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Motivational Team Leadership

Amidst considerable evidence of a great deal of underutilized human potential, organizational theorists are hard at work to find better ways to make use of the talents of people. From Machiavelli to Deming, authors have proposed a steady progression of methods from fear to coercion to extrinsic rewards to redesigning work to participation in decision-making. The direction of change has been consistently away from authoritarianism and the use of fear. Instead, management theory now urges motivating workers by capitalizing on their natural desires to excel. It is now widely accepted that effectiveness in organizations is largely a matter of human behavior (Hampton et al., 1987).

In contrast to Machiavelli’s approach which capitalized on natural fears to control and manipulate desired behavior on the part of followers, Deming asserted that we must drive out the fear in order to release workers’ potential. There has been increasing recognition that the older, fear-inspiring methods are inherently self-limiting. Such methods establish what is intended as a floor below which performance must not fall but which becomes a ceiling above which performance will not rise.

This unintended consequence was illuminated during the technical phase in the evolution of management theory which coincided with the industrial revolution. It focused on matters of physical science, materials, and measurement. Workers were seen as a passive factor of production just as land, capital, and equipment were. The lowest common denominator inevitably became the standard of performance.
In the early part of this century, a movement toward studying work as a social setting began. It offered promise of elevating work to a more sophisticated status where workers would draw satisfaction and enhanced self-esteem, organizations would enjoy greater productivity, and customers would reap benefits of better quality and lower costs resulting from the realization of the human potential. Acceptance has been slow as there was resistance to an idea which seemed to fly in the face of three widely held pessimistic beliefs about human nature:

1. Workers have a moral duty to “earn their keep” and therefore “shouldn’t” require motivation. This belief suggests that there is no need to motivate workers.
2. There is a human tendency toward negativism and blaming which holds managers accountable for anything that “goes wrong on his or her watch.” This tendency focuses managers’ energy on preventing what might go wrong at the expense of lost opportunities to inspire creativity.
3. “You can’t get something for nothing” and there is a limit to workers’ willingness to produce for management. This belief implies that there is nothing to gain from spending energy on the fruitless pursuit of motivating workers.

These pessimistic views were reflected in a striking parallel between generally held beliefs about the dependability of workers to perform and the dependability of customers to meet their credit obligations. Long after it was demonstrated that businesses could significantly expand their volume and enhance their profitability by assisting customers in financing purchases, there was a reluctance on the part of merchants to adopt policies favoring credit sales. All three pessimistic beliefs also raised questions here: (1) Wasn’t debt immoral? (2) What if they didn’t pay up? (3) What reason was there to believe credit would create more sales since customers would ultimately have to pay the same bills?
The collective result of these three beliefs continues to be that many managers of organizations have not discovered yet what coaches have known for years: Playing not to lose is less rewarding than playing to win. Today's leadership theory has come to recognize that organizations can and must find ways of motivating individual workers to work and customers to buy. Failure to do so is resulting in a lack of competitiveness and massive failure, or at least limited success, of many organizations long regarded as permanent fixtures (Lohr, 1993).

**Personal Investment and Motivation**

The old notion of motivation was of someone who "worked hard" and it was generally thought to be a personal characteristic of the worker. It has now been shown to be a product of the right combination of workers' interests, the setting, and the task which induces the worker to become personally invested in the outcome of the organizational efforts. As Maehr (1987) put it,

The use of the term personal investment is designed to stress that motivation is particularly indicated by the kinds of choices that people make in their lives....The point is that, for the most part, motivation cannot be appropriately viewed as something the person either has or doesn't have. Rather, people are differentially motivated depending on the situation. Boldly put, all exhibit these behaviors that reflect motivation under some conditions. Thus, the inevitable question of concern is——why in this but not that case? What is there about a particular job or job context that does not serve to elicit worker investment? In such instances the manager may be well-advised to ask: What is there about the job or the job context that does not serve to elicit her investment (p. 290)?

Studies have shown that people who are intrinsically motivated have a greater feeling of interest (Harackiewicz, 1979), develop increased self-esteem (Deci et al., 1981), exhibit preferences for choices in what they do (Haddad, 1982), will choose challenging tasks (Koestner et al., 1987), persist longer and tend to increase effort
after failure (Boggiano and Barrett, 1985), exhibit greater learning ability (Gro
dick and Ryan, 1987), display greater cognitive flexibility in problem-solving (Con
dry, 1977) and exhibit greater creativity, spontaneity, and expressiveness (McKay and
Fanning, 1987). A great deal of research has demonstrated that intrinsic motiva
tion produces achievement in educational and work settings (Koestner and McClellan
and McClelland, 1990).

A complication in understanding human motivation in organizations is that
theories of individual behavior have not been satisfactorily synthesized for effective
application in organizational settings. The works of McClelland (1961), Maslow
(1943), Rotter (1954) and others are oriented to various objects toward which
motivation is directed. Csikszentmihalyi (1990), Gollwitzer (1990), Hamachek
(1992), Kruglanski (1990), and others center their work around the ways in which
motivation is achieved and, in some cases, issues of degree, transferability, and
generalizability of motivation. Some synthesis of these works and others is essential
if guidance for administrators is to be at all comprehensive.

The three dimensional space depicted on the next page is convenient to
represent the majority of theoretical explanations of overt and observable individual
behavior and the factors which motivate and predict it. This space is a model which
uses three objects of human interest (task accomplishment, relationships with people,
and self-enhancement) as the three dimensions of motivation. Achievement
motivation is represented where task interest is high. Affiliation motivation is seen
where interest in people is high. McClelland's p power appears where self-interest
domina
tes. McClelland's s power is seen where all three interests are high. Blake
and Mouton (1964) were the first to argue that people need not choose between
interests but can maintain interest in two dimensions, people and
A Model of Human Motivation

Various theories of human motivation related in a space of three dimensions:

Interest in tasks
interest in relationships with people
interest in the enhancement of self-esteem
are high. Blake and Mouton (1964) were the first to argue that people need not choose between interests but can maintain interest in two dimensions, people and tasks, independently of each other (Hampton et al., 1987). According to the model advocated here, power is reflected when three interests operate independently. The person with no interests is obviously in a condition of apathy. Someone high in task interest is called a student and someone high in relationship interest is called a humanist. When the ego becomes involved, the task-interested person takes on an interest in achievement and the humanist becomes an affiliator as represented in the diagram. A person high in all three interests is a communitarian.

Leaders will find it helpful to bear this representation in mind when formulating approaches to elicit, rather than coerce, behavior that will benefit both the individual and the organization in which he or she functions. Expressing the motives in terms of their three objects helps managers fashion behavior to engage workers commitment and enthusiasm.

**Goal-Seeking**

Motivation and goals of individuals are not easily separated. Even more complicated is the question of how individual motivation is related to organizational goals. A major distinction has been established between goal-setting, a matter of choice, and goal-striving, actions to accomplish an established goal (Atkinson, 1957; Klingler, 1977; Lewin et al., 1944). The comparative expected value attributed by the individual to available options heavily influences goal-setting while goal-striving has been explained in terms of the forces and tensions which move a person towards a goal (Lewin, 1944; Rotter, 1954).
The “Rubicon” model of action phases was so named by Heckhausen in a metaphor of “crossing the Rubicon” attempting to capture the important transition that occurs when an individual moves from a state of merely wishing to a state of resolve pertaining to a goal (Heckhausen and Gollwitzer, 1986). The four phases of the model, deliberation, planning, implementation, and evaluation, are separated by three transitions: making a decision, initiating action, and conclusion of the action. Most goals cannot be accomplished in a single step. They call for interruptions and periods when the goal is in a delay or waiting stage while some resource or other decision is pending. Mostly people do not, even during these interruptions, reassess the quality or the consequences of the goal achievement. Rather, they are typically in a state of feeling obligated, if only to themselves, to achieve the goal even though they may no longer be conscious of the processes or motives which led them to choose the goal in the first place. They have forgotten what created the sense of obligation and where their intended actions will take them. They are, instead, concerned with when, where, how, and how long to act in order to achieve the goal (Gollwitzer, 1990).

The importance of Heckhausen's and Gollwitzer's concept for managers would be difficult to exaggerate. Shifting staff psychologically from their deliberation phase to a planning phase will result in a commitment to a goal. On the other hand, precipitating that shift before many followers have completed the deliberation phase will almost certainly generate antipathy for the action decided upon. Further, if some members of an organization gravitate to the planning phase while colleagues linger in the deliberation phase, conflict will result.

Gollwitzer proposed, as an explanation for the swiftness of some of these shifts, the existence of “certainty-oriented types” who will, when faced with a
vacuum of influence, tend to decide something and proceed to implement that decision. Kruglanski (1990) found that certainty-oriented people are predisposed to non-specific closure on open questions before they have adequate information to decide. Any decision is better for them than no decision. Having decided, their resistance to goals offered by others will be increased (Gollwitzer, 1990). Many theorists have noted differences among individuals in the degree of certainty orientation they feel (Beckman and Gollwitzer, 1987; Grolnick and Ryan, 1989; Jones and Gerard, 1967; and Kruglanski, 1990). Some people experience considerable anxiety in states of uncertainty while others enjoy exploring new concepts. Grolnick's and Ryan's (1989) finding of a continuum of people's degree of certainty-orientation is highly significant in establishing policy for organizational approaches to deliberations and decisions.

The Rubicon metaphor does not refer to a point of no return. Rather, it is an allusion to putting deliberation and perhaps procrastination to rest. Making a decision stops the "babble of competing inner voices" (Jones and Gerard, 1967, p. 181). Once the decision is made, attention turns to issues of implementation (Beckman and Gollwitzer, 1987). Gollwitzer found, in a series of controlled experiments, that subjects in different mind-sets exhibited different degrees of open-mindedness or bias toward competing information or goals. Individuals had decidedly more resistance to attempts to influence competing goal-directed behavior once the deliberation mind-set had been left.

Such behavior clearly suggests a managerial value of knowing about the mind-sets of followers. At minimum, leaders should have a repertoire of behaviors which influence broad classes of mind-sets or of producing desired mind-sets among many followers. It invites the attention of managers to questions of how to engage
the deliberative mind-set of followers. It would be especially useful to learn how to encourage organization members to decide “to cross the Rubicon” in concert.

An important consideration is that deliberations can themselves be a goal for followers. Establishing a forum and a time frame for deliberating will assuage some of the feelings of uncertainty. Focusing attention on deliberations as a goal can provide a comfortable feeling of certainty and direction for those who would otherwise be much more likely to close off deliberations prematurely. Declaring that planning or implementation are for another day offers promise of holding attention and interest in deliberations.

Participation in the deliberative process contributes to a sense of ownership of the goal once the decision is made, even for participants who were passive but present during the deliberations. Certainty-oriented people actually prefer that someone else take the decisive step but they will still be more comfortable with the decision if their attention was focused on the question during the deliberation phase and they heard the various arguments before one was identified as superior (Gollwitzer, 1990). If given direction without the opportunity to be heard during a deliberation phase, people may engage in renegade deliberations after a decision has been reached and many will be disposed to find a different, “more attractive” action than the directive.

**Fear of Playing to Win**

Not unrelated to the concept of mind-set is the work of Csikszentmihalyi (1990) in identifying the motivational conditions which improve the concentration of attention on a particular goal. The factors which produce an optimal experience
for maximizing performance, productivity, and satisfaction carry significant implications for changed leadership behavior. Csikszentmihalyi describes a condition within the individual worker where she becomes so engrossed in her activity that she temporarily loses awareness of herself, time, and other constraints. As she works, she experiences unusual command of her thoughts and actions. Concentration becomes intense. Completing such an experience has the further desirable effect of enhancing self-esteem with obvious positive implications for staff development and for future, even if unrelated, tasks.

In order to achieve the state of goal concentration, which Csikszentmihalyi calls flow, the worker must (1) be convinced of her capability for the task at hand and (2) have no fear of possible failure (implying much about prior relationships with and current conduct of management). Flow offers hope for much greater productivity and worker satisfaction. The value to organizations is obvious.

Current evaluative techniques are inimical to the development of such conditions. To develop flow, eight elements must be present which, drastically simplified, fall into two types: (1) a supportive management environment that removes fear and concern for the self and (2) a conviction on the part of the worker that skills, resources, and insights are suitable for the challenge being faced.

The matching of skills to the challenge is essential. Insufficient challenge results in loss of interest and too much results in anxiety. Proper amounts of control by the worker are also important. Achieving flow requires that the worker be in control of her work, but the amount of control desired is a matter that varies with the individual. It is not a condition that lends itself to a formula. It requires professionalism and enlightenment on the part of leaders.
It is self-evident that individuals who adopt an attitude of personal responsibility for outcomes are desirable workers. There is considerable controversy as to whether the tendency to perceive either external or internal causality on a preponderant basis is a personal trait or whether it is learned. Internal causal perception was associated with good information, good health, and success at previous task-oriented behavior. It is a condition which is generally regarded as healthy and good and certainly a contributor to productivity (Weiner, 1990).

Rotter (James and Rotter, 1958) documented differences in expectancies from involvement in tasks requiring skill as compared to expectancies from involvement in chance governed tasks. He concluded that some individuals view the world as a place where skill (internal causation) is the predominant cause while others perceive life to be determined by chance (external causation).

Emerging from many disagreements among researchers was strong consensus that a powerful factor in raising an individual's aspiration level and performance is the expectancy of success. This consensus is in good agreement with Csikszentmihalyi's precaution about the importance of matching skills to challenges. Nathanson (1992) has produced a powerful argument that success expectancy requires overcoming the two strongest and most influential emotions: fear and shame. Fear is the reaction to the negative things that might happen and shame is the negative reaction to what already has happened. There is a natural human tendency toward self-doubt the neutralization of which requires great awareness, skill, and sensitivity on the part of managers.
The impact of a one-time attempt to influence an individual's expectancy of success on an immediate task is likely to be negligible (Weiner, 1990). However, previous experience has a cumulative effect on subsequent expectancies. There are opportunities for staff development by persistent application of the conditions which increase expectancy of success. Conditions which support enhanced success expectancies include (1) providing adequate time to complete tasks in a competent manner, (2) avoiding authoritarian structures, (3) assigning intrinsically motivating tasks, (4) adopting moderately (neither high nor low) challenging goals, (5) providing accurate and depersonalized feedback about results (Koestner and McClelland, 1990).

Sorrentino et al. (1990) point out that the motivation to achieve and the motivation to avoid failure exist along different dimensions. Playing to win is not the same as playing not to lose. A focus on what went wrong at some earlier time will have a current effect of riveting the attention of persons high in the “failure-avoiding motivation” upon ways to avoid mistakes. For many, this will distract from their focus on achievement. Blaming results in fear, self-doubt, and defensiveness.

Deming goes so far as to argue that evaluations of individuals should not even be performed. He says, a results orientation (towards individual performance) is “like driving a car by looking in the rear view mirror” (Deming, 1992). Kanter (1983) found that reward systems which offer benefits for past performance tend not to be present in innovative companies. Such rewards are payoff-centered, rather than investment centered and exacerbate tendencies of fearfulness. The result of such rewards “is captured nicely by the ‘Peter Principle’ of promoting a person to his/her level of incompetence” (p. 33).
Fear creates a defensive condition in the individual wherein the best he or she can hope for is to maximize limited resources and opportunities. New assaults are expected from the natural order of things and the best one can do is maintain the status quo (Kuhl and Atkinson, 1986). Fear is a force which stifles creativity. Steger et al. (1982) found, in an extensive literature review of organizational motivation a focus on the fear of failure (the opposite of expectancy of success) is a prominent determinant of motivation and behavior.

Deming argued that the responsibility of leadership is not to blame people, to tell them what to do, or to punish them for poor performance. Instead, it is management's task to lead by seeking out better methods and finding out what in the system is preventing workers from realizing what is possible. He has convincingly demonstrated that annual reviews of personnel performance and merit ratings, if not carefully mitigated, have an invidious potential to wreak devastation on teamwork and motivation and to exacerbate the natural fears of workers. He maintains that evaluations should be assessments of the system, not of the personnel, and should be executed jointly by management and staff (Walton, 1986).

The Social Contract

Several authors have identified a problematic issue in the way that the macrocosm of group behavior grows out of the microcosm of individual behavior. Two physicists recently borrowed the computer managed statistical process methods developed for the field of thermodynamics to derive the macroscopic behavior of gases from the interactions of constituent molecules. They used these methods to study the aggregate behavior of individuals when confronted with social dilemmas resulting from perceived conflict over the need to choose a course of action when
that course which would produce the greater good for a larger group (cooperating) differed from that course which was perceived to produce the greatest advantage for the individual (defecting). When such choices had to be made in the absence of a central authority, the authors found that the critical factor governing the individual's choices was their belief about how their peers were reacting in similar circumstances (Glance and Huberman, 1994).

The authors concluded that there is a critical mass of the proportion of decisions which are cooperating needed to create a self-perpetuating tendency among the group's individuals to similarly continue to make cooperating decisions. They drew several conclusions about elements which could be introduced into the group setting which could enhance or hinder the likelihood that a sustainable level of cooperation could be achieved. Beyond some size which varies according to the time horizon length, cooperation becomes very difficult to sustain. Uncertainty creates more fluctuation and greater likelihood that defections will occur. Establishing small groups, building networks, promoting a sense of security, providing unfettered communication including especially sensitive information and giving cooperation some impetus from something like a reorganization were all actions which could be taken to increase the cooperating tendencies of group members.

**Organizational Climate**

Mayberry (1985) found common themes among the organizational situations which stimulate various types of motivations. Maehr concluded that Mayberry's, "...sophisticated analysis showed he could do at least as well or better [than analyzing individuals] in predicting job satisfaction and personal investment by measuring organizational culture and not considering personal orientation" (Maehr,
1987, p. 306). Maehr concludes that leaders should be encouraged to focus on the general facets of the workplace with specific advice, discussed below, about a manageable number of objectives related to culture that leaders can focus upon.

Structure reduces challenge and value placed on outstanding performance. Therefore, structure is inhibiting to self-worth and motivation. Taguiri and Litwin (1968) pointed out that many features of organizations (size, differentiation, individual autonomy, modes of control, sanctions, flexibility, communication styles, openness of expression, individual role structures, status, interpersonal distances, participation in decision-making, etc.) had a strong impact on the development of members of the organization. Modes of conflict resolution tend to be excellent predictors of effective integration into complex organizations (Litwin and Stringer, 1968). Argyris (1964) argues that the healthiest form of conflict resolution is confrontation.

Weick found, “...that managers often get in the way of activities that have their own self-regulation, form, and self-correction tendencies. These natural control circuits frequently are disrupted by managerial meddling” (1979, p. 8). Katz and Kahn (1966) argue that leadership can serve four general functions in the development of climate:

1. Leadership can fill voids left by incompleteness and imperfections in organizational design.
2. Leadership can maintain stability in turbulent environments.
3. Leadership can coordinate and adjudicate change.
4. Leadership can maintain human organizational membership.
Conspicuous in its absence from this list of functions is any reference to motivating workers or to initiative in seeking new directions. These are considerations which Litwin and Stringer (1968) found important dimensions.

Block (1993) decries the tendency to attribute to leadership that which properly belongs in the arena of organizational culture.

[The concept] of leadership carries the baggage ... of being inevitably associated with behaviors of control, direction, and knowing what is best for others. ... Focusing power and purpose at one point in an organization, usually the top, has over time the impact of destroying the culture and very outcomes we sincerely intend to create. ... The act of a few, in charge, defining the future, controlling the path, and knowing what is best for others, interferes with its own desire for cultural change as much as it fosters it. ... We pay a price for attributing to people in power the ability to transform whole institutions. ... We credit individuals for outcomes that required teams and communities to accomplish (pp 13-15).

Mullin (1985) reviewed the literature of leadership impact upon organizational climate and compiled a listing of competencies that enabled leaders to positively influence climate. She found 12 competencies grouped in three clusters. The four competencies in the first cluster (sense of direction) are: thinking of the future, recognizing present momentum and applying it to decisions, owning educational convictions, and thinking globally. The four competencies in the second cluster (structure for implementation) are: respecting expertise in others, possessing a bias for action, using appropriate power and authority, implementing change by increments. The four competencies in the third cluster (personal commitment) are: thinking positively, possessing personal energy, having a motivational orientation, having personal convictions.
In researching these competencies, Mullin found the three strongest predictors of positive impact on organizational climate were: (1) thinking globally, (2) possessing a bias for action, and (3) using appropriate power and authority.

Maehr found that three elements of organizational climate contributed to personal investment in organizational goals. First, the saliency (degree and effectiveness with which goals are communicated) of the organization's mission gave followers a needed context within which their efforts could have meaning. It was less necessary that the mission be agreed to in its entirety. Second, performance appraisal must eventuate in feedback to followers with emphasis on the positive side of the individual's performance. Social competition was not a positive contributor to personal investment and merit-based rewards were problematic. Third, employees were more likely to invest in a place where people care about them and where their relationships with others are positive. Combining these findings with Mayberry's (1985) results led Maehr to the conclusion that leaders should be encouraged to focus on the general facets of the workplace and to treat individual motivational problems as exceptions.

Much can be accomplished through a positive climate stressing the value of the organizational mission, not individual qualities and relationships. Yet the individual motivations and natural inclinations of managers is precisely the opposite of what is required. The introduction of more participatory leadership into an organization which has a history of authoritarian patterns is likely to initially reduce effectiveness and efficiency. The emphasis on short term goals which plagues American society creates concern on the part of managers when this temporary decline sets in. The attendant "stress and crises caused a reversion to a more
authoritarian management and infighting [at organizations studied]" (Kanter, 1983, p. 122). Hirschhorn (1991) agrees that "the old ways... internalized [within managers] one command without question: 'Stay in control'" (p. 3).

**Enlightened leadership**

Successful executives focus on the processes of supervising and coordinating rather than the content or the end result of individual assignments. They are hesitant about manipulating people and conscious that the attempt to control creative people is self-defeating because control restricts creativity. These executives allow substantial autonomy and self-control by staff and consider it important to establish a climate that encourages subordinates to enlarge their horizons.

In apparent contradiction, successful executives have been found to be quite loyal to their organization and its goals. They de-emphasize personal values such as kindness, gentleness, and sympathy, and instead emphasized getting desired results. They gauge the results, however, not of the individual, but of the organization. The apparent contradiction is resolved by noting that successful executives see their task to be one of getting, not themselves, but the workers to focus on the end results with full confidence that an atmosphere in which it is possible to excel is one in which workers will thrive and respond naturally in that fashion. Such a premise makes obsolete any use of coercion or inducement to motivate.

Concentrating too specifically upon the results of an individual worker begins a self-perpetuating cycle in which blame, or the appearance of it, results in defensiveness and reduced effectiveness which provides more evidence for blame.
The logical conclusion is that leaders should focus on organizational goals and results, not individual worker duties and their result.

A Program of Motivational Team Leadership

Community colleges are characterized by certain conditions which may not be true of all organizations. Taking advantage of those characteristics may yield effective ways to motivate faculty and staff to the advantage of all. The three salient characteristics assumed to exist or which may be developed for the application of this approach to leadership are:

1. A staff that is highly professional and educated.
2. Consensus agreement upon well understood goals.
3. Mutual respect between and among the leader, faculty, and administrators.

Motivational team leadership (MTL) assumes that the success of the organization is to a very great extent dependent upon the willingness of staff to commit their creative energy to the attainment of organizational goals. Organizational leadership is inherently very complicated. The variables have been variously indicated as the exercise of authority, power, and control, group participation as an alternative to control, task-orientation (achievement motivation), people-orientation (affiliation motivation), maturity of workers, and organizational climate or culture. None of the theories advanced to date have attempted to combine all of these variables to the extent that effectiveness demands. Neither has the long term developmental impact of self-esteem been adequately taken into account.

Motivational team leadership theory divides the study of leadership into three broad and interrelated groups of variables. The three groups are: developed staff
competence (DSC), leadership style (LS), and organizational climate and context (OCC). Each of the three variables is complex in its own right and the three interact with each other in complicated ways which compound the complexity. DSC incorporates the collective talent of the entire staff including inherent and learned ability, knowledge, skills, and motivation. Two fundamental underlying assumptions of the theory are that:

1. A small minority of decisions facing organizations will feature both (a) an available course of action having a wide advantage over the alternatives in desirability of result and (b) lack of obviousness about which alternative is best. In the vast majority of cases, either the choice of best alternatives will be apparent after a reasonable study or, if it is not clear which is best, the comparative advantage among the leading alternatives will be comparatively slight. The consequence of this assumption is that it appropriately biases the theory in favor of participatory decision making since the presence of either (a) or (b) obviates the central expertise presumed to be the justification for authoritarian decision-making.

2. Over time, staff can be selected and developed such that the staff will collectively have the wherewithal to achieve organizational goals.

Three fundamental drives of all individuals affect DSC. The goals of the three drives are achievement, affiliation, and self-esteem respectively. Each of the three can be positively influenced through appropriate education, training, and a supportive environment. Each requires knowledge and skill on the part of leaders to develop among staff. Providing ways by which these drives can be satisfied produces a powerful motivating impetus which can be harnessed in favor of both the individual
and the organization to which he or she contributes. Elements of climate which contribute to the development of DSC are:

1. Widespread understanding within and without the organization of what the organizational goals and mission are as well as the role of the individual in that mission.

2. At minimum, a sense of common purpose. In addition, fellowship and affiliation with other organizational members will add to personal investment in and identification with the organization. Rewards should be collectively earned so as to encourage collaboration and to inhibit destructive competition.

3. Enough structure to allay fears of uncertainty but attention to the need to minimize structure and constraints, punishment for failure, extrinsic rewards for success, and negative criticism.

4. The maximization of nurturing support, encouragement and development of individual organizational members, commitment to long term relationships and longevity of organizational membership, tolerance for conflict and failure, high performance standards and expectations, and individual autonomy.

5. Insofar as possible, complicated deliberations should be emphatically separated from implementation, planning, and evaluation of ideas. Deliberations about major topics should be open to all members of the organization in an unstructured and unsegmented way.
6. Planning and evaluation of programs should be carried out by a council with a broad representation of various sections of the organization. Plans must respond to conclusions emanating from deliberation sessions and differences between those conclusions and plans should be explained. Implementation of plans should be carried out by individuals in accordance with their position descriptions and organizational development.

7. Position descriptions should be analyzed to assure that staff abilities are well matched to assignments. An important element will be the provision of adequate time and support so that the worker is able to attain the satisfaction of doing his or her job in a competent manner. Review of tasks should be undertaken to maximize the extent to which tasks are intrinsically motivating.

8. Lavish amounts of energy and resources should be expended on a forward-looking staff development program. A specific focus should be the inculcation of the advantages of collaborative action, team spirit, and the enhancement of individual self-esteem of all organizational members.

9. Evaluations should be mutual explorations of how the organization and its systems can be continuously improved. It should be expected that the task of improvement will never be completed and that individuals are never to blame when systems don't work the way they were intended.
A Deliberations Council will be the forum in which those who choose can involve themselves in deliberations as they see fit. Early deciders will have their attention focused upon the need to deliberate in a formal way capitalizing on the notion that the deliberations themselves are the goal of the exercise. Those who choose can absent themselves from the discussions and will understand that, in doing so, they were not by others excluded from the process.

The attitude of the leader should be focused on the long-term and on investment in staff rather than short term results. The leader believes that staff want to excel in everything they do. The leader accepts the responsibility for showing them how. The primary functions of the organizational leader should be:

1. Selecting, developing, and motivating staff. Elaborate amounts of time and communication should be devoted to encouraging risk-taking on the part of staff. It should be made clear that mistakes and false starts are expected when attempting creative ventures. Blame and recrimination should be eliminated. What should be offered is nurturing support, encouragement and development of individuals, and commitment to long term relationships.

2. Relating and interpreting the organization to its environment. The leader should act as a cheerleader, coordinator, interpreter, and dispute resolver of last resort.

3. Initiating the establishment, review, and promulgation of goals. The organizational mission and each worker's part in it should be
clearly understood. New initiatives should be the leader's responsibility though they will often originate with staff.

4. Inculcating the value of “teamship” in organization members.
Stress the value of each member of the team, their importance and value to each other, the extent to which they depend on one another, and the degree to which life and work in a team environment can be fun.

5. Managing by exception. It is the leader’s responsibility to fill the breach when the inevitable unexpected occurrence foils plans.
Constant attention should be given to the organization, its needs, its structures, and especially its goals.

If an organization is willing to invest the time and energy in studying the complexities of human reactions, MTL offers improved organizational effectiveness. Because there is a requirement for staff development and organizational learning, anyone who tries MTL should anticipate a fall-off in efficiency upon initial application. Certainty-oriented members of the organization will feel uneasy at first about losing a familiar mode of operation. Workers long confined in authoritarian structures will understandably feel urges to exercise newly liberated opportunities. Some of these urges will be oriented toward self-satisfaction more than the accomplishment of organizational goals.

It is to be expected that some short-term perturbations will be experienced and members of the organization should prepare for that eventuality. Indeed, the literature overwhelmingly suggests that this initial decline in results when new ideas
are introduced has inhibited the advancement of leadership and organizational theory. Faced with an initial fall off in productivity, only the stout of heart and supremely confident will persist with a new approach which seems to be producing negative results. The theory of motivational team leadership calls for an “investment in staff for the future” approach.

But the leader who is persistent in the application of MTL principles will be rewarded. As time goes by, MTL will surpass the highest effectiveness conceivable using authoritarian leadership.
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