-level management*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Supervisors	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Workers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

* Omit if not appropriate

2. Connect the circled numbers with a solid line to produce a “power profile.” The farther to the right the line is, the more “total influence” exists in the organization. Research studies show that total influence is positively related to measures of organizational performance. A quantitative score can be obtained by adding the circled numbers and dividing by the number of levels.
 - a. Sum of circled numbers: _____
 - b. Number of levels: _____
 - c. $a \div b$: _____
3. Look at the “slope” of the line. In some organizations no one has much power, while in others almost everyone has quite a bit. However, in *all* organizations the line goes diagonally up from left to right. Typically, the more sloped the line, the less satisfied organizational members are, while the more the line approaches the vertical (straight up and down) the higher average satisfaction is. A rough quantitative score can be calculated simply by taking the *range*—the highest circled number minus the lowest, plus one.
4. Not every “higher” level will necessarily have more influence than the next lower level. It is not uncommon for supervisors to have more power than lower-level managers, for lower-level managers to have greater influence than mid-level managers, or for top managers to have more power than the chief executive. Identify those levels (if any) where “power peaks” appear, pointing to the right.

Three important pieces of information have been obtained about influence (applied power) in the organization being examined. *First*, the most *influential levels* in the system have been identified. *Second*, a picture of the *power distribution* across levels has been drawn. *Third*, the *total amount* of influence in the organization has been defined. This is a variable factor—it is possible to increase the total amount of influence in the system so that everyone has more. This involves a long-range approach to OD, through participative management (such as Likert’s System 4), team building that opens people up to increased mutual (reciprocal) influence, job redesign, and other OD approaches.

Any OD actions, however, are likely to be more effective when supported by those who hold power. The next step is to identify such individuals, along with the sources of their power.

PART II

1. Beginning with the most influential level *below* the chief executive, list, in order, the most powerful people at that level. Continue the list by adding, in rank order, the most powerful people at the second most influential level. Continue on to include people at the third most influential level, but stop when your list has ten names. Remember that influence means applied power: the ability to get things done that one wants done. Influence is not the same as legitimate authority.


2. In the column labeled “Strategic Resources,” write beside each person’s name the most important resource—activity, material, information, etc.—that that person controls.
3. Using the far right-hand column, indicate the most important of all the strategic resources listed. If possible rank them all; at the least, identify the most important three with a check mark.
4. Compare your influence ranking of individuals with your strategic resources list. Reconsider individuals’ actual organizational influence where appropriate; revise the original ranking if necessary.

<i>Rank</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Strategic Resources</i>	
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

PART III

You have now identified the most influential levels and individuals in the organization, along with the strategic resources these people control (which are the sources of their power). The decision tree that follows is designed to help develop OD action strategies using the information developed in Parts I and II. Starting at the left, answer question 1. Then refer to the strategy chart (indicated with a circled Roman numeral) or proceed to question 2. Repeat this process with questions 2 and 3.

PODIA Decision Tree



PODIA STRATEGY CHART I

Procedures

Plan: Review PODIA Parts I & II; determine why these people were “overlooked.”

Questions

- How can the PODIA data be tested?
- Why were these people not involved?
- What do these people know about the OD effort?
- What can they do?
- How can they be reached?

Actions

1. Compare judgments of several people.
2. Interview managers.
 1. Interview person(s) initiating OD effort.
 2. Review history of OD effort.
1. Interview power people.
 2. Review public statements of power people.
1. Review resources they control.
 2. Determine what resources are desirable and which, if any, are critical for OD success.
1. Develop contact/involvement plan.
 2. Review plan with managers already involved.

Do: Develop a plan for involving these people in the OD effort so as to use the strategic resources they control to support the OD effort.

When a specific plan for involving these people has been formulated, return to the PODIA Decision Tree and answer Q.2.

PODIA STRATEGY CHART II

Procedures	Questions	Actions
<p><i>Plan:</i> Review PODIA Part II; determine what strategic resources are not being fully utilized or could be better utilized to support the OD effort.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are all strategic resources that were identified being used? • How can unused resources be used? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review PODIA Part II Strategic Resources column. 2. Identify unused or underused resources. 1. Review with power people who control the resources under consideration. 2. Interview others involved in the OD effort.
<p><i>Do:</i> Develop specific plans for utilizing strategic resources.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can the OD effort increase support? • What specifically can be done? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interview power people and others. 2. Identify ideas, suggestions, etc. 1. Develop action plans, first with the individuals who control the strategic resources under consideration, then with others (consultants and managers) involved in the OD effort. 2. Formalize action plans with persons mentioned.

Tactics

Plan actions to increase the frequency and range of contacts with and support from power people:

- How can these people be more involved in the OD activity?
- How can the frequency and types of contact with them be increased?
- What can be done to get their attention (e.g., introducing innovations, taking risks)?

When specific plans have been developed, go to PODIA Strategy Chart III.

PODIA STRATEGY CHART III

Procedures

Plan: Review PODIA Part II; continue the process of identifying influential persons and the strategic resources they control.

Do: Develop a plan for broadening the base of the OD effort through involving additional, less influential people who control less significant resources.

Questions

- Who controls other, less important, resources?
- What resources and how important are they?
- How can these resources be used to support the OD effort?
- What should be done?

Actions

1. Add names to the list.
 2. Verify with other consultants and with managers.
-
1. Identify resources as in PODIA Part II, step 2.
 2. Evaluate resources as in PODIA Part II, step 3.
-
1. Review with persons already heavily involved (consultants and managers).
 2. Interview persons identified; ask them.
-
1. Develop action plans with persons newly identified.
 2. Review, refine, modify plans with new persons and those already involved.

Tactics

Look for support among individuals who control resources and are *not* being threatened:

- Which high-influence people are *not* threatened?
- What kinds of contacts can be made with these people?
- How can the frequency and types of contacts with them be increased?
- What could be done for them right now?
- Can a high-level, powerful sponsor be found?

PODIA STRATEGY CHART IV

Procedures	Questions	Actions
<p><i>Plan:</i> Review PODIA Parts II & III; identify specific plans or actions that threaten specific individuals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which persons feel threatened? • What specifically is producing the threat? • Is the threat real? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interview other managers. 2. Confirm by interviewing threatened persons, if this is not likely to worsen the situation. 1. Review OD plans, attempt to identify specific actions or expressions that resulted in the felt threat. 2. Confirm with concerned persons, if feasible. 1. Check the accuracy of power persons' perceptions of the OD actions under consideration. 2. Independently project effects of actions; determine whether the perceived threat is real.
<p><i>Do:</i> Develop plans to reduce the threat.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can a real threat be reduced? • How can an imagined threat be removed? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review this issue with the threatened person(s). 2. Revise OD action plans. 1. Involve concerned persons in open discussion to express fears. 2. Involve nonthreatened parties, to express differing (accurate) perceptions.

Tactics

Increase threatened person's level of involvement in the OD effort and increase the OD consultant's credibility:

- Is there any way to involve these people in the OD effort?
- What major risks might be taken to gain stature and/or power?

■ S-C (STUDENT-CONTENT) TEACHING INVENTORY

Morris S. Spier

The S-C Teaching Inventory (SCTI) is an “armchair” instrument. There has been no standardization or investigation of its statistical properties. The inventory was not developed to classify behavior or to measure teacher effectiveness. It was not developed to define or monitor “successful” classroom methods or the “correct” philosophy of education. It is a device designed to help respondents focus on, organize, and understand their own experiences in the teacher-student interaction.

DEVELOPMENT

First, several hundred statements reflecting the kinds of experiences that might be encountered in the real world of teaching were generated. Each statement was typed on a separate 3" x 5" card. Working independently, four of my colleagues and I sorted the statements into the following four categories:

Category I: Statements that reflect a teacher’s willingness to share classroom authority and responsibility with students.

Category II: Statements that reflect a teacher’s tendency to centralize classroom authority in his or her own hands.

Category III: Statements that reflect a teacher’s concern for the content of the job, i.e., the performance of task activities, including planning and scheduling course content and evaluating student progress.

Category IV: Statements that reflect a teacher’s concern for the role attributes of the job, including having the respect of students and colleagues, being an expert, or modeling behavior for students to evaluate.

Statements falling into none of the above categories were discarded, and only those items placed in a particular category by all five judges were retained.

The second step involved pairing every statement in Category I above with every statement in Category II, and every statement in Category III with every statement in Category IV. Each resulting pair of statements was typed on a separate 3" x 5" card and sorted into two dimensions by the five judges. Again, only those statement-pairs that all five judges placed in the same dimension were retained. The two resulting dimensions were the following orientations:

Student Orientation (S). These items allow a teacher to choose between attitudes and behaviors that reflect an emphasis on sharing versus those that reflect an emphasis on personally retaining classroom authority.

Content Orientation (C). These items allow a teacher to choose between attitudes and behaviors that reflect emphasis on job activities versus those that reflect an emphasis on role attributes.

In its present form, the SCTI contains forty items (i.e., pairs of statements) measuring the dimensions outlined above. Twenty items drawn from the Category I & II statement-pairs make up the student-orientation (S) scale, and twenty items drawn from the Category III & IV statement-pairs make up the content-orientation (C) scale.

ADMINISTRATION

A nonthreatening climate is important. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. The instrument will simply help to make some of the issues covered in this introduction more meaningful and useful.

It is helpful if the facilitator reads the instructions aloud while the participants read them silently to themselves. He or she should emphasize particularly:

- The repetitiveness of some of the items, noting that this is not an attempt to measure the participant's response consistency;
- That it may sometimes be difficult to choose the most important statement of two equally attractive alternatives, but the participant must choose one or the other;
- That participants may find some items in which they feel both alternatives are unattractive, but they should still choose the most important, i.e., the statement that they feel is least unattractive; and
- That participants should not spend too much time on any single item, because first impressions may be best.

If some participants complete the instrument sooner than others, they should sit quietly until all others are finished. Most people complete the inventory in about fifteen to twenty minutes.

THEORY INPUT

The way a teacher runs his or her classroom does not just happen. Instead, a teacher's behavior is determined by his or her *beliefs* about the real world. One set of beliefs centers on aspects of the psychological contract between teachers and students. The other set of beliefs centers on aspects of the psychological contract between teachers and the educational system.¹

¹ Research has shown two similar dimensions to be important in determining leadership behavior in organizations. Blake and Mouton (1964) built a model to understand leadership styles in organizations (the Managerial Grid) and named the dimensions "concern for people" and "concern for production." The former stresses a manager's concern for the needs of the people who work for the organization. The latter stresses his or her concern for the needs of the organization.

Basic Assumptions

First, what a teacher does in the classroom reflects some basic assumptions and beliefs about students and learning. Every teacher's behavior reflects his or her personal answer (voiced or unvoiced) to the question "Do you really believe that people *want* to learn and are capable of taking responsibility for their own learning, or that they need to be coerced or seduced into receiving an education?" Thus a teacher who gives frequent quizzes, reviews students' notebooks to be sure they are taking notes, and checks off homework assignments reflects certain beliefs about students' attitudes toward learning—as does a teacher who is friendly and easy-going in his or her approach.

Second, a teacher's behavior also reflects voiced or unvoiced answers to questions about a teacher's role in the learning process. Teachers who emphasize planning and organizing course content, meeting with students, and designing new approaches to class material reflect certain beliefs about the expectations of their administrators and the educational system. So do other teachers who emphasize personal expertise, respect, and setting an example for students.

In the SCTI, a teacher's assumptions and beliefs about students' attitudes toward learning and how a teacher should respond to students' needs are measured by the S scale. A teacher's assumptions and beliefs about his or her role in the classroom are measured by the C scale.

Both orientations, of course, exist simultaneously in the behavior of every teacher. A teacher can be highly student oriented and highly content oriented at the same time. It is a teacher's philosophy that determines the emphasis he or she places on each orientation. Some teachers, who feel that the needs of students and of the system are mutually exclusive and inevitably in conflict, strive to resolve the conflict by concentrating on one or the other set of needs. Other teachers, while also feeling that a conflict between incompatible needs is inevitable, work toward some compromise or balance in which neither orientation is fully emphasized. Still other teachers see the student orientation and content orientation as functionally related. They aim to *integrate* student and system needs by emphasizing both.

FIVE TEACHING STRATEGIES

Five "pure" teaching strategies (or styles) result from (1) the interaction of the student and content orientations, and (2) the differing degrees of emphasis that teachers place on each orientation. The five styles are discussed below and are visually depicted in Figure 1, "Models of Teaching Strategies" (adapted from Blake & Mouton, 1964).

Strategy 1

The strategy at the lower right-hand corner of the diagram defines the style of teachers whose basic philosophy dictates that student and system needs are mutually exclusive. Thus these teachers resolve the conflict by placing maximum emphasis on content orientation and minimum emphasis on student orientation.

For these teachers, the syllabus defines what should be taught; the length of the term governs the time available. Because students naturally resist school and learning, a teacher's primary responsibility is to make sure the material *gets taught*. It is important to set definite standards of classroom performance and to check continually to see that students are meeting the standards. This is accomplished by giving frequent quizzes, taking attendance at all classes, constructing some test questions from minute points contained in footnotes in the text, and so on.

Strategy 2

These teachers, whose strategy appears at the upper left-hand corner of the diagram, also feel that student and system needs are incompatible and in conflict. Like their Strategy 1 colleagues, they believe that students really do resist school and learning. But they disagree that the basic conflict can be overcome by tight classroom control. Instead, these teachers place maximum emphasis on student orientation and minimum emphasis on content orientation.

Students will be taught by teachers they like—so being liked is both practical and personally gratifying for these teachers. They feel that a teacher's primary responsibility is to be supportive and to win the friendship of his or her students. This is accomplished by being friendly in the classroom, ignoring attendance, allowing students to set their own course grades, inviting students to visit at home, and so on.

Strategy 3

Like their Strategy 1 and 2 colleagues, the teachers whose strategy is defined in the lower left-hand corner of the diagram also believe in the conflict of student and system needs and in students' natural resistance to learning. But, unlike their colleagues, they feel helpless to deal with the situation.

Students will learn what they want to learn, when they want to learn it. Teachers simply cannot change this fact. Thus, their primary responsibility is to present the information and to do what their job descriptions require. If teachers get "good classes," they are lucky; if they get "bad classes," there is nothing they can do about it. Those students with initiative will learn. For these teachers, their philosophy justifies their dull, mechanical presentations. At the university level they may prefer to teach advanced seminars and shun the basic core courses.

Strategy 4

At the middle of the diagram is the strategy of those teachers who believe in the basic incompatibility of student and system needs. But they aim for a compromise, or balance, by fully emphasizing neither the student orientation nor the content orientation.

Both system needs and student needs matter, but these teachers cannot see how to put them together. They end up with a moderate level of concern for each. Thus, the system requires teachers to give examinations, but they may specify the exact pages in

the text from which questions will be drawn. Similarly, because they are required to give grades, they may grade on a curve, allow students to omit one or more test scores in computing final grades, give extra points for class attendance, or allow students to write an extra paper or book review to improve their grades.

Strategy 5

At the upper right-hand corner of the diagram is the strategy of teachers who believe that students are always learning. In their mind, student and system needs are not *inevitably* in conflict. They aim to *integrate* both sets of needs by placing maximum emphasis on both student and content orientations.

These teachers feel that their primary responsibility is not to see that something is *taught*, but rather to see that something is *learned*. Thus it is important to create a climate in which learning is involving, meaningful, and relevant. Learning activities are structured to bring maximum benefit to the student, the teacher, and the school system.

The preceding descriptions are clearly caricatures of teacher behavior; they are not intended to be descriptions of real people. Certainly there are as many different classroom strategies as there are teachers. The strategy descriptions exaggerate behaviors that differentiate types of teachers, not to simplify behavior but to make it more understandable. If the strategies are defined, they can be changed. The S-C Teaching Inventory is a way of opening this process by providing a vocabulary, a model, and some self-involving experiences to focus on one's own behavior.

REFERENCE

Blake, R., & Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The managerial grid*. Houston: Gulf Publishing.




Figure 1. Models of Teaching Strategies

S-C TEACHING INVENTORY

Morris S. Spier

The following inventory concerns your feelings about some teaching practices. Its purpose is to provide you with meaningful information about yourself as a teacher.

There are no right or wrong answers. The best answer is the one most descriptive of your feelings and opinions. Therefore, answer honestly, because only realistic answers will provide you with useful information.

Each of the forty items consists of two statements, either about what a teacher can do or ways he or she can act. Circle the letter (A or B) in front of the statement that *you* think is the more important way for a teacher to act. In the case of some items you may think that both alternatives are important, but you still should choose the statement you feel is *more* important. Sometimes you may think that both alternatives are unimportant; still you should choose the statement you think is *more* important.

It is more important for a teacher:

1. (A) To organize his or her course around the needs and skills of every type of student.
(B) To maintain definite standards of classroom performance.
2. (A) To let students have a say in course content and objectives.
(B) To set definite standards of classroom performance.
3. (A) To emphasize completion of the term's course syllabus.
(B) To let students help set course goals and content.
4. (A) To give examinations to evaluate student progress.
(B) To allow students a voice in setting course objectives and content.
5. (A) To reward good students.
(B) To allow students to evaluate the performance of their instructor.
6. (A) To allow students to make their own mistakes and to learn by experience.
(B) To work to cover the term's subject matter adequately.
7. (A) To make it clear that he or she is the authority in the classroom.
(B) To allow students to make their own mistakes and to learn by experience.
8. (A) To be available to confer with students on an "as needed" basis.
(B) To have scheduled office hours.
9. (A) To give examinations to evaluate student progress.
(B) To tailor the course content to the needs and skills of each class.
10. (A) To draw a line between himself or herself and the students.
(B) To let students plan their own course of study according to their interests.
11. (A) To take an interest in the student as a person.
(B) To make it clear that the teacher is the authority in the classroom.

12. (A) To draw a line between himself or herself and the students.
(B) To be available for conferences with students on an “as needed” basis.
13. (A) To modify a position if a student points out where he or she was wrong.
(B) To maintain definite standards of classroom performance.
14. (A) To allow students to have a say in evaluating teacher performance.
(B) To draw a line between himself or herself and the students.
15. (A) To see that the class covers the prescribed subject matter for the course.
(B) To be concerned about the student as a person.
16. (A) To let students learn by experience.
(B) To maintain definite standards of classroom performance.
17. (A) To allow students a voice in setting course objectives and content.
(B) To make it clear that he or she is the authority in the classroom.
18. (A) To discourage talking among students during class time.
(B) To establish an informal classroom atmosphere.
19. (A) To allow student evaluation of faculty.
(B) To make it clear that the teacher is the authority in the classroom.
20. (A) To draw a line between himself or herself and the students.
(B) To let students make mistakes and learn by experience.
21. (A) To be an authority on the class materials covered.
(B) To keep up to date in the field.
22. (A) To be respected as a person of high technical skill in the field.
(B) To update class and lecture materials continually.
23. (A) To attend to his or her own professional growth.
(B) To be an authority on the class materials covered.
24. (A) To attend to his or her own professional growth.
(B) To set an example for his or her students.
25. (A) To see that each student is working at his or her full capacity.
(B) To plan, in considerable detail, all class activities.
26. (A) To construct fair and comprehensive examinations.
(B) To set an example for his or her students.
27. (A) To be known as an effective teacher.
(B) To see that each student is working at his or her full capacity.
28. (A) To construct fair and comprehensive examinations.
(B) To see that each student is working at his or her full capacity.
29. (A) To be an authority on the class materials covered.
(B) To plan and organize his or her course work carefully.
30. (A) To be a model for his or her students to emulate.
(B) To try out new ideas and approaches on the class.

31. (A) To see that each student is working at his or her full capacity.
(B) To plan and organize course content carefully.
32. (A) To have scheduled office hours to meet with students.
(B) To be an expert on the course subject matter.
33. (A) To set an example for his or her students.
(B) To try out new ideas and approaches on the class.
34. (A) To teach basic courses as well as more advanced courses.
(B) To be a model for his or her students to emulate.
35. (A) To plan and organize the class activities carefully.
(B) To be interested in and concerned with student understanding.
36. (A) To be an authority on the course content.
(B) To be known as an effective teacher.
37. (A) To give examinations to evaluate student progress.
(B) To be an authority on the class materials covered.
38. (A) To attend professional meetings.
(B) To be respected as a person of high technical skill in the field.
39. (A) To be respected for his or her knowledge of the course subject matter.
(B) To try out new ideas and approaches on the class.
40. (A) To be an authority on the course content.
(B) To construct fair and comprehensive examinations.

S-C TEACHING INVENTORY SCORING SHEET

The instrument may be self-scored directly on the questionnaire or it may be scored using a template. To score directly on the questionnaire, the following steps should be used.

1. Participants are asked to draw a line across the page under item 20.
2. Items 1 to 20 comprise the S scale. The following answers are read to the group, calling out first the item number, then the response. The participants should place an "X" next to each item for which they have chosen the response indicated below.

Item	Response	Item	Response	Item	Response
1	A	8	A	15	B
2	A	9	B	16	A
3	B	10	B	17	A
4	B	11	A	18	B
5	B	12	B	19	A
6	A	13	A	20	B
7	B	14	A		

3. Items 21 to 40, which comprise the C scale, are scored as in Step 2 above. The answers follow.

Item	Response	Item	Response	Item	Response
21	B	28	A	35	A
22	B	29	B	36	B
23	A	30	B	37	A
24	A	31	B	38	A
25	B	32	A	39	B
26	A	33	B	40	B
27	A	34	A		

4. The number of X's scored for items 1 through 20 are counted. This number should be written in the top square of the box (next to the S) on the Summary Sheet.
5. The number of X's scored for items 21 through 40 are counted and written in the bottom square of the box (next to the C) on the Summary Sheet.
6. Next, both S and C scores should be plotted on the chart on the Summary Sheet. The score in the S box should be plotted on the left side (vertical scale) of the chart. The score in the C box should be plotted on the bottom (horizontal scale) of the chart. The participants make a mark on the chart where their S and C scores intersect.

If preferred, a scoring template can be made by taking another sheet and punching out holes for the appropriate responses as indicated above. Then the number of X's showing for items 1 through 20 and the number showing for items 21 through 40 are counted. Steps 4 through 6 follow as above.

INTERPRETATION OF SCORING

With a score of 20 denoting a “high” or maximal concern and a score of 0 denoting a “low” or minimal concern, teaching *philosophies* may be interpreted in terms of the degree of emphasis placed on each of the respective orientations.

A high score on the S scale of the SCTI means that the participant agrees that students should have a voice in planning, organizing, implementing, and evaluating classroom activities. A low score on this scale means that the participant rejects student involvement in these activities and feels that classroom authority should be centered in the hands of the teacher.

A high score on the C scale means that the participant stresses the performance of the task activities of the teaching job, including the planning and organizing of course content and the evaluation of student progress. In contrast, a low score on this scale means that the participant stresses the role attributes of the teacher's job, including being an expert, being respected, and setting an example for students to emulate.


Similarly, teaching *styles* may be interpreted in terms of the interaction of the S and C scales, that is, in terms of the degree of student orientation versus content orientation which a given teacher exhibits. The intersect of the S and C scores, when plotted on the graph provided on the Summary Sheet, will place every participant somewhere on the chart. For example, an S-C intersect falling in the lower right-hand quadrant is indicative, as discussed above, of a Strategy 1 teaching style.

Finally, participants may review their responses to the specific items which resulted in their particular S- and C-scale scores. Discussion can then be generated about the specific teaching *behaviors* defined by the individual items. When participants are asked to go back over the questionnaire, noting items that caused them particular difficulty or about which they have particularly strong feelings, some lively small-group discussion is likely to result.

S-C TEACHING INVENTORY SUMMARY SHEET

Name _____ Date _____

S	
C	



■ TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT (TQM) INVENTORY

Gaylord Reagan

Often the process of total quality management (TQM) serves to differentiate successful organizations from unsuccessful ones. After inventing and then discarding the principles of TQM approximately five decades ago, American managers once again are learning *continuous improvement* for the quality of products and services they offer to internal as well as external customers. The basic criteria of TQM are simultaneously very simple and highly complex; however, they can be mastered by committed organizations. A necessary first step in learning about and implementing TQM is to assess the emphasis that an organization places on these eight basic criteria.

THE INSTRUMENT

Theoretical Framework

Total quality management is not a short-term, morale-boosting and efficiency-improvement program. In fact, TQM is not a “program” at all. It can be defined best as a strategic, integrated management philosophy based on the concept of achieving ever-higher levels of customer satisfaction. These higher levels are a result of the emphasis that an organization’s senior managers place on using participative management, total employee involvement, and statistical methods to make continual improvements in their organization’s processes.

The Total Quality Management (TQM) Inventory is based on the eight criteria identified by the President’s Council on Management Improvement, the Office of Personnel Management, the Federal Quality Institute, and the Office of Management and Budget. Specific content of the criteria is based on the following models: Deming’s (1982) statistical process-control, Juran’s (1986) project-by-project continuous improvement, Crosby’s (1986a) zero defects, and Feigenbaum’s (1983) total quality control.¹

Following are the eight TQM criteria:

This instrument is based on the Federal Quality Institute’s *Federal Total Quality Management Handbook 2: Criteria and Scoring Guidelines for the President’s Award for Quality and Productivity Improvement*, Washington, DC: Office of Personnel Management, 1990.

¹ Through mid-1991, four publications on these topics have been published by the Federal Quality Institute; another eight are scheduled to be released at later dates. Following are the titles published through mid-1991: (1) *How To Get Started: Implementing Total Quality Management Part—1*; (2) *How To Get Started: Appendix—Part 1A*; (3) *Criteria and Scoring Guidelines: The President’s Award for Quality and Productivity Improvement*; and (4) *Introduction to Total Quality Management in the Federal Government*.

Criterion 1: Top-Management Leadership and Support. This criterion examines upper management's role in building and maintaining a total-quality environment. It focuses on the following factors: visible, senior-management involvement in TQM; existence of written policies and strategies supporting TQM; allocation of human and other resources to TQM activities; plans for removing barriers to TQM implementation; and creation of a value system emphasizing TQM.

Criterion 2: Strategic Planning. This criterion probes the level of emphasis placed on total quality during the organization's planning process. The focus here is on the existence of strategic TQM goals and objectives, the use of hard data in planning for TQM, the involvement of customers and employees in planning for TQM, and the injection of TQM into the organization's budget process.

Criterion 3: Focus on the Customer. This criterion examines the degree to which the organization stresses customer service. It focuses on assessing customer requirements, implementing customer-satisfaction feedback mechanisms, handling customer complaints, empowering employees to resolve customer problems, and facilitating the communication processes required to support these activities.

Criterion 4: Employee Training and Recognition. This criterion explores the extent to which the organization develops and rewards behaviors that support total quality. It centers on the existence of a training strategy designed to support TQM, the use of needs assessments to identify areas in which TQM training is needed, the allocation of funds for TQM training, the assessment of the effectiveness of TQM training, and the recognition of employee accomplishments.

Criterion 5: Employee Empowerment and Teamwork. This criterion delves into the breadth and depth of total-quality involvement that organizational members are encouraged to demonstrate. Its focus is on increasing employee involvement in TQM activities, implementing feedback systems through which organizations can become aware of employee concerns, increasing employee authority to act independently, identifying ways to increase employee satisfaction, and using data to evaluate human resource management practices within the organization.

Criterion 6: Quality Measurement and Analysis. This criterion scrutinizes the organization's use of data within a total-quality system. The focus here is on using hard data to assess TQM results and on using the results of that assessment to identify changes needed to achieve higher levels of customer satisfaction.

Criterion 7: Quality Assurance. This criterion looks at the organization's use of total-quality practices in connection with the products and services provided to customers. It focuses on implementing new methods for achieving greater customer satisfaction, using rigorous scientific methods to verify that the new methods actually achieve their intended purposes, and assessing the outcomes of the new methods.

Criterion 8: Quality- and Productivity-Improvement Results. This criterion explores the actual results produced by the organization's total-quality efforts. Its focus is on

identifying specific instances in which the organization's TQM efforts over a long period of time (three to six years) actually resulted in higher levels of customer satisfaction in areas such as timeliness, efficiency, and effectiveness.

Extensive detail on the eight criteria can be found in the Federal Quality Institute's publication, *Criteria and Scoring Guidelines for the President's Award for Quality and Productivity Improvement* (Federal Quality Institute, 1990).² As the publication's editors point out (p. vi), "Other management systems may contain certain elements of these criteria, [but] it is the combination of all eight that distinguishes TQM."

Reliability and Validity

The Total Quality Management (TQM) Inventory is designed for use as an action-research tool rather than as a rigorous data-gathering instrument. Applied in this manner, the inventory has demonstrated a high level of face validity when used with audiences ranging from executive managers to nonmanagement personnel.

Administration

The following suggestions will be helpful to the facilitator who administers the instrument:

1. Before respondents complete the inventory, discuss briefly the concept of TQM. It is important that respondents understand that TQM is not another faddish, short-term, productivity-improvement "program." Instead, TQM is a strategic, culture-based commitment to meeting customer requirements and to continually improving products and services. The foundations on which that commitment is built can be found in the eight criteria forming the core of the instrument. Similar criteria are included in Japan's Deming prizes and in the United States' Baldrige award (Walton, 1986).
2. Distribute copies of the Total Quality Management (TQM) Inventory Theory Sheet. Review the descriptions of the eight criteria to ensure that respondents understand the focus of each one. Explanatory remarks should be simple and to the point. The purpose of this step is to clarify the meanings of the criteria, not to encourage respondents to initiate a premature discussion of their organizations' placements on criterion ranking scales.
3. Distribute copies of the instrument and read the instructions aloud as the respondents follow.
4. Instruct the respondents to read each of the six statements listed under each criterion. Each respondent chooses the statement that best describes how he or she perceives the present situation in his or her organization. Choices range from

² The President's Award is the United States government's version of its private sector's Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Awards and Japan's Deming prizes.

exceptionally strong performance to total absence of performance for each criterion.

5. Request that the respondents wait to score the instrument until everyone has completed it.

Scoring

Each respondent should be given a copy of the Total Quality Management (TQM) Inventory Scoring Sheet. The left column of the scoring sheet lists the eight criteria of total quality management. The right column of the scoring sheet lists point values for each of the six possible responses to each criterion. Respondents simply transfer their answers from the Total Quality Management (TQM) Inventory to the appropriate rows and columns on the scoring sheet. After responses have been circled for all eight criteria, each respondent totals the circled point values to obtain an overall score for the inventory.

Interpretation and Processing

When respondents finish determining their overall scores on the inventory, the facilitator should distribute the Total Quality Management (TQM) Interpretation Sheet. The Interpretation Sheet consists of five score categories ranging from “world-class TQM” to “absolutely no interest in learning about TQM.” Each category offers brief guidelines for preparing appropriate TQM goals.

The numbers listed in the Response Categories/Points section of the scoring sheet also represent the approximate weights attached to each individual TQM criterion by the Federal Quality Institute’s President’s Award. For example, note that an organization’s score for “Quality- and Productivity-Improvement Results” is much more central to successful TQM implementation efforts than its score on a criterion such as “Employee Training and Recognition”—although it is difficult to see how the former could be achieved without the presence of the latter. Respondents may wish to refer back to “A” statements for each criterion as bases for discussing “world-class” TQM activities.

Some groups find it useful to prepare a copy of the scoring sheet on a newsprint flip chart. In this case, the facilitator polls the individual respondents as to the option letter they selected for each criterion. Their differing perceptions then form the basis for discussion. In order to provide respondents with group norms, it may also be useful to compute average scores for each of the eight criteria and for the overall score.

Uses of the Instrument

The Total Quality Management (TQM) Inventory is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To offer the respondents the opportunity to identify and to define eight key criteria of TQM;

2. To differentiate the importance of each criterion;
3. To provide a framework for respondents to assess an organization's current emphasis on each of the eight criteria;
4. To initiate discussions about the adequacy of the organization's level of activity for each of the eight criteria; and
5. To stimulate planning designed to increase the organization's level of TQM involvement.

Therefore, the TQM Inventory can be used to diagnose the organization's readiness for involvement in total quality management. The instrument can focus on perceptions of the overall organization or of individual units or departments within the organization.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES

- Clements, R.R. (1988). *Statistical process control and beyond*. Malabar, FL: Robert E. Krieger.
- Crosby, P.B. (1984). *Quality without tears: The art of hassle-free management*. New York: New American Library.
- Crosby, P.B. (1986a). *Quality is free: The art of making quality certain*. New York: New American Library.
- Crosby, P.B. (1986b). *Running things: The art of making things happen*. New York: New American Library.
- Crosby, P.B. (1990). *Let's talk quality: 96 questions you always wanted to ask Phil Crosby*. New York: Plume.
- Deming, W.E. (1982). *Out of the crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for Advanced Engineering Study.
- Federal Quality Institute. (1990). *Federal total quality management handbook 2: Criteria and scoring guidelines for the President's award for quality and productivity improvement*. Washington, DC: Office of Personnel Management.
- Feigenbaum, A.V. (1983). *Total quality control*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gabor, A. (1990). *The man who discovered quality: How W. Edwards Deming brought the quality revolution to America—the stories of Ford, Xerox, and GM*. New York: Times Books.
- Juran, J.M. (1988a). *Juran on planning for quality*. New York: The Free Press.
- Juran, J.M. (Ed.). (1988b). *Juran's quality control handbook* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Juran, J.M. (1989). *Juran on leadership for quality: An executive handbook*. New York: The Free Press.
- The memory jogger: *A pocket guide of tools for continuous improvement*. (1988). Methuen, MA: GOAL/QPC.
- Townsend, P.L., & Gebhardt, J.E. (1990). *Commit to quality*. New York: John Wiley.
- Walton, M. (1986). *The Deming management method*. New York: Perigee Books.

TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT (TQM) INVENTORY THEORY SHEET

The Total Quality Management (TQM) Inventory is based on eight criteria identified by the President's Council on Management Improvement, the Office of Personnel Management, the Federal Quality Institute, and the Office of Management and Budget. Following are the eight criteria:

Criterion 1: Top-Management Leadership and Support

This criterion examines upper management's role in building and maintaining a total-quality environment. It focuses on the following factors: visible, senior-management involvement in TQM; existence of written policies and strategies supporting TQM; allocation of human and other resources to TQM activities; plans for removing barriers to TQM implementation; and creation of a value system emphasizing TQM.

Criterion 2: Strategic Planning

This criterion probes the level of emphasis placed on total quality during the organization's planning process. The focus here is on the existence of strategic TQM goals and objectives, the use of hard data in planning for TQM, the involvement of customers and employees in planning for TQM, and the injection of TQM into the organization's budget process.

Criterion 3: Focus on the Customer

This criterion examines the degree to which the organization stresses customer service. It focuses on assessing customer requirements, implementing customer-satisfaction feedback mechanisms, handling customer complaints, empowering employees to resolve customer problems, and facilitating the communication processes required to support these activities.

Criterion 4: Employee Training and Recognition

This criterion explores the extent to which the organization develops and rewards behaviors that support total quality. It centers on the existence of a training strategy that is designed to support TQM, the use of needs assessments to identify areas in which TQM training is needed, the allocation of funds for TQM training, the assessment of the effectiveness of TQM training, and the recognition of employee accomplishments.

Criterion 5: Employee Empowerment and Teamwork

This criterion delves into the breadth and depth of total-quality involvement that organizational members are encouraged to demonstrate. Its focus is on increasing employee involvement in TQM activities, implementing feedback systems through

which organizations can become aware of employee concerns, increasing employee authority to act independently, identifying ways to increase employee satisfaction, and using data to evaluate human resource management practices within the organization.

Criterion 6: Quality Measurement Analysis

This criterion scrutinizes the organization's use of data within a total-quality system. The focus here is on using hard data to assess TQM results and on using the results of that assessment to identify changes needed to achieve higher levels of customer satisfaction.

Criterion 7: Quality Assurance

This criterion looks at the organization's use of total-quality practices in connection with the products and services provided to customers. It focuses on implementing new methods for achieving greater customer satisfaction, using rigorous scientific methods to verify that the new methods actually achieve their intended purposes, and assessing the outcomes of the new methods.

Criterion 8: Quality- and Productivity-Improvement Results

This criterion explores the actual results of the organization's total-quality efforts. Its focus is on identifying specific instances in which the organization's TQM efforts over a long period of time (three to six years) actually resulted in higher levels of customer satisfaction in areas such as timeliness, efficiency, and effectiveness.

TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT (TQM) INVENTORY

Gaylord Reagan

Instructions: For each of the eight total quality management criteria listed below, choose the statement that best describes the present situation in your organization. Write the letter of that statement in the blank to the left of each criterion.

___ **Criterion 1: Top-Management Leadership and Support**

- A. Top managers are directly and actively involved in activities that foster quality.
- B. Top managers participate in quality-leadership activities.
- C. Most top managers support activities that foster quality.
- D. Many top managers are not only interested in but also supportive of quality improvement.
- E. Some top managers are beginning to tentatively support activities that foster quality.
- F. No top-management support exists for activities involving quality.

___ **Criterion 2: Strategic Planning**

- A. Long-term goals for quality improvement have been established across the organization as part of the overall strategic-planning process.
- B. Long-term goals for quality improvement have been established across most of the organization.
- C. Long-term goals for quality improvement have been established in key parts of the organization.
- D. Short-term goals for quality improvement have been established in parts of the organization.
- E. The goals of the organization contain elements of quality improvement.
- F. No quality-improvement goals have been established anywhere in the organization.

___ **Criterion 3: Focus on the Customer**

- A. A variety of effective and innovative methods are used to obtain customer feedback on all organizational functions.
- B. Effective systems are used to obtain feedback from all customers of major functions.
- C. Systems are in place to solicit customer feedback on a regular basis.

- D. Customer needs are determined through random processes rather than by using systematic methods.
- E. Complaints are the major methods used to obtain customer feedback.
- F. No customer focus is evident.

___ **Criterion 4: Employee Training and Recognition**

- A. The organization is implementing a systematic employee-training and recognition plan that is fully integrated into the overall, strategic, quality-planning process.
- B. The organization is assessing what employee training and recognition is needed, and the results of that assessment are being evaluated periodically.
- C. An employee training and recognition plan is beginning to be implemented by the organization.
- D. An employee training and recognition plan is under active development.
- E. The organization has plans to increase employee training and recognition.
- F. There is no employee training, and there are no systems for recognizing employees.

___ **Criterion 5: Employee Empowerment and Teamwork**

- A. Innovative, effective, employee-empowerment and teamwork approaches are used.
- B. Many natural work groups are empowered to constitute quality-improvement teams.
- C. A majority of managers support employee empowerment and teamwork.
- D. Many managers support employee empowerment and teamwork.
- E. Some managers support employee empowerment and teamwork.
- F. There is no support for employee empowerment and teamwork.

___ **Criterion 6: Quality Measurement Analysis**

- A. Information about quality and timeliness of all products and services is collected from internal and external customers and from suppliers.
- B. Information about quality and timeliness is collected from most internal and external customers and from most suppliers.
- C. Information about quality and timeliness is collected from major internal and external customers and from major suppliers.
- D. Information about quality and timeliness is collected from some internal and external customers.

- E. Information about quality and timeliness is collected from one or two external customers.
- F. There is no system for measuring and analyzing quality.

— **Criterion 7: Quality Assurance**

- A. All products, services, and processes are designed, reviewed, verified, and controlled to meet the needs and expectations of internal and external customers.
- B. A majority of products, services, and processes are designed, reviewed, verified, and controlled to meet the needs and expectations of internal and external customers.
- C. Key products, services, and processes are designed, reviewed, verified, and controlled to meet the needs and expectations of internal and external customers.
- D. A few products and services are designed, reviewed, and controlled to meet the needs of internal and external customers.
- E. Products and services are controlled to meet internally developed specifications that may or may not include customer input.
- F. There is no quality assurance in this organization.

— **Criterion 8: Quality- and Productivity-Improvement Results**

- A. Most significant performance indicators demonstrate exceptional improvement in quality and productivity over the past five years.
- B. Most significant performance indicators demonstrate excellent improvement in quality and productivity over the past five years.
- C. Most significant performance indicators demonstrate good improvement in quality and productivity.
- D. Most significant performance indicators demonstrate improving quality and productivity in several areas.
- E. There is evidence of some quality and productivity improvement in one or more areas.
- F. There is no evidence of quality and productivity improvement in any areas.

TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT (TQM) INVENTORY SCORING SHEET

To determine your scores on the inventory, complete the following three steps:

1. For each of the *Total Quality Management Criteria* listed in the left column, find the letter under the heading labeled *Response Categories/Points* that corresponds to the one you chose on the questionnaire.
2. Then circle the one- or two-digit *Point* number that corresponds to the letter you chose.
3. Finally, add up the points circled for all eight criteria to determine your *Overall Score*.

Note: The numbers you are about to circle correspond to the relative weights attached to individual Quality/Productivity Criteria in the President's Award.³ Therefore, in addition to helping to score your responses, the points also identify the categories that are more significant than others. For example, scores on Criterion 8 (Quality- and Productivity-Improvement Results) are better indicators of an organization's orientation toward quality and productivity than are its scores on Criterion 4 (Employee Training and Recognition).

Total Quality Management Criteria	Response Categories/Points					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
1. Top-Management Leadership and Support	20	16	12	8	4	0
2. Strategic Planning	15	12	9	6	3	0
3. Focus on the Customer	40	32	24	16	8	0
4. Employee Training and Recognition	15	12	9	6	3	0
5. Employee Empowerment and Teamwork	15	12	9	6	3	0
6. Quality Measurement and Analysis	15	12	9	6	3	0
7. Quality Assurance	30	24	18	12	6	0
8. Quality- and Productivity-Improvement Results	50	40	30	20	10	0
SCORES FOR CHOICE CATEGORIES	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
OVERALL SCORE:	_____	(Range: 0-200)				

³ This instrument is based on the Federal Quality Institute's *Federal Total Quality Management Handbook 2: Criteria and Scoring Guidelines for the President's Award for Quality and Productivity Improvement*, Washington, DC: Office of Personnel Management, 1990.

TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT (TQM) INVENTORY INTERPRETATION SHEET

166-200 points: An overall score in this range indicates a “world-class” organization with a deep, long-term, and active commitment to improving quality and productivity. At this level, goals should focus on the challenge of maintaining gains as well as seeking ways to attain even higher levels of quality and productivity.

120-159 points: An overall score in this range indicates that an organization with a sound, well-organized philosophy of quality and productivity improvement is beginning to emerge. At this level, goals should focus on fully implementing a sound TQM effort while continuing to build on current levels of excellence.

80-119 points: An overall score in this range indicates an organization that is starting to learn about and plan quality and productivity improvements. At this level, goals should focus on moving from the planning stages to actually implementing a TQM effort in order to gain the necessary hands-on experience.

40-79 points: An overall score in this range indicates an organization that is vaguely aware of quality and productivity improvement but has no plans to learn about or implement such activity. Scores at this level approach the danger point; if long-term organizational viability is sought, progress must be made quickly. Goals should focus on strongly encouraging top managers to learn more about TQM while reexamining their assumptions about possible contributions that the process can make to the health of their organization.

0-39 points: An overall score in this range indicates an organization that currently has neither an awareness of nor an involvement with quality- and productivity-improvement programs. Unless an organization has an absolute, invulnerable monopoly on extremely valuable products or services, this level represents a de facto decision to go out of business. Goals should focus on an emergency turnaround. Learning about total quality management must occur at an accelerated rate, and plans to bring quality and productivity consciousness to the organization must be implemented immediately.

■ THE TRAINER TYPE INVENTORY (TTI): IDENTIFYING TRAINING STYLE PREFERENCES

Mardy Wheeler and Jeanie Marshall

As change agents, most trainers are continually aware of changes in themselves. As they facilitate growth and development in others, they struggle to improve themselves, to become more effective as leaders, planners, presenters, and facilitators. Most trainers also recognize that different adults prefer to learn in different ways (Kolb, 1976), and these trainers often are motivated to become more skillful in training people in a variety of ways in order to be effective with as many trainees as possible. Rather than using only the training style(s) with which they may be most comfortable, trainers can learn to use new techniques and behaviors to suit different trainees and training objectives.

The Trainer Type Inventory (TTI) is designed to help trainers to identify their preferred training methods in order to:

1. Identify the areas in which they have the greatest skill and expertise, which they can share with other trainers.
2. Identify the areas in which they can attempt to increase their skills, thereby increasing their ability to address all aspects of the adult learning cycle (Kolb & Fry, 1981).

Change and growth can become more meaningful, more useful, and more exciting for everyone involved when trainers change and grow along with their trainees.

Malcolm Knowles (1984) says that adults will learn “no matter what.” Learning is as natural as rest or play. With or without books, visual aids, inspiring trainers, or classrooms, adults will manage to learn. Trainers can, however, make a difference in *what* people learn and in *how well* they learn it. If adults (and, many believe, children as well) know *why* they are learning, and if the reason fits their needs as they perceive them (the “so what?”), they will learn quickly and retain more information.

THE ADULT LEARNING CYCLE AND THE EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING CYCLE

Although adults learn continually, they do have preferences about how they learn. David Kolb (1976) calls these “learning style” preferences.

Some adults have a receptive, experience-based approach to learning; these individuals rely heavily on feeling-based judgements and learn best from specific examples, involvement, and discussions. Kolb calls these learners Concrete Experiencers (see Figure 1). In the Experiential Learning Cycle (Pfeiffer & Jones, 1980)

(see Figure 2), the Concrete Experiencer may be very receptive to and excited by experiencing the activity (step 1) and publishing and sharing reactions to the activity (step 2). At the same time, the Concrete Experiencer may become glassy eyed during step 4, in which the group generalizes about the activity.




Figure 1. The Adult Learning Cycle

Some adults have a tentative, impartial, and reflective approach to learning. Such individuals rely heavily on careful observation and learn best from situations that allow impartial observation. Kolb calls these the Reflective Observers (see Figure 1). These individuals, in terms of the Experiential Learning Cycle (Figure 2), obtain insight and learning most easily from processing (step 3) and generalizing (step 4), rather than from doing the activity (step 1) or applying the learning (step 5).

Continuing around the Adult Learning Cycle, other adults have an analytical and conceptual approach to learning, relying heavily on logical thinking and rational evaluation. These individuals learn best from impersonal situations, from the opportunity to integrate new learning with what is already known, and from theory. This

group is termed the Abstract Conceptualizers; they tend to be most comfortable in step 4 of the Experiential Learning Cycle, generalizing.




Figure 2. The Experiential Learning Cycle and the Adult Learning Cycle.

Finally there are adult learners who are called Active Experimenters. Their approach to learning is pragmatic (“Yes, but will it work?”). They rely heavily on experimentation and learn best from projects, back-home applications, and “trying it out.” They must have the answer to the question: “Now that I know all this, what am I going to *do* with it?” Step 5 in the Experiential Learning Cycle, applying, is especially necessary for the Active Experimenter.

The Experiential Learning Cycle cannot be abridged simply because an individual prefers one particular approach to learning. If effective, lasting, learning is to occur with any individual, the Experiential Learning Cycle must be completed. Although the Reflective Observer, for example, may *prefer* the impartial, reflective approach to learning, this learner must move through the entire cycle (concrete experience/activity → publishing/reflective observation/processing → abstract conceptualization/generalizing → active experimentation/applying) for the learning to settle and for the trainee to “own” whatever was learned. It therefore is necessary that a trainer be able to lead trainees skillfully through all aspects of the learning cycle.

THE TRAINER TYPE INVENTORY (TTI)

The title “Trainer Type Inventory” reflects an attempt to avoid confusion with Brostrom’s “Training Style Inventory,” published in *The 1979 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators* (Jones & Pfeiffer, 1979). The Trainer Type Inventory was originally designed in the belief that trainers train others most comfortably using or emphasizing their own preferred learning styles. The authors hypothesized that, for example, trainers who are Abstract Conceptualizers probably would feel very comfortable integrating theories with events, making generalizations, and interpreting—and would be most effective in training other Abstract Conceptualizers. Such trainers could grow and develop most by expanding their skills to include methods that would appeal to the Active Experimenters and Concrete Experiencers in training programs, thus addressing the preferred learning styles of a greater number of trainees. However, the authors of this inventory discovered that there is no significant relationship between a trainer’s own learning-style and training-style preferences. Nonetheless, the usefulness of the instrument becomes apparent when respondents identify their preferred or typical training styles. Such recognition has proved to be an exciting and valuable experience for many trainers. Further value is found when the respondents share insights, training techniques, and advice with other trainers who want to build skills in areas outside their current repertoires.

The Trainer Type Inventory describes four training approaches, categorized as “Listener,” “Director,” “Interpreter,” or “Coach.” The Listener trains the Concrete Experiencer most effectively and is very comfortable in the activity and publishing steps of the Experiential Learning Cycle. The Director obtains the best results from the Reflective Observer and usually is very comfortable during step 3, processing (particularly in helping trainees to make the transition from “How do I feel about this?” to “Now what?”). The Interpreter trains in the style favored by the Abstract Conceptualizer (step 4, generalizing), and the Coach trains in the style favored by the Active Experimenter (step 5, applying). These relationships are indicated in Table 1.

HISTORY OF THE TTI

The Trainer Type Inventory has been administered in conjunction with Kolb’s (1976) Learning Style Inventory to more than five hundred respondents, including participants in public workshops and seminars; undergraduate and graduate academic classes; and workshops conducted in-house for business, industry, and service organizations. In addition, the TTI alone has been administered to participants in programs such as American Society of Training and Development (ASTD) workshops and has been used numerous times by both authors in public training events, in programs conducted in-house for a casualty insurance company, and in private consulting work. Workshop participants have reported that they have, in turn, administered the TTI to colleagues in order to share insights and to facilitate team development for co-training. Respondents have found the instrument to be valid and useful, particularly as a tool for identifying

specific trainer-development needs. In addition, some revisions have been made to the instrument to reflect the contributions of respondents.

The TTI is intended for use in professional-development work and is not intended to be used as a psychological “test.”

Table 1. A Comparison of Trainer Types

	L Listener	D Director	I Interpreter	C Coach
Learning Environment	Affective	Perceptual	Symbolic	Behavioral
Dominant Learning Style	Concrete Experiencer	Reflective Observer	Abstract Conceptualizer	Active Experimenter
Means of Evaluation	Immediate personal feedback	Discipline based; External criteria	Objective criteria	Learner's own judgment
Means of Learning	Free expression of personal needs	Memorization; knowing terms and rules	New ways of seeing things	Discussion with peers
Instructional Techniques	Real-life applications	Lectures	Case studies, theory, reading	Activities, homework, problems
Contact with Learners	Self-directed; Autonomous	Little participation	Opportunity to think alone	Active participation
Focus	“Here and now”	“How and why”	“There and then”	“What and how”
Transfer of Learning	People	Images	Symbols	Actions
Sensory Perception	Touching	Seeing and hearing	Perceiving	Motor skills

SCORING THE TTI

The Trainer Type Inventory contains twelve sets of four words or phrases. Every word or phrase corresponds to one of the four training types. Respondents rank the four choices in a set, transfer the number they have assigned to each word or phrase to the scoring sheet (according to the instructions), and add the numbers posted for each category. The lowest total indicates the least preferred style and the greatest area of potential growth and development. The highest total indicates the respondent's most preferred style. One possible implication of the highest score is that the respondent might be using this training style to excess and may need to develop skills in other

training approaches in order to be able to present training that will make sense or transfer to a greater range of participants.

ADMINISTERING THE TTI

One suggested sequence for using the TTI in a training event is as follows.

1. Introduce the inventory and briefly describe its purpose.
2. Deliver a brief lecture on learning styles and the adult learning cycle.
3. Distribute blank paper and a pencil to each participant and direct each of them to write a few lines about the following:
 - a. As I reflect on my most successful experience as a trainer, I remember (For example: “. . . that I felt a part of the group” or “. . . that I facilitated action planning as part of the closing activities.”)
 - b. What I like most about being a trainer is (For example: “. . . being the expert” or “. . . empowering others.”)
 - c. My favorite instructional technique is (For example: “. . . case studies” or “. . . role plays.”)
 - d. What I find most difficult about training is (For example: “. . . getting started” or “. . . keeping track of time.”)
4. Ask the participants to set aside their responses for a brief period of time.
5. Administer the TTI and then lead the participants in scoring their own forms.
6. Divide the participants into four groups according to their highest scored types: L, D, I, or C. Ask them to discuss their sentence completions (from step 3) and common responses. Give a copy of the appropriate trainer-type description to each group (“Listener” to the L group, “Director” to the D group, etc.). Ask the members of each group to discuss the characteristics and implications of their type and to prepare a report describing how they train.
7. Before each group delivers its report to all participants, suggest that each individual refer to his or her TTI scoring sheet to find the type for which he or she has the lowest score and to pay special attention to the group report for that type in order to identify growth opportunities.
8. Encourage an exchange of suggestions for growth opportunities among those participants who want to expand their training style ranges. This can be accomplished in several ways:
 - a. Form small groups of participants of equally mixed training types and have them share suggestions and then report them to the larger group.
 - b. Ask the “same-type” groups to reassemble, to prepare suggestions for increasing one’s skill in their specific styles, and then to report these suggestions to the larger group.

- c. Encourage pairs of participants to form contractual agreements among themselves to practice new skills and to report back to each other.
9. Encourage commitment by asking each participant to complete the following sentence: “The next time I design a training program, I will”

REFERENCES

- Brostrom, R. (1979). Training style inventory (TSI). In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1979 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Knowles, M. (1984). *The adult learner: A neglected species* (3rd. ed.). Houston, TX: Gulf.
- Kolb, D.A. (1976). *Learning style inventory: Technical manual*. Boston: McBer.
- Kolb, D., & Fry, R. (1981). Experiential learning theory and learning experiences in liberal arts education. *New directions for experiential learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pfeiffer, J.W., & Jones, J.E. (1980). Introduction to the structured experiences section. In J.W. Pfeiffer & J.E. Jones (Eds.), *The 1980 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.

TRAINER TYPE INVENTORY (TTI)

Mardy Wheeler and Jeanie Marshall

Instructions: There are twelve sets of four words or phrases listed below. Rank order the words or phrases in each set by assigning a 4 to the word or phrase that most closely applies to or reflects your personal training style, a 3 to the word or phrase that next best applies to your training style, a 2 to the one that next applies your training style, and a 1 to the word or phrase that is least descriptive of your training style. Be sure to assign a different ranking number to each of the four choices in each set.

You may find it difficult to rank the items. Be assured that there are no right or wrong answers; the purpose of the inventory is to describe the style in which you train most often, not how effectively you train.

1. a. _____ Subgroups b. _____ Lectures c. _____ Readings d. _____ Lecture- discussions	2. a. _____ Showing b. _____ Perceiving c. _____ Helping d. _____ Hearing	3. a. _____ Symbols b. _____ Actions c. _____ People d. _____ Instructions
--	---	--

4. a. _____ Small-group discussions b. _____ Free expression c. _____ Little participation d. _____ Time to think	5. a. _____ Immediate personal feedback b. _____ Objective tests c. _____ Subjective tests d. _____ Personal evaluation	6. a. _____ Expert b. _____ Scholar c. _____ Advisor d. _____ Friend
---	--	--

<p>7.</p> <p>a. _____ Theory</p> <p>b. _____ Practical skills</p> <p>c. _____ Application to real life</p> <p>d. _____ New ways of seeing things</p>	<p>8.</p> <p>a. _____ Coach</p> <p>b. _____ Listener</p> <p>c. _____ Director</p> <p>d. _____ Interpreter</p>	<p>9.</p> <p>a. _____ Seeing “who”</p> <p>b. _____ Telling “how”</p> <p>c. _____ Finding “why”</p> <p>d. _____ Asking “what”</p>
--	---	--

<p>10.</p> <p>a. _____ Processing</p> <p>b. _____ Generalizing</p> <p>c. _____ Doing</p> <p>d. _____ Publishing</p>	<p>11.</p> <p>a. _____ Lead them to understand it</p> <p>b. _____ Perceiving</p> <p>c. _____ Let them enjoy it</p> <p>d. _____ Get them to think about it</p>	<p>12.</p> <p>a. _____ It’s yours</p> <p>b. _____ It’s ours</p> <p>c. _____ It’s mine</p> <p>d. _____ It’s theirs</p>
---	---	---

TRAINER TYPE INVENTORY SCORING SHEET

Instructions: Each word or phrase in each of the twelve sets on the TTI corresponds to one of four training styles, which will be described on the TTI Interpretation Sheet. To compute your scale scores for each type, transfer your numerical ranking for each item on the inventory to the appropriate space in the columns below. Then add up the numbers in each column and enter the totals in the spaces below the columns. The totals are your scores for the four training types.

L: 1a _____	D: 1b_____	I: 1c _____	C: 1d _____
2d _____	2a_____	2b _____	2c _____
3c _____	3d_____	3a _____	3b _____
4b _____	4c_____	4d _____	4a _____
5a _____	5b_____	5c _____	5d _____
6d _____	6a_____	6b _____	6c _____
7c _____	7d_____	7a _____	7b _____
8b _____	8c_____	8d _____	8a _____
9a _____	9b_____	9c _____	9d _____
10d _____	10a_____	10b _____	10c _____
11c _____	11d_____	11a _____	11b _____
12b _____	12c_____	12d _____	12a _____
Total: _____	Total: _____	Total: _____	Total: _____

TRAINER TYPE INVENTORY INTERPRETATION SHEET

Each of the four training styles identified by the TTI is characterized by a certain training approach, way of presenting content, and relationship between the trainer and the trainees. The following are the primary characteristics of the trainer for each of the four training types.

LISTENER (L)

- Creates an affective learning environment
- Trains the Concrete Experiencer most effectively
- Encourages learners to express personal needs freely
- Assures that everyone is heard
- Shows awareness of individual group members
- Reads nonverbal behavior
- Prefers that trainees talk more than the trainer
- Wants learners to be self-directed and autonomous
- Exposes own emotions and experiences
- Shows empathy
- Feels comfortable with all types of expression (words, gestures, hugs, music, art, etc.)
- Does not seem to “worry” about the training
- Stays in the “here-and-now”
- Is practical and adapts
- Appears relaxed and unhurried

DIRECTOR (D)

- Creates a perceptual learning environment
- Trains the Reflective Observer most effectively
- Takes charge
- Gives directions
- Prepares notes and outlines
- Appears self-confident

- Is well organized
- Evaluates with objective criteria
- Is the final judge of what is learned
- Uses lectures
- Is conscientious (uses the announced agenda)
- Concentrates on a single item at a time
- Tells participants what to do
- Is conscious of time
- Develops contingency plans
- Provides examples
- Limits and controls participation

INTERPRETER (I)

- Creates a symbolic learning environment
- Trains the Abstract Conceptualizer most effectively
- Makes connections (ties the past to the present, is concerned with the flow of the training design)
- Integrates theories and events
- Separates self from learners, observes
- Shares ideas but not feelings
- Acknowledges others' interpretations as well as own
- Uses theory as a foundation
- Encourages generalizations
- Presents well-constructed interpretations
- Listens for thoughts; often overlooks emotions
- Wants trainees to have a thorough understanding of facts, terminology
- Uses case studies, lectures, readings
- Encourages learners to think independently
- Provides information based on objective data

COACH (C)

- Creates a behavioral learning environment
- Trains the Active Experimenter most effectively
- Allows learners to evaluate their own progress
- Involves trainees in activities, discussions
- Encourages experimentation with practical application
- Puts trainees in touch with one another
- Draws on the strengths of the group
- Uses trainees as resources
- Helps trainees to verbalize what they already know
- Acts as facilitator to make the experience more comfortable and meaningful
- Is clearly in charge
- Uses activities, projects, and problems based on real life
- Encourages active participation

■ TRAINING STYLE INVENTORY (TSI)

Richard Brostrom

Training people for leadership roles in learning groups can be difficult, particularly when one consults the often conflicting “how to” literature on the subject. The classic debate between *behaviorists* (emphasizing control, shaping, prompting, reinforcing, token economy) and *humanists* (advocating freedom, spontaneity, student-centering, individuality, feelings) is just one example of basic differences.

A person new to training and teaching can be confused by these separate advocacies or feel obliged to follow an unnatural “teaching” script simply because a text says it is *the way*.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TRAINING STYLE INVENTORY (TSI)

The Training Style Inventory is designed as an orientation experience—one that explores various beliefs about the teaching-learning process and helps a trainer/teacher form decisions about the use of various methods and techniques. More than just techniques, however, participants learn about themselves and their personal impact on others in the teaching-learning setting. The goal is to develop a flexible set of alternative procedures and personal skills appropriate for learners, teachers, and trainers and for the task itself.

The TSI consists of fifteen stem phrases, each of which has four completion statements. The completion items correspond to four major instructional orientations: the behaviorist, structuralist, functionalist, and humanist approaches.

The inventory requires that each of the four statements in each group be ranked, with 4 points given to the most preferred response, 3 to the next preferred, 2 to the next preferred, and 1 to the least preferred response. Items are keyed with the small letters “a” through “h.” All “a” and “e” items measure the behaviorist orientation. Items keyed “b” or “f” relate to the structuralist orientation; those keyed “c” or “g” concern the functionalist orientation; and those keyed “d” or “h” measure the humanist approach. The four responses to each item are randomized, in order to avoid obvious response bias.

Based on and adapted from *Developing Effective Teaching Styles* by Richard Brostrom. Copyright © COMCOR, 1975. This material may be freely reproduced for educational/training/research activities only. Permission for systematic or large-scale reproduction or distribution—or inclusion in other publications—must be obtained from the copyright holder.

SUGGESTED DESIGN

The administration of the TSI falls into two categories: prework and the session itself.

Prework

Two suggestions that are helpful:

1. The Training Style Inventory is best administered prior to the training experience. Participants need not score and interpret at this point, however.
2. The facilitator may want to assign a single reading selected from one of the theoretical models—behaviorism, structuralism, functionalism, or humanism—to each of the participants. (Many sources exist, including Skinner, 1974—behaviorism; Mager, 1975—structuralism; McClelland, 1976—functionalism; Rogers, 1969—humanism.) Each participant should come to the session prepared to summarize the main thoughts contained in the article and to respond, from the perspective of that author, to issues raised in the activity. (An interesting technique is to give each participant the appropriate “name card” of the assigned author. The opposition that develops on certain issues causes a healthy, even entertaining, “conflict” and facilitates the discussion of the various theoretical positions.)

The Session

The following sequence is useful during the session itself.

1. The training experience is begun by asking participants to identify *what* is really being taught in their groups and *how* that particular content would most effectively be taught. The responses are displayed on newsprint or a chalkboard, and the group is invited to go beyond a superficial response to a level of genuine introspection, for example, on how one actually develops attitudes.
2. The discussion is concluded by suggesting that the group look more closely at what the experts have to say. The facilitator gives a brief orientation to the various theoretical approaches. He or she suggests how the theories differ, in general terms, and how these differences are expressed in training behaviors—the contrast between behaviorists and humanists, for example.
3. Participants then score the TSI and share their initial reactions. Clarity will develop with the individual presentations and feedback, helping participants see the accuracy or inaccuracy of the profiles for them.
4. Participants make their individual presentations, “teaching” the group about the learning approach they have studied. It is suggested that the order of presentations start with the behaviorist orientation and continue through the structuralist and functionalist, ending with the humanist. Videotaping of

individuals as they make their presentations can add the dimension of personal feedback.

5. After each presentation, the group is asked to reflect on both the *content* of what was presented and the *process*. The facilitator may elect to use a film featuring an expert describing that particular orientation.
6. The group's process eventually emerges as an exciting dimension of learning experiences—about the time that the group moves into the content on the humanist orientation to learning. People are usually ready for spontaneous experiencing and interacting at this point.

REFERENCES

- Mager, R.F. (1975). *Preparing instructional objectives*. Belmont, CA: Fearon.
- McClelland, D.C. (1976). *The achievement motive*. New York: Halsted Press.
- Rogers, C.R. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Skinner, B.F. (1974). *About behaviorism*. New York: Knopf.

TRAINING STYLE INVENTORY

Richard Brostrom

Instructions: For each of the following fifteen phrases printed in italics, rank the four statements given in the order that completes the phrase to your best satisfaction. You are to rank the statements for each phrase from 4 (your preferred statement) to 1 (your least favored statement).

1. *In planning to conduct training, I am most likely to*

- survey the problem and develop valid exercises based on my findings.
- begin with a lesson plan—specify what I want to teach, when, and how.
- pinpoint the results I want and construct a program that will almost run itself.
- consider the areas of greatest concern to the participants—and plan to deal with them regardless of what they may be.

2. *People learn best*

- when they are free to explore—without the constraints of a system.
- when it is in their selfish interest to do so.
- from someone who knows what he or she is talking about.
- when conditions are right—and they have an opportunity for practice and repetition.

3. *The purpose of training should be*

- to develop the participants' competency and mastery of specific skills.
- to transfer needed information to the learner in the most efficient way.
- to establish the learner's capacity to solve his or her own problems.
- to facilitate certain insights on the part of the participants.

4. *Most of what people know*

- they have acquired through a systematic educational process. f
- they have learned by experience in trial-and-error fashion. e
- they have gained through a natural progression of self-discovery rather than a teaching process. h
- is a result of consciously pursuing their goals—solving problems as they go. g

5. *Decisions on what to be covered in a training event*

- must be based on careful analysis of the task beforehand. a
- should be made as the learning process goes along and the learners show their innate interests and abilities. d
- should be mutually derived, by the learner and teacher. c
- are based on what learners now know and must know at the conclusion of the event. b

6. *Good trainers start*

- by gaining proficiency in the methods and processes of training—how to teach—and then bringing in the content. f
- by recognizing that learners are highly motivated and capable of directing their own learning—if they have the opportunity. g
- by mastering the field themselves and becoming effective models for the learners. h
- by considering the end behaviors they are looking for and the most efficient ways of producing them in learners. e

7. *As a trainer, I am least successful in situations*

- where learners are passive, noncommunicative, and expect the trainer to do all the work. d
- that are unstructured, with learning objectives that are unclear. a
- where there is no right answer. b
- when I am teaching abstractions, rather than concrete, specific ideas. c

8. *In a training event, I try to create*

- the real world—problems and all—and develop capacities for dealing with it.
- a learning climate that facilitates self-discovery, expression, and interaction.
- a stimulating environment that attracts and holds the learners and moves them systematically toward the objective.
- an interesting array of resources of all kinds—books, materials, etc.—directed at the learners’ needs.

g

h

e

f

9. *Emotions in the learning process*

- are utilized by the skillful trainer to accomplish the learning objective.
- have potential if the trainer can capture the learners’ attention.
- will propel the learner in many directions, which the trainer may follow and support.
- provide energy that must be focused on problems or questions.

a

b

d

c

10. *Teaching methods*

- should be relatively flexible but present real challenges to the learner.
- should be determined by the subject.
- must emphasize trial and feedback.
- must allow freedom for the individual learner.

g

f

e

h

11. *When learners are uninterested in a subject, it is probably because*

- they do not see the benefit.
- they are not ready to learn it.
- the instructor has not adequately prepared the lesson.
- of poor planning.

c

d

b


a

12. *Learners are all different:*
- some will learn, but others may be better suited for another activity. h
 - the best approach is to teach the basics well and put learners on their own after that. g
 - with an effective training design, most tasks can be mastered by the majority of learners. e
 - an experienced teacher, properly organized, can overcome most difficulties. f
13. *Evaluation of instruction*
- is done by learners regardless of the instructor; the instructor should be a sounding board. d
 - should be built into the system, so that learners continually receive feedback and adjust their performance accordingly. a
 - is ultimately decided when the student encounters a problem and successfully resolves it. c
 - should be based on pre-established learning objectives and done at the end of instruction to determine learning gains. b
14. *Learners seem to have the most regard for a trainer who*
- taught them something, regardless of how painful. g
 - guided them through experiences with well-directed feedback. e
 - systematically led them step-by-step. f
 - inspired them and indirectly influenced their lives. h
15. *In the end, if learners have not learned,*
- the trainer has not taught. b
 - they should repeat the experience. a
 - maybe it was not worth learning. c
 - it may be unfortunate, but not everyone can succeed at all tasks. d

TRAINING STYLE INVENTORY SCORING AND INTERPRETATION SHEET

Instructions: Sum all the numbers that you placed in the “a” and “e” boxes in the Training Style Inventory. Place this total in the “a + e” box in the figure below. This is your behaviorist score. Do the same for the following totals: “b” and “f”; “c” and “g”; “d” and “h.” Then study the interpretive material as it applies to your profile.

People deal with wholes, not parts—intuitively, emotionally, physically. They move spontaneously, “unpredictably,” instinctively, unconsciously, nonlinearly (right-brain activity).



People's minds work “rationally,” intellectually, scientifically. Information is processed systematically, sequentially, for storage (memory) and retrieval (language) (left-brain activity).

Questions for Self-Study

1. What type of *learner* learns most effectively in the behaviorist orientation? the structuralist? the functionalist? the humanist?
2. What type of *learning tasks* should be undertaken with the techniques of the behaviorist? the structuralist? the functionalist? the humanist? Give examples. What tasks should *not* be undertaken by each? Consider such tasks as manual skills, information transfer, problem solving, creativity, etc.
3. Is it possible to incorporate in a single learning situation a training role that prescribes supportive, directive, assertive, and reflective emphases? Think of examples. What might make this assignment difficult?
4. Consider how the qualities of the various training styles may be developed.

5. Examine the model that integrates the orientations to learning on two axes, a cognitive mode axis (holistic to analytic) and a locus of control axis (external to internal).
 - a. Is this representation essentially correct? Why or why not?
 - b. Considering the stages of growth of people (for example, from infancy to maturity) and assuming that the model is correct, what would it indicate as the most suitable learning orientation in various stages?
 - c. Considering the stages of development of a training group, what would the model imply that the trainer's role should be, both early in the process and later as the group develops?
 - d. What are some other applications of the model?

TSI STYLE CONTRASTS

	Behaviorist	Structuralist	Functionalist	Humanist
<i>Orientation to Teaching-Learning</i>	New behavior can be caused and “shaped” with well-designed structures around the learner.	The mind is like a computer; the teacher is the programmer.	People learn best by doing and they will do best what <i>they</i> want to do. People will learn what is practical.	Learning is self-directed discovery. People are natural and unfold (like a flower) if others do not inhibit the process.
<i>Basic Assumptions</i>	Training designers select the desired end behaviors and proceed to engineer a reinforcement schedule that systematically encourages learners’ progress toward those goals. Imaginative new machinery has made learning fun and thinking unnecessary. Learners often control the speed.	Content properly organized and fed bit-by-bit to learners will be retained in memory. Criterion tests will verify the effectiveness of teaching. The teacher “keeps people awake” while simultaneously entering data—a much-envied skill.	The learner must be willing (or motivated) by the process or the product, otherwise it is useless to try teaching. Performance “on-the-job” is the true test. Opportunity, self-direction, thinking, achieving results, and recognition are important.	“Anything that can be taught to another is relatively inconsequential” (Rogers). Significant learning leads to insight and understanding of self and others. Being a better human being is considered a valid learning goal. Can be a very inefficient, time-consuming process.
<i>Key Words and Processes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ stimulus-response ■ practice ■ shaping ■ prompting ■ behavior modification ■ pinpointing ■ habit formation ■ reward and punishment ■ teaching machines ■ environmental design ■ successive approximation ■ sensitizing ■ extinction ■ token economy ■ mastery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ task analysis ■ lesson planning ■ information mapping ■ chaining ■ sequencing ■ memory ■ audiovisual media ■ presentation techniques ■ standards ■ association ■ evaluation ■ measuring instruments ■ objectives ■ recitation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ problem solving ■ simulation ■ “hands-on” ■ reasoning ■ learner involvement ■ reality-based consequences ■ achievement ■ failure ■ confidence ■ motivation ■ thinking ■ competence ■ discipline ■ recognition ■ feedback ■ working 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ freedom ■ individuality ■ ambiguity ■ uncertainty ■ awareness ■ spontaneity ■ mutuality ■ equality ■ openness ■ interaction ■ experiential learning ■ congruence ■ authenticity ■ listening ■ cooperation ■ feelings
<i>Interpersonal Style</i>	<i>Supportive:</i> emphasis on controlling and predicting the learner and learning outcomes—cooperative, stimulus-response mentalities are valued. Process is product centered.	<i>Directive:</i> planning, organization, presentation, and evaluation are featured. Process is teacher centered.	<i>Assertive:</i> a problem-focused, conditional, confrontational climate—striving, stretching, achieving. Process is task oriented and learner centered.	<i>Reflective:</i> authenticity, equality, and acceptance mark relationship. Process is relationship centered.
<i>Strengths</i>	“The Doctor”: clear, precise, and deliberate; low risk; careful preparation; emotionally attentive; complete security for learners; a trust builder; everything “arranged”; protective; patient; in control	“The Expert”: informative; thorough; certain; systematic; stimulating; good audiovisual techniques; well rehearsed; strong leader; powerful; expressive; dramatic; entertaining	“The Coach”: emphasizes purpose; challenges learners; lets people perform and make mistakes; takes risks; gives feedback; builds confidence; persuasive; gives opportunity and recognition	“The Counselor”: sensitive; empathic; open; spontaneous; creative; a “mirror”; non-evaluative; accepting; responsive to learners; facilitative; interactive; helpful
<i>Limitations</i>	“The Manipulator”: fosters dependence; overprotective; controlling; manipulative “for their own good”; sugar-coating; hypocritical agreeing; deceptive assurances; withholds data	“The Elitist”: preoccupied with means, image, or structure rather than results; ignores affective variables; inflexible (must follow lesson plan); dichotomous (black or white) thinking; superior	“Sink or Swim”: ends justify means; loses patience with slow learners; intimidating; insensitive; competitive; overly task oriented; opportunistic, return-on-investment mentality	“The Fuzzy Thinker”: vague directions; abstract, esoteric, or personal content; lacks performance criteria; unconcerned with clock time; poor control of group; resists “teaching”; appears unprepared

■ STUDYING ORGANIZATIONAL ETHOS: THE OCTAPACE PROFILE¹

Udai Pareek

THE NEED FOR TAXONOMICAL CLARITY

Studies of organizational culture use different terminology, and the same terms are used with different meanings. There is a need to clarify terms and to create common understanding of their use. Brief definitions of some often-used terms are offered here as a precursor to using these terms for further study.

Words used in the context of organizational culture include ethics, values, beliefs, attitudes, norms, ethos, climate, environment, and culture. Ethics refers to normative aspects—what is socially desirable. Values, beliefs, attitudes, and norms are interrelated. Interactions between beliefs and values result in attitude formation (beliefs x values = attitudes) and then produce norms. When these become “institutionalized” (accumulated and integrated), the result is social phenomena.

Culture-related concepts also can be seen as multilevel concepts. At the core (first level) are the values, which give a distinct identity to a group. This is the *ethos* of the group. The *Random House Dictionary* defines ethos as “the fundamental character or spirit of a culture . . . dominant assumptions of a people or period.”

The second-level concept is that of climate, which can be defined as the perceived attributes of an organization and its subsystems as reflected in the way it deals with its members, groups, and issues. The emphasis is on *perceived attributes* and the working of the subsystems.

The third-level concept relates to the effects of the climate. The *Random House Dictionary* defines atmosphere as a “distinct quality” and environment as “. . . affecting the existence or development of someone or something.” The concept of *atmosphere* can be proposed as one related to the effect of climate.

The fourth-level concept is that of culture, the cumulative beliefs, values, and assumptions that underlie transactions with nature and important phenomena, as reflected in artifacts, rituals, and so on. Culture is reflected in the means that are adopted to deal with basic phenomena.

These concepts need elaboration and discussion. The author has developed four instruments to measure them: ethos (OCTAPACE Profile), climate (MAO-C), atmosphere (MAO-A), and culture (Organizational Survey). The instrument on ethos is

¹ Expanded with permission, from a preliminary note published in *HRD Newsletter*, October-December 1992, pp. 4-7, 16.

shared here. Interested readers can obtain information on the other instruments from the reference list at the end of this article.

ORGANIZATIONAL ETHOS AND VALUES

As already suggested, organizational ethos can be defined in terms of core values. The author suggests seven organizational values: openness, confrontation, trust, authenticity, proaction, autonomy, and collaboration (Pareek, 1975) as the core values for organization development. The initial instrument was used extensively in OD and HRD (Rao & Abraham, 1990), and another value was added, that of experimentation.² In addition to being an acronym for the values, “octapace” is a meaningful term, indicating eight (octa) steps (pace) to create functional ethos. The following definitions may help to clarify the values:

1. **Openness:** Spontaneous expression of feelings and thoughts and receiving feedback and information without defensiveness;
2. **Confrontation:** Facing—not shying away from—problems; deeper analysis of interpersonal problems; taking on challenges;
3. **Trust:** Maintaining confidentiality of information shared by others and not misusing it; a sense of assurance that others will help when needed and will honor mutual obligations and commitments;
4. **Authenticity:** Congruence between what one feels, says, and does; owning one’s actions and mistakes; unreserved sharing of feelings;
5. **Proaction:** Initiative; preplanning and preventive action; calculating payoffs before taking action;
6. **Autonomy:** Using and giving freedom to plan and act in one’s own sphere; respecting and encouraging individual and role autonomy;
7. **Collaboration:** Giving help to, and asking for help from, others; team spirit; working together (individuals and groups) to solve problems; and
8. **Experimentation:** Using and encouraging innovative approaches to solve problems; using feedback for improving; taking a fresh look at things; encouraging creativity.

THE OCTAPACE PROFILE

The OCTAPACE Profile has been developed to measure organizational ethos in terms of the eight values listed previously. The instrument contains three items that measure values and two items that measure beliefs on each of the eight dimensions, with a total of forty items. Respondents rate their organizations on eight aspects, using a five-point scale. The scores range from 5 to 20 on each aspect.

² Somnath Chattopadhyay suggested this value. He also prepared a long questionnaire to measure the eight OCTAPACE values.

Reliability and Validity

Split-half reliability of the OCTAPACE Profile on a sample of 135 college/university teachers was found to be .81 (Mathur, 1991).

To discover the internal consistency of the instrument, each of the forty items was correlated with the total score for a group of 102 managers from three steel plants. Out of forty, twenty-seven items had correlations significant at the .001 level, four at the .01 level, and two (numbers 19 and 35) at the .05 level. Six items (numbers 12, 22, 25, 31, 36, and 40) had zero correlation, and one (14) had negative but nonsignificant correlation with the total score. Five items with zero and negative correlations are on the aspects of openness (25), authenticity (12), autonomy (14, 22), collaboration (23), and experimenting (40). It is interesting to note that all these items are among the eleven items that are worded negatively. On the whole, item-total correlations provide satisfactory results.

To test the effect of social desirability on the items, analysis of kurtosis and skewness was carried out on all forty items, eight aspects, and the total OCTAPACE Profile on a sample of 102 managers from three steel plants. Only two items (numbers 15 and 26) had higher kurtosis, the first item being leptokurtic and the second platikurtic. Confrontation and collaboration also were leptokurtic. Skewing was satisfactory except for items 29, 33, and 34, all of which were negatively skewed. On the whole, the indices were acceptable.

Validity was indirectly tested by comparing the scores from three departments ranked by two judges for their effectiveness. The rankings of the judges, independently done, agreed with one another. Tests showed no differences between the first- and second-ranked departments or between the second- and third-ranked departments. However, there were significant differences between the first- and third-ranked departments, the former having higher means than the latter on the following aspects: confrontation (significant at the .01 level), collaboration (.04 level), proaction (.048 level), and openness (.10 level). Validity needs to be further tested and established.

The mean values of seven groups are provided in Table 1. Based on mean and standard deviation (SD) values, tentative norms were obtained, and these are shown in Table 2.

CORRELATES OF ORGANIZATIONAL ETHOS

To study the correlates of ethos, OCTAPACE Profile scores were correlated with internality (internal locus of control) at the individual level and with motivational climate and organizational learning at the organizational level.

Internality was measured by a scale developed for use in organizations (Pareek, 1992). It measures internality, externality (others), and externality (chance). Correlations were found for two groups (N = 39 and N = 35, respectively). In one group (N = 39), externality (chance) did not have significant correlations with any aspect of ethos.

Table 1. Mean Values of the OCTAPACE Profile

College/University Teachers	General Managers	Managers in Steel Plants			Construction Managers	Dairy Co-Op Managers		
T n=135	M n=55	S1 n=42	S2 n=35	S3 n=25	C1 n=35	D1 n=29	D2 n=85	
O	14.5	15.8	14.4	15.2	13.6	11.4	13.4	15.0
C	13.2	15.0	14.0	14.2	12.0	13.8	14.8	14.9
T	13.2	14.8	13.6	13.8	13.1	11.2	13.2	14.5
A	12.6	13.1	12.5	12.8	12.4	11.2	11.5	14.2
P	13.6	14.4	15.0	16.6	13.7	13.0	13.4	15.4
A	12.3	14.0	13.8	14.9	13.9	12.7	12.7	12.3
C	14.4	14.9	14.9	15.0	13.4	13.0	15.7	13.9
E	13.8	14.0	13.7	14.7	12.6	12.4	12.4	13.6

Table 2. Tentative Norms for the OCTAPACE Profile

	: Low	: High
1. Openness	: 13	: 17
2. Confrontation	: 10	: 16
3. Trust	: 10	: 16
4. Authenticity	: 10	: 14
5. Proaction	: 12	: 18
6. Autonomy	: 11	: 16
7. Collaboration	: 13	: 17
8. Experimenting	: 11	: 16

Regarding internality, all aspects except authenticity had positive correlations significant at the .01 level. In the other group (N = 35), there were three positive correlations, significant at the .05 level (for confrontation, authenticity, and experimenting).

Externality (others) was negatively correlated (significant at the .01 level) for five aspects; proaction, autonomy, and collaboration did not have significant correlations. It can be concluded that OCTAPACE ethos reinforces internality among managers, or that managers who score high on internality perceive the ethos in a positive way.

Regarding organizational variables, motivational climate was measured by the MAO-C (Pareek, 1989). This instrument assesses organizational climate in terms of six motives, three positively correlated to organizational functioning (achievement, expert power, and extension) and three negatively correlated (control, affiliation, and dependency). In one group of thirty-five managers, achievement climate was positively correlated (.05 level of significance) with openness. Extension climate (concern for others and larger cause) had positive correlations (significant at the .01 level) with all

aspects except autonomy and collaboration. Control climate had negative correlations (at the .05 level of significance) with openness and confrontation. No other correlation was significant. It can be concluded that extension climate seems both to contribute to and be promoted by OCTAPACE ethos.

Organizational learning (OL) mechanisms were assessed by means of the Organizational Learning Diagnostics (OLD) (Pareek, 1988). This instrument helps to diagnose organizational learning during the three phases of change (innovation, implementation, and stabilization) and five OL mechanisms (experimenting and flexibility, mutuality and teamwork, contingency and incremental planning, temporary system, and competence building). Of all the correlations between the OCTAPACE Profile and the OLD, the most significant aspect was trust, which had five positive correlations (.01 level of significance) with two phases (implementation and stabilization) and three mechanisms (teamwork, contingency planning, and temporary systems). The implementation phase had four significant correlations (all significant at the .01 level) with openness, confrontation, trust, and proaction. It can be concluded that although trust promotes organizational learning, OCTAPACE ethos is especially important at the stage of implementation of change.

In conclusion, internal locus of control and OCTAPACE ethos reinforce each other. OCTAPACE ethos promotes and is reinforced by extension climate; trust promotes organizational learning, whereas OCTAPACE ethos is critical mainly in the implementation phase. These findings are tentative and need further exploration.

SCORING AND INTERPRETATION

Based on the tentative norms (Table 2), scores shown under the column labeled “Low” or scores below these show weak aspects of the ethos in the organization. These can then be used for action planning to improve organizational ethos, as suggested in the next section. New norms can be evolved by finding mean scores of each aspect of ethos for a large sample, and using one-half standard deviation, “low scores” can be fixed (mean *minus* $\frac{1}{2}$ SD).

Use of the Instrument

This instrument can be used by HRD professionals and OD consultants to improve organizational ethos and to increase openness, creativity, and collaboration. The following uses have been tried in some organizations:

1. After they have responded to the instrument, the participants are given definitions of the eight values of organizational ethos. They may then work in small groups to prepare a profile of their organizational ethos in terms of “low,” “medium,” or “high.” While this is being done, the instrument is being scored. The profile of the organization derived from the scoring of the participants’ responses to the instrument then is distributed to the groups, and the members discuss how the two profiles match or differ and why.

2. The “weak” aspects of the organizational profile are used for action planning. Each weak value is assigned to a small group that prepares four lists: indicators of the weakness of that value in their organization, outcome of the weak aspect (its cost to the organization), forces that promote that value in the organization, and forces that make the value weak. These findings are then discussed in the larger group.
3. Then small groups regroup to prepare action plans—specific action steps to improve a specific value of ethos (ways of promoting positive forces and, more importantly, of reducing or eliminating the negative forces).
4. After four to six months, the group reviews the progress of implementation of the action plans and improvement in organizational ethos and notes indicators of improvement or deterioration.
5. The instrument can be completed for the total organization (O), or a specific unit (U), and/or the “ideal” ethos (I) one would like to have in the organization. Differences in the mean values of the eight aspects of ethos (O, U, and I) then can be calculated.
6. Small groups can be assigned to work on the differences. The difference in mean values for the organization and the unit may show if the respondents perceive the ethos of the total organization (macro ethos) as “better” than that of the unit (micro ethos), or vice versa. There also may be differences in specific dimensions. For example, in a multilocal manufacturing company, mean scores of micro ethos were higher than those for macro ethos, although the difference was significant only on one value (confrontation), indicating that the company was seen as avoiding basic issues. This information became a useful lead for discussing implications and possible action to be taken.
7. Indices of “fit” also can be derived, between desired or ideal ethos and the perceived ethos. This can be done by averaging the difference between I (ideal) and O (macro ethos), and between I and U (micro ethos). In the case of the manufacturing company, for example, it was found that there was a good fit on autonomy for both the macro and micro ethos. For both micro and macro ethos, there was the least fit on confrontation and proaction, followed by openness, trust, and collaboration. The need to work on increasing the fit (and reducing dissatisfaction) on these values was recognized. This could be done by small-group work, analysis, action planning, and making the plans a strategy for improving ethos.

REFERENCES

- Mathur, S. (1991). *A study of some psychological and organization correlates of role stress in college and university teachers*. Unpublished master's thesis in psychology, University of Udaipur.
- Pareek, U. (1975). The concept and the process of organization development. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 36(2), 109-125.
- Pareek, U. (1988). Organizational learning diagnostics (OLD): Assessing and developing organizational learning. In J.W. Pfeiffer & L.D. Goodstein (Eds.), *The 1988 annual: Developing human resources* (pp. 125-135). San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Pareek, U. (1989). Motivational analysis of organizations—climate (MAO-C). In J.W. Pfeiffer & L.D. Goodstein (Eds.), *The 1989 annual: Developing human resources* (pp. 161-178). San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Pareek, U. (1992). Locus of control inventory. In J.W. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *The 1992 annual: Developing human resources* (pp. 135-148). San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Rao, T.V., & Abraham, E. (1990). HRD climate survey. In J.W. Pfeiffer (Ed.), *The 1990 annual: Developing human resources* (pp. 143-151). San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.

OCTAPACE PROFILE

Udai Pareek

Name: _____ Job title: _____

Organization: _____ Date: _____

This instrument will help you to look at some values and beliefs of your organization. Below are statements that indicate some organizational values. If these are values of top management, they generally will be shared in an organization. Read each statement and indicate in the blank to the left of the statement how much the spirit contained in the statement is valued in *your* organization. Please be candid in answering.

Instructions: Use the following key for your responses:

- 4 = Very highly valued in the organization
- 3 = Valued in the organization
- 2 = Given rather low value in the organization
- 1 = Not valued in the organization

- _____ 1. Free interaction among employees, each respecting the feelings, competence, and judgment of others
- _____ 2. Facing problems, not shying away from them
- _____ 3. Offering moral support and help to employees and colleagues in crisis
- _____ 4. Congruity between feelings and expressed behavior
- _____ 5. Preventive action on most matters
- _____ 6. Employees' taking independent action relating to their jobs
- _____ 7. Teamwork and team spirit
- _____ 8. Employees' trying out innovative ways of solving problems
- _____ 9. Genuine sharing of information, feelings, and thoughts in meetings
- _____ 10. Going deeper rather than doing surface-level analysis of interpersonal problems
- _____ 11. Interpersonal contact and support among employees

- 4 = Very highly valued in the organization
- 3 = Valued in the organization
- 2 = Given rather low value in the organization
- 1 = Not valued in the organization

- _____ 12. Tactfulness, cleverness, and even a little manipulation to get things done
- _____ 13. Superiors' encouraging their subordinates to think about their development and take action in that direction
- _____ 14. Close supervision and direction of employees regarding action
- _____ 15. Accepting and appreciating help offered by others
- _____ 16. Encouraging employees to take a fresh look at how things are done
- _____ 17. Free discussion and communication between superiors and subordinates
- _____ 18. Facing challenges inherent in the work situation
- _____ 19. Confiding in superiors without fear that they will misuse the trust
- _____ 20. "Owning" mistakes made
- _____ 21. Considering both positive and negative aspects before taking action
- _____ 22. Obeying and checking with superiors rather than acting on one's own
- _____ 23. Performing immediate tasks rather than being concerned about larger organizational goals
- _____ 24. Making genuine attempts to change behavior on the basis of feedback received

Instructions: Use the following key for the remainder of your responses:

- 4 = This belief is very widely shared in the organization
- 3 = This belief is fairly well shared in the organization
- 2 = Only some people in the organization share this belief
- 1 = Few or no people in the organization share this belief

- _____ 25. Effective managers suppress their feelings.
- _____ 26. Pass the buck tactfully when there is a problem.

- 4 = This belief is very widely shared in the organization
- 3 = This belief is fairly well shared in the organization
- 2 = Only some people in the organization share this belief
- 1 = Few or no people in the organization share this belief

- _____ 27. Trust begets trust.
- _____ 28. Telling a polite lie is preferable to telling the unpleasant truth.
- _____ 29. Prevention is better than cure.
- _____ 30. Freedom for employees breeds lack of discipline.
- _____ 31. Emphasis on teamwork dilutes individual accountability.
- _____ 32. Thinking and doing new things tones up organizational vitality.
- _____ 33. Free and candid communication between various levels helps in solving problems.
- _____ 34. Surfacing problems is not enough; we should find the solutions.
- _____ 35. When the situation is urgent and has to be dealt with, you have to fend for yourself.
- _____ 36. People are what they seem to be.
- _____ 37. A stitch in time saves nine.
- _____ 38. A good way to motivate employees is to give them autonomy to plan their work.
- _____ 39. Employee involvement in developing the organization's mission and goals contributes to productivity.
- _____ 40. In today's competitive situation, consolidation and stability are more important than experimentation.

OCTAPACE PROFILE SHEET

Instructions: The OCTAPACE Profile assesses eight aspects of organizational culture. Each aspect is listed below, along with the items related to it. For each aspect, add the ratings you assigned to the item numbers indicated. **Important:** For each item with an asterisk, you must convert your rating as follows: 1 becomes 4, 2 becomes 3, 3 becomes 2, and 4 becomes 1.

Openness

Items 1 _____
9 _____
17 _____
25* _____
33 _____
Total _____

Proaction

Items 5 _____
13 _____
21 _____
29 _____
37 _____
Total _____

Confrontation

Items 2 _____
10 _____
18 _____
26* _____
34 _____
Total _____

Autonomy

Items 6 _____
14* _____
22* _____
30* _____
38 _____
Total _____

Trust

Items 3 _____
11 _____
19 _____
27 _____
35* _____
Total _____

Collaboration

Items 7 _____
15 _____
23* _____
31* _____
39 _____
Total _____

Authenticity

Items 4 _____
12* _____
20 _____
28* _____
36 _____
Total _____

Experimentation

Items 8 _____
16 _____
24 _____
32 _____
40* _____
Total _____

OCTAPACE INTERPRETATION SHEET

Ethos can be defined as the underlying spirit or character of the beliefs, customs, or practices of an entity or a group. At the base of ethos are core values. The seven values of organizational ethos are **O**penness, **C**onfrontation, **T**rust, **A**uthenticity, **P**roaction, **A**utonomy, **C**ollaboration, and **E**xperimentation. In addition to being an acronym for these values, OCTAPACE is a meaningful term, indicating eight (octa) steps (pace) to create functional ethos. The following definitions may help to clarify the values.

1. **Openness:** Spontaneous expression of feelings and thoughts and sharing of these without defensiveness.
2. **Confrontation:** Facing—not shying away from—problems; deeper analysis of interpersonal problems; taking on challenges.
3. **Trust:** Maintaining confidentiality of information shared by others and not misusing it; a sense of assurance that others will help when needed and will honor mutual obligations and commitments.
4. **Authenticity:** Congruence between what one feels, says, and does; owning one’s actions and mistakes; unreserved sharing of feelings.
5. **Proaction:** Initiative; preplanning and preventive action; calculating payoffs before taking action.
6. **Autonomy:** Using and giving freedom to plan and act in one’s own sphere; respecting and encouraging individual and role autonomy.
7. **Collaboration:** Giving help to, and asking for help from, others; team spirit; working together (individuals and groups) to solve problems.
8. **Experimentation:** Using and encouraging innovative approaches to solve problems; using feedback for improving; taking a fresh look at things; encouraging creativity.

Norms for the OCTAPACE Profile

	Low	High
1. Openness	13	17
2. Confrontation	10	16
3. Trust	10	16
4. Authenticity	10	14
5. Proaction	12	18
6. Autonomy	11	16
7. Collaboration	13	17
8. Experimentation	11	16
Based on studies of the OCTAPACE Profile so far, these are the high- and low-scoring norms.		

High scores indicate strong belief in the values and, thus, a strong organizational ethos. Low scores show weak aspects of the ethos in the organization. If the average or mean score for your organization is low, the questions on the profile can be used as the basis for action planning to improve organizational ethos and to increase openness, creativity, and collaboration. Remember that items 12, 14, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 31, 35, and 40 are scored backward, that is, the items on the profile reflect a low organizational ethos, not a high one.

■ ORGANIZATIONAL-TYPE INVENTORY

Manfred F.R. Kets de Vries, Danny Miller, and Gaylord Reagan

Organizations mirror the styles of their chief executive officers. Strategies, structures, and cultures all bear the imprint of executives' personalities. In some cases top managers (and their organizations) are composed, open, engaged, stimulating, and thoughtful. In other cases, top managers (and their organizations) are dramatic, suspicious, detached, depressive, or compulsive. Executives can produce organizations that boast tremendous success, such as IBM or 3M or Hewlett-Packard; or, given the existence of certain vulnerabilities and biases, executives can gravely damage their organizations. The first step in avoiding or combating a problem in executive-management style is to confirm its presence by identifying the type of organization that the executive has built.

THE INVENTORY

Theoretical Framework

In the book *Unstable at the Top: Inside the Troubled Organization*, Kets de Vries and Miller (1987) describe five patterns that result from problem personalities in top management:

1. The dramatic organization;
2. The suspicious organization;
3. The detached organization;
4. The depressive organization; and
5. The compulsive organization.

These patterns can produce disastrous consequences for their host organizations. Kets de Vries and Miller (1987) contend that by identifying an organization's dominant pattern, one can either avoid these consequences or detect and overcome them:

Too often the problems in unsuccessful organizations come about because . . . top executives get stuck in a specific scenario . . . from which they are unable to disentangle themselves . . .

Obsessions motivate a need to control; fears breed suspicion; dramatic behaviors lead to grandiosity. The executives hold fast to archaic, unhealthy, counterproductive activities that once proved effective or pleasant for them, but that no longer seem to be working. The result is a

general ossifying of the organization When this happens, it can all but completely cancel out the company's effectiveness. (pp. 195-196)

Kets de Vries and Miller (1987, p. 199) caution readers that only a "disposition toward self-discovery and exploration can provide organizations with insight into their counterproductive behaviors. And only in this way can a new, effective configuration evolve, one in which the individual pieces complement each other, one that is in tune with the market." Finally, they write (1987, p. xiv) that this framework applies ". . . mainly where decision-making power and initiative reside largely in the chief executive. But in healthy organizations, and where power is dispersed . . . there tend to be fewer extremes, less uniformity in culture, structure, and strategy, and as a result, fewer problems."

Reliability and Validity

The Organizational-Type Inventory is designed for use as an action-research tool rather than as a rigorous data-gathering instrument. Applied in this manner, the inventory has demonstrated a high level of face validity when used with audiences ranging from executive managers to nonmanagement personnel.

Administration

The following suggestions will help facilitators to administer the inventory:

1. Before respondents begin completing the inventory, discuss the five organizational patterns identified by Kets de Vries and Miller.
2. Distribute copies of the Organizational-Type Inventory, and read the instructions aloud as the respondents follow. Resolve any questions at this time.
3. Urge respondents to avoid overanalyzing their choices. For each item, each respondent should record an initial impression by checking either the "Yes" box or the "No" box, indicating his or her response to each question in each of the five pattern categories. Then each respondent should circle the number indicating his or her reaction to the attribute described in each question.
4. Ask respondents to wait to score their instruments until all respondents have finished.
5. After scoring their inventories and discussing the resulting scores, respondents should prepare brief answers to Steps 2 through 5 on the interpretation sheet. These answers provide a useful entry point to the processing of the inventory.

Scoring

Each respondent should be given a copy of the Organizational-Type Inventory Scoring Sheet. Using the scoring sheet, respondents should first record the number of "Yes" choices they made within each of the five pattern categories. Then they should record

their “No” choices in a similar manner. Finally, respondents should record the total of their “Reaction” choices for each of the pattern categories.

The pattern(s) with the most “Yes” choices best describes the respondent’s organization as the respondent perceives it. Specifically, if a respondent checked half or more of the “Yes” boxes within a pattern, that person is probably working in that type of organization. However, if a pattern receives only one or two “Yes” choices, the respondent is probably not working in that type of organization.

“Reaction” scores are used to determine the kind of organization that respondents should seek out or avoid. A low reaction score for a given pattern suggests that the pattern is regarded favorably by the respondent. Conversely, a higher score suggests that the respondent regards the pattern unfavorably.

Respondents may find it easier to interpret their reaction scores if they first convert those scores into numeric averages for each pattern. Averages nearer “1” suggest a favorable reaction, whereas averages nearer “3” indicate an unfavorable reaction.

Interpretation and Processing

When respondents finish scoring their inventories, the facilitator should distribute copies of the interpretation sheet. The interpretation sheet contains brief descriptions of each of Kets de Vries and Miller’s five patterns. The descriptions provide information about the characteristics, strengths, weaknesses, and needs of each pattern and offer brief prescriptions for overcoming problems associated with the patterns. While reading this information, respondents should remember that organizations (and individuals) generally do not fall into a single pattern. It is normal for organizations (and individuals) to be hybrids.

Some groups find it useful to prepare a large copy of the scoring sheet on newsprint. In this case the facilitator polls individual respondents about the “Yes”/“No” and reaction scores that they assigned to each of the five patterns. The shared results then form the basis for a group discussion.

The brief answers that respondents wrote for Steps 2 through 5 on the interpretation sheet should also be discussed at this point. The facilitator should allow sufficient time to cover this information, as it provides respondents with an opportunity to apply Kets de Vries and Miller’s model to their organization. Special attention should also be devoted to discussing the effects of the organizational weaknesses described in the interpretation sheet and to identifying ways to mitigate those effects. This is a good opportunity for respondents to begin forming a group action plan.

While respondents process the results of their inventories, it is important for the facilitator to encourage them to view their collective results in a positive manner. Once respondents identify their organization in one or more of the five patterns, there is an understandable tendency for the ensuing discussion to become somewhat negative. Respondents should be aware of Kets de Vries and Miller’s (1987, p. 196) admonition that all organizations share elements of several of the styles, “. . . each of which tends to become more pronounced under varying circumstances. There is cause for concern only

if one style takes over and consistently dominates all aspects of an organization's life." In addition, the authors point out that it is possible for organizations to influence the personalities of top managers. For example, failing organizations can depress previously successful executives. Also, Kets de Vries and Miller note that it is possible for the weaknesses of one pattern to be canceled out by the strengths of another pattern.

Uses of the Inventory

The Organizational-Type Inventory is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To identify the presence (or absence) of the five patterns within respondent organizations;
2. To encourage discussion of the impact of identified patterns on respondent organizations;
3. To initiate discussions about the appropriateness of respondent pattern preferences within the context of an organization's short- and long-term viability;
4. To help differentiate respondent preferences for the five patterns; and
5. To stimulate planning designed to increase individual and organizational-group use of healthy, positive patterns.

REFERENCE AND SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1980). *Organizational paradoxes: Clinical approaches to management*. London: Tavistock.
- Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (Ed.) (1984). *The irrational executive*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kets de Vries, M.F.R., & Miller, D. (1984). *The neurotic organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kets de Vries, M.F.R., & Miller, D. (1987). *Unstable at the top: Inside the troubled organization*. New York: New American Library.
- Miller, D., & Friesen, P.H. (1984). *Organizations: A quantum view*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zahznik, A., & Kets de Vries, M.F.R. (1985). *Power and the corporate mind* (rev. ed.) Chicago: Bonus Books.

ORGANIZATIONAL-TYPE INVENTORY¹

Manfred F.R. Kets de Vries, Danny Miller, and Gaylord Reagan

Instructions: For each of the numbered items in patterns A to E below, check “Yes” or “No”; then refer to the following three-point scale and circle the number that indicates your reaction to that condition (or the lack of that condition).

- 1 = Favorable
- 2 = Neutral
- 3 = Unfavorable

Yes No Reaction

Pattern A

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1. Is power within your organization highly centralized in the hands of the chief executive? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Is there a very strong organizational culture in which everyone at the managerial level sees things in essentially the same way? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. Is the chief executive “put on a pedestal” by many employees? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Is there suppression of dissent and contrary opinions by getting rid of or ignoring “rebels?” | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Does the chief executive seem overburdened with work because he or she tries to do everything himself or herself ? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Are there many grandiose and risky ventures that deplete organizational resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Does the chief executive make decisions rapidly and without consulting other people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Is the organization rapidly diversifying, introducing many new products or services, or expanding geographically in a way that depletes organizational resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 9. Does the chief executive appear to be vain or egotistical? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |

¹ This instrument is based on *Unstable at the Top: Inside the Troubled Organization* by Manfred F.R. Kets de Vries and Danny Miller, 1987, New York: New American Library.

1 = Favorable
 2 = Neutral
 3 = Unfavorable

	Yes	No	Reaction
10. Are sycophants the main ones being promoted?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
11. Does most information flow down rather than up the hierarchy?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
12. Does the strategy of the organization reside mainly inside the chief executive's mind?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
13. Are growth and expansion pursued seemingly for their own sake?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3

Pattern B

1. Is there an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust in the organization?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
2. Do managers blame external "enemies" (regulators, government, competitors) for the organization's problems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
3. Is there a strong emphasis on management information systems to identify inadequacies and assign blame?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
4. Are there organizational "spies" who inform top managers about what is happening at lower levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
5. Is organizational loyalty a big factor in assessing personnel performance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
6. Does the chief executive have a "siege mentality," constantly defending against perceived external attacks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
7. Is the organization's strategy focused more on copying other organizations than on trying new, unique approaches?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
8. Is there much secrecy regarding performance information, salaries, decisions, etc.?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3
9. Does the organization's strategy vacillate too much according to external conditions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1 2 3

1 = Favorable
 2 = Neutral
 3 = Unfavorable

	Yes	No	Reaction		
10. Is there excessive risk avoidance in the organization?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
11. Is the organization too unfocused?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3

Pattern C

1. Is the organization badly split, with much disagreement among the various functional areas or divisions?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
2. Does political infighting occur very often?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
3. Is the chief executive somewhat reclusive, refraining from personal contact and preferring to communicate by memo?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
4. Is there a “leadership vacuum” in the organization?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
5. Do decisions get delayed for long periods of time because of squabbling?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
6. Do the personal ambitions of managers take dramatic precedence over broader organizational goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
7. Are strategies badly fragmented, vacillating between one approach and another according to which senior manager is favored by the chief executive?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
8. Is the chief executive too busy with outside matters to pay much attention to the organization and its business?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
9. Do very few decisions emanate from the top of the organization as things just drift along?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
10. Is it difficult to perceive what the chief executive really wants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3

1 = Favorable
 2 = Neutral
 3 = Unfavorable

Yes No Reaction

Pattern D

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1. Is there a feeling of helplessness to influence events on the part of the chief executive or the key top managers? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Has the organization stagnated while other, similar organizations have advanced? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. Are the organization's products or services antiquated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Is there very little "scanning" of the organization's environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Are work facilities poor and inefficient? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Are the organization's strategies very narrow and resistant to change? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Is there a lack of action, an atmosphere of "decision paralysis"? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Do many young, aggressive managers leave the organization because of the stifling climate and the lack of opportunity for advancement? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 9. Is there extreme conservatism when it comes to making capital expenditures? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 10. Do bureaucratic rules set long ago replace communication and deliberation in decision making? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Pattern E

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|---|
| 1. Is the organization very bureaucratic, filled with red tape, regulations, formal policies and procedures, and the like? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Is there a tendency for precedents to decide issues more than analysis or discussion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 | 2 | 3 |

1 = Favorable
 2 = Neutral
 3 = Unfavorable

	Yes	No	Reaction		
3. Has strategy remained essentially unchanged for many years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
4. Is the organization slow to adapt to trends in the marketplace?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
5. Does the chief executive hoard power?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
6. Is the chief executive overly concerned with one or two elements of strategy (efficiency, productivity, quality, costs) to the exclusion of most others?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
7. Did a former chief executive leave a strategic legacy that is held to be sacrosanct by current managers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
8. Are strategies very precisely articulated, down to the last detail?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
9. Do information systems provide too much "hard" and too little "soft" data on customer reactions, trends, etc.?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
10. Does the chief executive prefer subordinates who follow directives very precisely and refrain from arguing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3
11. Is there a great emphasis on position and status?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1	2	3

ORGANIZATIONAL-TYPE INVENTORY SCORING SHEET

1. Count the number of “Yes” checks for each pattern, and enter each total below.
2. Count the number of “No” checks for each pattern, and enter each total below.
3. Add the numbers circled under “Reaction” for each pattern, and enter each total below.

Name of Pattern	Number of “Yes” Checks	Number of “No” Checks	Reaction Total
Pattern A: “The Dramatic Organization”			
Pattern B: “The Suspicious Organization”			
Pattern C: “The Detached Organization”			
Pattern D: “The Depressive Organization”			
Pattern E: “The Compulsive Organization”			

ORGANIZATIONAL-TYPE INVENTORY INTERPRETATION SHEET¹

Step 1

Determine which pattern collected the most “Yes” responses. If you checked only one or two “Yes” boxes within a pattern, you probably *are not working* in that type of organization. However, if you checked half or more “Yes” boxes within a pattern, you probably *are working* in that type of organization.

Pattern A: “The Dramatic Organization”

Characteristics

- Has strong leader who is idealized by subordinates
- Has leader who is the primary catalyst for subordinates’ morale and initiatives
- Exhibits very centralized policy making (in hands of impulsive, hyperactive leader)

Strengths

- Can create momentum needed to take organization through start-up phase
- Has ability to rebound after failures and to continue moving forward
- Comes up with ideas to revitalize the organization

Weaknesses

- Lacks a consistent strategy
- Sometimes lacks necessary controls
- Tends to avoid consulting with, or getting feedback from, lower levels

Needs

- Distribute authority—empowerment, delegation
- Codify a clear strategy
- Establish a clear hierarchy
- Provide controls and coordination
- Scan the organization’s environment

¹ The content of this interpretation sheet is based on *Unstable at the Top: Inside the Troubled Organization* by Manfred F.R. Kets de Vries and Danny Miller, 1987, New York: New American Library.

- Scale down huge projects
- Review core business
- Sharpen focus—get rid of worthless propositions

Prescription

- Plant both feet firmly on the ground

Pattern B: “The Suspicious Organization”

Characteristics

- Has fight-or-flight culture
- Lacks trust—emphasis placed on intimidation and uniformity
- Is reactive, conservative, overly analytical, secretive

Strengths

- Shows good knowledge of events inside and outside the organization
- Avoids dependence on a single market segment/customer
- Provides positive opportunities for growth and diversification

Weaknesses

- Lacks a concerted and consistent management strategy; falls victim to “groupthink”
- Has reactive, piecemeal, contradictory, distrustful atmosphere
- Experiences high staff turnover because of insecurity and disenchantment

Needs

- Foster trust and break down communication barriers
- Establish a participative culture
- Break down “policing” systems
- Pursue strategic themes
- Create distinctive competencies

Prescription

- Develop a unified strategy and sense of mission

Pattern C: “The Detached Organization”

Characteristics

- Lacks warmth and emotion
- Engages in jockeying for power—lots of conflict and insecurity
- Demonstrates strategic thinking dominated by indecisive, inconsistent, narrow perspectives

Strengths

- Has middle managers who play an active role
- Shares variety of points of view in formulating strategies
- Has individual managers who take initiative

Weaknesses

- Lacks leadership
- Exhibits inconsistent or vacillating strategy
- Decides issues by political negotiating rather than on the basis of facts

Needs

- Get a senior manager willing to provide active leadership
- Establish active coordinating committees
- Discourage parochial interests
- Reward overall organizational performance
- Pursue strategic themes
- Create distinctive competencies

Prescription

- Consider the whole

Pattern D: “The Depressive Organization”

Characteristics

- Lacks initiative—lots of passivity and negativity
- Lacks motivation—leadership vacuum
- Drifts, with no sense of direction—inward focused

Strengths

- Generally enjoys an excellent reputation for past successes

Weaknesses

- Tends to live in the past, when things were good for the organization
- Focuses on supplying dying markets/customers/products/services
- Has apathetic and inactive senior management

Needs

- Seek new leadership that is focused on new markets/customers/products/services
- Prune unpromising or older ventures
- Obtain resources for organizational reorientation and renewal
- Find new opportunities in identified markets
- Scan the organization's environment

Prescription

- Challenge the status quo

Pattern E: "The Compulsive Organization"

Characteristics

- Is rigid, directed inward, insular
- Fosters submission, lack of creativity, and insecurity in subordinates
- Focuses on one aspect of a strategy (quality, efficiency, cost cutting); is unable to switch focus quickly

Strengths

- Possesses fine internal controls
- Has a tightly focused strategy
- Exhibits efficient operations

Weaknesses

- Is too attached to tradition
- Responds inflexibly and inappropriately to customer/market demands
- Stifles creativity and influence of middle managers

Needs

- Conduct creativity seminars
- Change selection practices
- Become open to suggestions from lower levels
- Scan markets for problems and opportunities
- Respond better to customer needs
- Get rid of bureaucratic structures

Prescription

- Wage a battle against control

Step 2

Write brief answers to each of the following ten questions. Use specific examples where possible. Do your answers to these questions help you to understand why you classified your organization within the pattern(s) you did? In the book *Unstable at the Top: Inside the Troubled Organization*, Kets de Vries and Miller point out that organizations falling into one or more of these patterns can be very unpleasant places to work and will be unlikely to change without extreme pressure from within to do so.

1. How would you describe your organization's environment?
2. What does your organization stand for? What are its goals?
3. What are your chief executive's "dreams?"
4. What aspects of your organization's functioning are important to its senior leaders? What makes them excited, angry, happy?
5. How are crises and "critical incidents" dealt with in your organization?
6. What kind of people do well in your organization?
7. What measures of performance are used in your organization? What are the criteria for rewards and punishment?
8. What are the criteria for selection, promotion, and termination in your organization?
9. What kind of organizational "war stories" and "rituals" exist in your organization? What are the "taboos?"
10. How would you describe your organization's structure?

Step 3

By totaling your reaction scores for each pattern, you can determine the kind of organization that is most comfortable for you. The higher your reaction score is for a given pattern, the more unfavorable that pattern appears to you. What do your scores

suggest? Are you and your organization a “good fit?” Write your answers to these questions in the space that follows.

Step 4

Kets de Vries and Miller identify five “cultural blockades” to adaptation that influence the strength of an organization’s culture as well as its resistance or receptivity to change. Which of these blockades exist in your organization, and what needs to be done to make sure that they produce positive results?

1. Adverse (or favorable) impact of senior leaders’ legacy
2. Similarity (or dissimilarity) of views within groups whose membership is highly stable
3. Lack (or presence) of employee commitment to overall goals and procedures
4. Presence (or absence) of organizational conflict and distrust
5. Climate of stagnation (or change)

Step 5

Kets de Vries and Miller identify seven “organizational blockades” to adaptation that must be eliminated. Which of these blockades exist within your organization, and how can they be mitigated? For each blockade that you identify as applicable to your organization, use the space provided under the suggestion to jot down notes about steps you might be able to take.

Excessive Bureaucracy

- *Suggestion:* Identify and combat unnecessary rules, regulations, and procedures with the support of top management.

Inadequate Information Systems

- *Suggestion:* Question the relevance of reports, and ask whether the system truly enlightens the organization about emerging trends.

Uneven Distribution of Power

- *Suggestion:* Maintain constant vigilance and an awareness of the abuses of power.

Overexplicit Planning

- *Suggestion:* Constantly update plans, goals, objectives.

Overly Narrow Goals and Strategies

- *Suggestion:* Create alternative plans and contingency plans.

Reliance on Past Success

- *Suggestion:* Critically evaluate present strategy, information systems, power distribution, and so forth.

Limited Resource Availability

- *Suggestion:* Keep track of the flow of resources. Determine how many failures can be tolerated.

■ OD VALUES-CLARIFICATION INSTRUMENT

Susan H. DeVogel

Abstract: Organization development (OD) is a value-driven profession; thus, it is imperative that OD consultants exemplify OD values in their professional conduct with clients, peers, society, and themselves. Organization development consultants deal with the vulnerabilities of client systems and the individual members of those systems. Those vulnerabilities and the competing interests that arise in OD interventions can place the consultants in positions in which they must make difficult choices based on values. Such positions can be called ethical dilemmas.

This instrument provides a framework within which consultants can recognize the values that they use in solving ethical dilemmas. The information that results can help consultants in their own individual decision making. In addition, this information can be used to identify colleagues with similar values, thereby forming support networks within which to discuss ethical dilemmas when they arise.

The organization development (OD) literature yields little practical advice—or philosophical help—on resolving ethical dilemmas that OD consultants face. What discussion there is frequently begins with Kant’s categorical imperative (DeGeorge, 1986; Jaspers, 1957), in which one must treat others as ends rather than solely as means. Jaspers writes, “Act as though the maxim of your action, through your will, were to become a universal law of nature” (p. 65). In short, people should not use other people for their own purposes.

Snell (1986) proposes that the best way for consultants to deal with ethical dilemmas is by discussing them with other consultants at the time they arise. In a context of trust, consultants can evaluate and criticize one another’s ethical criteria.

Gellermann, Frankel, and Ladenson (1990) suggest that learning to practice ethically is a developmental process. They describe the importance of developing one’s ethical “fluency” (p. 64)—which involves understanding and commitment—as a preparation for rational decision making that is based on a more structured form of problem analysis and ethical analysis. The consultant develops ethical sensitivity through intuition and reflection on his or her beliefs, values, and hypothetical or experienced ethical dilemmas. This leads to the consultant consciously choosing his or her values and ethical standards. The decision-making model rests, ultimately, on clarifying one’s personal values and learning to apply them in a systematic fashion.

McLean, Sims, Mangham, & Tuffield (1982) conducted an interview study of actual OD practices and discovered that the reality of OD differs significantly from what appears in OD theory and texts. OD consultants reported pushing clients toward certain purposes, actions, agreements, and conclusions.

THE INSTRUMENT ¹

Theoretical Framework

DeVogel (1992) conducted thirty-four interviews and surveyed 182 OD consultants to determine which ethical dilemmas occurred most frequently in actual OD practice. The survey pool was a random sample of members of the OD Professional Practice Area of the American Society for Training and Development (ASTD). A questionnaire containing thirty-nine potential dilemmas was used, and respondents were asked how often they encountered these dilemmas.

Of the thirty-nine dilemmas listed, thirteen (Figure 1) were reported by at least 40 percent of the respondents as occurring occasionally, frequently, or almost always. The thirteen, in decreasing order of frequency, are discussed in the following sections.

1. An Illusion of Participation.
2. Skip the Diagnosis.
3. Inappropriate Intervention.
4. Stretch the Limits of My Competence.
5. Coercion.
6. Political Pressure.
7. Informed Consent.
8. Client Has Misled the Consultant.
9. Misuse of Information.
10. Violate Confidentiality.
11. Priority of Interests.
12. Role Expectations.
13. Conflict with Co-Consultant.

Figure 1. Ethical Dilemmas Reported by Consultants

1. *An Illusion of Participation.* “Employees are given the illusion of participatory decision making when management’s mind is already made up.” Seventy-one percent of respondents reported that they face this dilemma at least occasionally. The most common methods of handling it were confronting the client (44 percent) and negotiating an alternative approach (18 percent). Few respondents refused to cooperate or terminated the relationship based on this client behavior.

2. *Skip the Diagnosis.* “I am asked to skip a needs assessment or diagnosis and just do an intervention (for example, training or team building).” Sixty-five percent of respondents reported that they face this dilemma at least occasionally. The most common methods of handling it were negotiating an alternative approach (35 percent) and confronting the client (25 percent). Eight percent of the respondents refused to comply. None reported leaving the relationship.

¹ This instrument is excerpted from *Practicing OD: A Guide for Consultants*, edited by William C. Rothwell, © 1995 by Pfeiffer & Company. This book is available from Pfeiffer & Company.

3. *Inappropriate Intervention.* “I am asked to conduct an OD intervention (e.g., team building) which I think is inappropriate for the organization.” Sixty-one percent reported this dilemma as occurring at least occasionally. Negotiation (32 percent), action research (30 percent), and confrontation (28 percent) were the most common methods for handling it. Few respondents refused to comply; none reported terminating a relationship.

4. *Stretch the Limits of My Competence.* “I try a new intervention with a client that might stretch beyond my competency or skill.” Fifty-eight percent of respondents faced this situation at least occasionally. The most common methods of handling it included using action research (43 percent) and taking independent action (24 percent). Some respondents (17 percent) reported that they did not consider this to be a problem. Very few (14 percent) discussed it with their clients.

5. *Coercion.* “Employees are forced to participate in an intervention against their will.” Fifty-seven percent of respondents reported confronting this dilemma at least occasionally. The most common methods to handle it were to negotiate (37 percent), confront the problem (23 percent), or gather more information using action research (23 percent). None of the respondents refused to cooperate or terminated the relationship.

6. *Political Pressure.* “I find my behavior shaped by the internal policies of the client organization.” This dilemma was reported by 57 percent of the respondents as occurring at least occasionally. There was little consensus on how to deal with this problem. The most frequent approaches used by respondents were using action research (23 percent) and taking independent action (23 percent). Others negotiated (18 percent), responded indirectly (17 percent), or simply did not consider it to be a problem (15 percent).

7. *Informed Consent.* “Employees are drawn into an intervention without really knowing what they are getting into.” Fifty-six percent of respondents reported that this occurs at least occasionally. They dealt with this problem through negotiation (34 percent), action research (21 percent), independent action (18 percent), or confrontation (18 percent). None of the respondents reported refusing to cooperate or leaving the consulting relationship. Five percent did not consider this to be a problem.

8. *Client Has Misled the Consultant.* “I discover that the client has misled me about the nature of the problems in the organization or his or her willingness to cooperate.” Fifty-four percent of respondents reported that this occurred at least occasionally. The most common methods of handling this problem were confrontation (46 percent) and action research (25 percent). Few respondents terminated their relationships because of this problem.

9. *Misuse of Information.* “A manager asks me for information with the intent to use that information for administrative purposes (for example, promotions, dismissals).” Fifty percent of respondents reported that this occurred at least occasionally. There was no clear consensus on how to approach this dilemma. The most frequent response was to refuse flatly (23 percent). Other respondents negotiated an alternative approach (17

percent), confronted the problem (15 percent), or conducted action research (13 percent). Fifteen percent did not consider this to be a problem.

10. *Violate Confidentiality*. “A manager asks me to divulge information that I have explicitly promised not to share with others (for example, what happened in a team-building session).” Forty-seven percent of respondents report that this occurred at least occasionally. Of that group, 47 percent handled it by refusing to comply, and an additional 29 percent confronted the problem by saying they did not like it (without necessarily refusing).

11. *Priority of Interests*. “I struggle with whose interests should take precedence: management’s or employees’.” This was at least occasionally a problem for 46 percent of respondents. The most common methods of handling this problem were action research (40 percent) and negotiation (26 percent).

12. *Role Expectations*. “I get caught between my view of the consultant’s role and the expectations the client has about what my role should be.” This dilemma was experienced at least occasionally by 44 percent of respondents. Negotiation (38 percent) and confrontation (31 percent) were the most typical methods of handling the problem.

13. *Conflict with Co-Consultant*. “I disagree with a co-consultant about what to do with the client.” This dilemma was reported as occurring at least occasionally by 43 percent of respondents. They were most likely to negotiate (44 percent), conduct action research (27 percent), or confront the problem (22 percent) in order to handle the problem.

Reliability and Validity

The OD Values-Clarification Instrument is designed to help OD consultants to clarify and categorize the values that shape their decision making. Applied in this manner, the instrument has a high level of face validity.

Uses of the Instrument

The major use of this instrument is to provide a framework within which consultants can recognize the values that they use in solving ethical dilemmas. The information that results can help consultants in their own individual decision making. In addition, this information can be used to identify colleagues with similar values, thereby forming support networks within which to discuss ethical dilemmas when they arise.

Administration

The following suggestions will help facilitators to administer the instrument:

1. Before respondents complete the instrument, discuss the thirteen types of ethical dilemmas identified by DeVogel (1992).
2. Distribute copies of the OD Values-Clarification Instrument, and read the instructions aloud as the respondents follow. Resolve any questions at this time.

3. Urge respondents to avoid overanalyzing their responses.
4. Distribute copies of the OD Values-Clarification Instrument Scoring Sheet and the OD Values-Clarification Instrument Interpretation Sheet. After respondents have scored their inventories, lead a brief discussion of the learnings that resulted from the instrument.

CONCLUSION

An ethical OD consultant respects and practices the following key principles:

Client Autonomy. An ethical consultant honors a client's preferences, pace, direction, judgment, and decisions, and he or she allows the client to decide how far to extend the OD process and when to terminate a consulting contract.

Client Freedom. The consultant ensures that each person involved in an intervention is participating willingly, understands why the intervention is being conducted and how it will work, and has the right to choose which of his or her opinions to disclose to others.

Collaboration. The OD consultant offers advice, choices, and recommendations rather than prescriptions; he or she does not act as an expert, but as a facilitator who helps a client to identify problems and find solutions.

Objectivity and Independence. The OD consultant remains neutral in the face of organizational politics, conflicting stories, or opposing emotional needs of organizational members. He or she insists on raising difficult issues when necessary, regardless of the potential reaction to them.

Anonymity. The OD consultant does not share specific information about any intervention, client, or employee without the clear consent of the person or people involved. He or she does not ever gather information in order to help fire an employee.

Truthfulness. An OD consultant is forthright about the risks, estimated cost, estimated time, and potential effectiveness of a proposed intervention, as well as about his or her own experience, viewpoint, biases, concerns, and doubts.

Professional Development. In order to remain effective, an OD consultant keeps up with the OD field by attending professional meetings, reading the current literature, discussing problems with colleagues, and serving as a mentor.

Social Justice. The OD consultant refuses to work for any client whose goals, products, or services violate his or her own values. The consultant speaks out against any and all discrimination that he or she sees in a client organization.

Recognition of Limits. The OD consultant contracts only with clients whom he or she has the time and skills to serve well; he or she maintains clear boundaries between personal and professional relationships; and he or she is aware of his or her own biases and idiosyncracies, seeking outside guidance on these issues if necessary.

REFERENCES

- DeGeorge, R.T. (1986). *Business ethics*. New York: Macmillan.
- DeVogel, S.H. (1992). *Ethical decision making in organization development: Current theory and practice*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Gellermann, W., Frankel, M., & Ladenson, R. (1990). *Values and ethics in organization and human systems development: Responding to dilemmas in professional life*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Jaspers, K. (1957). *Kant*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- McLean, A.J., Sims, D.B.P., Mangham, I.L., & Tuffield, D. (1982). *Organization development in transition: Evidence of an evolving profession*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Snell, R. (1986). Questioning the ethics of management development: A critical review. *Management Education and Development*, 17(1), 43-64.

OD VALUES-CLARIFICATION INSTRUMENT

Susan H. DeVogel

Instructions: This instrument consists of pairs of statements related to OD values. For each pair of statements, you are to distribute three points between the two alternatives (a and b). Base your answers on how important each statement is to you. Although some pairs of statements may seem equally important to you, assign more points to the alternative that is more representative of your thinking most of the time.

Although there will be some repetition of ideas throughout the instrument, treat each pair of statements independently. Do not struggle long over any decision; go with your initial instinct.

Example 1:

It is important to me that . . .

 3 a. I can go to the beach during the summer.

 0 b. I have fresh vegetables.

Example 2:

 2 a. I have fresh fruit.

 1 b. I can go to the beach during the summer.

It is important to me that . . .

_____ 1a. the client decide how far the OD process should be pushed through the organization.

_____ 1b. all of the participants understand why an intervention is being conducted.

_____ 2a. I abide by a client's preference for a certain intervention, whether or not a diagnosis has indicated that it is needed.

_____ 2b. when I have reached the limits of my ability to serve a client, I discuss the situation with the client and offer options.

_____ 3a. when I am asked to give advice about an organizational problem, I assist the client in exploring the problem further rather than giving my opinion.

_____ 3b. I try to remain neutral when I encounter a client system's politics.

_____ 4a. I refuse to share what went on during an intervention with people who were not present in the group.

_____ 4b. if I have doubts about the effectiveness of a requested or proposed intervention, I share those doubts with the client.

It is important to me that...

- _____ 5a. I am willing to discuss my professional ethical dilemmas with colleagues.
- _____ 5b. I do not remain silent when I see evidence of gender discrimination or sexual harassment in a client organization.

- _____ 6a. all participants in an intervention be there willingly.
- _____ 6a. when a manager asks me for feedback about his or her personal effectiveness, I give my honest views.

- _____ 7a. I try to remain neutral even when I have friends within an organization.
- _____ 7b. I serve as a mentor to somebody who wishes to enter the field of OD or who is less experienced.

- _____ 8a. I trust the client's judgment when the client believes that an OD process has proceeded far enough.
- _____ 8b. I give recommendations rather than instructions about how the OD process should proceed.

- _____ 9a. when alternative interventions seem to be equally beneficial, I let the client choose the intervention.
- _____ 9b. I refuse to share what went on during an intervention with people who were not present in the group.

- _____ 10a. when a manager asks me for feedback about his or her personal effectiveness, I give my honest views.
- _____ 10b. I do not participate in organizational processes that will result in people losing their jobs.

- _____ 11a. I do not work for a client whose product or service conflicts with my personal values.
- _____ 11b. I keep clear boundaries between my personal and professional relationships.

- _____ 12a. all participants understand how an intervention will proceed before we begin.
- _____ 12b. I view myself as a facilitator rather than as an expert.

- _____ 13a. I do not downplay the estimated time or cost when preparing an intervention proposal.
- _____ 13b. I attend as many meetings of professional organizations as I can.

It is important to me that...

- _____ 14a. I insist that the organization confront difficult issues when I believe that the client prefers to avoid them.
- _____ 14b. I do not reveal the names of my clients to others without the clients' express permission.
- _____ 15a. before I try a new intervention, I study the theory behind it.
- _____ 15b. I try to be aware of the biases I bring to any interaction, including my own cultural and gender biases.
- _____ 16a. the client determines which interventions are appropriate for the organization.
- _____ 16b. I insist that the organization confront difficult issues when I believe that the client prefers to avoid them.
- _____ 17a. I do not share personal information that I know about an employee, regardless of how I gained it.
- _____ 17b. I do not take on consulting projects in areas in which I have little knowledge or experience.
- _____ 18a. when alternative interventions seem to be equally beneficial, I let the client choose the intervention.
- _____ 18b. I do not work for a client whose product or service conflicts with my personal values.
- _____ 19a. the client determines which interventions are appropriate for the organization.
- _____ 19b. I am willing to discuss my difficult cases with colleagues.
- _____ 20a. all of the participants understand why an intervention is being conducted.
- _____ 20b. I try to remain neutral when I get caught between conflicting emotional needs of organizational members.
- _____ 21a. I insist on raising difficult issues, even if I know that doing so might jeopardize my contract or job.
- _____ 21b. I am honest with a client about the extent of the potential benefits that might be expected from an intervention.
- _____ 22a. I view myself as a facilitator rather than as an expert.
- _____ 22b. I do not take on consulting projects in areas in which I have little knowledge or experience.

It is important to me that...

- _____ 23a. employees have the right to decide how much of their personal opinions to disclose to others during an OD intervention.
- _____ 23b. I never share information when I have promised to keep it confidential.
- _____ 24a. I try to remain neutral even when I have friends within an organization.
- _____ 24b. I only take on as many clients as I have time to serve well.
- _____ 25a. if a manager asks me to gather information to help fire somebody, I refuse.
- _____ 25b. before I try a new intervention, I study the theory behind it.
- _____ 26a. I abide by a client's preference for a certain intervention, whether or not a diagnosis has indicated that it is needed.
- _____ 26b. I refuse to give recommendations about who should be laid off, based on information I have gained during an OD intervention.
- _____ 27a. when I am asked to give advice about an organizational problem, I assist the client in exploring the problem further rather than giving my opinion.
- _____ 27b. if I have doubts about the effectiveness of a requested or proposed intervention, I share those doubts with the client.
- _____ 28a. when asked by a client about a specific intervention, I am truthful about whether or not I have ever tried it.
- _____ 28b. I keep clear boundaries between my personal and professional relationships.
- _____ 29a. employees not be forced by their supervisor or manager to participate in an OD activity.
- _____ 29b. I do not remain silent when I see evidence of discrimination against persons with differing abilities in a client organization.
- _____ 30a. I trust the group to find the answers to organizational problems.
- _____ 30b. I am willing to discuss my difficult cases with colleagues.
- _____ 31a. I refuse to share what went on during an intervention with people who were not present in the group.
- _____ 31b. I do not remain silent when I see evidence of gender discrimination or sexual harassment in a client organization.

It is important to me that...

- _____ 32a. I allow the client to determine the pace and direction of the consulting relationship.
- _____ 32b. I disclose the risks of an intervention, even if I believe the potential benefits greatly outweigh the risks.
- _____ 33a. I try to remain neutral when I get caught between conflicting emotional needs of organizational members.
- _____ 33b. I do not keep silent when I see evidence of racism in a client organization.
- _____ 34a. all participants in an intervention be there willingly.
- _____ 34b. before I try a new intervention, I study the theory behind it.
- _____ 35a. I allow the client to determine the pace and direction of the consulting relationship.
- _____ 35b. I do not participate in organizational processes that will result in people losing their jobs.
- _____ 36a. all participants understand how an intervention will proceed before we begin.
- _____ 36b. I keep clear boundaries between my personal and professional relationships.

OD VALUES-CLARIFICATION INSTRUMENT SCORING SHEET

Instructions: Transfer your scores from the instrument to this scoring form. Note that the items are *not* listed sequentially. When you have filled in all the blanks, total each of the nine columns.

Client Autonomy

1a. _____
2a. _____
8a. _____
16a. _____
19a. _____
26a. _____
32a. _____
35a. _____
Total _____

Informed Consent

1b. _____
6a. _____
12a. _____
20a. _____
23a. _____
29a. _____
34a. _____
36a. _____
Total _____

Collaboration

3a. _____
8b. _____
9a. _____
12b. _____
18a. _____
22a. _____
27a. _____
30a. _____
Total _____

Objectivity and Independence

3b. _____
7a. _____
14a. _____
16b. _____
20b. _____
21a. _____
24a. _____
33a. _____
Total _____

Confidentiality

4a. _____
9b. _____
14b. _____
17a. _____
23b. _____
25a. _____
26b. _____
31a. _____
Total _____

Truth Telling

4b. _____
6b. _____
10a. _____
13a. _____
21b. _____
27b. _____
28a. _____
32b. _____
Total _____

Professional Development

5a. _____
7b. _____
13b. _____
15a. _____
19b. _____
25b. _____
30b. _____
34b. _____
Total _____

Social Justice

5b. _____
10b. _____
11a. _____
18b. _____
29b. _____
31b. _____
33b. _____
35b. _____
Total _____

Recognizing Limits

2b. _____
11b. _____
15b. _____
17b. _____
22b. _____
24b. _____
28b. _____
36b. _____
Total _____

Instructions: Transfer your total score for each of the nine values on the scoring form to the chart below.

OD Value	Score
Client Autonomy	_____
Informed Consent	_____
Collaboration	_____
Objectivity and Independence	_____
Confidentiality	_____
Truth Telling	_____
Professional Development	_____
Social Justice	_____
Recognizing Limits	_____

The higher your total score for a particular value, the more important that value is to you. On the lines provided, rank order each value according to the score you have accumulated for each. The resulting list may help you to understand the priorities you use in resolving ethical conflicts, particularly when you must make choices between two values that are both important to you.

Value preferences:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____

OD VALUES-CLARIFICATION INSTRUMENT INTERPRETATION SHEET

This instrument is designed to help individuals clarify their values. The following list explains what each value of the instrument indicates:

Client autonomy, broadly defined, means that the authority for decision making about the OD process rests with the client. The data are owned by the client, as are choices about contracting and interventions.

Informed consent means that an organization and its members have the rights of informed consent (they understand and agree to the purpose and methods of an intervention before participating) and freedom from coercion (nobody is forced to participate in an OD intervention, particularly if personal disclosures will be requested).

Collaboration means that an OD consultant chooses to conduct his or her relationship with a client from a perspective of equality. Although the OD consultant has specialized skills and knowledge, he or she believes that the ultimate resource for solving the organization's problems is to be found within the client group. The style that the consultant adopts is thus a nonexpert, collaborative approach.

Objectivity and independence mean that an OD consultant, whether internal or external, places a high value on maintaining objectivity with regard to the client system. He or she makes an effort to stay out of organizational politics. The consultant does not get involved in the client system's dynamics or collude consciously or unconsciously with the client's desire to avoid unpleasant issues. The consultant is able to sort through the conflicting messages and demands coming from the client system. Objectivity and independence also mean that the needs of the client and standards of sound professional practice come before considerations of the consultant's contract, job security, or friendships within the client organization. The consultant does not seek to benefit financially from the relationship.

Confidentiality means that a consultant has a high concern for protecting privileged information and informants. The consultant is careful to uphold his or her promises, to maintain the trust of individuals, and to safeguard sensitive information about the organization. The consultant also protects the privacy of clients.

Truth telling means that a consultant is open and honest with a client about such matters as the limits of his or her skill or knowledge. The consultant also explains to the client the full cost, possible risks, and hoped-for benefits of an intervention, even when doing so might result in the termination of a contract. The value of truth telling may sometimes conflict with the value of preserving confidentiality.

Professional development means that a consultant has a high concern for improving his or her own skills and for contributing to the advancement of the profession. The consultant gives credit to others when it is due and he or she shares materials.

Social justice means that a consultant is concerned about the value issues pertaining to society, such as race, gender, and equality. The consultant is concerned about

economic justice in the organization's business or management practices, such as producing hazardous waste or involving the consultant in downsizing and layoff decisions.

Recognizing limits means that a consultant is aware of the limitations of his or her ability to serve a client responsibly. These limitations include his or her availability, knowledge, skill, cultural awareness, idiosyncrasies, and conflicts of interest, such as the consultant's financial involvement with the client or his or her involvement with the client's competitors. Recognizing limits means that the consultant has a clear sense of boundaries.

■ REENGINEERING-READINESS ASSESSMENT

Gaylord Reagan

Abstract: Hammer and Champy's (1963) landmark work on reengineering is the basis for this instrument. Reengineering consists of organizing work around complete processes rather than around individual tasks performed by specialists. In the theoretical information preceding this instrument, the author offers a succinct summary of Hammer and Champy's approach, including (1) examples of reengineering projects and accompanying changes, (2) descriptions of key roles that must be filled if reengineering is to succeed, (3) a method for selecting processes to reengineer, and (4) guidelines for reengineering success.

After providing this background information, the author addresses the most important issue surrounding the topic of reengineering: *How can an organization's personnel know whether they are truly ready for this radical approach?* The Reengineering-Readiness Assessment provides a means of answering this question.

Members of the organization (executive managers or representatives from all levels) evaluate the organization's current approach to process problems ("What Is") as well as their preferred approaches to process problems ("What I'd Like"). From the standpoint of adopting Hammer and Champy's reengineering model, ideal ratings should be high on both the "What Is" and "What I'd Like" scales.

Organizational reengineering offers an answer to a growing uneasiness with a long-accepted management practice. That practice consists of first dividing and subdividing processes into micro tasks performed by specialists and then organizing the incoherent results into vertical units, each of which busily pursues its own goals.

Researchers have suggested an alternative: It is not necessary or even desirable for an organization to structure work around the old division-of-labor model. Instead, work should be organized around complete processes (Hammer & Champy, 1993).

This alternative approach is based on a critical question that Hammer and Champy claim must be answered by an organization's members: If we were re-creating this organization today, given what we know and given current technology, what would that organization look like?

According to Hammer and Champy, truly useful responses to this question must produce fundamental, radical, and dramatic rethinking of organizational processes. The Reengineering-Readiness Assessment is designed to help respondents examine their organizations' readiness to embrace this question and to begin implementing the reengineering model.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: REENGINEERING¹

Hammer and Champy (1993, p. 35) define a process as “a collection of activities that takes one or more kinds of input and creates an output that is of value to the customer.” From time to time various forces reveal problems in the processes of all organizations. Typical responses to these problems include incremental changes (total quality management or TQM), downsizing, restructuring, reorganizing, flattening the hierarchy, delegating, automating, delaying, and eliminating bureaucracy.

Hammer and Champy contend that these responses often do not have the desired results. They recommend an alternative approach called organizational reengineering, which they define as “The *fundamental* rethinking and *radical* redesign of business processes to achieve *dramatic* improvements in critical, contemporary measures of performance, such as cost, quality, service and speed” (Hammer & Champy, 1993, p. 32).

According to Hammer and Champy, successful organizations focus on changing how work is done instead of on trying to improve what is currently being done. They claim that successful reengineering requires the following:

- A focus on complete processes;
- Ambitious thinking;
- A willingness to break old rules; and
- The use of contemporary information technology.

Furthermore, Hammer and Champy claim that three key drivers are pressuring organizations to reengineer their processes:

- *Customers*, whose rising demands for tailored products and services are taking control away from producers;
- *Competition*, which is increasing rapidly and is heavily impacted by new technologies; and
- *Change* itself, whose pace is accelerating while lead time has evaporated.

These drivers encourage organizations to empower their personnel to do whatever is needed in order to eliminate waste and “nonvalue-added work” (work that does not result in perceived value to the customer) as they recombine fragmented processes. Obviously, personnel working in reengineered processes have to be given the authority needed to make their own rules, and they must be willing and able to perform complex tasks on their own.

¹ The following section is based on *Reengineering the Corporation: A Manifesto for Business Revolution* by M. Hammer and J. Champy, 1993, New York: HarperBusiness Division of HarperCollins. Used by permission of the authors.

Examples of Reengineering Projects and Accompanying Changes

Examples of reengineering projects include combining several jobs into one (horizontal compression), having operating personnel make production decisions (vertical compression), performing process steps in their natural order (delinearizing), designing processes to have multiple versions (destandardization), and reducing controls and checks (eliminating nonvalue-added costs). Hammer and Champy note that such projects are normally accompanied by a series of major organizational changes:

1. Jobs evolve from narrow to multidimensional. Assembly-line work disappears. People who once did only what they were told to do begin to make their own decisions and choices. Old-style, intrusive supervision disappears.
2. Functional departments lose their reason for existing and are replaced by teams. Hammer and Champy (1993, p. 66) define a team as “A unit that naturally falls together to complete a whole piece of work.”
3. The focus of performance measures and compensation shifts from activity to results. Managers’ attitudes and values change in response to new incentive patterns.
4. Continuing education becomes mandatory and expands.

Key Roles in Reengineering

As is the case with any large-scale, top-down, structured organizational-change effort, the reengineering process has key leadership roles that must be filled. As described in the following paragraphs, Hammer and Champy identify four roles that must be filled and suggest an optional fifth role.

Role 1: Leader

A self-appointed senior executive should authorize and impel the overall effort. This individual must have authority over all areas involved in the process being reengineered. Most reengineering breakdowns occur because of leadership problems at this level.

The leader also appoints the *process owner* and presents the reengineering *case for action* to all of the employees. Hammer and Champy state that the components of the case for action include the following:

- *Context*—what is happening or changing;
- *Problem identification*—the source of concern pressuring for change;
- *Marketplace demands*—the emerging performance requirements that the organization cannot meet;
- *Diagnostics*—the reasons why the organization cannot meet the new performance requirements;
- *Costs of inaction*—the consequences of not reengineering; and

- *Vision*—what the organization wants to become, including measurable objectives.

Role 2: Reengineering Czar

This person, the leader's chief of staff, is responsible for developing reengineering techniques and tools within the organization and for achieving synergy among the organization's separate reengineering projects.

Because the czar develops the needed infrastructure, information systems, rewards, performance measures, and management systems, he or she must be experienced in reengineering.

Role 3: Process Owner

This individual is the senior-level manager who is responsible for a specific process and the reengineering effort focused on it. (Each process targeted for reengineering has its own process owner.) The process owner must assemble and enable the *reengineering team*, run interference with the bureaucracy, and gain cooperation from other managers whose areas are involved.

Role 4: Reengineering Team

This team is dedicated to diagnosing an existing process and to overseeing the process redesign and implementation. Generally it consists of five to ten "insiders" (those who are expert at performing the process in question) and "outsiders" (those who are not expert but whose input is deemed valuable). The team has no official chairperson but may elect one member to facilitate its meetings. In addition, the team is assisted by the *reengineering czar*.

The minimum time commitment for team members is 75 to 100 percent for one year. The team also can use the services of outside, part-time, and occasional contributors. Efforts should be restricted to one process at a time.

Hammer and Champy emphasize that a team should attempt to understand the process it is reengineering—not analyze that process in agonizing detail. The best place to begin is from the customers' perspective (what they want, what they need, what problems they have, what they do with the organization's output).

The reengineering team should seek "order of magnitude" improvement, not marginal benefits. "Order of magnitude" improvement is change that produces results that are several hundred percent better than the initial conditions, instead of 10 percent or 20 percent better. In addition, the team should be aware of the need to avoid trying to fix or improve the existing process. Instead, the goal of reengineering is to *change the process*.

Finally, the team needs to remember that no two reengineering projects are alike. If a given technique works for the organization, the team should use it, regardless of whether it follows some ideal model.

Role 5 (Optional): Steering Committee

This committee is an optional, policy-making body of senior managers. Its membership is limited to *process owners*, and it is chaired by the *leader*. The committee's task is to develop the organization's overall reengineering strategy, monitor progress, plan, prioritize projects, and resolve resource-allocation issues.

How to Select Processes to Reengineer

Unlike improvement strategies such as TQM, organizational reengineering does not focus on continually improving existing processes and products. Instead, the focus is on top-down, structured reintegration or complete reinvention of fragmented processes that cut across several areas of activity.

Hammer and Champy identify eight criteria to use in selecting a process to reengineer:

1. *Which process is in the deepest trouble?* Common symptoms of trouble include (a) Information-exchange overload; (b) extra inventory or stored assets; (c) high ratios of nonvalue-added to valued-added tasks; (d) rework and needless repetition; and (e) lots of exceptions and special cases.
2. *What are customers saying about the relative value of the organization's processes for them?*
3. *How likely is it that the effort to reengineer a particular process will succeed?*
4. *Does the process have a significant effect on the organization's strategic direction?*
5. *Does the process have a high impact on customer satisfaction?*
6. *Is the organization's performance in this process far below the benchmark?*
7. *Is the organization unable to gain more from the process without reengineering it?*
8. *Is the process antiquated?*

Guidelines for Reengineering Success

All large-scale change projects contain elements of risk—there are no guarantees of success. By the same token, there are no guarantees that successfully completing an improvement project in one area of operation will produce a favorable outcome for the organization as a whole. Even proven, classic models such as TQM may work for one organization or in one area, but not for another organization or in another area.

For example, many organizations have become discouraged by what they see as an unfavorable cost-benefit ratio and the protracted time frame required by TQM and have, therefore, abandoned the model. Although each organization must assess its individual situation to see how much risk it can tolerate, Hammer and Champy offer practical guidelines to help ensure the success of reengineering projects:

1. Differentiate continuous improvement (TQM) from process reengineering.
2. Select pilot projects carefully, and seek order-of-magnitude results.
3. If an activity really adds value for customers, then put more of it into the process.
4. Recognize that in order to succeed, reengineering must be a top-down strategy—not a bottom-up strategy.
5. Communicate constantly.
6. Assign the best people to reengineering projects.
7. Accept the fact that reengineering is a way of life, not a one-time project.
8. Acknowledge that customers are the starting point for all reengineering efforts.
9. Expect resistance to reengineering, and deal with it immediately.
10. Reengineer both human and technical systems, but be aware that everything cannot happen at once. An organization's human resources, infrastructure, and information technology must all support a reengineering effort if that effort is to succeed.
11. Be aware that reengineering is not neat, orderly, linear, tidy, or comfortable.
12. Consider the fact that simply changing the order in which tasks are done can sometimes suffice.
13. Do not try to fix an existing process; change it. Seeking change in small increments is the path of least resistance and the surest way to fail.
14. Keep in mind that there are no guarantees; 50 to 70 percent of reengineering efforts fail. But remember, too, that 30 to 50 percent succeed.

THE INSTRUMENT

Reliability and Validity

The Reengineering-Readiness Assessment is designed to be used as an action-research tool rather than as a rigorous data-gathering instrument. Applied in this manner, the assessment has demonstrated a high level of face validity when administered to groups ranging from executive managers to nonmanagement personnel.

Administration

Administration of the instrument should be handled in the following manner:

1. *Discuss the concept of reengineering.* Before respondents complete the assessment, discuss briefly the concept of reengineering. Hammer and Champy present a model that an organization can use to help it reintegrate fragmented processes, overcome the conventional wisdom of fixing instead of reinventing, and move beyond incremental improvement of the status quo. Reengineering marks a radical alternative to previous

organizational-improvement strategies, including TQM, downsizing, restructuring, reorganizing, pyramid flattening, delegating, automating, delayering, and bureaucracy busting. While these strategies generally seek to improve what already exists, reengineering discards the old, familiar ways.

2. *Distribute and explain how to complete the instrument.* Give each respondent a copy of the Reengineering-Readiness Assessment, and read the instructions aloud as the respondents follow. Answer any questions that the respondents may have.

3. *Make certain that respondents understand the intended difference between “What Is” and “What I’d Like” responses.* The “What Is” responses reflect each respondent’s assessments of the way things currently are, and the “What I’d Like” responses reflect the respondent’s assessments of the way he or she would like things to be in the future. It may also be necessary to differentiate the five levels of agreement indicated on the rating scale for the twenty instrument items.

4. *Ask respondents to defer scoring.* Instruct them to wait to score their assessments until everyone has completed the task.

Scoring

Each respondent should be given a copy of the Scoring Instructions and the Scoring Grid on which to record results. Experience has shown that assessment scoring is facilitated if the following steps are completed in order.

Step 1: Scoring “What Is”

To score “What Is” responses, each respondent should draw *squares* around the corresponding numbers on the rating portion of the Scoring Grid and then connect the squares with a *solid line* to form a vertical line graph. The line represents the respondent’s perceptions of how his or her organization currently deals with process problems.

Step 2: Scoring “What I’d Like”

To score “What I’d Like” responses, each respondent should draw *circles* around the corresponding numbers on the rating portion of the Scoring Grid and then connect the circles with a *dashed line* to form a second vertical line graph. The line represents the respondent’s perceptions of how he or she would like the organization to deal with process problems.

Note: In some cases the same rating number may have both a square and a circle drawn around it. This suggests that the respondent is satisfied with things just the way they are in the area described by the corresponding statement.

Step 3: Analyzing Gaps

Each respondent should use gap analysis to identify assessment items for which a significant measure of tension exists. To do so, the respondent makes a checkmark in front of each item on the Scoring Grid for which either or both of the following situations exist:

- There is a difference of three or more points between “What Is” and “What I’d Like” ratings for a given statement.
- A “What Is” or “What I’d Like” rating of 1 with a square or circle around it.

Interpretation and Processing

The Meanings of Various Ratings

It is important for respondents to realize that the twenty items in the assessment are worded so that higher “What Is” ratings of 4 or 5 closely parallel what Hammer and Champy advocate for conditions that are conducive to reengineering. Lower “What Is” ratings of 1 or 2, in contrast, suggest that the respondent sees his or her organization as having a lot of distance to make up before reengineering projects can be undertaken successfully.

Higher “What I’d Like” ratings of 4 or 5 suggest that the respondent wants his or her organization to use a reengineering model in dealing with process problems. Lower “What I’d Like” ratings of 1 or 2 suggest that the respondent might not be comfortable with the organization’s adopting that model.

From the standpoint of encouraging an organization to employ the reengineering model, ideal ratings would be high on both the “What Is” and “What I’d Like” scales. Serious problems arise when either or both of the following situations exist:

- Both “What Is” and “What I’d Like” ratings are very low (meaning that both the organization and the respondent are inclined to ignore process problems); and
- One set of ratings is very high and the other is very low. If “What Is” ratings are high and “What I’d Like” ratings are low within an organization, the respondents need to become more comfortable with the model. If “What Is” ratings are low and “What I’d Like” ratings are high, the organization needs to increase its comfort level to match that of its personnel.

It is most common for ratings within an organization to be mixed, with some areas favoring reengineering and others being less supportive.

Approaches to Processing

The Reengineering-Readiness Assessment can be processed in several different ways, depending on the needs of the group whose members completed it. At the most basic level, the assessment serves as a training aid that provides group members with an

introduction to Hammer and Champy's reengineering model and the behaviors on which that model is based. In this case individual respondents or respondents from different areas or organizations can gain as much benefit as can members of intact groups.

Respondents also might be searching for an alternative to slower, incremental models such as TQM or continuous improvement. In this case the assessment can be used to help them become familiar with reengineering and to differentiate it from TQM and continuous improvement.

At a more advanced level, the assessment can be used by intact groups or a senior-management group as an action-oriented diagnostic tool to help respondents share their perceptions of their organization's readiness to undertake the kind of changes involved in the reengineering model. Where weaknesses are identified, appropriate remediation efforts can then be implemented, thereby increasing the likelihood of success in upcoming reengineering projects.

Finally, a facilitator can use the assessment as a probe to generate data for use in subsequent training efforts.

Uses of the Instrument

The Reengineering-Readiness Assessment is designed to accomplish the following objectives:

- To acquaint individual respondents and groups with the basic concepts of organizational reengineering and the necessary day-to-day practices that underlie successful application of those concepts;
- To provide respondents with an framework to use in assessing the presence or absence of those necessary day-to-day practices within their organization(s) before reengineering projects are attempted;
- To provide respondents with a method of identifying gaps between their assessment of an organization's readiness to undertake reengineering and the level of readiness that respondents would like the organization to demonstrate; and
- To facilitate discussion about respondents' individual and collective assessment patterns for the purpose of fostering group development.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Doty, D.H., Glick, W.H., & Huber, G.P. (1993). Fit, equifinality, and organizational effectiveness: A test of two configurational theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6), 1196-1250.
- Drucker, P.F. (1986). *The frontiers of management: Where tomorrow's decisions are being shaped today*. New York: Truman Talley Books and E.P. Dutton.
- Hammer, M., & Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the corporation: A manifesto for business revolution*. New York: HarperBusiness Division of HarperCollins.

- Krishnan, R., Shani, A.B., Grant, R.M., & Baer, R. (1993). In search of quality improvement: Problems of design and implementation. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 8(4), 7-20.
- Naisbitt, J., & Auburdene, P. (1985). *Re-inventing the corporation: Transforming your job and your company for the new information society*. New York: Warner.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: William Patrick and Addison-Wesley.
- Peters, T. (1992). *Liberation management: Necessary disorganization for the nanosecond nineties*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Pfeiffer, J.W., Goodstein, L.D., & Nolan, T.M. (1989). *Shaping strategic planning: Frogs, dragons, bees, and turkey tails*. Glenview, IL, and San Diego, CA: Scott, Foresman and Pfeiffer & Company.
- Schoderbek, P.P., Schoderbek, C.G., & Kefalas, A.G. (1985). *Management systems: Conceptual considerations*. Plano, TX: Business Publications.
- Spencer, L.M., Jr. (1986). *Calculating human resource costs and benefits: Cutting costs and improving productivity*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Steers, R.M. (1977). *Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Tomasko, R.M. (1987). *Downsizing: Reshaping the corporation for the future*. New York: AMACOM.

REENGINEERING-READINESS ASSESSMENT

Gaylord Reagan

Instructions: The twenty items in this assessment deal with how process problems are confronted in your organization. For each item you will assess the current situation in your organization (“What Is”) as well as the situation as you would like it to be (“What I’d Like”). The numbers on the top and bottom of the response scales (labeled “What Is” and “What I’d Like”) correspond to five levels of agreement or disagreement: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Generally Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Generally Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree.

To record your responses to each item, first circle the top number that corresponds to your perception of *how it is right now* in your organization. Then circle the bottom number that corresponds to your perception of *how you would like it to be* in your organization.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Neutral	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree

When process problems are confronted in your organization:

1. People are expected to change processes rather than merely “fix” them.

What Is	1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>					
What I’d Like	1	2	3	4	5

2. People are expected to take a “process perspective” in dealing with problems.

What Is	1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>					
What I’d Like	1	2	3	4	5

3. It is accepted that problem-solving teams will probably need to “redesign the company.”

What Is	1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>					
What I’d Like	1	2	3	4	5

4. Management systems and values are changed to support redesigned processes.

What Is	1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>					
What I’d Like	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Neutral	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
5. People accept the pain of major change instead of settling for slow, incremental improvement.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
6. Change efforts are not called off at the first sign of trouble or after a little bit of success.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
7. Prior constraints are not placed on problem definitions or the scope of redesign efforts.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
8. Existing cultures and management attitudes are not allowed to prevent the start of the redesign process.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
9. It is accepted that redesign crosses organizational boundaries and happens from the top down.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
10. Redesign efforts are led by process-oriented senior managers who really understand what they are doing.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
11. There is no skimping on the resources needed to make redesign efforts succeed.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Neutral	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
12. Redesign efforts are placed at the top of the organization's agenda instead of being buried at lower levels.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
13. Redesign efforts are characterized by sharp focus and high levels of discipline.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
14. Redesign efforts are postponed if the chief executive officer (CEO) is only a year or two from retirement.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
15. Redesign is neither delegated to a staff department nor confused with improvement programs such as total quality management (TQM).					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
16. New designs and ideas are actually implemented instead of remaining in proposals or plans.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
17. No attempt is made to please everyone who will be impacted by changes resulting from redesign.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5
18. Leaders realize that resistance to redesign is inevitable and do not allow it to set the process back.					
What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Neutral	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree

19. Redesign efforts are completed in no more than twelve months.

What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5

20. The redesign effort was “born in the executive suite” and enjoys strong executive leadership and support.

What Is	1	2	3	4	5
What I'd Like	1	2	3	4	5

REENGINEERING-READINESS ASSESSMENT SCORING SHEET

Instructions: The following three steps will help you transfer your responses from the Assessment to the Scoring Grid.

1. To transfer your “What Is” responses:
 - Draw a *square* around the appropriate “What Is” rating number for each of the twenty items.
 - Form a line graph of your “What Is” scores by connecting the boxes with a *solid line*.
 - These scores reflect your assessment of how process problems are currently approached in your organization.
2. To transfer your “What I’d Like” responses:
 - Draw a circle around the appropriate “What I’d Like” rating number for each of the twenty items.
 - Form a line graph of your “What I’d Like” scores by connecting the circles with a *dashed line*.
 - These scores reflect your assessment of how you would like process problems to be approached in your organization in the future.
3. Place a checkmark in front of each item on the Scoring Grid for which either or both of the following situations exist:
 - *There is a difference of three or more points between “What Is” and “What I’d Like” ratings for a given statement.* For example, if for item 7 (“Prior constraints are not placed on problem definitions or the scope of redesign efforts”) you drew a square around “What Is” rating level 4 (“Generally Agree”) and a circle around “What I’d Like” rating level 1 (“Disagree Strongly”), the difference between the two ratings you selected is 3. In this example, you would place a checkmark in front of item 7.
 - *A “What Is” or “What I’d Like” rating of 1 with a square or circle around it.* For example, if for item 16 (“New designs and ideas are actually implemented instead of remaining in proposals or plans”) you drew a square or circle around “What Is” or “What I’d Like” rating level 1 (“Strongly Disagree”), you would place a checkmark in front of item 16.

REENGINEERING-READINESS ASSESSMENT SCORING GRID

Rating⇒	Strongly Disagree	Generally Disagree	Neutral	Generally Agree	Strongly Agree
↓ Assessment Item					
1. Use a “change it, don’t fix it” approach	1	2	3	4	5
2. Focus on complete processes	1	2	3	4	5
3. Redesign the company if necessary	1	2	3	4	5
4. Change management systems/values	1	2	3	4	5
5. Stress major change, not “incrementalism”	1	2	3	4	5
6. Do not quit—persist	1	2	3	4	5
7. Avoid prior constraints on problem definitions	1	2	3	4	5
8. Overcome barriers to redesign process	1	2	3	4	5
9. Use a top-down implementation format	1	2	3	4	5
10. Make sure knowledgeable leaders head redesign	1	2	3	4	5
11. Do not skimp on redesign resources	1	2	3	4	5
12. Put redesign process at top of agenda	1	2	3	4	5
13. Make sure redesign is focused and disciplined	1	2	3	4	5
14. Avoid redesign when CEO about to retire	1	2	3	4	5
15. Distinguish redesign from improvement	1	2	3	4	5
16. Implement new designs and ideas	1	2	3	4	5
17. Realize you cannot please everyone	1	2	3	4	5
18. Overcome resistance to redesign process	1	2	3	4	5
19. Complete process in one year or less	1	2	3	4	5
20. Ensure strong executive leadership/support	1	2	3	4	5

REENGINEERING-READINESS ASSESSMENT INTERPRETATION GUIDE

The Reengineering-Readiness Assessment is an action-research instrument. As such, it is intended to be used as a tool for introducing respondents to Hammer and Champy's (1993) reengineering model and for initiating discussion about the feasibility of using that model within respondents' organizations.

However, the assessment should not be viewed as offering an absolute set of standards against which respondents can judge their organizations' readiness to undertake reengineering. On the other hand, the twenty items in the assessment are worded so that the "Strongly Agree" ratings of items parallel what Hammer and Champy advocate for conditions that are conducive to reengineering. On the other hand, the "Disagree Strongly" ratings on the "What Is" and "What I'd Like" scales designate sharp deviations from that model, and respondents are urged to discuss all such ratings.

Broad guidelines for interpreting specific rating numbers are as follows:

1. "What Is" ratings of 1 or 2 suggest that the respondent sees his or her organization as having a lot of distance to make up before reengineering projects can be undertaken successfully.
2. Equally low "What I'd Like" ratings suggest that the respondent may not be comfortable with the reengineering model.
3. "What Is" ratings of 4 or 5 suggest that the organization is perceived as being ready for reengineering.
4. "What I'd Like" ratings of 4 or 5 suggest that the respondent wants the organization to use a reengineering model in dealing with process problems.
5. Moderate scores (3) suggest a cautionary stance. The respondent sees himself or herself and/or the organization as possibly benefiting from reengineering but withholding a final decision on either adopting the model or seeking an alternative response to identified process problems.

From the standpoint of adopting the reengineering model, ideal ratings are high on both the "What Is" and "What I'd Like" scales. Serious problems arise when either or both of the following situations exist:

- Both "What Is" and "What I'd Like" ratings are very low (meaning that both the organization and the respondent are inclined to ignore process problems); and
- One set of ratings is very high and the other is very low. If "What Is" ratings are high and "What I'd Like" ratings are low within an organization, the respondents need to become more comfortable with the model. If "What Is" ratings are low and "What I'd Like" ratings are high, the organization needs to increase its comfort level to match that of its personnel.

Most commonly, though, ratings within an organization are mixed and lead to fruitful discussions. And such discussions are the real goal of action-research tools like the Reengineering-Readiness Assessment.

Useful questions for respondents to discuss include these:

- 1 To which questions did individual respondents assign the highest “What Is” and “What I’d Like” ratings? To which did they assign the lowest? What patterns of strengths and problems are suggested by the high and low ratings? How will perceived strengths be capitalized on, and how will problem areas be improved?
- 2 Where are the gaps between “What Is” and “What I’d Like” the largest? Where are they the smallest? What patterns are revealed by this gap analysis? (Gaps of three or more rating points suggest the existence of significant tension surrounding the behavior described in the assessment item being examined.)
- 3 Are there instances in which the “What I’d Like” ratings are lower than the “What Is” ratings? (If so, this pattern suggests that the respondent sees himself or herself as less comfortable with reengineering than the organization is.) What actions will be taken to raise the respondent’s comfort level?
- 4 If the respondents all represent the same organization, what are the averages of their “What Is” and “What I’d Like” ratings? What do those numbers indicate? Alternatively, what do scattergrams of respondents’ individual “What Is” and “What I’d Like” ratings indicate? What are the areas of convergence and/or divergence? Is there noticeable clustering? What do the results indicate?
- 5 Do the “What Is” or “What I’d Like” averages of identifiable subgroups within the same organization differ markedly from one another, or are they similar? If they differ, how and where do they do so? Where are they similar? What are the implications of identifiable differences and similarities?

REFERENCE

Hammer, M., & Champy, J. (1993). *Reengineering the corporation: A manifesto for business revolution*. New York: HarperBusiness Division of HarperCollins.

■ THE BIG FIVE LOCATOR: A QUICK ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR CONSULTANTS AND TRAINERS

Pierce J. Howard, Phyllis L. Medina, and Jane Mitchell Howard

Abstract: Instruments based on individual trait theory tend to be cumbersome and to take a long time to complete and score. The Big Five Locator is a quick and easy-to-use instrument designed to be used by a consultant or trainer with a willing client who desires a quick assessment of his or her individual traits. It also can be used to assess team traits.

The instrument is based on the traditional five-factor model (FFM). The bipolar factors measured are negative emotionality resilient, responsive, reactive); extroversion (introvert, ambivert, extravert); openness (preserver, moderate, explorer); agreeableness (challenger, negotiator, adapter); and conscientiousness (flexible, balanced, focused). The scoring is simple, and the validity and reliability are sufficient to warrant use of the instrument in a training or consulting context.

The organization development (OD) consultant and professional development trainer have a common need: occasionally they would like to have a quick means to assess the personality of a client. However, most instruments take twenty minutes or longer to complete, and to pull one out in the middle of an interview or training session would be awkward. Therefore, one needs a tool that takes only two or three minutes to complete, that is valid and reliable, and that can be scored quickly and on the spot. The Big Five Locator fills this need.

FUNDAMENTAL THEORY

Over the past decade, trait theory has regained the interest of personality researchers. One model in particular, the five-factor model (FFM), has received the most attention because of its ability to withstand every kind of statistical analysis using modern, high-speed computers (Goldberg, 1993; Barrick & Mount, 1991; Digman, 1990).

The FFM—popularly referred to as the Big Five—is founded in the tradition of the lexical hypothesis (Galton, 1884), which postulates that single terms are encoded and used in all languages to describe the most important individual differences. Pioneering researchers, stimulated by the lexical hypothesis, conducted exhaustive searches through English dictionaries in attempts to glean from them personality-descriptive terms (see John, Angleitner, & Ostendorf, 1988, for a historical review of the model). Through these efforts, it was found that people describe themselves and others in terms of five fundamental dimensions of individual difference. These dimensions are:

Negative Emotionality: adjustment versus emotional instability, an individual's resilience in the face of unpleasant and disturbing emotions, reliance on rational processes, resistance to excessive cravings or urges, and use of constructive coping

responses. (Note: In the research literature, this dimension has been referred to as neuroticism, but, in the process of adapting the model from academic and clinical uses to those of the business world, we prefer this less clinical term.)

Extraversion: preference for social interaction and lively activity, one's need for stimulation and capacity for joy.

Openness: one's receptiveness to, or tolerance of, new ideas, experiences, and approaches; proactive seeking and appreciation of experience for its own sake.

Agreeableness: the quality of one's interpersonal orientation along a continuum from compassion to antagonism in thoughts, feelings, and actions.

Conscientiousness: an individual's degree of organization, persistence, and motivation in goal-directed behavior; contrasts dependable, fastidious people with those who are spontaneous and unorganized.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

Format

It has been shown that the five dimensions of the FFM—negative emotionality, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness—are normally distributed among the population (Costa & McCrae, 1992; McCrae & Costa, 1990). That is, the five dimensions identify domains that vary from person to person rather than define all-or-nothing categories into which some people fall and others do not. For this reason, a bipolar, adjective-pair format was selected for use in the Big Five Locator. The format utilizes adjective pairs that represent opposite poles of a single continuum. A five-point scale is presented between the adjectives, and the respondent is instructed to mark the spot on the continuum that is most descriptive of him or her.

Validity

The adjective pairs selected for the Big Five Locator were obtained through an extensive review of the literature. Because of the academic and clinical orientation of the literature, care was taken to select personality-descriptive adjectives that are found in typical business communications. The instrument developers field tested a large pool of items and selected those items that make the greatest contribution to validity and reliability.

The *NEO PI-R* currently is the best measure of the FFM's five dimensions of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1990), and provides the reference by which to establish the construct validity of the desired subset. After several revisions, the current form of the Locator was determined. It contains twenty-five pairs of bipolar adjectives or phrases that correlate with the five NEO factors at .40.

Reliability

Test-retest was utilized to establish the reliability of the Big Five Locator. Thirty adults, ranging in age from twenty-two to forty-six, completed the Big Five Locator form twice, one week apart. The coefficients of reliability resulting from the test-retest sample indicate that the Big Five Locator is sufficiently reliable ($r \geq .728$) for its intended purpose. Coefficient alpha, a measure of internal consistency, was as follows: N = .63, E = .77, O = .69, A = .74, and C = .75 ($n = 110$).

SUGGESTED USES

Personality-test scores have become useful adjuncts to the information that OD consultants and trainers garner during interviews and other forms of data collection. The Big Five Locator allows comprehensive assessment of normal adult personality. In providing a quick, general look at the “whole person,” the Big Five Locator can be used to facilitate training and consulting and to provide a means of quick intervention during communication problems that stem from identifiable individual differences. Use of the Big Five Locator is ideal for consultants and trainers who are proficient in applying the FFM but do not have the time or financial resources to conduct more extensive evaluation of clients’ personalities. Some situations in which such knowledge would be helpful include the following:

- A consultant is confronted with two clients who do not understand their source of conflict or who do not acknowledge each others’ opinions or perspectives.
- Over lunch during a training program, a trainee asks for insight into his or her behavior or personality.
- Team members request an evaluation that will aid their understanding of personality differences within the team.
- A consultant or trainer is asked to work with a nonprofit group that cannot afford to use a commercial instrument.

Because of its effectiveness and ease of use, the Big Five Locator provides a quick solution to unexpected or resource-limited situations in which proper identification of individual differences would prove to be beneficial.

LIMITATIONS

Despite the fact that the Big Five Locator provides a brief, comprehensive measure of the five dimensions of personality, care must be taken in using it. Limitations do exist. For instance, the instrument does not provide the validity and reliability obtained by other personality inventories (e.g., the *NEO PI-R* or *NEO-FFI*). Additionally, there are situations in which a more detailed personality evaluation is appropriate (e.g., career counseling). The five dimensions measured by the Big Five Locator are broad

personality descriptions and, thus, do not provide the depth attainable by using measures that account for the specific individual differences underlying each dimension.

Therefore, the Big Five Locator should be used by professionals who are familiar with the FFM and who already utilize the *NEO PI-R* or *NEO-FFI*. Ideally, use of the Big Five Locator would be followed by use of the *NEO PI-R*.

ADMINISTRATION

Both the administration and scoring of the Big Five Locator are straightforward and do not require special training. The Big Five Locator may be administered to individuals alone or in groups. In some circumstances, a consultant or trainer may choose to have someone who knows another individual well complete the instrument *about* the other person in order to obtain an “other” score. There is no time limit for completing the Big Five Locator; most respondents, however, will complete the inventory in less than two minutes.

SCORING

Calculating Dimension Scores

In order to calculate raw scores for the five dimensions (i.e., the individual scores for each dimension), the administrator should sum the following item sequences, tallying the scores circled by the respondent:

Dimensions Item (= Row) Numbers to be Summed

1. Negative Emotionality: 1, 6, 11, 16, 21
2. Extraversion: 2, 7, 12, 17, 22
3. Openness: 3, 8, 13, 18, 23
4. Agreeableness: 4, 9, 14, 19, 24
5. Conscientiousness: 5, 10, 15, 20, 25

Enter the sums of these sequences in the spaces provided on the bottom of the inventory.

Missing Responses

If any item has been left blank on any one dimension scale, the blank item should be scored as neutral (i.e., 3). If more than one item on any dimension scale has been left blank, the inventory should be considered invalid and should not be scored.

Profiling Scores

Profile areas are provided on the Score Conversion Sheet. Locate the row labeled “Negative Emotionality” and within this row place an “X” over the number that corresponds to the respondent’s negative emotionality dimension raw score. Use a

similar procedure for all the respondent's raw scores. Connect the Xs with a line after all the respondent's scores have been marked to produce a graph.

Preparing to Provide Feedback

The Big Five Locator Interpretation Sheet was designed to provide feedback to the respondent after scoring and profiling the results of the Big Five Locator have been completed. Examine the respondent's *T* score (the top row of the Big Five Locator Score Conversion Sheet) for negative emotionality. Locate the row labeled "Negative Emotionality" on the Big Five Locator Interpretation Sheet. Within this row, place an "X" over the number that corresponds to the respondent's negative emotionality *T* score. Use a similar procedure to complete the remainder of the sheet.

INTERPRETATION

In order to interpret the results of the Big Five Locator effectively, one must be familiar with the basics of psychological testing, know what the scales measure, and be able to integrate the information provided by the scale scores into a meaningful profile. The following provides basic information regarding the constructs measured by the Big Five Locator and suggests guidelines for interpreting profiles.

The Meaning of Scale Scores

The Big Five Locator's scales measure traits that approximate normal distributions. Most respondents will score near the average for each scale, with a small percentage at either end of the continuum. Thus, professionals should avoid "typing" any individual when interpreting scores. For instance, because most individuals can best be described as "ambiverts" who show a combination of introverted and extraverted tendencies, it is unfair to think or speak strictly in terms of "introverts" and "extroverts" (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

Expanded Definitions of the Five Domains

Negative Emotionality

The negative emotionality trait is about an individual's resilience in response to stressful situations. At one extreme is the "reactive," who experiences more negative emotions than most people and who reports less satisfaction with life than most people. This is not meant to place a value judgment on reactives; the susceptibility to negative emotions and discontent with life provides the basis for several roles in our society, such as social scientists and customer-oriented workers. At higher intellectual and academic levels, however, extreme reactivity (high negative emotionality) interferes with performance.

On the other extreme are the "resilients," who tend to experience life on a more rational level than most people and who appear impervious to what is going on around

them. Such people seem unflappable. This extreme is the foundation for many valuable social roles, from air-traffic controllers and airline pilots to military snipers, finance managers, and engineers.

Along the continuum from resilient to reactive is the vast middle range of “responsives,” who are a mixture of qualities characteristic of resilient and reactives. Responsives are more able to turn behaviors from both extremes on and off, calling on what seems appropriate to the situation. A responsive typically is not able to maintain the calmness of a resilient for as long a period of time, nor is a responsive typically able to maintain the nervous edge of alertness of a reactive.

Extraversion

The extraversion trait is about the degree of one’s preference for being actively engaged with other people. On the one hand, the “extravert” tends to exert more leadership, to be more physically and verbally active, and to be more friendly and outgoing around others than most people tend to be. The extraverted profile is the foundation of many social roles, including sales, politics, the arts, and the social sciences.

At the other extreme, the “introvert” tends to be more independent, reserved, steady, and more comfortable with being alone than are most people. The introverted profile is the basis of such varied social roles as production managers and the physical and natural sciences.

In between these two extremes are the “ambiverts,” who are able to move comfortably from outgoing social situations to the isolation of working alone. The stereotypical ambivert is the player-coach, who moves on demand from the leadership demands of coach to the personal production demands of player.

Openness

The openness trait is about the degree to which one is curious about one’s inner and outer worlds. On the one hand, the “explorer” has broader interests, has a fascination with novelty and innovation, would generally be perceived as liberal, and reports more introspection and reflection than most people. Explorers are not unprincipled but tend to be open to considering new approaches. The explorer profile forms the basis for such social roles as entrepreneurs, architects, change agents, artists, and theoretical scientists (social and physical).

On the other hand, the “preserver” has narrower interests, is perceived as more conventional, and is more comfortable with the familiar. Preservers are perceived as more conservative but not necessarily as more authoritarian. The preserver profile is the basis for such social roles as financial managers, performers, project managers, and applied scientists.

In the middle of the continuum lies the “moderate.” The moderate can explore the unusual with interest when necessary but would find too much exploration to be tiresome; on the other hand, the moderate can focus on the familiar for extended periods of time but eventually would develop a hunger for novelty. This trait is not an indicator

of intelligence, as explorers and preservers both score well on traditional measures of intelligence. It does tend to be a measure of creativity, as openness to new experience is an important ingredient of creativity.

Agreeableness

The agreeableness trait is a measure of altruism versus egocentrism. At one end of the continuum, the “adapter” is prone to subordinate personal needs to those of the group, to accept the group’s norms rather than insisting on his or her personal norms. Harmony is more important to the adapter than, for example, broadcasting his or her personal notion of truth. Galileo, in recanting his Copernican views before the Roman Inquisition, behaved as an adapter. The adapter profile is the core of such social roles as teaching, social work, and psychology.

At the other end of the continuum, the “challenger” is more focused on his or her personal norms and needs rather than on those of the group. The challenger is more concerned with acquiring and exercising power. Challengers follow the beat of their own drums, rather than falling in step with the group. The challenger profile is the foundation of such social roles as advertising, managing, and military leadership.

In the middle of the continuum is the “negotiator,” who is able to move from leadership to followership as the situation demands. Karen Horney (1945) describes the two extremes of this trait as “moving toward people” (adapter) and “moving against people” (challenger). The former, known as the tender-minded, in the extreme becomes a dependent personality who has lost his or her sense of self. The latter, known as the tough-minded, in the extreme becomes narcissistic, antisocial, authoritarian, or paranoid—a person who has lost his or her sense of fellow feeling. In one sense, this trait is about the dependence (altruism) of the adapter, the independence (egocentrism) of the challenger, and the interdependence (situationalism) of the negotiator.

Conscientiousness

The conscientiousness trait is about self-control in the service of one’s will to achieve. At one extreme, the “focused” profile portrays high self-control, resulting in consistent focus on personal and occupational goals. In a normal state, the focused person is characterized by academic and career achievement, but when focus turns extreme, it results in workaholism. The focused person is difficult to distract. Such a profile is the basis for such social roles as leaders, executives, and high achievers in general.

At the other extreme, “flexible” person is more easily distracted, is less focused on goals, is more hedonistic, and is generally more lax with respect to goals. The flexible is easily seduced from the task at hand by a passing idea, activity, or person; he or she has weak control over his or her impulses. Flexibles do not necessarily work less than focused people, but less of their total work effort is goal-directed. Flexibility facilitates creativity, inasmuch as it remains open to possibilities longer without feeling driven to closure and moving on. This profile is the core of such social roles as researchers, detectives, and consultants.

Toward the middle of this continuum is the “balanced” person, who finds it easier to move from focus to laxity, from production to research. A balanced person would make an ideal manager of either a group of flexibles or a group of focuseds, providing just enough of both qualities to keep flexibles reasonably on target without alienating them and to keep focused people sufficiently spontaneous to prevent them from missing important opportunities.

SAMPLE PROFILES

An Individual Profile: The Burned-Out Producer

Negative Emotionality = 76 (Very High)
Extraversion = 67 (Very High)
Openness = 42 (Low)
Agreeableness = 51 (Medium)
Conscientiousness = 72 (Very High)

Situation: Henry is a freelance television sports producer who is rich and miserable. He has plenty of work but he is worn out. At 11:00 p.m., after wrapping up his evening’s work broadcasting a professional basketball game, he finds that he cannot get to sleep until five or six in the morning, and then it is time to get up. Each game frazzles his nerves, and it takes him a long time to calm down. He is good at his job and he loves sports. He does not know what is wrong with him but knows that the quality of his life must change.

Analysis: The key here is Henry’s high N. His scores on the other four dimensions are a perfect fit for his job, but live, on-the-air sports production is no place for a reactive personality. The behind-the-scenes producer needs to be relatively sedate, calmly monitoring all the cameras and coolly giving instructions to guide the show’s progress. Henry’s high reactivity in a stressful environment with no margin for error is an unhealthy combination. He would probably be more comfortable in a job doing sports documentaries, where he could edit without the stress of real time.

A Team Profile: A Human-Service-Agency Team

Negative Emotionality = 3 low, 5 medium, 8 high
Extraversion = 2 low, 1 medium, 13 high
Openness = 3 low, 4 medium, 9 high
Agreeableness = 4 low, 2 medium, 10 high
Conscientiousness = 2 low, 2 medium, 12 high

Situation: In this team of sixteen members, meetings are loud and competitive, with little real listening. Side conversations continually crop up. Team members love to brainstorm but often lose track of many of their good ideas. Some tend to feel arrogant with respect to the rest of the agency, particularly to what they perceive as sluggish upper management. Most of them, however, are uncomfortable with conflict and dread the meetings, which frequently erupt into accusation, blaming, and intimidation.

Analysis: The fact that thirteen of the sixteen team members are moderate or higher in N suggests that the problems simply will not go away. The abundance of extraverts calls for strict norms regarding how to conduct meetings. The abundance of explorers (high O) calls for detailed minutes with follow-up to evaluate suggestions, establish priorities, and assign responsibility for implementation. The high number of adapters (high A) accounts for the discomfort with conflict and the need to agree to turn every complaint into a plan of action (“fix it or accept it”). The large number of focused (high C) team members accounts for the perception of others as sluggish. Members need to learn to ask for and accept time lines for decisions from top management.

REFERENCES

- Barrick, M.R., & Mount, M.K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.
- Costa, P.T., Jr., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *NEO PIR: Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Digman, J.M. (1989). Five robust trait dimensions: Development, stability, and utility. *Journal of Personality, 57*(2), 195-214.
- Digman, J.M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual Review of Psychology, 41*, 417-440.
- Galton, F. (1884). Measurement of character. *Fortnightly Review, 36*, 179-185.
- Goldberg, L.R. (1993, January). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist, 48*(1), 26-34.
- Horney, K. (1945). *Our inner conflicts*. New York: Norton.
- Howard, P.J., & Howard, J.M. (1993). *The big five workbook: A roadmap for individual and team interpretation of scores on the five-factor model of personality*. Charlotte, NC: Center for Applied Cognitive Studies.
- John, O.P., Angleitner, A., & Ostendorf, F. (1988). The lexical approach to personality: A historical review of trait taxonomic research. *European Journal of Personality, 2*, 171-203.
- McCrae, R.R. (Ed.). (1992, June). The five-factor model: Issues and applications. *Journal of Personality* (special issue), *60*(2).
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1989). Reinterpreting the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator from the perspective of the five-factor model of personality. *Journal of Personality, 57*(1), 17-40.
- McCrae, R.R., & Costa, P.T. (1990). *Personality in adulthood*. New York: Guilford.
- Norman, W.T. (1963). Toward an adequate taxonomy of personality attributes: Replicated factor structure in peer nomination personality ratings. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66*, 574-583.
- Peabody, D. (1987). Personality dimensions through trait inferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 59-71.

THE BIG FIVE LOCATOR

Pierce J. Howard, Phyllis L. Medina, and Jane M. Howard

Name: _____

Instructions: On each numerical scale that follows, indicate which point is generally more descriptive of you. If the two terms are equally descriptive, mark the midpoint.

1. Eager 5 4 3 2 1 Calm
2. Prefer Being with Other People 5 4 3 2 1 Prefer Being Alone
3. A Dreamer 5 4 3 2 1 No-Nonsense
4. Courteous 5 4 3 2 1 Abrupt
5. Neat 5 4 3 2 1 Messy
6. Cautious 5 4 3 2 1 Confident
7. Optimistic 5 4 3 2 1 Pessimistic
8. Theoretical 5 4 3 2 1 Practical
9. Generous 5 4 3 2 1 Selfish
10. Decisive 5 4 3 2 1 Open-Ended
11. Discouraged 5 4 3 2 1 Upbeat
12. Exhibitionist 5 4 3 2 1 Private
13. Follow Imagination 5 4 3 2 1 Follow Authority
14. Warm 5 4 3 2 1 Cold
15. Stay Focused 5 4 3 2 1 Easily Distracted
16. Easily Embarrassed 5 4 3 2 1 Don't Give a Darn
17. Outgoing 5 4 3 2 1 Cool
18. Seek Novelty 5 4 3 2 1 Seek Routine
19. Team Player 5 4 3 2 1 Independent
20. A Preference for Order 5 4 3 2 1 Comfortable with Chaos
21. Distractible 5 4 3 2 1 Unflappable
22. Conversational 5 4 3 2 1 Thoughtful
23. Comfortable with Ambiguity 5 4 3 2 1 Prefer Things Clear Cut
24. Trusting 5 4 3 2 1 Skeptical
25. On Time 5 4 3 2 1 Procrastinate

N= _____ E= _____ O= _____ A= _____ C= _____

THE BIG FIVE LOCATOR SCORING SHEET

Instructions:

1. Find the sum of the circled numbers on the *first* row of each of the five-line groupings (Row 1 + Row 6 + Row 11 + Row 16 + Row 21 = ____). This is your raw score for “negative emotionality.” Circle the number in the NEGAT EMOT: column of the Score Conversion Sheet that corresponds to this raw score.

2. Find the sum of the circled numbers on the *second* row of each of the five-line groupings (Row 2 + Row 7 + Row 12 + Row 17 + Row 22 = ____). This is your raw score for “extraversion.” Circle the number in the EXTRA: column of the Score Conversion Sheet that corresponds to this raw score.

3. Find the sum of the circled numbers on the *third* row of each of the five-line groupings (Row 3 + Row 8 + Row 13 + Row 18 + Row 23 = ____). This is your raw score for “openness.” Circle the number in the OPEN: column of the Score Conversion Sheet that corresponds to this raw score.

4. Find the sum of the circled numbers on the *fourth* row of each of the five-line groupings (Row 4 + Row 9 + Row 14 + Row 19 + Row 24 = ____). This is your raw score for “agreeableness.” Circle the number in the AGREE: column of the Score Conversion Sheet that corresponds to this raw score.

5. Find the sum of the circled numbers on the *fifth* row of each of the five-line groupings (Row 5 + Row 10 + Row 15 + Row 20 + Row 25 = ____). This is your raw score for “conscientiousness.” Circle the number in the CONSC: column of the Score Conversion Sheet that corresponds to this raw score.

6. Find the number in the far right or far left column that is parallel to your circled raw score. Enter this norm score in the box at the bottom of the appropriate column.

7. Transfer your norm score to the appropriate scale on the Big Five Locator Interpretation Sheet.

BIG FIVE LOCATOR SCORE CONVERSION SHEET

NORM SCORE:	NEGAT. EMOT:	EXTRA:	OPEN:	AGREE:	CONSC:	NORM SCORE:
80			25			80
78	22		24			78
76			23			76
74	21		22	25		74
72		25	21			72
70	20	24	20	24	25	70
68		23	19		24	68
66	19					66
64		22	20	23	23	64
62	18	21	19	22	22	62
60		20	18	21	21	60
58	17	19	17		20	58
56						56
54	16	18	16	20	19	54
52		17	15	19	18	52
50	15	16	14	18	17	50
48		15	13	17	16	48
46	14	14			15	46
44						
42	13	13	12	16	14	44
40		12	11	15	13	42
38	12	11	10	14	12	40
36						38
34	11					36
34		10	9	13	11	34
32	10	9	8	12	10	32
30		8	7	11	9	30
28	9	7	6	10	8	28
26		6	5	9	7	26
24	8			8	6	24
22					5	22
20	7	5				20
ENTER NORM SCORES HERE:	N =	E =	O =	A =	C =	

(Norms based on a sample of 161 forms completed in 1993-94.)

THE BIG FIVE LOCATOR INTERPRETATION SHEET

Name: _____

<p>LOW NEG. EMOTIONALITY: secure, unflappable, rational, unresponsive, guilt free</p>	<p><u>Resilient</u> <u>Responsive</u> <u>Reactive</u></p> <p>35 45 55 65</p>	<p>HIGH NEG. EMOTIONALITY: excitable, worrying, reactive, high strung, alert</p>
<p>LOW EXTRAVERSION: private, independent, works alone, reserved, hard to read</p>	<p><u>Introvert</u> <u>Ambivert</u> <u>Extravert</u></p> <p>35 45 55 65</p>	<p>HIGH EXTRAVERSION: assertive, sociable, warm, optimistic, talkative</p>
<p>LOW OPENNESS: practical, conservative, depth of knowledge, efficient, expert</p>	<p><u>Preserver</u> <u>Moderate</u> <u>Explorer</u></p> <p>35 45 55 65</p>	<p>HIGH OPENNESS: broad interests, curious, liberal, impractical, likes novelty</p>
<p>LOW AGREEABLENESS: skeptical, questioning, tough, aggressive, self-interest</p>	<p><u>Challenger</u> <u>Negotiator</u> <u>Adapter</u></p> <p>35 45 55 65</p>	<p>HIGH AGREEABLENESS: trusting, humble, altruistic, team player, conflict averse, frank</p>
<p>LOW CONSCIENTIOUSNESS: spontaneous, fun loving, experimental, unorganized</p>	<p><u>Flexible</u> <u>Balanced</u> <u>Focused</u></p> <p>35 45 55 65</p>	<p>HIGH CONSCIENTIOUSNESS: dependable, organized, disciplined, cautious, stubborn</p>

The Big Five Locator is intended for use only as a quick assessment to be used with a consultant and a willing client. Care should be taken to follow up this profile with a more reliable instrument, such as the *NEO PI-R* or the *NEO-FFI* (Costa & McCrae, 1992).

■ INSTRUCTIONAL STYLES DIAGNOSIS INVENTORY: INCREASING STYLE AWARENESS AND FLEXIBILITY

Greg Cripple

Abstract: The Instructional Styles Diagnosis Inventory (ISDI) has the potential to provide feedback from multiple sources on a trainer's instruction style. Style is measured on two dimensions: who and what. The "who" dimension indicates the degree to which the trainer gives greater attention to trainer delivery or to learner receptivity. The "what" dimension indicates the degree to which the trainer's attention is on the content/subject matter or on the actual learning/skill development taking place.

For each of the two dimensions (who and what), 20 behavioral variables are identified, and for each variable there are two neutrally worded statements, one representing each extreme in focus of attention.

The pure styles described are "the seller," "the professor," "the entertainer," and "the coach." The ISDI Interpretation Sheet allows trainers to see how close they are to each of these pure styles and to explore the possibility of increasing their behavioral flexibility in terms of training styles.

Instructing others often can be a frustrating undertaking. In addition, the rapid changes in our society; the accelerated production of new knowledge; the escalating requirements that employers have of employees; the increasing expectations of learners; and the steady movement to lifelong learning, multiple career changes, and learning organizations have added difficult new challenges to the instructional process.

To meet these challenges, trainers today need to be able to balance simultaneous demands. This places a premium on frequent, accurate feedback about the impact of the trainer's efforts on the many stakeholders in the learning process.

Most traditional trainer-feedback forms result in a single-source appraisal of trainer performance. Because of their predominantly evaluative nature, such forms tend to be perceived by trainers as threatening. Thus, these forms are more likely to produce defensive reactions than productive behavioral change. The focus of the Instructional Styles Diagnosis Inventory (ISDI) is on style rather than performance assessment and may offer a more attractive alternative to trainers.

INTRODUCTION TO THE ISDI

The ISDI serves as a catalyst to open participants' minds to the potential benefits of various instructional approaches.

The ISDI is similar in intent to the Employee Training Development Grid (Blake & Mouton, 1976), the Training Style Inventory (Bostrom, 1979), the Educational Orientation Questionnaire (Hadley, 1975), the Principles of Adult Learning Scale

(Conti, 1982), the Student-Content Teaching Inventory (Spier, 1974), the Canfield Instructional Styles Inventory (Canfield & Canfield, 1975) and the Instructional Skills Assessment (Training House, 1982). Each of these yield unique insights into training styles. The ISDI is more similar in content to the Styles of Training Index (Michalak, 1974), the Jacobs-Fuhrmann Learning Style Inventory: Trainer Version (Jacobs & Fuhrmann, 1984), and the Trainer Type Inventory (Wheeler & Marshall, 1986). In deciding on the most appropriate instrument for a specific purpose, the trainer is encouraged to examine all these instruments before making a decision.

Instructional Style

Most trainers have a preferred set of training philosophies, methods, and behaviors that form a predictable “instructional style.” Each instructional style has a different impact on different types of learners.

The training and development literature presents variety of definitions of instructional style. Mann, Arnold, Binder, Cytrunbaum, Newman, Ringwald, and Rosenwein (1970) propose that an instructor’s style is a combination of six primary styles:

- Expert/giving information,
- Formal authority/directing and controlling,
- Socializing agent/developing professionals,
- Facilitator/enabler,
- Ego ideal/inspirational model, and
- Person/caring co-learner.

Baird (1973) also describes instructor style as being a combination of six dimensions; these include:

- Didactic approach,
- Generalist approach,
- Researcher approach,
- Degree of direct student-teacher contact,
- Clarity/ambiguity of teacher demands, and
- Degree of affective rewards given to students.

Dobson & Dobson (1974) suggest that style is a synthesis of instructors’ efforts to establish congruence between their beliefs and practices. Bostrom (1979) sees style defined by degree of disposition toward the behaviorist, structuralist, functionalist, or humanist approaches. Spier (1974) proposes that style is the outgrowth of an attempt to balance beliefs about student attitudes toward learning with beliefs about content

emphasis. Bergquist and Phillips (1975) relate style to the type of learning environment the instructor creates (teacher-oriented, automated, interaction-oriented, or experience-oriented). Jacobs & Fuhrmann (1984) base style distinctions on Hersey and Blanchard's Situational Leadership® Model (directive, collaborative, or delegative). Wheeler and Marshall (1986) relate "trainer type" to the trainer's effectiveness in training students who are operating in one of Kolb's (1976) four learning-style categories (concrete experienter, active experimenter, abstract conceptualizer, or reflective observer).

In contrast, the ISDI suggests that instructional styles are determined by dichotomies between "who" and "what" are the focus of the trainer's attention. The "who" dimension indicates the degree to which the trainer gives greater attention to trainer delivery or to learner receptivity. The "what" dimension indicates the degree to which the trainer's attention is on the content/subject matter or on the actual learning/skill development taking place. Several years after the ISDI was developed, the author discovered that Michalak (1974) had used this idea in his Styles of Training Index. However, Michalak's scales are not dichotomous, and he defines them differently.

PURPOSE AND FORMAT OF THE ISDI

It is not the intention of the ISDI to promote an "ideal" style. There is a great deal of debate in instructional style research about whether there is such a thing as an ideal style and, if so, what determines it (e.g., student learning style, instructional objectives, nature of subject matter, situational variables). As early as 1969, Flanders, in his research on high- and low-achieving instructors, suggested that ideal style be viewed as the trainer's ability to use a wide range of styles as his or her reading of situational variables demands. Reddin (1970) referred to this as "style flexibility." Entwistle (1982) concluded, "The existence of widely different learning styles prevents there being any possibility of there being any single correct way to teach Versatility in teaching is essential No extreme style of teaching can be expected to be suitable for the majority of students."

The purpose of the ISDI is to provide "style awareness," defined as the accuracy of one's perception of his or her preferred instructional behavior.

To achieve this, for each of the two dimensions (who and what), twenty behavioral variables are identified. For each variable, two neutrally worded statements are presented, one representing each extreme in focus of attention. (The final part of the ISDI Interpretation Sheet contains a complete listing of paired statements by dimension.) The statements are distributed among twenty groups of four statements representing each of the four possible extremes of instructor behavior along the two dimensions. No statement is in the same group with the statement representing its contrasting extreme. This approach was chosen to reduce the "fakability" of results and to simulate the simultaneous decisions on aspects of the learning experience that trainers must make.

Completing the ISDI requires the respondent to rank each statement in a group of four from most descriptive (4) to least descriptive (1) of the trainer's instructional behavior.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ISDI WITH TRAINERS

1. The ISDI is distributed to participants, with instructions to complete it using their most recent training assignments as frames of reference. They are reminded that they are evaluating themselves as trainers just as future respondents will be evaluating them.
2. *(Optional)* Before scoring and interpreting the ISDI, each participant is asked to prepare a three-to-five-minute "mini-class" on a simple task such as making a paper airplane or tying a square knot. The classes are then videotaped as they are presented to other participants.
3. The ISDI Scoring Sheets are distributed, and participants begin by transferring their responses from the ISDI to the Scoring Sheet. They then complete six more steps, as directed on the Scoring Sheet, totaling their response scores for each extreme of each dimension, and plotting their final two dimension scores on the ISDI Scoring Sheet.
4. The ISDI Interpretation Sheets are distributed, and time is provided for participants to review their profiles in light of the information on the Interpretation Sheet. The facilitator answers any questions.
5. *(Optional)* The videos of participants' "mini-classes" are replayed. Participants are instructed to compare their ISDI scores with what they observe of themselves on video. After hearing comments of others in their group, participants share their results and reactions with the group.
6. Participants are asked to review the figure of the ISDI Quick Reference Guide on the Interpretation Sheet and to contrast the behaviors that characterize the four basic styles.
7. Participants are asked to volunteer situations in which they can use the ISDI with others to receive feedback on their instructional styles.

Suggested Discussion Questions

The following items are suggested for use in a general discussion.

1. General reactions/comments/questions.
2. Do you think that the inventory was accurate? Did it assess or describe you as you think you are?
3. As you completed the inventory, were you ranking the statements in terms of how you think you are or how you would like to be seen?

4. What concerns other than “who” and “what” would be key influences on your instructional style?

The following items are suggested for use after replay of the mini-classes video.

1. Do the results of the inventory and what you saw of yourself on the video match?
2. What are the discrepancies, if any?
3. Why do you believe you have the particular instructional style you now have? What have been the key influences on your style?
4. Which of these styles have you noticed most frequently in other trainers to whom you have been exposed recently? Were they appropriate and/or effective in the particular situations?
5. Which instructional style do you respond to best as a learner? Why?
6. Which style is most appropriate to your specific instructional situations? Why?
7. What changes do you think you need to make to become a more effective instructor?

RECOMMENDED USES OF THE ISDI

Feedback from only a single source no longer is adequate if we expect continuous improvement in trainers and instructional processes. Self-assessment is beneficial to a point, but research has shown that it typically suffers from a leniency effect. Feedback from multiple sources has proven to be a much more valuable indicator of performance.

The ISDI can be useful as a multi-source, nonevaluative performance-development tool for trainers. It provides learners, peers, supervisors, and other stakeholders an objective means to provide behaviorally based feedback. The knowledge of how their actions are actually perceived (style awareness) should lead to an increase in trainers’ behavioral repertoires (style flexibility) and, ultimately, to continuous improvement of the learning process.

REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Baird, L.I. (1973). Teaching styles: An exploratory study of dimensions and effects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 64, 15-21.
- Bergquist, W.H., & Phillips, S.R. (1975). *A handbook for faculty development*. Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges.
- Blake, R., & Mouton, J.S. (1976). *The employee training & development grid*. Austin, TX: Scientific Methods.
- Bostrom, R. (1979). Training style inventory (TSI). In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1979 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Canfield, A.A., & Canfield, J.S. (1975). *Instructional styles inventory*. Ann Arbor, MI: Humanics Media.
- Conti, G.J. (1982, Spring). The principles of adult learning scale. *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*.

- Dobson, R.L., and Dobson, J.E. (1974). Teacher beliefs-practices congruency. *Journal of the Student Personnel Association for Higher Education*, 12, 157-164.
- Entwhistle, N. (1982). *Styles of learning and teaching*. New York: John Wiley.
- Flanagan, D. (1983, January). Check out your training personality. *Training*, pp. 26-27.
- Flanders, N.A. (1969). Teaching effectiveness. In Robert L. Ebel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational research* (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Hadley, H.N. (1975). *Development of an instrument to determine adult educators' orientation: Andragogical or pedagogical*. Unpublished thesis, Boston University School of Education, Boston, MA.
- Jacobs, R.T., & Fuhrmann, B.S. (1984). The concept of learning style. In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1984 annual: Developing human resources*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Kolb, D.A. (1976). *Learning style inventory: Technical manual*. Boston: McBer.
- Lefton, R.E., & Buzzota, V.R. (1980, November). Trainers, learners and training results. *Training & Development Journal*, pp. 12-18.
- Mann, R.D., Arnold, S.M., Binder, J., Cytrunbaum, S., Newman, B.M., Ringwald, J., & Rosenwein, R. (1970). *The college classroom: Conflict, change, and learning*. New York: John Wiley.
- Michalak, D. (1974). *Styles of training index*. Tucson, AZ: Michalak Training Associates.
- Newstrom, J.W. (1987, September). HRD and the rule of four. *Training*, pp. 61-65.
- Parry, S. (1982). *Instructional skills assessment*. Princeton, NJ: Training House.
- Pickren, B., & Blitzer, R.J. (1992, March). How to escape your training horrors. *Training*, pp. 32-35.
- Reddin, W.J. (1970). *Managerial effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Spier, M.S. (1974). S-C (student content) teaching inventory. In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1974 annual handbook for group facilitators*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Tindal, C.R., & Doyle, P. (1977, May). Trainers or trainees—Who dominates? *Training & Development Journal*, pp. 64-71.
- Wheeler, M., & Marshall, J. (1986). The trainer type inventory (TTI): Identifying training style preferences. In J.E. Jones & J.W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), *The 1986 annual: Developing human resources*. San Diego, CA: Pfeiffer & Company.
- Yeager, D.A. (1981, December). Understanding—and adapting—your instructional style. *Training*, pp. 44, 48.

INSTRUCTIONAL STYLES DIAGNOSIS INVENTORY

Greg Cripple

Instructions: Think of your most recent learning experience with the trainer who is being evaluated. Each of the twenty items that follows contains four statements about what instructors can do or ways in which they can act.

Rank each set of statements to reflect the degree to which each statement in the set describes the trainer's instructional style. Assign a ranking of four (4) to the statement most characteristic or descriptive of the trainer; assign a three (3) to the next most descriptive statement; a two (2) to the next most descriptive statement; and a one (1) to the statement that is least descriptive of the trainer. Record your response for each statement in the blank next to it.

For some items, you may think that all statements are very descriptive or that none fit very well. To give the most accurate feedback, force yourself to rank the statements as best you can.

“When Instructing Adults, This Person Would Be Most Likely to . . .”

1. ____ a. Allow extended practice or discussion in areas of particular interest to learners.
____ b. Judge trainer's effectiveness by how well the prepared materials are covered.
____ c. Sit down with learners while instructing them.
____ d. Set trainer up as a role model and encourage learners to emulate trainer.
2. ____ a. End a training session by summarizing the key subject matter and recommending that learners find ways to apply it on the job.
____ b. Arrange the room so as to provide for better discipline and control.
____ c. Use specific course objectives to inform learners as to what they should expect to be able to do.
____ d. Focus learners' attention more on themselves and their own performance than on trainer.
3. ____ a. Gain supervisors' involvement by providing ideas on how to support learners' attempts to apply new skills.
____ b. Let the group “handle” difficult learners or privately explore reasons for problems.
____ c. Evaluate learners by giving examinations to test their retention of presented materials.
____ d. Carefully lead and control any group discussions.

4. a. Put his or her primary focus on giving a technically polished presentation.
 b. Avoid reducing impact by not disclosing any course materials prior to the program.
 c. Show willingness to learn from learners by admitting errors or lack of knowledge when appropriate.
 d. Collect background information and adjust the level of content material for each particular group.
5. a. Involve learners in activities designed to stimulate critical or reflective thought.
 b. Communicate positive expectations to slower learners through feedback and encouragement, in order to help them improve.
 c. Motivate learners with enthusiastic talks, humorous stories, and entertaining or inspirational videos.
 d. Maintain punctuality of published program schedules.
6. a. Make occasional use of media tools to support other primary learning activities.
 b. Present materials in the most logical order.
 c. Allow learners to influence or prioritize course content and objectives.
 d. Ensure that learners perform and apply newly learned skills as instructed.
7. a. Thoroughly cover all subject-matter areas in the scheduled time allotted.
 b. Change course materials or training methods based on feedback about performance changes after training.
 c. Maintain a consistent pace of presentation throughout the program.
 d. Express concern for and interest in individual learners and their problems.
8. a. Judge trainer's effectiveness based on learners' "liking" of trainer.
 b. Allow learners to make mistakes and learn from session experiences.
 c. Expose learners to traditionally accepted subject matter and correct procedures.
 d. Ask learners questions designed to guide them to self-discovery of key points.
9. a. Frequently assess learners' body language and emotional states and adjust activities or schedule appropriately.
 b. Explore content-related controversial issues as potential learning experiences.
 c. Plan and structure course materials in considerable detail.

- d. Begin program by informing learners of trainer's experience or qualifications and trainer's goals for the program.
- 10. a. Cite a bibliography of resources concerning materials discussed for further learner self-development.
- b. Use position as instructor to quickly resolve "difficult learner" problems (e.g., monopolizers, side conversations, sharpshooters, etc.).
- c. Encourage casual or comfortable dress to increase the informality of the learning environment.
- d. Avoid potentially time-wasting tangents by dealing with learners' questions quickly and moving on.
- 11. a. Direct learners' attention primarily to trainer and to what is being said or demonstrated.
- b. Frequently redirect learners' questions to other learners to be answered.
- c. Send out self-study "prework" materials to spark learner interest and formation of course expectations.
- d. Consistently cover the same material with each group.
- 12. a. Arrange the room so as to promote group activities and discussions.
- b. Always stand in front of the class while instructing.
- c. Send learners' bosses an overview of course subject matter.
- d. Judge trainer's effectiveness based on how proficient learners are in performing new skills or applying new concepts on the job.
- 13. a. Project a professional image by maintaining a separation between trainer and learners.
- b. Help learners motivate themselves by developing new skills through involvement and participation.
- c. Closely direct learners' activities.
- d. Allow learners to analyze materials and draw their own conclusions.
- 14. a. End a training session by helping learners create action plans to apply course content to real-world problems.
- b. Criticize slow learners to help them improve.
- c. Avoid controversy as a potential distraction or turnoff.
- d. Coach learners as they practice new skills.
- 15. a. Encourage detailed note taking by learners.
- b. Encourage learners to challenge outdated course materials or concepts of questionable value on the job.
- c. Sequence activities so as to stimulate and hold learner interest.

- d. Use media (video, slides, overheads, etc.) extensively to increase the professionalism of the presentation.
- 16. a. Use an introductory overview to inform learners of the subject matter to be covered.
- b. Judge trainer's effectiveness based on learners' increase in confidence and self-esteem.
- c. Maintain a formal dress code to establish a more serious atmosphere.
- d. Encourage creativity in the performance and application of course concepts.
- 17. a. Change course materials or training methods based on update of expertise in the subject matter.
- b. Begin a program by having learners introduce themselves to one another and communicate to trainer what their expectations are.
- c. Adjust time schedules during the program in response to learners' interests and concerns.
- d. Enhance credibility with learners by answering all questions quickly and accurately.
- 18. a. Avoid potentially embarrassing questions and protect material by keeping content resources confidential.
- b. Highlight key points in detail, speaking from carefully prepared notes.
- c. Vary pace of the program to adjust to natural daily highs and lows in learners' energy levels.
- d. Evaluate learners based on their abilities to perform specific objectives.
- 19. a. Defend trainer's expertise and credibility when challenged by a learner on a content issue.
- b. Emphasize establishing open, two-way communication.
- c. Leave the structure of the program loose to respond to the specific needs of the group.
- d. Aim the level of sophistication of course material at the "average" learner.
- 20. a. Listen attentively and observe group discussion of content issues or problem applications.
- b. Ensure that learners reach the right conclusions and accept the key points or concepts presented.
- c. Explore reasons that learners ask questions, to bring out individual concerns and hidden agendas.
- d. Project confidence and assurance by using effective gestures, posture, and vocal dynamics while instructing.


INSTRUCTIONAL STYLES DIAGNOSIS INVENTORY SCORING SHEET (To be completed by trainer)

Step 1. *Instructions:* Transfer the rankings from the ISDI to the Scoring Chart below. Note that the letter items in each set are **not** in alphabetical order.

Scoring Chart

	A	B	C	D
1	d	a	c	b
2	b	c	d	a
3	d	a	b	c
4	a	d	c	b
5	c	a	b	d
6	b	c	a	d
7	c	b	d	a
8	a	b	d	c
9	d	b	a	c
10	b	a	c	d
11	a	c	b	d
12	b	d	a	c
13	a	d	b	c
14	b	a	d	c
15	d	b	c	a
16	c	d	b	a
17	d	c	b	a
18	b	d	c	a
19	a	c	b	d
20	d	c	a	b
Total				

- Step 2.** Determine the sum of the rankings in each column and record them at the bottom of that column.
- Step 3.** Subtract the lower of the Column A or C totals from the higher.
- Step 4.** Subtract the lower of the Column B and D totals from the higher.
- Step 5.** Plot the result from Step 3 on the vertical scale of the graph that follows. If the “A” total is higher, plot the result below the midpoint “O.” If the “C” total is higher, plot the result above this point.
- Step 6.** Plot the result from Step 4 on the horizontal scale. If the “B” total is higher, plot the result to the right of the midpoint “O.” If the “D” total is higher, plot the result to the left of this point.
- Step 7.** Extend lines from the plotted points on each scale to the point where the two lines intersect.



INSTRUCTIONAL STYLES DIAGNOSTIC INVENTORY INTERPRETATION SHEET (For the trainer)

COMPONENTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL STYLES

The styles that trainers use in developing and presenting learning experiences are based on their personal beliefs about what the purposes of instruction are and how they can best contribute to achieving those purposes.

The ISDI attempts to determine training style as the interactive product of two dimensions: *what* the trainer's attention is focused on and *who* is the focus of attention while the trainer is instructing. Each dimension is a function of two sets of concerns.

The *what* dimension (the horizontal scale) represents the tradeoff between:

1. Concern for content quality and thoroughness of presentation coverage (represented by the Column D total); and
2. Concern for the actual learning that takes place with learners who are working with the content (represented by the Column B total).

The *who* dimension (the vertical scale) represents the tradeoff between:

1. Concern for the trainer and how polished, impressive, or entertaining his or her delivery is (represented by the Column A total); and
2. Concern for the learners and how effectively or positively they are receiving, practicing, considering, discussing, or applying new skills (represented by the Column C total).

No model of this type is perfect. For instance, you may be able to think of trainers who are able to balance a high concern for content with a high concern for the learning that the content produces. However, for most instructors, it is realistic to expect that balancing the two involves influencing one at the expense of the other. The same may be said for the *who* dimension.

INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES

The point on the graph at which the scores of these two dimensions intersect represents your overall training style.

To interpret your results, you must consider three things:

1. The comparative strengths of the four individual column totals,
2. The position of each of the two dimension scores, and
3. The direction and distance from the center of the point where the two dimension scores intersect.

For instance, were the four column totals high and low or were they close to one another? This indicates whether you tend to balance each aspect of training style equally or whether some aspects differ greatly to you in degree of importance. This directly effects the position of the dimension scores, which is the next consideration. If a dimension score is far toward one extreme or the other, this indicates a higher degree of tradeoff between the two sets of concerns involved. Dimension scores more near the middle represent a balanced degree of tradeoff, regardless of individual emphasis.

The intersection of the two dimension scores represents your overall training style, the product of your attempt to achieve balance among concerns for content, learning, delivery, and reception. The further this point is from the center of the graph, the more extreme your training style tends to be. The closer to the center this point is, the more “balanced” it tends to be.

DESCRIPTIONS OF STYLES

Following are short descriptions of the types of behaviors, attitudes, tendencies, and preferences that characterize each of the four styles.



I. “The Seller”

A person who has the “seller” instructional style is primarily concerned with the content and how positively it is received and understood. Learning is the participant’s responsibility, and it may or may not happen as a result. Because getting the message across and creating a good attitude toward it are the primary goals, “seller” instructors tend to focus their attention on the learners and the learners’ receptivity to the message.

They build a receptive atmosphere by creating a comfortable learning environment, encouraging learners, answering questions, varying the pace of the program, and so on. They tend to use lectures or prepared media presentation methods, interspersed with discussion to hold interest and attention. Note taking is encouraged to aid retention of material.

Homework, prework, and course-summary materials are used extensively to communicate or reinforce the content. Pass/fail or nongraded examinations are preferred to assess retention without turning the learners off.

The “seller” style is common in public schools and is probably more appropriate for building general educational backgrounds than for developing specific skills. It may also be appropriate for situations in which the selling of a technique, concept, or product is more important than the learners’ becoming proficient in it. It is not as appropriate when learners are expected to perform better or differently as a result of the training.



II. “The Professor”

Instructors who have a high concern for both content and delivery probably see themselves primarily as presenters. The “professor” types tend to be highly concerned about such things as their image, their technique and smoothness of speaking, and creating a proper impression. They prefer to have the spotlight on themselves, because this focuses the learners’ attention on them. The atmosphere in their sessions tends to be formal, and the separation between the presenter and the audience is emphasized.

“Professor” types are, at the same time, concerned with the adequacy of what they are presenting. Their presentations are usually well-researched, often impressively footnoted and referenced, planned and organized in detail, and well-rehearsed. Time is important because it reflects on their images as presenters (i.e., punctuality is impressive) and on their ability to cover all important content.

Their preferred teaching method is to lecture, as this allows them to focus attention on themselves, to control time, and to cover the content they believe is important. There is a tendency to overuse or inappropriately use media such as video, slides, or overheads because of their perceived ability to impress, entertain, and present large amounts of information in short time spans.

Typical situations where the “professor” style would be appropriate are: making a speech, delivering an after-dinner talk, communicating a report, and presenting or selling ideas to decision makers. This style usually is not as effective where actual skill development or behavioral change is expected from the learners. It may be appropriate for attitude change purposes; however, change produced by this method typically is short-lived unless constantly reinforced.



III. “The Entertainer”

Instructors who use the “entertainer” style focus on the results of training but also feel that people will learn best from instructors they like, respect, or admire. They have many of the same personal-image concerns as “professors.” They are very concerned with their credibility and whether the learners have confidence in their expertise.

“Entertainers” are concerned about involvement in the learning process, but more with their own than with the learners’. Thus, methods such as watching a role model (the instructor) demonstrate proper technique are preferred over self-discovery or group learning activities. When more participatory methods are used, these instructors tend to exercise close control and make themselves an integral part of the learning process.

Because these instructors generally believe that learners need to be “inspired” if they are going to perform differently, sessions often are designed to be highly motivational or entertaining. This can be effective but has the potential limitation of making what is learned instructor- dependent. When this occurs, learners can suffer drops in motivation when attempting to apply new skills on the job because the dynamic instructor is not there.

The fact that they are personally influencing learners is often more important to these instructors than the specific change that take place or the input that cause it. Thus, specific content is not an important issue.

This style probably is most appropriate for personal growth seminars, sales meetings, and programs that are meant to “recharge learners’ batteries.”

In its worst case, the “entertainer” style could be likened to a medicine-show huckster who dazzles you and takes your money before you have a chance to judge the value of his product.



IV. “The Coach”

Instructors who are oriented both to learning and to the learners tend to have the spotlight reversed so that the learners’ attention is focused on themselves most of the time. These trainers see their role more as facilitators of learning experiences than as presenters of information. They see value in course content only insofar as it enables learners to perform in new ways.

The focus of most coaching activities is on skill development, confidence building, and application, rather than on retention of information. Learners are evaluated, but mostly through observation of performance or behavioral change rather than through written tests. Grades usually are ignored, because most instruction is aimed at upgrading everyone’s skills to a minimum or improved level rather than on determining who is most proficient.

There is less concern for polished delivery because “coach” instructors spend much less time “delivering.” Also, because of the informal atmosphere created, there is less pressure on the instructor to perform, motivate, or entertain. Use of a high ratio of self-discovery and group-learning activities allows the learners to motivate and entertain themselves. The responsibility to perform is, in effect, shifted from the instructor to them.

Separation between the instructor and the learners is deemphasized. The prevailing philosophy typically is that the best instructor is the one who sets high expectations, guides and coaches the learners, and then gets out of the way so they can perform.

The instructor has a message, but the message is determined more by specific learner needs and less by what the instructor thinks might be good for the learners. Rather than forcing learners to understand and accept new ideas, “coaches” use questions, discussions, self-study, group work, and other involving techniques to lead learners to conclusions, but they allow the learners to make the commitments on their own.

The “coach” style tends to be most effective in bona fide training situations where skill building and behavioral change are the primary concerns. Potential problems with this style are tendencies to ignore time constraints, skip over important content issues,

SOURCES OF ANSWERS

Obviously, the preceding descriptions are those of the more extreme examples in each quadrant. The closer the intersection of the two scales to the center of the graph, the closer one would tend to be to a more “middle of the road” style with aspects of all four dimensions.

If you think that some respondents ranked you as more to the “ideal” than the “real,” it would probably be worth your time to go back and rank the items yourself, being brutally honest, to get a more balanced picture of yourself.

The following shows the location of the polar statements for each item measured by the ISDI.



Application of Skills

- L 16. d. Encourage creativity in the performance and application of course concepts.
- C 6. d. Ensure that learners perform and apply newly learned skills as instructed.

Punctuality of Scheduling

- L 17. c. Adjust time schedules during the program in response to learners’ interests and concerns.
- C 5. d. Maintain punctuality of published program schedules.

Currency and Applicability of Materials

- L 15. b. Encourage learners to challenge outdated course materials or concepts of questionable value on the job.
- C 8. c. Expose learners to traditionally accepted subject matter and correct procedures.

Degree of Program Structure

- L 19. c. Leave the structure of the program loose to respond to the specific needs of the group.
- C 9. c. Plan and structure course materials in considerable detail.

Evaluation of Learners

- L 18. d. Evaluate learners based on their abilities to perform objectives.
- C 3. c. Evaluate learners by giving examinations to test their retention of presented materials.

Direction of Activities

- L 8. b. Allow learners to make mistakes and also learn from session experiences.
- C 13. c. Closely direct learners' activities.

Handling of Controversy

- L 9. b. Explore content-related controversial issues as potential learning experiences.
- C 14. c. Avoid controversy as a potential distraction or turnoff.

Role of the Learner

- L 5. a. Involve learners in activities designed to stimulate critical or reflective thought.
- C 15. a. Encourage detailed note taking by learners.

Updating Methods or Materials

- L 7. b. Change course materials or training methods based on feed-back about learners' performance changes after training.
- C 17. a. Change course materials or training methods based on update of expertise in the subject matter.

Probing Individual Concerns

- L 20. c. Explore reasons that learners ask questions, to bring out individual concerns and hidden agendas.
- C 10. d. Avoid potential time-wasting tangents by dealing with learners' questions quickly and moving on.

Determining Level of Material

- L 4. d. Collect background information and adjust the level of content material for each particular group.
- C 19. d. Aim the level of sophistication of course material at the "average" learner.

Sharing Resources

- L 10. a. Cite a bibliography of resources concerning materials discussed for further learner self-development.
- C 18. a. Avoid potentially embarrassing questions and protect material by keeping content resources confidential.

Controlling Learner Expectations

- L 11. c. Send out self-study “prework” materials to spark learner interest and formation of course expectations.
- C 4. b. Avoid reducing impact by not disclosing any course materials prior to the program.

Flexibility of Course Content

- L 1. a. Allow extended practice or discussion in areas of particular interest to learners.
- C 7. a. Thoroughly cover all subject-matter areas in the time allotted.

Instructor Evaluation

- L 12. d. Judge trainer’s effectiveness based on how proficient learners are in performing new skills or applying new concepts on the job.
- C 1. b. Judge trainer’s effectiveness by how well the prepared materials are covered.

Gaining Learner Commitment

- L 13. d. Allow learners to analyze the materials and draw their own conclusions.
- C 20. b. Ensure that learners reach the right conclusions and accept the key points or concepts presented.

Maintenance of Learned Behavior

- L 14. a. End a training session by helping learners create action plans to apply course content to real-world problems.
- C 2. a. End a training session by summarizing key subject matter and recommending that learners find ways to apply it on the job.

Communicating Course Intent

- L 2. c. Use specific course objectives to inform learners as to what they should expect to be able to do.
- C 16. a. Use an introductory overview to inform learners of the subject matter to be covered.

Involving Learners’ Bosses

- L 3. a. Gain supervisors’ involvement by providing ideas on how to support learners’ attempts to apply new skills.
- C 12. c. Send learners’ bosses an overview of course subject matter.

Responding to Learners' Needs

- L 6. c. Allow learners to influence or prioritize course content and objectives.
- C 11. d. Consistently cover the same material with each group.



Communication of Expectations

- I 9. d. Begin program by informing learners of trainer's experience or qualifications and trainer's goals for the program.
- S 17. b. Begin a program by having learners introduce themselves to one another and communicate to trainer what their expectations are.

Dress/Atmosphere

- I 16. c. Maintain a formal dress code to establish a more serious atmosphere for the learning environment.
- S 10. c. Encourage casual or comfortable dress to increase the informality of the learning environment.

Motivation of Learners

- I 5. c. Motivate learners with enthusiastic talks, humorous stories, and entertaining or inspirational videos.
- S 13. b. Help learners motivate themselves by developing new skills through involvement and participation.

Improving Learner Performance

- I 14. b. Criticize slow learners to help them improve.
- S 5. b. Communicate positive expectations to slower learners through feedback and encouragement, in order to help them improve.

Establishing Program Pace

- I 7. c. Maintain a consistent pace of presentation throughout the entire program.
- S 18. c. Vary pace of the program to adjust to natural daily highs and lows in learners' energy levels.

Building Communication Patterns

- I 4. a. Put primary focus on giving a technically polished presentation.

- S 19. b. Emphasize establishing open, two-way communication.

Use of Media

- I 15. d. Use media (video, slides, overheads, etc.) extensively to increase the professionalism of the presentation.
- S 6. a. Make occasional use of media tools to support other primary learning activities.

Method of Presentation

- I 18. b. Highlight key points, in detail, speaking from carefully prepared notes.
- S 8. d. Ask learners questions designed to guide them to self-discovery of key points.

Building Instructor Credibility

- I 19. a. Defend trainer's expertise and credibility when challenged by a learner on a content issue.
- S 4. c. Show willingness to learn from learners by admitting errors or lack of knowledge when appropriate.

Guiding Learner Performance

- I 1. d. Set trainer up as a role model and encourage learners to emulate trainer.
- S 14. d. Coach learners as they practice new skills.

Sequencing Activities

- I 6. b. Present materials in the most logical order.
- S 15. c. Sequence activities so as to stimulate and hold learner interest.

Positioning the Instructor

- I 12. b. Always stand in front of the class while instructing.
- S 1. c. Sit down with learners while instructing them.

Evaluating Instructor Effectiveness

- I 8. a. Judge trainer's effectiveness based on learners' "liking" of trainer.
- S 16. b. Judge trainer's effectiveness based on learners' increase in confidence and self-esteem.

Use of Body Language

- I 20. d. Project confidence and assurance by using effective gestures, posture, and vocal dynamics while instructing.
- S 9. a. Frequently assess learners' body language and emotional states and adjust activities or schedule appropriately.

Arranging the Room

- I 2. b. Arrange the room so as to provide for better discipline and control.
- S 12. a. Arrange the room so as to promote group activities and group discussions.

Focusing Learners' Attention

- I 11. a. Direct learners' attention primarily to trainer and to what is being said or demonstrated.
- S 2. d. Focus learners' attention more on themselves and their own performance than on trainer.

Personal Concern for Learners

- I 13. a. Project a professional image by maintaining a separation between trainer and learners.
- S 7. d. Express concern for and interest in individual learners and their problems.

Controlling Activities

- I 3. d. Carefully lead and control any group discussions.
- S 20. a. Listen attentively and observe group discussion of content issues or problem applications.

Maintaining Discipline

- I 10. b. Use position as instructor to quickly resolve "difficult learner" problems (e.g., monopolizers, side conversations, sharpshooters, etc.).
- S 3. b. Let the group "handle" difficult learners or privately explore reasons for problems.

Handling Learners' Questions

- I 17. d. Enhance credibility with learners by answering all questions quickly and accurately.
- S 11. b. Frequently redirect learners' questions to other learners to be answered.

■ WORKING WITH RESISTANCE TO CHANGE: THE SUPPORT FOR CHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE ¹

Rick Maurer

Abstract: Resistance to change is a natural human response. Attempting to overcome it only intensifies it. Therefore, it is important that change agents (clients and consultants) know how to work with resistance. One key element is to identify the level of resistance and recognize its source.

The three levels of resistance each represent several issues that could make it difficult if not impossible to implement organizational change. The Support for Change Questionnaire allows change agents to survey a cross-section of organizational members in order to identify levels and categories of potential resistance. A program for using the questionnaire in the process of implementing change also is presented.

With the unrelenting change that is occurring in organizations, knowing how to work with resistance is a critical skill for consultants and clients. Resistance and change go together: it is virtually impossible to have significant change without resistance. People naturally resist anything that seems unfamiliar or potentially harmful from their points of view.

Unfortunately, resistance usually is viewed as bad and as something to be overcome. Many books and articles use the phrase “overcoming resistance to change.” This is dead wrong. Fighting, ignoring, or attempting to manipulate resistance intensifies the differences between those who want the change and those who resist it.

When we attempt to overcome, we enter into a win-lose contest. Winning is fine in sports, but inside an organization it is deadly. When we need people’s support, winning at another’s expense can be devastating. In 279 B.C., the army of the emperor Pyrrhus won at Asculum, but at a considerable cost of life. He is reputed to have said, “One more such victory and we are lost.” Many organizations have not learned this lesson and continue to win Pyrrhic victories.

THE INTENSITY OF RESISTANCE

An important step in dealing effectively with resistance is understanding its intensity. Categorizing resistance on one of three levels, from least intense to most intense, may be somewhat arbitrary but can help consultants and clients begin a conversation about the subject.

¹ Article and questionnaire adapted from *Beyond the Wall of Resistance: Unconventional Strategies that Build Support for Change* (Austin, TX: Bard & Stephen, 1996). By permission of the author. Copyright © 1996 by Rick Maurer.

Level 1: The Idea Itself

Level 1 is resistance to the change itself. People simply oppose, question, or are confused by the change. For example, management wants to paint the office pea green. Others resist. Their objection is simple: they hate the color pea green. There is no hidden agenda. Consider this low-grade resistance.

In Level 1, people resist change for the following reasons:

- They do not understand exactly what management is trying to accomplish;
- They do not know why it is important;
- They like the status quo;
- They do not know what impact the change will have on them;
- They do not think management realizes what the change will cost in time or money;
- They have their own ideas about what the organization should do;
- They like the idea but think the timing is wrong.

Most articles and books on the subject deal with resistance at this level. These publications usually suggest informing people about the change and getting them involved to some degree. Unfortunately, most resistance is deeper than Level 1, so a broader range of strategies is needed. Using the Support for Change Questionnaire is one strategy that can help a client and consultant identify and begin working with deeper levels of resistance.

Level 2: Deeper Issues

Level-2 resistance is always deeper than the particular change at hand. It indicates that there are other forces at work. For example, this level of resistance over the color that the office is to be painted has little to do with the actual color and a lot to do with other—often unspoken—issues. Conversations focused on the topic of color will not reveal the true nature of the resistance.

Most organizational resistance falls in Level 2, deeper than just the change itself. This resistance appears in a number of ways, as the sections that follow explain.

Distrust

Distrust arises when people believe they have been hurt in the past by someone or some group. Typically, people believe that management (or a consultant) has pushed through changes without regard for the human toll. They may believe that management (or a consultant) has made promises that were not kept. They resolve not to trust this person or group again. They question motives; read between the lines; and extract hidden meanings from every word, nuance, or perceived slight.

Because trust is low, anything can disrupt change at this level. People are likely to remain suspicious throughout the process, wondering if management is up to something. Rumors of a layoff, a contentious grievance settlement—almost anything—can drive the resistance even deeper.

Bureaucratic Culture

In traditional organizations with many layers of reporting, people often feel powerless—and well they should. People survive in bureaucracy by lying low and keeping things predictable. Success is sometimes measured by amassing whatever power one can get. For example, controlling critical information may make a worker seem indispensable. Change upsets the precarious balance.

Punishments and Rewards

If what is rewarded gets done, it is also true that what is punished is avoided. People will resist change that runs counter to the rewards and punishments inside the organization. For example, a company wanted to change how it handled billing because a typical bill moved through many departments on its way to the customer and the process was slow and prone to error. The vice president asked each department to assign a representative to a task force to do something about the problem. The project had difficulty making any progress because people's "real work" kept piling up when they attended meetings. Soon, they began to send substitutes to meetings, and the process disintegrated.

Need for Respect and Status

People need to save face. Change often threatens that strong human need. People are afraid that change may result in loss of respect, status, power, or control.

When one company tried to implement quality improvement, a manager asked if everything they had been doing to that point had been worthless. From his vantage point, this change was a repudiation of his life's work. He was not resisting quality, he was resisting the strong personal blow to his self-esteem.

Fear of Loss

The need to be part of something is strong for most people. When they believe that they will be cast out as a result of a change, they resist it. The need to be included is so deep that we may not be aware that it is guiding our actions. Although resistance may come out in a variety of ways (e.g., face-to-face criticism, silence, malicious compliance), it might not reveal that the concern is really about not belonging any more. Unless the consultant and client can find ways to hear this concern, they run the risk of solving the wrong problem.

Events in the World

The world does not begin and end at the edge of the organization. People read articles about downsizing, outsourcing, and mergers, some of which relate to changes their organization is trying to implement. People are afraid that a change is really the start of something bigger and deeper. The events of the world have an impact on the change agent's ability to get things done.

Lack of Resilience

The pace of change in many organizations is so rapid that people may be worn out. They do not necessarily resist a particular change, they just cannot imagine taking on something else (Conner, 1993). When resilience is low, resistance takes the form of chronic fatigue.

Level 3: Deeply Embedded

This is the deepest, most entrenched level of resistance. The problems are big and may seem overwhelming. In the example of painting the office, resistance at this level has nothing to do with the color of paint and a lot to do with negative perceptions of those who want to make the change. People resent or do not trust the management and may regard it as the enemy.

Major reasons for Level-3 resistance include the following:

Historic Animosity

Distrust is deeply entrenched. Often the hurt goes back a number of years, perhaps even generations. Some management-labor relationships have not improved since the growth of the labor movement in the early 1900s. When Frank Borman, former chairman of the ill-fated Eastern Airlines, was asked what he thought of employee involvement, he replied, "There is no way I'm going to have the monkeys running the zoo" (Gibney, 1986). Such an attitude makes cooperation extraordinarily difficult, if not impossible.

Conflicting Values and Visions

What management wants and what the people who have to live with the change want may be far apart. The two sets of goals may appear to be in direct opposition. Moreover, when historic animosity and conflicting values and visions meet, Level-3 resistance is extremely difficult to deal with.

Combination of Level-2 Factors

Some of the issues identified for Level 2, if particularly severe, become Level-3 concerns. In particular, distrust, punishments and rewards, need for respect and status, and fear of loss often appear in combination when resistance is deeply embedded.

USING THE SUPPORT FOR CHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE TO INITIATE CONVERSATION

The Support for Change Questionnaire provides consultants and clients a means to assess the intensity of resistance to change. Responses to the questionnaire act as a springboard for conversation about change and resistance.

The quality of the scores is determined by who takes part. If the survey is used only with the senior management team, the result probably will be a skewed view of reality. It is better to obtain data from a cross-section of the organization in order to create a more complete picture.

The actual scores are less interesting than the reasons that people responded the way they did. Conversations with clients should focus on the stories that accompany the scores. For example, if the CEO rates everything seven (high), middle managers' scores range from three to five, and the nonmanagement staff rates everything low, you have the makings of a very intriguing conversation.

The purpose of the conversation is to get opinions and feelings out in the open. Obviously, the consultant's skill at facilitating dialogue is critical.

Using the Questionnaire

The following is a recommended format for working with the Support for Change Questionnaire.

Prework

Explain to the client the importance of working with, rather than against, resistance. Suggest that a cross-section of the organization complete the questionnaire. This need not be a large group as long as the scores reflect the range of opinions about whatever change is being considered. Make certain not to overlook individuals or groups who may be critical to implementing the change.

Inform the people who will be completing the questionnaire of its purpose; why they have been selected to respond to it; the date, time, and place of its administration; and any other pertinent details.

Administration

Thank the selected participants for coming and state the purpose of administering the questionnaire and the value of their spending their time on it. Distribute copies of the questionnaire and pencils to the participants, read the instructions aloud, and answer any questions. Before they leave, tell the participants when they will receive feedback on the results and thank them for their efforts.

Scoring

Score the responses. (A scoring sheet is provided after the questionnaire for your convenience, or you may prefer to develop one appropriate to the organization's particular needs.) Provide anonymity for individuals, but break out the scores by stakeholder groups. For example, use one color to indicate scores of senior management, another color for those of middle managers, and so forth.

Reporting to the Client

Meet privately with the client to go over the scores prior to providing feedback to all others concerned.

Reporting to Respondents and Others

Prior to the meeting, review the "Interpretation" section that appears after the questionnaire. Use this information to help form questions to ask during the meeting. No matter what the scores are, the following questions probably will be of value:

- What interests you about the scores?
- Where do you see patterns?
- Where are the greatest points of agreement?
- Where are the greatest points of disagreement?

Convene a meeting of all interested parties.

1. Present the three levels of resistance.
2. Display the scores on large sheets of flip chart paper, slides, or overhead transparencies. Preserve anonymity for individual respondents, but display the scores by stakeholder groups, e.g., different colors for senior management, middle management, etc.
3. Encourage people to explain why they scored the way they did. Do not force anyone to speak involuntarily. When people do speak, keep the atmosphere "safe" so that people can describe the reasons for their scores. (This is especially important if most scores are on one end of the scale.) Do not allow people to try to convert their colleagues.
4. Once you have explored the reasons behind the scores, consider asking the following questions:
 - What are the implications of these scores for this change?
 - If we proceed with the change, what must we do to build support for it?
 - How can we get people actively involved in the change process?

- How can all individuals and groups be treated with dignity and respect during the planning and implementation of the change?

REFERENCES

Conner, D. (1993) *Managing at the speed of change: Guidelines for resilience in turbulent times*. New York: Random House.

Gibney, A. (1986, June). Paradise tossed. *The Washington Monthly*, pp. 24-34.

SUPPORT FOR CHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE

Rick Maurer

Instructions: This article and questionnaire² are designed to help people understand the inherent level of support or opposition to change within the organization. Please respond to each item according to how true you think it is in your organization. Circle the appropriate number on the scale that follows the item.

Not True	Usually Not True	Somewhat Untrue	Neutral	Somewhat True	Usually True	True
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Values and Visions

1. Do people throughout the organization share values or visions?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

History of Change

2. Does the organization have a good track record in implementing change smoothly?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Cooperation and Trust

3. Is there a lot of cooperation and trust throughout the organization (as opposed to animosity)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

² Adapted from *Beyond the Wall of Resistance: Unconventional Strategies that Build Support for Change* (Austin, TX: Bard & Stephen, 1996). By permission of the author. Copyright © 1996 by Rick Maurer

Not True	Usually Not True	Somewhat Untrue	Neutral	Somewhat True	Usually True	True
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Culture

4. Does the organization's culture support risk taking (as opposed to being highly bureaucratic and rule bound)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Resilience

5. Are people able to handle change (as opposed to being worn out from recent, unsettling changes)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Punishments and Rewards

6. Does the organization reward people who take part in change efforts (as opposed to subtly punishing those who take the time off other work to get involved)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Respect and Status

7. Will people be able to maintain respect and status when the change is implemented (as opposed to losing these as a result of the change)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Status Quo

8. Will the change be mild (and not cause a major disruption of the status quo)?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

SUPPORT FOR CHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE SCORING SHEET

	Overall Total	Average	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
1. Values and Visions						
2. History of Change						
3. Cooperation and Trust						
4. Culture						
5. Resilience						
6. Punishments and Rewards						
7. Respect and Status						
8. Status Quo						

SUPPORT FOR CHANGE QUESTIONNAIRE INTERPRETATION SHEET

Consider the following elements when interpreting the results of the questionnaire.

NUMBERS NEED TO BE EXPLAINED

Even though 1, 2, and 3 should be considered low scores; 4 and 5, mid-range scores; and 6 and 7, high scores; these are just numbers. One person's "5" is another person's "3." The value lies in understanding the meanings people give to their scores.

Generally, low to mid-range scores should be cause for concern. Lower scores indicate fertile soil for the growth of resistance.

LOOK FOR PATTERNS

Are scores similar or clustered on particular items? If so, this probably indicates agreement among most people regarding the relative support for change on that scale.

Are scores split on particular items? This may indicate that one respondent group (e.g., nonmanagement staff) consistently rates things low, while another group (e.g., supervisors) rates things high.

A pattern of high scores may indicate that the resistance will be Level 1. The organization's culture and history are such that people probably feel free to speak their minds. Therefore, conversations about change should be relatively easy to facilitate. However, it should be remembered that anything can drive resistance into Level 2. For example, a rumor or a newspaper report about downsizing in the industry could increase people's fears.

A pattern of low scores indicates deep (probably Level-3) concerns. Clients and change agents must take these concerns seriously. They will need to take a long-range view of change. It is imperative that they get people involved and begin building bridges.

Any low or mid-range scores indicate resistance waiting to happen. Mid-range scores also may indicate that there are concerns deeper than the change itself (Level 2). It is important to get these issues out into the open for discussion.

There are no right or wrong answers. Scores merely reflect people's perceptions.

ITEM ANALYSIS

Examine each item on the questionnaire. Use the following explanations to form questions to ask during the meeting.

Values and Visions

Low scores may indicate Level-3 concerns. Values may be in conflict, and individuals and groups may not see any common ground. This is serious. It almost guarantees that any major change will be resisted unless people learn how to build a shared set of values. On the other hand, low scores may indicate a communication problem. In some organizations, values and visions remain secret. People do not know where the organization is going. This communication problem needs to be solved but may not indicate deeper potential resistance.

History of Change

Low scores indicate a strong likelihood that a change will be resisted with great force. Those who want the change will need to demonstrate repeatedly that they are serious this time. People are likely to be very skeptical, so persistence will be critically important.

Cooperation and Trust

Low scores probably indicate Level-3 concerns. This should be taken seriously. It is difficult, if not impossible, to build support for any major change without some degree of trust. The opposite of trust is fear, so a low score indicates not just the absence of trust but the presence of fear.

Culture

Mid-range to low scores indicate that it may be difficult for people to carry out changes even if they support them. They are saying that the systems and procedures in the organization hinder change. The change agents must be willing to examine these deeper systemic issues.

Resilience

Low scores probably indicate that people are burned out. Even though they may see the need for change, they may have little strength to give to it. Two important questions should be asked:

- Is this change really necessary at this time?
- If it is, how can the organization support people so that the change causes minimal disruption?

Punishments and Rewards

Low scores indicate strong potential resistance. Who in their right minds would support something that they knew would harm them? If the respondents' perceptions are accurate, the change agents must find a way to move forward with the change *and find*

ways to make it rewarding for others. If the low scores indicate a misperception, the change agents must let people know why they are misinformed. It is likely that this message will need to be communicated repeatedly (especially if trust is low as well).

Respect and Status

Low scores indicate potential Level-2 concerns. The change agents must find ways to make this a situation in which all can win.

Status Quo

Low scores indicate that people regard the potential change as very disruptive and stressful. The more involved people are in the change process, the less resistance they are likely to experience. Most often, people resist change when they feel out of control.

■ THE HIGH-PERFORMANCE FACTORS INVENTORY: ASSESSING WORK-GROUP MANAGEMENT AND PRACTICES¹

Robert P. Crosby

Abstract: Twenty-five factors have been identified that are necessary for the creation of an empowered and high-performing organization. The High-Performance Factors Inventory can be used to assess group and/or its manager in terms of these factors and to identify areas in which further development is needed. Research has shown that when these factors are attended to, productivity, quality, and employee satisfaction are high.

In this article, the twenty-five factors are explained, and a four-step plan is presented for working through the inventory and planning action steps based on the results.

Empowerment in organizations is a balance of management authority and employee influence. It is also helping people to channel the power they already have toward qualitative and productive ends. Unfortunately, many managers flip from being too authoritarian to being too permissive and back again. Finding the appropriate balance is difficult.

The creation of an empowered and high-performing organization is dependent on many factors; twenty-five that impact performance have been identified through the use of data resulting from the author's instrument, the *People Performance Profile*. When these factors are attended to, productivity and quality are high, absenteeism is low, accidents are reduced, and employees are more likely both to enjoy and be motivated in their work environment.

The twenty-five high-performance factors are influenced by the manager of the work team or leader of the group. In teams without any management or leadership, the use of consensus is overly time consuming and often is controlled by the most rigid or resistant group members. Authoritarian management often is associated with pinpointing what is wrong and blaming. Permissive management often is associated with avoidance of responsibility and chaos. The balanced management approach is focused on "making it work."

The leader must have enough authority to create a participative culture and a loyalty that motivates followers. The opportunity to do productive work in a humane organization, with clarity of direction, is the most powerful motivating and esteem-enhancing force known. It also leads to bottom-line results.

¹ Adapted from the book, *Walking the Empowerment Tightrope* by Robert P. Crosby, © 1992, published by Organization Design and Development, Inc., King of Prussia, PA. Copies of the book may be ordered from the *HRD Quarterly*, 2002 Renaissance Boulevard, Suite 100, King of Prussia, PA 19406.

HIGH-PERFORMANCE FACTORS

The twenty-five high-performance factors are as follows.

1. Sponsorship

The most critical factor in the success or failure of a plan or change project is the presence or absence of clear sponsorship from all managers and supervisors whose employees are involved in or affected by the plan or change. Sponsorship must be cascaded so that all are aligned. When such alignment is missing, employees receive conflicting messages. Lack of clarity about sponsorship is a primary cause of mistrust and dysfunction. Clarity reduces ambiguity and increases the possibility of success. This includes clarity about both direction and implementation. The fundamental principle is that one can only sponsor direct reports. Therefore, alignment down and across the organization is critical.

2. Openness

When autocratic managers refer to “troublemakers,” they often are referring to people who bring up problems, ask questions, or make suggestions. Effective managers create an open climate in which information flows overtly rather than covertly. This involves “practicing what you preach,” welcoming open—rather than underground—resistance, and listening actively so that people know that their messages have been heard and they have a chance to clarify any misperceptions. When the manager and group members have been trained in communication, arguments and blaming are reduced, and productivity increases.

3. Influence

Everyone should understand that the manager’s or group leader’s role is necessary. Likewise, the group members have roles. The manager makes certain decisions and puts certain systems in place. Group members must ensure that they have clarity about their jobs, about who decides what, and about how they are doing. All need to have the ability to get commitments from others, information they need to do their jobs, and materials or other resources they need to do their jobs. All need to have the ability to impact productivity and quality issues and to influence decisions that affect them, such as work space and environmental factors, procedures and processes, equipment, measurements of work, schedules, compensation, and openness about what is and what is not working.

4. Distinguish Between Decision Making and Influence

The group leader and the group members must understand the different decision-making and influence styles and know which ones they employ. Lack of clarity about decision making and influence is a dominant cause of mistrust and low productivity. It is also important to know who makes which decisions. In different circumstances, the leader

may make a unilateral decision, describe the problem and ask for recommendations from group members before deciding, accept a majority decision from the group, ask for a consensus decision, or delegate the decision. What the leader should not do is make a decision and then pretend to solicit input. In each case, the type of decision should be made clear.

5. Decisions Are Made

Taking too much time to make a decision is as bad as not taking enough time or not making a decision at all. A person with a high need for accuracy often postpones decisions, always seeking more information. A person with a high relationship orientation may postpone decisions while striving for agreement or consensus. On the other hand, a hard-charging person could make a decision without understanding its impact. It is important to understand one's decision-making style and *manage* it productively. Group members also can help one another and their manager by "calling" one another on decision-making problems when needed.

6. Implementation

Many organizations and managers announce plans or changes and then act as if a magic wand had been waved and the plans or changes were immediately in effect. In fact, implementation is the most critical step. If the people affected by the plan or change are to buy into it, they must be involved in the planning of both the plan or change and the implementation strategy. As with other factors, clarity is essential in all aspects of the implementation.

7. Input Needs

Input is what is received into the unit. Throughput is what happens to that material, information, order, etc., as it moves through the unit—the work flow and processes. Output is what goes to the internal or external customer. Building relationships with suppliers can improve the quality and timeliness of input. More timely notification of needs and better adherence to procedures about paperwork can help the suppliers achieve this.

8. Throughput

Continuous improvement of throughput processes is essential. Initially, survey feedback is a useful tool if there is a lot of data to be gathered regarding manager/employee relations, role clarity, accountability, intergroup issues, and other dimensions related to group effectiveness. Often, other groups and the relationships with them need to be considered, and the groups' processes may need to be aligned. Creating models of each process, developing flow charts, and clarifying individual tasks and perceptions are useful in the development of efficient throughput. Measurement of results is critical.

Then continual review of processes with the goals of updating and improving helps to keep things productive, keep quality up, and ensure safety.

9. Output

Obtaining feedback on output is the best way to track quality and customer satisfaction. Developing a feedback form may be problematic if the persons involved have different perceptions of their jobs, so creating clarity and alignment again is essential. The feedback form can contain yes/no questions, multiple choice questions, scaled responses, and/or open-ended questions (these are more difficult to score, but a wider range of information can be obtained). If the feedback reveals problems, the manager and group engage in identifying the actual problem, identifying possible solutions, analyzing solutions and possible results, and developing a plan for action.

10. Meetings

Most meetings can be improved. Deciding on the purpose of each meeting; asking whether the purpose can be served better by means of telephone calls, memos, or electronic mail; and determining who actually needs to attend and who does not can help to keep meetings from becoming time wasters. An agenda should be developed for each meeting, with estimated times, and all key agenda items should be addressed. Discussions that can be conducted with smaller groups should be assigned to another time. All commitments and action items should be recorded, with the “who,” “what,” and “by when” specified. All members should feel empowered to comment on process, such as when the meeting strays from the topic. Finally, each meeting should be reviewed briefly with the aim of continually improving the process.

11. Creativity

A climate for creativity is built when people are thanked for contributing ideas, whether one agrees with them or not. Brainstorming is a good way to introduce the creative process. Looking for the kernel in wild ideas often yields productive applications. If the group members are assured of the manager’s support, they will learn to keep contributing, even when some of their ideas are not accepted or implemented.

12. Job Clarity

Confusion about priorities is a common cause of lack of job clarity. Confusion between the understood job assignment and what one is asked to do and assignments or requests from multiple sources are other causes. If other people are unclear about a person’s role, they may ask that person to do things outside of the person’s understood role. The manager should clarify his or her expectations of each member’s role, and members should clarify their expectations of one another. Duplication of effort can be eliminated, and gaps can be filled.

13. Person-Task Fit

Organizations function best when their members can do what they do well and enjoy doing. Of course, some routine, uninspiring tasks need to be done, but it is often possible to adjust tasks in order to achieve a better person-task fit. The manager and group members can discuss the possibilities for shifting work around or doing it differently. Team planning also can lead to trading of tasks and cross-training so that people can support one another better.

14. Authority

A recurring problem in organizations is that people have responsibility for tasks but not the authority to carry them out. Authority may mean being able to enlist help or attain resources. This is experienced by managers as well as others. If this problem can be solved without bringing it to the attention of higher levels, so much the better. If not, it is important to identify the sponsors of the tasks and enlist their aid.

15. Resource Availability

Resources include people, information, time, materials, equipment, and repairs. Availability of resources is a system issue and demands a system response. To tackle this issue, both workers and decision makers must be involved. It may require an ad hoc team effort, with membership from all parts of the organization and a skilled facilitator. Dialogue must be kept open between key decision makers and the problem solvers, and the effort may take some time. Nevertheless, the effort is required, as lack of resources cannot be solved at the work-group level although it greatly impairs productivity at that level.

16. Team Measurements

Many aspects of input, throughput, and output are measurable. The idea of continuous improvement is based on measurement to chart progress. Choosing what is to be measured is a shared activity, and it must be remembered that measurement is aimed at improvement, not at assigning blame. If measurement devices are kept simple, they will not impede the usual work flow.

Productivity measurements may include increases in numbers of items produced or processed, profit, accuracy, new clients, etc. They also may include reductions in time, absenteeism, costs, returns, incorrect shipments, and so on.

17. Big-Picture Perspective

Most people work better when they understand the “big picture” related to a task and their role in it. When group members understand the manager’s and the group’s goals, risks, and market opportunities, they are better able to participate in creating success. It is important that the group leader answer questions and realize that different people may

want different information. Keeping group members informed of changes in the marketplace, the organization, and the competition helps them to understand why they are doing what they are doing.

18. Training

“Just in time” training is based on the idea that training loses its effectiveness if it does not immediately precede application. For example, computer training at an outside facility is largely forgotten if the workers do not immediately begin to use what they have learned on computers in the workplace. Implementing continuous improvement and measurement practices will help to pinpoint training needs, which should be met as soon as possible so that inefficient practices do not become part of work habits.

19. Priorities

Lack of clear priorities is a common complaint in organizations, although it may be expressed as “I have too much work” or “I have too many bosses.” Many people find it difficult to say no or to draw boundaries. Thus, they feel stressed and victimized. It is important that the manager take responsibility for setting priorities or determining exactly how they are set. Clear job descriptions and task expectations help. Often, a lead member of the team may be assigned responsibility for keeping track of priorities. Task priorities should be related to each member of the team at least once each week.

20. By-Whens

When people leave a meeting, it should be clear who will do what and by when it will be done. “I’ll get around to it” is not a commitment. Each meeting should begin with a review of the commitments made at the previous meeting. The right to ask for a “by-when” must go up and down and laterally across the organization. Whoever has responsibility for a task must be empowered to remind others of their commitments when breakdowns occur.

21. Follow Through

Making a good decision is not the same as taking action. Too often, assumed action does not take place. People do things to which they are committed. If someone says, “I’ll try . . .,” it is an indication of low commitment, whereas “I will . . .” is an indication of dedication to achieving results. In addition to obtaining “by-whens,” it is important to obtain acceptance of responsibility for achievement. When people give their word, others need to be able to count on it so that actions can happen in a predictable way. People also need to know that if they have overcommitted, they can go to the manager or the group and rectify the situation. When a group norm of following through on commitments has been established, schedules are met, budgets are accurate, and a new energy flow is created.

22. Single-Point Accountability

It is important that someone be accountable for the satisfactory completion of each task. This person can keep track of schedules, resources, and people, and spot small problems or delays before they become major ones. This person is a catalyst of the task.

Accountability is a particular problem in a matrixed organization. Matrices create holes through which fingers can be pointed and people can escape from accountability. When two or more groups share a task, it is important that managers agree among themselves about where accountability for each segment will lie. Each manager then communicates this to his or her employees.²

23. Reinforcement

A fundamental principle of psychology is that people repeat behaviors that they are rewarded for. Too often, people in organizations only hear about what they have done wrong. Managers can reward employees by giving them a chance to work with people, projects, or equipment they are interested in; by sponsoring their attendance at training events and conferences; by providing relief from repetitive tasks; and by saying “thank you” privately and publicly in a timely manner. Organizations can introduce motivational profit-sharing programs and can celebrate achievement by inviting employees to dinners and cake breaks and by handing out free passes to movies or other events. Timely recognition that states specifically what performance is being recognized will reinforce that achievement.

24. Reprimands

If managers’ expectations are made clear, and employees have clarity about their roles and responsibilities, reprimands are not needed as often and are not as much of a surprise when they occur. When reprimands are stated in general and judgmental ways, they are destructive. In order for them to be constructive, certain preconditions must be met: job assignments and expectations must be clear, positive reinforcement must occur when things are done right, and there must be a climate of openness in the organization. Then reprimands must be given privately, not publicly; they must be specific about which behaviors are unacceptable; and the timing of the reprimand must be close to the event that required it. After making a reprimand, the manager should make it clear what behaviors should replace the undesirable ones and should assure the employee of his or her value to the group.

25. Work Relationships

Most conflict at work is not interpersonal but is caused by poor sponsorship, unclear roles and priorities, and confused authority and decision making. However, people often assign blame for these things to others and complain about the person rather than

² Crosby’s book, *Solving the Cross-Work Puzzle* (Seattle, WA: LIOS Publishing, 1994) is about these issues.

attempting to solve the problem. In this triangle, the person being complained about has no chance to defend himself or herself or to solve the problem. A norm of speaking directly to the person involved can help to nip many work-group problems in the bud. If the issue is severe, a third party or skilled facilitator may be asked to moderate the conversation. If work-group members are focused on problem solving rather than on blaming, interpersonal issues are resolved more easily.

Many of the factors discussed here are organizational system problems rather than individual problems. It is important to remember the formula used by Kurt Lewin: Behavior is a function of the person and the environment.

USES OF THE INSTRUMENT

The High-Performance Factors Inventory can be used by members of a group or team to assess the group's functioning. It also can be used by the manager of a team or by a team leader to assess his or her management influence. The respondent(s) then should follow the steps outlined below to generate an improvement plan and follow through for the group.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENT

Step One: Appraising the Group

The facilitator can begin by stating the purpose of the instrument without divulging its content to the point that respondents attempt to give the "right" answers. Each respondent is given a pencil and a copy of the High-Performance Factors Inventory and reviews the instructions on the inventory.

Step Two: Reviewing the Results

When the respondents have completed the inventory, copies of the High-Performance Factors Scoring and Interpretation Sheet are distributed to them. They add up the scores they gave the items on the inventory and read the feedback for their totals.

Step Three: Developing an Improvement Plan

The respondents are asked to review the items for which their scores were lower than they would wish and to think about some specific ways to improve them. The facilitator then posts the list of the twenty-five High-Performance Factors and explains each factor, in turn. Respondents may be asked to reveal their ideas for improving their scores for that factor, while the facilitator records all suggestions on newsprint.

The facilitator suggests that the respondents list actions that they would want from others and also list what they intend to do to improve those factors rated low. The principle is as follows:

You are your words and your actions. If your words are “probably,” “I hope,” “if I can,” “I’ll try,” “I don’t know when,” “it wasn’t my fault,” and “nobody told me,” you will create a pattern of not achieving, of blaming, and of finding excuses. If your words are “here’s what I expect,” “how can I support you?,” “when do you need this?,” “I’ll complete it by (when),” and “here’s when I need this from you,” you will create a pattern of achieving. You must not only meet your commitments, you must provide others with the resources and support they need to make their commitments. You can begin to recast accountability and support in your organization. You create by initiating your own behavior.

The respondents and supervisor agree on specific actions and record who will do what and by when.

Step Four: Involving Work-Group Members in Follow Through

The next step, which should be taken within approximately a month, is to meet again and review the agreements. Members and managers can score each agreement on a “1” to “10” scale (“1” is low and “10” is high) and discuss their results. Some will score high, and some will score low. There will be successes and breakdowns. Celebrate the successes and fix the breakdowns.

HIGH PERFORMANCE FACTORS INVENTORY¹

Robert P. Crosby


Instructions: For each item that follows, circle the number on the continuum that best represents your work group.

1. Sponsorship

The supervisor firmly supports his/her direct reports, providing direction, resources, clarity, and enthusiasm to guarantee success.

Almost Always

Almost Never




2. Openness

Data flows accurately so that problems are identified. Disagreements are viewed as opportunities for dialogue and are dealt with directly.

Almost Always

Almost Never




3. Influence

Employees have input and influence on factors that impact their work life, i.e., suggesting solutions, often seeing suggestions being acted on, and getting feedback when suggestions are rejected.

Almost Always

Almost Never




4. Distinguish Between Decision Making and Influence

Managers are clear about the distinction between “who is deciding” versus “who is influencing” and communicate that.

Almost Always

Almost Never




¹ Reprinted from the book, *Walking the Empowerment Tightrope* by Robert P. Crosby, © 1992, published by Organization Design and Development, Inc., King of Prussia, PA.

5. Decisions Are Made

Decisions are made in an expedient amount of time; it does not take forever to get a decision made.

Almost Always

Almost Never




6. Implementation

Once decisions are made, they are effectively implemented in a timely way.

Almost Always

Almost Never




7. Input Needs

We get on time and with quality what we need from outside or inside suppliers, such as materials, maintenance support, information, equipment, and/or commitments to service.

Almost Always

Almost Never




8. Throughput

Once input is received, we are organized in the best possible way to produce quality output in a timely manner with clear and efficient processes. Our equipment is up-to-date and effectively used.

Almost Always

Almost Never




9. Output

We give to others what they need and provide excellent service, on time and with quality. This includes internal customers (within the organization) and external customers.

Almost Always

Almost Never




10. Meetings

Our meetings are effective. Time is not wasted. Appropriate people attend. Participation is shared. When needed, we solve issues, and decisions are made.

Almost Always

Almost Never




11. Creativity

New ideas for improving work processes, communication, product development, etc., are encouraged. It is easy in our climate to suggest or try something new.

Almost Always

Almost Never




12. Job Clarity

I know exactly what I am to do. My boss' expectations are clear. My job does not unnecessarily duplicate someone else's job.

Almost Always

Almost Never




13. Person-Task Fit

The right people are doing the right tasks. My skills and the skills of others are being used effectively here.

Almost Always

Almost Never




14. Authority

People have the authority to do what they are expected to do. They typically do not have to be persuaded or manipulated to act in the absence of higher authority.

Almost Always

Almost Never




15. Resource Availability

We are able to get the resources we need to do our jobs well. These include information, equipment, materials, and maintenance.

Almost Always

Almost Never



16. Team Measurements

We have measurements that help us regularly track key factors related to our input, throughput, and output so that we can monitor and quickly solve identified problems and issues.

Almost Always

Almost Never



17. Big-Picture Perspective

We know the larger picture, i.e., where our organization is headed, how world and national economic and competitive factors affect us, and how we are doing. On everyday tasks we know why we are doing what we are doing.

Almost Always

Almost Never



18. Training

Members of our work team are well-trained technically as well as in teamwork and communication skills.

Almost Always

Almost Never



19. Priorities

No time is wasted wondering which task is more important. Priorities are consistently clear.

Almost Always

Almost Never




20. By-Whens

Whenever a decision is made, someone clarifies who will do what and by when. Also, by-whens are not only *given* to bosses but *received* from them as well.

Almost Always

Almost Never




21. Follow Through

Commitments are effectively tracked, i.e., reviewed at subsequent meetings or tracked by computer. Missed commitments are discussed and recommitted or are reassigned to someone else.

Almost Always

Almost Never




22. Single-Point Accountability

There is one person accountable for each task. Even on a matrixed group across departments, one person holds the single-point accountability rather than the group.

Almost Always

Almost Never




23. Reinforcement

People are appreciated for work well done. Expressions of thanks are clear enough so that the receivers know precisely what they did that was liked.

Almost Always

Almost Never




24. Reprimands

When our supervisor is unhappy with our work, he/she tells us as soon as possible, privately. The reprimand is clear and very specific about the unappreciated work or action but not accusatory, judgmental, or vindictive.

Almost Always

Almost Never




25. Work Relationships

Work relationships are maintained. When two or more people disagree, the issue is dealt with directly and effectively rather than avoided or escalated.

Almost Always

Almost Never



HIGH PERFORMANCE FACTORS SCORING AND INTERPRETATION SHEET ²

Instructions: Total the numbers that you circled for each of the items on the High-Performance Factors Inventory and write the total here:

107 and Over: Outstanding

Congratulations, your group is among the rare, high-performing groups. The chances are that your leader and group members are open, nondefensive, and problem-solving people who balance caring with clarity about expectations.

95 to 106: Excellent

Your group is in the top tenth of those studied. You are doing very well and could easily reach a higher goal.

77 to 94: Good

Many groups score in this range. Applying the insights from your discussions about group performance can boost your scores. Achieving a higher level of performance is within reach.

76 and Below: Needs Improvement

The majority of groups score in this range. Opportunities abound. To make improvements, your group may need some coaching. The lower your score, the greater the need to seek skilled, outside help from someone who can see the high-performance factors either happening or not happening. A skilled consultant also notices when intentions do not match behaviors within the group and can help the members to learn more effective ways of interacting and working.

Conclusions

In addition, you may want to consult with two or three other groups that have scores for the twenty-five factors. Share your scores and support one another by making suggestions in areas where you have high scores and others have lower scores. If you are the group's manager or leader, you may want to consult with other managers or leaders whose groups have completed the inventory.

² Reprinted from the book, *Walking the Empowerment Tightrope* by Robert P. Crosby, © 1992, published by Organization Design and Development, Inc., King of Prussia, PA.

Answering the following questions can help you to prepare for looking at how to improve your group's functioning:

- What is the mission of the group? If it is part of a larger organization, what is the organization's stated mission? What is the group's "piece of the pie"?
- What values are important to the group members? To the group collectively? Are these in line with the organization's stated values? Do the organization's values impact its day-to-day activities or are they simply slogans?
- What are the group's business objectives? What do the members want to achieve in the next twelve months?
- Who supports and has ownership of the objectives? The group leader or manager? The members? A higher manager?
- Are the mission, values, and business objectives known and integrated in the daily work life? Do group members know what they can do to impact these? Do they know their "piece of the pie"?
- Are organizational progress reports regularly made available to all group members?
- Are you (as the group's leader or manager) able to state the group's specific business objectives and values? Can you state what is expected from group members to achieve these?

■ KOSMOS TOAST: A TEST FOR ORGANIZATIONAL AWARENESS OF SYSTEMS THINKING

Konstantine K. Zakzanis and Lesley A. Ruttan

Abstract: Systems thinking is an imperative individual and organizational skill. The Kosmos TOAST (test for organizational awareness of systems thinking) allows organizations and consultants to assess the ability of individuals within a group or organization to think in terms of the often invisible, interrelated systems that make up the group or organization. The instrument is composed of twenty-one items, rated on a five-point Likert scale. By measuring each respondent's current ability to think in terms of systems and then aggregating each individual's score, the consultant can create a holistic picture of the organization's ability to do systems thinking and devise appropriate interventions.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND INSTRUMENT RATIONALE

A cloud masses, the sky darkens, leaves twist upward, and we know it will rain. We also know that after the storm, the runoff will feed into groundwater kilometers away, and the sky will grow clear by tomorrow. All these events are distant in time and space, and yet they are all connected within the same pattern. Each has an influence on the rest, an influence that is usually hidden from view. You can only understand the system of a rainstorm by contemplating the whole, not any individual part of the pattern (Senge, 1990, pp. 6-7).

The above is an example of the essence of the system. Organizations and other human endeavors also are systems. They are bound by invisible strands of interrelated actions; it often takes years to fully play out their effects on one another (Senge, 1990). Because we are part of the lacework, it is extremely difficult for us to see the whole pattern of change. Instead, we tend to focus on snapshots of isolated parts of the system and wonder why our deepest problems never seem to be solved (Rummler & Brache, 1980). Systems thinking is a conceptual framework, a body of knowledge and tools that have been developed over the past fifty years to make the full patterns clearer and to help us see how to change them effectively.

There is something in all of us that loves to put together a puzzle, that loves to see the image of the whole emerge. The beauty of a person or a flower or a poem lies in seeing all of it. It is interesting that the words "whole" and "health" come from the same root (the Old English "hal," as in "hale and hearty"). So it should come as no surprise that the unhealthiness of our world today is in direct proportion to our inability to see it as a whole (Honeycut & Richards, 1991; Senge, 1990).

This unhealthiness is not limited to individuals. The unhealthy organization is a perfect example of how the inability of individuals to think in terms of systems within a whole (an organization) can lead the whole to extinction. Argyris (1962, 1967) and, later, Ackoff (1974) state that the organization that thinks in terms of systems and

understands its environment and situation as a whole will succeed, prosper, and move forward. The effective organization is one that encompasses individuals who think “systems” (Argyris, 1990; Cummings & Schwab, 1973; Lawler, Nadler, & Cammann, 1980; Senge, 1990). An organization that wishes to be healthy and survive must provide the opportunity for each individual in it to learn the concepts of systems thinking.

Before the concepts of systems thinking are taught, there needs to be empirical evidence that the ability to “think systems” is lacking. This will guard against a wasteful effort to fix a perceived problem if the problem is actually something else. Until now, there has been no psychological assessment instrument available to measure whether individuals in organizational settings are engaging in systems thinking. There is no doubt that many organizations have wasted money and other resources on attempts to learn the principles of systems thinking that have ended in disappointment.

Kosmos TOAST is a tool to diagnose organizational awareness of systems thinking. It has been created to assess whether organizations are suffering from a lack of systems thinking. By measuring each individual’s current ability to think in terms of systems and then aggregating each individual’s score on Kosmos TOAST, the consultant can create a holistic picture of the organization’s ability to do systems thinking. If a deficit exists, a decision then can be made about whether the properties of systems thinking need to be learned. If no deficit exists, the consultant can search for the problems that are actually encumbering the organization’s effectiveness.

The reasoning behind the name Kosmos TOAST is partly historical. Many centuries ago, with the emergence of the astrological perspective, it was widely believed that human life was ruled not by capricious chance but by an ordered and knowable destiny defined by the celestial deities according to the movements of the planets. Through such knowledge (by understanding the system of our universe) it was thought humans could understand their fates and act with a new sense of cosmic security. “The astrological conception of the world closely reflected the essential Greek concept of *Kosmos* itself, the intelligibly ordered patterning and interconnected coherence of the universe, with man an integral part of the whole” (Tarnas, 1991, pp. 82-83). We think that the word Kosmos captures the essence of systems thinking; thus it is used as a qualifier of TOAST (test for the organizational awareness of systems thinking).

Systems Thinking: A Definition of the Construct

“Systems thinking is a discipline for seeing wholes. It is a framework for seeing interrelationships rather than things, for seeing patterns of change rather than static ‘snapshots’.” (Senge, 1990, p. 68). It is a set of general principles distilled over the course of the Twentieth Century, spanning fields as diverse as the physical and social sciences, engineering, and management (Senge, 1990). It is also a set of specific tools and techniques that originated in two threads: in the “feedback” concepts of cybernetics and in “servo-mechanism” engineering theory, which dates back to the nineteenth century (Badger, 1991; Bowers & Franklin, 1977). During the last thirty years, these tools have been applied to a wide range of corporate, urban, regional, economic,

political, ecological, and even psychological systems. Systems thinking is a sensibility for the subtle interconnectedness that gives living systems their unique character.

Today, systems thinking is needed more than ever because we are becoming overwhelmed by complexity. Perhaps for the first time in history, humankind has the capacity to create far more information than anyone can absorb, to foster far greater interdependence than anyone can manage, and to accelerate change far faster than anyone's ability to keep pace (Senge, 1990). Certainly the scale of complexity is without precedent. All around us are examples of systemic breakdowns—problems such as global warming, ozone depletion, the international drug trade, and provincial trade and budget deficits—problems that have no simple, local causes. Similarly, organizations break down, despite individual brilliance and innovative products, because they are unable to pull their diverse functions and talents into a productive whole (Katz & Kahn, 1978).

Complexity can easily undermine confidence and responsibility (e.g., “It’s all too complex for me,” “There’s nothing I can do; it’s the system.”) Systems thinking is the antidote to the sense of helplessness that many feel as we enter the age of interdependence. Systems thinking is a discipline for seeing the structures that underlie complex situations. That is, by seeing and understanding wholes, we learn how to foster health. Thus, when each individual in an organization starts to see the whole and understands the concepts of systems thinking, we have individually fostered health and organizational health (Honeycut & Richards, 1991).

Kosmos TOAST is a tool to measure and diagnose the present ability to think in terms of systems. The discipline of systems thinking and Kosmos TOAST are concerned with whether individuals are seeing parts or seeing the whole of the organization; whether people see themselves as helpless reactors or see themselves as active participants in shaping their reality; whether individuals are reacting to the present to create the future; whether individuals see interrelationships rather than linear, cause-and-effect chains; and whether individuals within an organization are seeing processes of change rather than static snapshots. Learning how to “system think” teaches individuals and, thus, organizations to see themselves as connected to the world. They go from seeing problems as caused by someone or something “out there” to seeing how our own actions create the problems we experience. They discover how they create their reality and how they can change it.

DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING OF THE ITEMS

Based on a review of the systems-thinking and organizational-effectiveness literature and the authors' conceptualization of the systems-thinking construct, eighty-one self-descriptive statements were written that encompass the domain of the construct. The creation of these items followed the guidelines set forth by Crocker and Algina (1986) and Nunnally and Bernstein (1994). An initial version of the instrument was submitted to several individuals employed in the “business world” and to an organizational

consultant, in order to determine whether the specific words in each item were accurate representations of current terminology in the business world. These individuals were also asked to review the clarity and usefulness of the items.

Moos' (1974) Family Environment Scale was helpful in generating items that represented systems thinking. These items were tailored to the organizational level of analysis and, therefore, are not exact reproductions of the statements in a subset of the Family Environment Scale. The remaining items were new. The items were integrated statements to represent fundamental aspects of the construct. Some items were positively keyed, and others were negatively keyed, in order to control for acquiescent response. The items were to be rated on a five-point Likert scale. All eighty-one items were randomized for presentation.

Instructions informed respondents to indicate the extent to which they strongly agreed or disagreed with a statement. The scale was labeled strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, neutral = 2, disagree = 1, and strongly disagree = 0. Numerical values were assigned to each label, and their values were dependent on whether they were worded negatively or positively.

Test Subjects and Procedure

Test subjects were volunteer male and female employees of randomly chosen organizations. All the organizations were of small-to-medium size. The subjects were informed that the purpose of the instrument administration was to develop items for use in an organizational test, and informed consent was obtained. The instrument was administered to 246 subjects (163 males and 83 females). The age range of the total sample was sixteen to sixty-three years, with a mean age of twenty-seven years. The education level of the total sample ranged from eight to twenty years, with a mean of eleven years. Subjects completed a few demographic questions as well as the scale. Data were then used for the item-selection process to arrive at a final version of Kosmos TOAST.

Final Item Selection

Final Kosmos TOAST items were selected by subjecting the original eighty-one item instrument to exploratory factor analysis (principal factoring with fifty iterations specified, varimax rotation, and the number of factors unspecified). Retained items had to meet three statistical criteria:

- First, items had to load significantly on those factors theoretically consistent with the systems-thinking construct.
- Second, items had to demonstrate adequate item-total correlations (minimum item-total correlation accepted was .40).
- Third, items had to demonstrate the ability to differentiate between subjects.

In the initial analysis, the item-total correlation yielded a high degree of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .92), indicating that the items were tapping a similar domain. Seven factors emerged from preliminary factor-analytic results using eigenvalues of greater than one and screen test criteria. Factor one accounted for 50.1 percent of the total variance, while all other factors were weak in comparison. The authors therefore inspected the twenty-one items that composed factor one, concluded that they were consistent theoretically, and assumed those items to be the single-factor solution. Thus, a twenty-one item version of Kosmos TOAST was retained. This version produced a single-factor solution and achieved an increased degree of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha = .97).

PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF KOSMOS TOAST

Subjects and Procedure

Once the item selection was completed and the factor structure of the scale was determined, the twenty-one item Kosmos TOAST was administered to another group of subjects for further validation. Subjects were volunteer male and female employees of randomly chosen organizations. All the organizations were of small-to-medium size; they were not the same organizations represented in the first administration of the instrument. The subjects were informed that the study was for a research project for a graduate psychology course in psychological measurement and assessment. Informed consent was obtained.

Kosmos TOAST was administered to sixty-five subjects (twenty-five females and forty males). The age range of the total sample was seventeen to fifty-two years, with a mean age of thirty years. The educational level of the sample ranged from eleven to twenty-two years, with a mean of thirteen years. Subjects completed a few demographic information questions, the twenty-one item instrument, the Personal Reaction Inventory (a social desirability scale), and a subset of the Organizational Health Survey (Kehoe & Reddin, 1994).

Descriptive Statistics

For the sample of sixty-five participants, total scores ranged from six to eighty-two. The twenty-one items were each rated on a zero-to-four-point Likert scale, with possible scores of zero (low) to a high score of eighty-four. Table 1 shows the descriptive data obtained for this sample of sixty-five subjects. Table 2 shows the means and standard deviation for this scale with this subject sample. It should be noted that, in general, the mean for each item answered fluctuates around 1.75, which is slightly below the midpoint of the scale. The standard deviations fall between 1.32 and 2.26, indicating considerable variation among the subject samples. The distribution of Kosmos TOAST scores was approximately normal, with a slight tendency for individuals to score below the halfway point of the test. This implies that there are fewer people who engage in

systems thinking than those who do not in the sample, which is assumed to be true in the general population.

Interestingly, there was a significant correlation between years of education and Kosmos TOAST total score ($r = .66, p < 0.0005$). Moreover, although there was a small trend for females to score higher, there was no significant sex difference found on Kosmos TOAST total score, and no relationship found between age and Kosmos TOAST total score.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Subject Sample

	n	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Total Subjects	65			
Males	40			
Females	25			
Age (in years)	28	17-52	30	9.07
Education (in years)	37	11-22	13.73	2.34

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics and Corrected Item-Total Correlations for Kosmos TOAST Test Items

Item	Mean	S.D.	Corrected Item Total Correlation
1	1.49	1.51	.56
2	1.75	1.41	.58
3	2.37	2.00	.59
4	1.46	1.46	.43
5	1.65	1.32	.57
6	1.42	1.55	.63
7	1.57	1.66	.69
8	1.45	1.68	.73
9	1.82	1.50	.64
10	1.49	1.49	.71
11	1.63	1.63	.71
12	2.26	2.26	.73
13	1.49	1.67	.74
14	1.54	1.52	.70
15	1.60	1.58	.59
16	1.95	2.00	.63
17	1.68	1.47	.48
18	1.92	1.57	.63
19	1.62	1.63	.56
20	1.77	1.38	.52
21	1.80	1.53	.42

Mean Total Score for n=65 = 35.72 s.d. = 29.08

Factor Analysis

The single-factor solution converged on twelve iterations and accounted for 50.1 percent of the total variance (eigenvalue = 16.91). The factor loadings for the twenty-one items

are shown in Table 3. We believe that this single-factor solution describes the ability to engage in systems thinking accurately.

Table 3. Factor Loadings of Kosmos TOAST

Item	Loading
1. The economic success of the organization is more important than my personal economic success.	.67
2. I willingly volunteer when something has to be done at work.	.50
3. If my actions positively affect others, I will go ahead and do it.	.69
4. I almost always rely on myself when a problem arises.	.47
5. I always make sure my work space is neat.	.58
6. I do what I want at work without worrying about its effect on others.	.68
7. It is hard for me to work on my own without affecting someone else's work in the organization.	.77
8. My actions influence the way in which fellow employees interact and work together.	.83
9. Departments within this organization do not operate independently of one another.	.75
10. I feel that my work is not a part of the organization's larger task.	.79
11. My actions can create problems for the whole organization.	.83
12. I can change the whole organization in different subtle and dramatic ways.	.77
13. I take responsibility for only the things that are required of my position.	.82
14. There usually is an obvious cause for every event that takes place in my organization.	.79
15. The primary threats to me keeping my job come from sudden events.	.74
16. I experience the consequences of my work-related actions.	.67
17. Individual mistakes can cause a crisis for the entire organization.	.49
18. In order for this organization to succeed, every individual working here must succeed.	.73
19. When my work goes wrong, I can usually blame it on the mistakes of others in the organization.	.67
20. Previous solutions can lead to new problems.	.66
21. Small changes in what I do can produce big results for the organization's benefit.	.62

Internal Reliability

The internal consistency reliability for Kosmos TOAST was based on Cronbach's standardized alpha (.97). This reliability is acceptable and indicates that this scale has a strong internal consistency. Similarly, the mean inter-item correlation of Kosmos TOAST (.70) was above the recommended range (0.2-0.4) for a single factor scale, thus indicating that Kosmos TOAST is homogeneous (Briggs & Cheek, 1986).

The authors also calculated Guttman split-half reliability statistic and retrieved a value of .89, with an alpha value for part one equaling .85, and for part two, .83. Further, the unequal-length Spearman-Brown reliability statistic retrieved a value of .90. These statistics lend further support to the internal reliability of Kosmos TOAST.

Validity

In order to establish the validity of Kosmos TOAST, the authors needed to determine whether a conceptually related construct would correlate in a predicted direction with Kosmos TOAST. (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Because Kosmos TOAST measures a construct that has not been developed in a test format, the authors returned to the literature on systems thinking and determined that "organizational health" would be conceptually related (i.e., the more people are systems thinking, the more successful and, therefore, "healthy" should be the organization). Because there are developed tests measuring the construct of organizational health, the convergent validity of Kosmos TOAST could be assessed.

Convergent Validity

Convergent validity asks if a construct correlates with some theoretically relevant variable (Crocker & Algina, 1986). According to Corcoran and Fischer (1987), "with convergent validity you want to find statistically significant positive correlations between the instrument and other measures of relevant variables."

The systems-thinking construct score that Kosmos TOAST provides is understood to be an indication of how much systems thinking the individual is doing when considering the organization that he or she operates in. The literature suggests that, when the organization is composed of individuals who do not engage in systems thinking, the organization usually is not functioning effectively. If, however, the organization is composed of individuals who are engaging in systems thinking, the organization is characterized as being effective and capable of surviving with success. This type of organization is considered to be "healthy." Therefore, it was expected that Kosmos TOAST would correlate positively with a measure of organizational health. Thus, the Organizational Health Survey (Kehoe & Reddin, 1994) was used to assess this issue.

Results indicated that there was a strong positive correlation between Kosmos TOAST and the Organizational Health Survey ($r = 0.87$, $p < 0.0005$). Thus, there seems to be an indication of convergent validity between Kosmos TOAST and the Organizational Health Survey.

Social Desirability

People do not always tell the truth when responding to surveys. Some may lie to present themselves in a good light, hoping to appear productive, intelligent, considerate, or motivated. Occasionally they present themselves in a negative light to avoid new circumstances for themselves or in the hope of obtaining improved conditions or terms of employment. Some employees believe that if they (incorrectly) report extensive job dissatisfaction, it will motivate their employers to increase pay or provide other equivalent benefits. Therefore, the Marlow-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), entitled Personal Reaction Inventory, was used in order to test the social desirability of Kosmos TOAST. By looking at every item on Kosmos TOAST individually, the authors attempted to detect false responses by correlating Kosmos TOAST items with the measure of social desirability (total score on the Personal Reaction Inventory). This, at least, pinpointed the areas of social desirability in which people are most likely to lie on Kosmos TOAST. Fortunately, no significant correlations were found. Thus, the claim can be made that Kosmos TOAST does not lend itself statistically to social desirability. However, it can be hypothesized that if the anonymity of the respondent is violated by asking for his or her name on the test or by some other means, the social-desirability bias might increase significantly and invalidate the findings that Kosmos TOAST was meant to provide.

Limitations

It is important to note some of the limitations in the construction of Kosmos TOAST. The foremost limitation was the inadequate sample size. This limited sample did not provide an appropriate number of subjects for a thorough investigation of factor-analytic methodology. This is a concern because the factor analysis to which the initial instrument was subjected required a substantially larger number of subjects. Therefore, it is suggested that for future study, and for the future success of the instrument, research should draw on a larger sample size to confirm the factor loading that created Kosmos TOAST.

Another limitation was the lack of discriminant validity, which needs to be established. Discriminant validity refers to the way theoretically nonrelevant and dissimilar variables should not be associated with scores on the instrument (Corcoran & Fischer, 1987). Further investigation regarding discriminant validity is vital to improving the validity of Kosmos TOAST.

Even though Kosmos TOAST appears to be an internally reliable instrument, it needs to be assessed over time in order to establish its test-retest reliability. It is also suggested that the construct validity of Kosmos TOAST undergo further analysis. Perhaps administering Kosmos TOAST with other measures of organizational health, success, prosperity, climate, and longitudinal functioning would further demonstrate convergent validity.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE INSTRUMENT

Kosmos TOAST may be administered in groups as well as individually. Demographic and personal information may be tailored for specific organizational purposes but should minimally include questions regarding the nature of the organization and the position held by the test respondent in the organization. Instructions to respondents are presented at the top of the instrument form. In order to simplify the rating choices, the rating scale is reproduced at the top of each page of the questionnaire.

It is important to administer the instrument first, before providing any theoretical information regarding systems thinking. It also is important to tell respondents that, although their responses will be tabulated to provide information about the organization, their anonymity will be preserved, i.e., the names of individual respondents will not be linked to their answers.

Scoring and Interpretation

In scoring Kosmos TOAST, the ratings of items that are negatively keyed are first inverted (i.e., a rating of 0 becomes 4, 1 = 3; 2 = 2; 3 = 1; and 4 = 0). The following items require reverse scoring: 4, 6, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 19. Individual ratings of the twenty-one items are then simply tabulated, in order to obtain an overall systems-thinking score. The overall score can range from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 84 (provided all items are answered). Ratings of the items are oriented such that a higher numerical value indicates a greater degree of systems thinking. Therefore, the higher the overall score, the greater is the systems-thinking ability of the particular respondent.

Systems thinking has been conceptualized as a dimensional rather than a categorical variable. It is thus assumed to vary along a continuum. As such, no arbitrary cut-off score has been established as a means by which to distinguish between those individuals who are systems thinkers and those who are not. The establishment of standards relating to the information provided by the quantification of systems thinking will require further empirical validation and will depend on the specific purposes for its use as well as the characteristics of the population for which it is employed.

A test for the organizational awareness of systems thinking has yet to be created. It is evident that Kosmos TOAST is a needed and important psychological instrument that can serve organizations in achieving more effective and cohesive functioning.

REFERENCES

- Ackoff, R.L. (1974). *Redesigning the future: A systems approach to societal problems*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Argyris, C. (1962). *Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.
- Argyris, C. (1967). Today's problems with tomorrow's organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 4, 31-55.
- Argyris, C. (1990). *Overcoming organizational defenses*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Badger, C. (1991, February). Associations in evaluation: A closer look. *Association Management*, 43, 156.

- Bowers, D.G., & Franklin, J.L. (1977). *Survey-guided development I: Data-based organizational change*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer, an imprint of Jossey-Bass.
- Briggs, S.R., & Cheek, J.M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of personality scales. *Journal of Personality*, 54, 106-148.
- Corcoran, K., & Fischer, J. (1987). *Measure for clinical practice: A sourcebook*. London: The Free Press.
- Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Press.
- Crowne, D.P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24, 349-354.
- Cummings, L.L., & Schwab, D. (1973). *Organizational effectiveness*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Ghorpade, J. (1971). *Assessment of organizational effectiveness: Issues, analysis, and readings*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.
- Honeycut, A., & Richards, B. (1991, November). An organizational transformation model: The road to renewal. *Journal of Systems Management*, 42, 28-30.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kehoe, P.T., & Reddin, W.J. (1994). *The organizational health survey*. Toronto: Organizational Tests Ltd.
- Lawler, E.E., Nadler, D.A., & Cammann, C. (1980). *Organizational assessment: Perspectives on the measurement of organizational behavior and the quality of work life*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Moos, R.H. (1974). *Combined preliminary manual: Family, work and group environment scales manual*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rummler, A.G., & Brache, A.P. (1980, September). The systems view of human performance. *Training*, 46, 45-53.
- Senge, P.M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday Currency.
- Tarnas, R. (1991). *The passion of the western mind: Understanding the ideas that have shaped our world views*. New York: Ballantine Books.

KOSMOS TOAST

Konstantine K. Zakzanis and Lesley A. Ruttan

Name of Organization _____

Position _____ Date _____

Sex _____ Age _____ Education _____

Instructions: Each of the following statements concerns personal feelings and experiences. There are no right or wrong answers. You will probably agree with some items and disagree with others. First impressions are usually best. Read each statement and decide if you agree or disagree with it and the strength of your opinion. Then indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement by circling the appropriate group of letters.

SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree N = Neutral A = Agree SA = Strongly Agree

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. The economic success of the organization is more important than my personal economic success. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 2. I willingly volunteer when something has to be done at work. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 3. If my actions will positively affect others, I will go ahead and do it. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 4. I almost always rely on myself when a problem arises. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 5. I always make sure my work space is neat. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 6. I do what I want at work without worrying about its effect on others. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 7. It is hard for me to work on my own without affecting someone else's work in the organization. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 8. My actions influence the way in which fellow employees interact and work together. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 9. Departments within this organization do not operate independently of one another. | SD | D | N | A | SA |
| 10. I feel that my work is not a part of the organization's larger task. | SD | D | N | A | SA |

SD = Strongly Disagree D = Disagree N = Neutral A = Agree SA = Strongly Agree

11. My actions can create problems for the whole organization.	SD	D	N	A	SA
12. I can change the whole organization in different subtle and dramatic ways.	SD	D	N	A	SA
13. I take responsibility for only the things that are required of my position.	SD	D	N	A	SA
14. There usually is an obvious cause for every event that takes place in my organization.	SD	D	N	A	SA
15. The primary threats to me keeping my job come from sudden events.	SD	D	N	A	SA
16. I experience the consequences of my work-related actions.	SD	D	N	A	SA
17. Individual mistakes can cause a crisis for the entire organization.	SD	D	N	A	SA
18. In order for this organization to succeed, every individual working here must succeed.	SD	D	N	A	SA
19. When my work goes wrong, I can usually blame it on the mistakes of others in the organization.	SD	D	N	A	SA
20. Previous solutions can lead to new problems.	SD	D	N	A	SA
21. Small changes in what I do can produce big results for the organization's benefit.	SD	D	N	A	SA

KOSMOS TOAST SCORING SHEET

	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. Economic success of the organization is more important than my personal economic success.	0	1	2	3	4
2. I willingly volunteer when something has to be done at work.	0	1	2	3	4
3. If my actions positively affect others, I will go ahead and do it.	0	1	2	3	4
4. I almost always rely on myself when a problem arises.	0	1	2	3	4
5. I always make sure my workspace is neat.	0	1	2	3	4
6. I do what I want at work without worrying about its effect on others.	0	1	2	3	4
7. It is hard for me to work on my own without affecting someone else's work in the organization.	0	1	2	3	4
8. My actions influence the way in which fellow employees interact and work together.	0	1	2	3	4
9. Departments within this organization do not operate independently of each other.	0	1	2	3	4
10. I feel that my work is not a part of the organization's larger task.	0	1	2	3	4
11. My actions can create problems for the whole organization.	0	1	2	3	4
12. I can change the whole organization in different subtle and dramatic ways.	0	1	2	3	4
13. I take responsibility for only the things that are required of my position.	0	1	2	3	4
14. There is usually an obvious cause for every event that takes place in my organization.	0	1	2	3	4
15. The primary threats to me keeping my job come from sudden events.	0	1	2	3	4

	SD	D	N	A	SA
16. I experience the consequences of my work-related actions.	0	1	2	3	4
17. Individual mistakes can cause a crisis for the entire organization.	0	1	2	3	4
18. In order for this organization to succeed, every individual working here must succeed.	0	1	2	3	4
19. When my work goes wrong, I can usually blame it on the mistakes of others in the organization.	0	1	2	3	4
20. Previous solutions can lead to new problems.	0	1	2	3	4
21. Small changes in what I do can produce big results for the organization's benefit.	0	1	2	3	4

■ THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE (OCQ)

Adrian Furnham and Leonard D. Goodstein

Abstract: Although several organizational climate instruments are available, few have the formal psychometric characteristics necessary for practical use and few have been standardized on a broad international population. This 108-item questionnaire, which contains a seven-point Likert-type scale, has been developed on the basis of extensive pilot testing. Fourteen different climate dimensions are tapped by the instrument: role clarity, respect, communication, reward system, career development, planning and decision making, innovation, relationships, teamwork and support, quality of service, conflict management, commitment and morale, training and learning, and direction.

The instrument provides two scores for each of the fourteen dimensions: *agreement* (employee satisfaction with how things are done) and *importance* (the degree to which respondents believe that the item is a significant aspect of the way in which work is performed in the organization). These two scores provide a fourfold table of action steps: (1) *ignore*—low agreement and low importance—areas unworthy of further consideration; (2) *consider*—high agreement and low importance—unimportant things done well (often misguided efforts that could be reduced); (3) *celebrate*—agreement and importance both high—management should celebrate the fact that these things are being done well; and (4) *fix*—low agreement and high importance—things that need prompt attention.

Organizational climate is a topic of increasing interest in the management literature. The initial interest in organizational climate usually is attributed to Kurt Lewin (1951) and his field theory of motivation. Managers became more aware of the importance of organizational climate through the work of George Litwin and his colleagues (Litwin & Stringer, 1968; Tagiuri & Litwin, 1968) and of Forehand and Von Gilmer (1964) and James and Jones (1964). The topic remains one of considerable theoretical and practical interest (Jackofsky & Slocum, 1988; Kozlowski & Doherty, 1989; La Follette, 1975; Payne, 1990; Qualls & Puto, 1989; Schneider, Brief, & Guzzo, 1996).

Organizational climate is defined as a psychological state strongly affected by organizational conditions, such as systems, structures, and managerial behavior. Organizational climate is a perception of how things are in the organizational environment, which is composed of a variety of elements or dimensions. As Tagiuri and Litwin point out (1968), there is no universal set of dimensions or properties for organizational climate. Rather, one must describe climate along different dimensions, depending on the kind of organization involved and which particular behaviors are studied. Tagiuri and Litwin consider climate to be a molar, synthetic, and changeable construct. Organizational climate is relatively malleable; changes in systems, structures, and managerial behavior impact the climate, while enduring group values and norms tend to stabilize the climate.

Although organizational climate is shaped by a variety of organizational factors, climate itself impacts both individual and group performance. Litwin and Stringer (1968) empirically demonstrate how different organizational climates impacted both individual and organizational performance in a variety of research settings. Schneider, Brief, and Guzzo (1996) provide similar evidence that organizational climate directly affects organizational change efforts.

Organizational climate can be understood as a moderator variable, serving as an indirect link between job satisfaction and productivity. Caused by organizational structures, systems, and managerial behavior, climate directly affects job satisfaction which, in turn, impacts both individual and organizational productivity.

Organizational culture refers to the relatively enduring set of values and norms that underlie a social system. An organization's culture provides a "meaning system" that provides members of a culture a way to attribute meaning and value to the endless variety of events that occur, both within and outside the organization. Climate is the more transitory of the two; changes in culture take time and considerable effort and typically must be preceded by systematic and consistent changes in the climate of the organization. Burke and Litwin (1989) provide a useful model of how climate and culture interact both with each other and with a myriad of other organizational variables.

A number of measures of organizational climate exist, including the trail-blazing instrument of Litwin and Stringer (1968), a fifty-item questionnaire that taps nine dimensions: structure, responsibility, reward, risk, warmth, support, standards, conflict, and identity. Other instruments include the Organization Description Questionnaire (House & Rizzo, 1972); the Survey of Organizations (SOO) (Taylor & Bowers, 1972); the Business Organization Climate Index (Payne & Pheysey, 1971), which is based on Stern's (1967) Organizational Climate Index (developed to describe university climates); and many others. Two limitations that all these instruments share are poor internal reliability and weak validation data—inadequate psychometrics. Applied-research needs required the development of a new instrument, presented here, the Organizational Climate Questionnaire (OCQ).

Several considerations were paramount in developing the OCQ. First, the instrument should be comprehensive—covering all the salient dimensions of climate—but not overlong or redundant. Second, the instrument should be highly reliable, showing strong internal consistency. Third, the instrument should be valid, that is, have clear evidence that it does measure organizational climate. Fourth, the instrument should travel well, so that it can be used in different organizations and different cultures, permitting comparisons of the same or different companies internationally. Fifth, it should ask respondents to state the degree of importance of each element of the culture. This is not a feature of the preexisting instruments, which only tap the degree to which respondents agree or disagree that specific elements of organizational climate are present in their organization. Having a rating of importance, as well as agreement, is a way of assessing the validity of the questionnaire; items that measure climate should be regarded by respondents as of more than passing interest.

The OCQ is comprehensive and can be used as a before-and-after measure to evaluate the effectiveness of organizational change programs. Although the OCQ collects personal views and beliefs, these inevitably reflect the organizational structures and systems that affect them. As Payne (1990) points out, climate measures inevitably involve structural issues because “social structures are designed to produce certain patterns of behavior and belief” (p. 79). In recognition of this concern, items on the OCQ are phrased to minimize this problem. Nevertheless, users of the OCQ and other such instruments must keep this important issue in mind.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A review of the organizational climate literature in both academic and applied publications led to the identification of a number of dimensions. Items tapping each of these dimensions were written. These items were then reviewed by several directors of human resources in a large number of both large and small organizations as well as by a number of management consultants and teachers of organizational behavior and management. On the basis of this feedback, many changes were made: some dimensions were added, others were removed, and still others were collapsed or subdivided. In the end, fourteen dimensions remained, with a total of 108 questions.

Field Testing

The final questionnaire was field tested on two samples, both employees of an American-owned international airline. High levels of reliability (internal consistency) were obtained as was evidence of validity.

The first sample consisted of 204 British subjects, 110 males and 94 females, performing a variety of jobs from secretarial to engineering. They ranged in age from their early twenties to their middle fifties; 43 held managerial positions, and 161 were nonmanagers. Length of service varied from new hire to over seventeen years, averaging twelve-plus years. These clearly were people who had experienced the organizational climate.

The second sample consisted of 345 employees, 177 males and 168 females, working in seven different European countries where the airline had operations. These employees, all of whom were fully fluent in English, held the same range of positions as those in the first sample, with a similar age range. There were 67 managers and 244 nonmanagers. The length of service of the employees in the second sample did not differ significantly from that of the first.

Copies of the questionnaire, with postage-paid envelopes, were distributed to all employees, with a request that they be returned to the consultants for analysis. Despite the guarantee of anonymity, the response rate varied as a function of organizational segment and country, ranging from 40 percent to 80 percent. All employees were provided with extensive group feedback about two months after the surveys were conducted.

The OCQ asks respondents to read each item carefully and to decide how much they agree with the statement, using a seven-point Likert rating scale ranging from “strongly agree” (7) to “strongly disagree” (1). After rating all 108 items, respondents are asked to reread each and then rate it on its importance to the success of the organization, again using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from “essential” (7) to “quite unimportant” (1). In the field tests, the instructions generated no questions, suggesting that they are self-explanatory.

Reliability

Cronbach Alpha coefficients—a measure of internal consistency—were calculated for each of the fourteen OCQ dimensions, separately for the two samples and for the “agreement” and “importance” ratings. For the British sample, the Alphas for the agreement ratings ranged from .60 to .86, with a mean of .77; for the European sample, the Alphas ranged from .63 to .85, with a mean of .78. For both samples, the lowest Alphas were for dimension I, teamwork and support, suggesting some caution in interpreting this dimension. For the importance ratings, the Alphas ranged from .70 to .88, with a mean of .78 for the British sample, and from .73 to .87, with a mean of .81, for the European sample. These results offer strong support for the internal consistency of both scales, with the possible exception of the agreement with dimension I, teamwork and support. Interestingly, the Alphas for the agreement and importance scales are virtually identical. Overall, these data indicate that the OCQ improves the reliability of climate measures, as the data represent a significant improvement over those reported for the other instruments.

Interrelation Among Measures

Because previous work has indicated that the dimensions of climate are correlated with one another, a number of intercorrelational matrices were calculated. As expected, most of the correlations were low and positive, ranging from .22 to .70, with an average of .51. This suggests that, although organizational climate has a common core, the fourteen dimensions are indeed rather distinct. Some dimensions, e.g., L, commitment and morale, significantly correlated with virtually all other dimensions (.34 to .69); the opposite is true for other dimensions, e.g., H, client relationships (.19 to .50).

It is important to note that the correlations between ratings of agreement and importance for the fourteen dimensions are quite low, ranging from -.08 to .24, with an average of .06. These results strongly suggest that respondents are quite able to understand the distinction between agreement and importance and to make independent ratings of these two critical aspects of organizational climate.

Demographic Differences

Both the agreement and importance scores for each of the fourteen dimensions were compared with a variety of demographic variables, including gender, age, seniority,

country, department, and job function. An inspection of the data led to three conclusions. First, there were no differences in importance ratings as a function of sex, age, or seniority, which indicates strong consensus about the relative importance of climate dimensions. Second, there were some statistically significant differences in agreement ratings as a function of gender, and there were some for age; however, they were few in number, and no clear patterns were discernable. (For gender, there were four differences found in the British sample and four in the European sample, but none of them were the same; for age, there were five differences for the British and two for the Europeans, with no overlap.) Third, the differences with seniority were systematic, substantial, and very similar for the two samples. The more senior the employee, the higher the rating they gave all fourteen of the climate dimensions. Clearly, the more senior the employee, the better the climate appears. The data do not allow an answer to the question of whether the more satisfied employees tend to stay or whether remaining on the job leads to greater satisfaction with the climate. Longitudinal research on this issue is necessary.

Validity

The validity of the OCQ was dealt with in two ways. First, the introduction of the importance ratings meant that it was possible to examine the average importance rating on the fourteen dimensions for the two samples. The mean on each of these dimensions exceeded 5.0 (on a seven-point scale) for both samples, indicating that, overall, the respondents believed the dimensions to be important. Since the correlations between the importance and agreement dimensions were negligible, importance was independent of how the respondents perceived the climate of the company.

Second, a set of statistical analyses (ANOVA) were computed between the various scores on the OCQ and the obtained demographic data. These analyses revealed negligible differences as a function of gender, age, job site, job function, and nationality, but striking differences as a function of seniority. These data strongly suggest that the employees had a shared perception of the organizational climate of the company, regardless of where they worked, both within and between countries, or what they did on the job. The one difference that was found, that seniority led to more positive ratings, was both predictable and expected (Jackofsky & Slocum, 1988). These two sets of findings provide strong preliminary evidence for the validity of the OCQ.

USING THE OCQ

The OCQ should be duplicated and distributed to participants with a cover letter explaining how and why the instrument will be used. Anonymity should be assured, and the completed questionnaires should be returned to a neutral, external party.

The completed questionnaires should be tabulated so that mean scores are developed for agreement and importance on each of the 108 items. Results with the two samples described above suggest that average agreement scores of 4.0 or above can be

considered high, and scores of 2.5 and below can be considered low. Average scores of 5.0 or above on importance can be considered high, and importance scores of 2.0 and below can be considered low. Users, however, should inspect their own array of scores to determine what are the appropriate cutting scores that differentiate the upper and lower quartile of each distribution of scores.

Once the items that yield high and low scores have been determined, the actual item numbers should be entered into the matrix that appears below:

		IMPORTANCE	
		Low	High
PERFORMANCE	Ratings	Low	High
	High	<i>Consider</i>	<i>Celebrate</i>
Low		<i>Ignore</i>	<i>Fix</i>

The process identifies four different courses of action for the identified items, depending on where they fall in the matrix:

Fix: These are the items that are high in importance but for which performance is low. It is these items that warrant the most prompt attention, particularly those that have very low performance coupled with very high importance ratings.

Ignore: These are the items that involve behaviors that are neither very present nor very important. These items are of little importance to the organization. Efforts to change them are unlikely to pay off and are not worthy of attention.

Consider: These are items for which performance is high (i.e., positive) but of low importance. Employees see that certain things are being done well but are not very important. These behaviors need to be considered, as they may represent misguided efforts. Reducing attention to these may give management the time and resources to concentrate on those items that need to be fixed.

Celebrate: Where both performance and importance are high, management can celebrate that important issues are receiving the attention they deserve. It is important that these behaviors be maintained while the organization attempts to fix the problem areas.

It is also possible to use this process to subdivide the data for the total organization and to study the climate in different functions, locations, and departments. Further, summary scores can be developed for each of the fourteen dimensions. These scores can provide an overall picture of the organizational climate. The OCQ provides a valuable diagnostic tool for organizations to study how organizational climate is experienced and to develop action plans to fix what needs to be fixed.

REFERENCES

- Burke, W.W., & Litwin, G.L. (1989). A causal model of organizational performance. In J.W. Pfeffer (Ed.), *The 1989 annual: Developing human resources*. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer, an imprint of Jossey-Bass.
- Forehand, G., & Von Gilmer, B. (1964). Environmental variations in studies of organizational behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, *62*, 362-381.
- House, R., & Rizzo, J. (1972). Toward a measure of organizational practices: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *56*, 388-396.
- Jackofsky, E., & Slocum, J. (1988). A longitudinal study of climate. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *9*, 319-334.
- James, L., & Jones, A. (1974). Organizational climate: A review of theory and research. *Psychological Bulletin*, *72*, 1096-1112.
- Kozlowski, S., & Doherty, M. (1989). Integration of climate and leadership: Examination of a neglected topic. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *74*, 546-553.
- La Follette, W. (1975). How is the climate in your organization? *Personnel Journal*, *6*, 376-379.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in the social sciences*. New York: Harper.
- Litwin, G.L., & Stringer, R. (1968). *Motivation and organizational climate*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Payne, R. (1990). Madness in our method: A comment on Jackofsky and Slocum's "A longitudinal study of climate." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *11*, 77-80.
- Payne, R., & Pheysey, D. (1971). C.G. Stern's organizational climate index. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *18*, 45-62.
- Qualls, W., & Puto, C. (1989). Organizational climate and decision framing. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *26*, 179-192.
- Schneider, B., Brief, A., & Guzzo, R. (1996). Creating a climate and culture for sustainable organizational change. *Organizational Dynamics*, *24*(4), 7-19.
- Stern, C.G. (1967). *People in context*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Tagiuri, R., & Litwin, G.L. (Eds.). (1968). *Organizational climate: Explorations of a concept*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Taylor, J., & Bowers, D. (1972). *Survey of organizations: A machine-scored standardized questionnaire instrument*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE (OCQ)

Adrian Furnham and Leonard D. Goodstein

Instructions: Read each item carefully. Then rate how much you *agree* with each item, using the seven-point scale immediately below, recording your rating in the space provided to the left of the item.

- 7. Strongly agree
- 6. Agree
- 5. Slightly agree
- 4. Neither agree or disagree
- 3. Slightly disagree
- 2. Disagree
- 1. Strongly disagree

After you have rated your agreement with each of the 108 items, then rate each item on *how important you think it is to your organization's success*, using the seven-point scale immediately below, using the space provided to the right of each item.

- 7. Essential
- 6. Important
- 5. Somewhat important
- 4. Neither important or unimportant
- 3. Somewhat unimportant
- 2. Unimportant
- 1. Quite unimportant

Agreement
Rating

Importance
Rating

A. Role Clarity

- | | | |
|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | 1. I have clear goals and objectives for my job. | _____ |
| _____ | 2. I am clear about my priorities at work. | _____ |
| _____ | 3. I know what my responsibilities are. | _____ |
| _____ | 4. I know exactly what is expected of me. | _____ |
| _____ | 5. I know what most people in the company do. | _____ |
| _____ | 6. Work in the company makes the best use of people's experience. | _____ |
| _____ | 7. I know what most people around me do. | _____ |
| _____ | 8. I know what most departments do. | _____ |
| _____ | 9. The company has good quality workers. | _____ |

Agreement
Rating

Importance
Rating

B. Respect

- | | | |
|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | 10. I feel valued by my colleagues in the department. | _____ |
| _____ | 11. I value my colleagues in the department. | _____ |
| _____ | 12. I feel valued by my colleagues in the company as a whole. | _____ |
| _____ | 13. I value my colleagues in the company as a whole. | _____ |
| _____ | 14. My department respects other departments. | _____ |
| _____ | 15. My department is respected by other departments. | _____ |

C. Communication

- | | | |
|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | 16. I receive all the information I need to carry out my work. | _____ |
| _____ | 17. People in this company do not spend too much time on unessentials. | _____ |
| _____ | 18. I am kept adequately informed about significant issues in the company as a whole. | _____ |
| _____ | 19. I am kept appropriately informed by the grapevine and other informal means. | _____ |
| _____ | 20. My department works well with other departments. | _____ |
| _____ | 21. My department receives all the information it needs to carry out its function well. | _____ |
| _____ | 22. My department is kept adequately informed about significant issues in the company as a whole. | _____ |
| _____ | 23. I understand clearly how I can contribute to the general goals of the company. | _____ |
| _____ | 24. I have adequate opportunities to express my views in my department. | _____ |
| _____ | 25. My colleagues are generally eager to discuss work matters with me. | _____ |
| _____ | 26. In general, communication is effective in this company. | _____ |
| _____ | 27. I work effectively because other employees communicate regularly with me. | _____ |

Agreement
Rating

Importance
Rating

D. Reward System

- | | | |
|-------|--|-------|
| _____ | 28. Good work is recognized appropriately. | _____ |
| _____ | 29. I think my boss is too tolerant of poor performers. | _____ |
| _____ | 30. Work that is not of the highest importance is dealt with appropriately. | _____ |
| _____ | 31. In general, people are adequately rewarded in this company. | _____ |
| _____ | 32. In my opinion, the company's pay scale is competitive with similar companies. | _____ |
| _____ | 33. I receive an appropriate salary. | _____ |
| _____ | 34. I receive appropriate benefits. | _____ |
| _____ | 35. There is an appropriate difference between the pay awarded to good and bad performers. | _____ |
| _____ | 36. I feel a strong sense of job satisfaction. | _____ |
| _____ | 37. Virtually everyone in the company receives an appropriate salary. | _____ |

E. Career Development

- | | | |
|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | 38. My work is regularly reviewed with my development in mind. | _____ |
| _____ | 39. I understand how the appraisal system works. | _____ |
| _____ | 40. There is an adequate means of appraising my performance. | _____ |
| _____ | 41. I can develop my career within the company. | _____ |
| _____ | 42. I have an opportunity to see my appraisal report and discuss it with my supervisor. | _____ |
| _____ | 43. In general, there is an adequate system for career development in the company. | _____ |
| _____ | 44. There is the opportunity to work for this company until I retire. | _____ |
| _____ | 45. People are promoted fairly in this company. | _____ |
| _____ | 46. My current job makes full use of my talents. | _____ |
| _____ | 47. Career development is taken seriously in the company. | _____ |

Agreement
Rating

Importance
Rating

F. Planning and Decision Making

- | | | |
|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | 48. The work of departments is well-coordinated. | _____ |
| _____ | 49. People here rarely start new projects without deciding in advance how they will proceed. | _____ |
| _____ | 50. In general, planning is carried out appropriately in the company. | _____ |
| _____ | 51. I am allowed to participate sufficiently in significant decisions that affect my work. | _____ |
| _____ | 52. I am delegated work and authority appropriate to my expertise. | _____ |
| _____ | 53. I am made responsible only for those things I can influence. | _____ |
| _____ | 54. My supervisor likes me to consult him/her before I take action. | _____ |
| _____ | 55. I have confidence in the process by which important decisions are made in the company. | _____ |
| _____ | 56. I'm kept well enough informed for me to make decisions well. | _____ |
| _____ | 57. I feel that I have the right amount of authority over my subordinates. | _____ |
| _____ | 58. In general, delegation, responsibility, and decision making are all handled well in this company. | _____ |

G. Innovation

- | | | |
|-------|--|-------|
| _____ | 59. I am encouraged to be innovative in my work | _____ |
| _____ | 60. My department is encouraged to innovate. | _____ |
| _____ | 61. The company plans adequately for the future. | _____ |
| _____ | 62. The company responds promptly to new commercial and technical innovations. | _____ |
| _____ | 63. Work methods here are quickly changed to meet new conditions. | _____ |

Agreement
Rating

Importance
Rating

H. Relationships

- _____ 64. Workers' needs are well met by this company. _____
- _____ 65. The needs of women and minority employees are greatly respected here. _____
- _____ 66. Virtually everybody in the company is aware of people's special needs. _____
- _____ 67. This company is flexible in order to meet people's needs. _____
- _____ 68. The ways in which women and minority employees are treated in this company is likely to attract other women and minority workers. _____

I. Teamwork and Support

- _____ 69. My department collaborates well with other departments. _____
- _____ 70. By and large, people in my group pull their weight. _____
- _____ 71. I am rarely put under undue work pressure by my colleagues. _____
- _____ 72. People here generally support each other well. _____
- _____ 73. I usually do not have to put in long hours to complete my work. _____
- _____ 74. I do not feel that the pressure of work is excessive. _____
- _____ 75. Work rarely piles up faster than I can complete it. _____
- _____ 76. There is rarely too much work and too little time. _____
- _____ 77. In general, this is a caring and cooperative organization. _____

J. Quality of Service

- _____ 78. When it comes to the provision of our services, we do the best. _____
- _____ 79. We are proud of the quality of service our company provides. _____
- _____ 80. We are proud of the quality of service in our department. _____

Agreement Rating		Importance Rating
---------------------	--	----------------------

_____	81. This company has quality standards that are higher than those of its competitors.	_____
-------	---	-------

K. Conflict Management

_____	82. Conflicts are constructively/positively resolved in this company.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	83. We are generally encouraged to resolve our conflicts quickly rather than let them simmer.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	84. There are helpful ways of preventing conflicts from getting out of hand in the company.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	85. There is little conflict between departments.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	86. In general, conflict is managed well here.	_____
-------	--	-------

L. Commitment and Morale

_____	87. Motivation is kept at high levels in the company.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	88. Morale is high in most departments.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	89. Morale is high in my department.	_____
-------	--------------------------------------	-------

_____	90. My personal morale is high.	_____
-------	---------------------------------	-------

_____	91. The commitment of the staff is high in this company.	_____
-------	--	-------

_____	92. The company solves the vast majority of its important problems.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	93. I am proud to be part of this company.	_____
-------	--	-------

_____	94. I feel that I am a valued member of the company.	_____
-------	--	-------

_____	95. In general, people are strongly committed to the company.	_____
-------	---	-------

M. Training and Learning

_____	96. Most departments review their work on a regular basis.	_____
-------	--	-------

_____	97. There are appropriate orientation procedures in this company.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	98. I have received the training I need to do a good job.	_____
-------	---	-------

_____	99. Most of us in this company are committed to helping one another learn from our work.	_____
-------	--	-------

Agreement
Rating

Importance
Rating

- | | | |
|-------|--|-------|
| _____ | 100. In general, this company learns as much as is practically possible from its activities. | _____ |
| _____ | 101. The training I receive is of high quality. | _____ |
| _____ | 102. I get the training I need to further develop my skills. | _____ |

N. Direction

- | | | |
|-------|---|-------|
| _____ | 103. The future of this company has been well communicated to all employees. | _____ |
| _____ | 104. We all feel part of the company. | _____ |
| _____ | 105. I am clear about the part I can play in helping this company achieve its goals. | _____ |
| _____ | 106. The future objectives of the company are consistent with my personal objectives. | _____ |
| _____ | 107. The future of this company is bright. | _____ |
| _____ | 108. The vast majority of the employees share a clear understanding of where the company is going and what it is trying to achieve. | _____ |

THE ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE (OCQ) PROFILE SHEET

Adrian Furnham and Leonard D. Goodstein

Instructions: Tabulate the mean (average) agreement score on each of the 108 items for all the completed questionnaires. Then calculate the mean (average) importance score for each of the 108 items. In general, mean agreement scores of 4.0 or above can be considered *high*, and mean agreement scores of 2.5 or below can be considered *low*. Mean importance scores of 5.0 or above can be considered *high*, and mean importance scores of 2.0 or below can be considered *low*. Users, however, should inspect their own array of scores and determine what are appropriate cutting scores that differentiate the upper (high) and lower (low) quartile of each distribution of scores.

Once the items that yielded high and low scores have been determined, the item numbers should be entered into the matrix that follows:

		IMPORTANCE	
		<i>Ratings</i>	
		Low	High
PERFORMANCE	High		
	Low		

The process identifies four different courses of action for the identified items, depending on where they fall in the matrix:

Fix (lower right): These are the items that are high in importance but for which there is agreement that performance is low. These items warrant the most prompt attention, particularly those that are very low in performance (agreement) and very high in importance.

Ignore (lower left): These are the items that are not being well done but also are not very important. They should be ignored. Efforts to change them are unlikely to pay off and are not worthy of attention.

Consider (upper left): These are the items for which performance (agreement) is high but they are perceived as being of low importance. Employees see these things as being done well but as not very important. These things should be considered, in that they may represent misguided efforts on the part of the organization, thus reducing the time and resources available for those items that do need to be fixed.

Celebrate (upper right): When both performance (agreement) and importance are high, management can celebrate that important issues are receiving the attention they deserve. It is important that these behaviors be maintained as the organization focuses on fixing the problem areas.