INFORMATION TO USERS

The interactive processes of leader vision alignment and team functioning in a temporary employment corporation

Colgan, Malinda Beasley, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1991

THE INTERACTIVE PROCESSES OF LEADER VISION

ALIGNMENT AND TEAM FUNCTIONING IN A

TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT CORPORATION

by

Malinda Beasley Colgan

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1991

Approved by

_____
Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the
following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation Adviser _David H. Reilly_

Committee Members _Joseph E. Bryson_
Dale Brubaker

4-3-91
_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

4-3-91
_____
Date of Final Oral Examination

ii

COLGAN, MALINDA BEASLEY, Ed.D. The Interactive Processes of
Leader Vision Alignment and Team Functioning in a Temporary
Employment Corporation. (1991). Directed by Dr. David H.
Reilly. 129 pp.

The influence of a leader on his followers is a

critical function of leadership. This influence is assuming

paramount importance as the trend in the American work ethic

moves toward a concept of team development in organizations.

The integration of leader vision with the personal goals of

team members is a significant factor in the development of

synergistic leadership teams.

This study investigated the interactive process of a

leader and his management team in a temporary employment

organization. The research involved in-depth interviews and

completion of a FIRO-B Assessment with those who were

members of the leaders management team over a one year

period.

The research identified six components which were

conducive to the integration of leader and follower vision.

The concepts of vision integration and vision interpretation

were related to a team members commitment to the

organization. The findings revealed the integration of the

leader and team member visions contributed to high team

performance. The research suggested four guidelines for

maintaining a synergistic management team.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

Introduction

Overview

The concept of leadership has captured the interest of

numerous researchers over the past several decades including

James MacGregor Burns in the 1970s and Warren Bennis in the

1990s. It has been perceived by many as a means by which to

manage work teams in the accomplishment of specific job

tasks on the one hand, while being assigned the

responsibility of increased productivity on the other hand.

The research has led to a multitude of definitions of

leadership. Foster (1986) reviewed definitions of

leadership found in the research literature. He stated:

> Stodgill (1974) found that 'The endless accumulation of
> empirical data has not produced an integrated
> understanding of leadership' (p. vii). Miner (1975)
> gave up: 'The heresy I propose is that the concept of
> leadership itself has outlived its usefulness (p. 5).
> Burns (1978) observed that 'Leadership as a concept has
> dissolved into small and discrete meanings... A
> superabundance of facts about letters far outruns
> theories of leadership' (p.227). Dubin (1979) finds
> that, 'By focusing on leaders' interpersonal relations
> with followers we have simply chosen a relatively
> trivial dimension' (p.227). Jago (1982) finds that,
> 'Although behavioral scientists have granted few
> topical areas greater research attention, the results
> of these efforts remain a bewildering melange for
> even the most serious student of organizations' (p.
> 315). McCall (1976) observes that, 'After forty years

> of accumulation, our mountain of evidence about leadership seems to offer few clear-cut facts. Most of the relative certainties deal with things that are not true, reflecting a tendency to hone our understanding of leadership by inadvertently finding out what it is not. (cited in Foster, 1976, p. 170)

Although leadership is a commonly used term, its definition is difficult to apply in an organizational setting. Psychological models abound in attempts to explain leadership (Foster, 1986). The value of these seems somewhat limited, in as much as the models are constructed more in relation to the researcher's affiliation with a particular discipline than with a consideration of the organizational culture (Foster, 1986). In addition, the psychological models do not deal with 'leadership', but describe models of management. These models focus on efficiency and effectiveness of workers and the enhancement of their production within the organization. They tend to ignore the needs and values of the worker focusing almost exclusively on the needs of the organizational firm.

Organizations are presently moving toward leadership team development (Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1985). As human resources are becoming the competitive difference in industry, the leadership team gains priority within the structure of the organization (Peters, 1987). Kanter (1983) concluded from her research on leader projects, that those

which failed did so because they did not build a coalition of supporters.

Leadership teams are essential in implementing the vision and the strategies necessary to achieve the mission of the organization. A positive relationship among cooperation, compliance, and teamwork is necessary, as well as a highly motivated core group of people to achieve the goals of the organization (Kotter, 1988). Kotter states,

> A firm that has taken the time to develop practices and programs that build strong management teams able to provide a business with effective leadership has the most powerful sources of competitive advantage today. (p. 133)

Kouzes and Posner (1987), in a study of 500 executives found the leader commented on the necessity of team work and collaboration in 91% of the cases they studied. Their study also discovered that the team members needed to feel they were understood by the leaders and that the leader had their best interests at heart. Essentially, a "buy in" must occur which involves the integration of leader and follower visions (Kouzes & Posner, 1987).

This type of team interaction with the leader is well developed by the political model which advocates a view of leadership that allows the follower to exert as much influence on the leader as the leader exerts on the follower. As Selznick (1957) explains,

> The leader is not just the manager; the leader is
> concerned with critical decisions in the
> institution.   Critical decisions involve the definition
> of purpose.   The leader engages in activities that
> provide meaning.   The institutional leader is primarily
> an expert in the promotion and protection of values.
> (p. 28)

This model of leadership presents a more complete view of

leaders in organizations and is expanded to follower or

worker social interactions.   Burns (1978) poses a political

leadership model which states in part that

> ...the most powerful influences consist of deeply human
> relationships in which two or more persons engage with
> one another.   (p. 11)

The transformational leader attempts to transform the

followers by communicating the vision in such a way as to

create congruence of the leader's personal goals and the

personal goals of the followers.   The leader engages with

the followers by intermeshing these goals and values.

Tucker (1981) offers an extension of the political model by

examining what leaders actually do.

> Leaders are expected to define this situation
> authoritatively for the group.   They must describe a
> course of group action... that will meet the situation
> as defined.   (p. 18-19)

Within the political realm of leadership Selznick

(1957) develops three propositions of leadership.   One of

particular importance here is that leadership occurs in a

social situation.   This is not to say leadership is totally

situational. It is inseparable from the social interactions within the organizational culture.

Bennis (1985) offers another conception of leadership within the political model. He found the leaders he studied shared the following qualities: vision, a direction and view of the future; communication and alignment, the ability to share the vision and bring others into its service; persistence, consistency, and focus, maintaining the vision and directing activities toward its accomplishment; empowerment, creating an organization where individuals can accomplish things; and organizational learning, the ability to learn from errors. These qualities of leadership within an organization allow the development of "transformative power" which Bennis summarizes as,

> In sum, the transformative power of leadership stems less from infeniously crafted organizational structures, successfully constructed management designs and controls, elegantly rationalized planning formats, or skillfully articulated leadership tactics. Rather, it is the ability of the leader to reach the souls of others in a fashion which raises human consciousness, builds meanings, and inspires human intent that is the source of power. Within transformative leadership, therefore, it is vision, purposes, beliefs, and other aspects of organizational culture that are of prime importance. (p. 70)

Many of the critical qualities of a leader as defined by Bennis' political model are those of social interaction, situational definition, organizational culture, direction of activities, communication and vision.

Through the political model, leadership is seen as an interaction between leaders and followers and not the manipulation of a group. The model offers valuable insights to our understanding of leadership. However, it lacks an explanation of how these qualities are internalized by the followers, leaving the interactive process between followers and leaders underdeveloped.

The influence of the leader on the follower is a critical function of leadership. This influence is assuming paramount importance as the trend in the work ethic moves toward the concept of team development in organizations. The role of leader vision and "buy in" from team members in the success of organizational development are moving leaders toward the need for increased sociological understanding. The importance of organizational culture is a dimension lacking adequate attention in current leadership research. The interactive process of team development and follower vision compatibility with leader vision is one which needs to be addressed to maximize the possible benefits for both individual success within the corporation and the corporation's success in a world of organizational change.

Through a shared vision team members can begin to see how supporting the leader's vision and the corporate mission increases their chances of getting what is most important to them as individuals. When team members operate with a sense of focus on what is important to themselves, the alignment

process gains integrity. Members begin to develop a sense of being in charge of their own destiny.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the interactive process between leaders and followers in an organization through an examination of the similarity of leader and follower vision. It is the belief of this researcher that compatibility of leader vision and follower vision offers insight for a heightened understanding of the leader's interaction with the social structure of the organization. The vision of the leader can be transferred and adopted by the leader's team of followers through a shared personal vision with the leader. A more complete model of leadership could be developed which would be applicable in an organization and offer a stronger integration of leader and worker vision within the organization. The performance of the team as well as the organization can be enhanced by the leader's vision becoming congruent with the personal vision of the workers. Hence, self-interest and corporate interest become synonymous.

Research Questions

Through a review of the literature on leader vision, team development, and integration of personal and leader vision, several questions arise which invite further study.

The following will be addressed in this study:

1. Are there significant differences in a leadership team's cohesiveness as a function of leader vision alignment with the personal vision of team members as measured by the three areas of the FIRO-B (Shutz, 1958)?

2. What are the components necessary for the process of alignment or shared vision to occur between the management team member's vision and the leader's vision?

3. Does understanding of the corporate leader's vision impact employee commitment to the organization as reported by team members and measured by turnover among team members?

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be used throughout this study. The terms are presented in an order which reflects their significance within the research material. This will assist the reader, giving an operational use of these terms within the confines of this research.

1. Alignment - When individuals integrate the leader's vision with their own and share responsibility for achieving both (Senge, 1990).

2. Vision - A direction and view of the future (Bennis, 1985).

3. Synergy - When individual energies harmonize as a result of team members becoming more aligned in their direction or focus (Senge, 1990).

4. Team - A group in which individuals have a common aim and where jobs and skills of each member fit in with those of others (Adair, 1986, p. 95).

5. Transformational Leadership - The process of influencing major changes in the attitude and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization's mission or objectives (Bennis, 1985).

6. Transformational Power - The ability of the leader to reach the souls of others in a fashion which raises human consciousness, builds meanings, and inspires human intent (Bennis, 1985, p. 70).

7. Power - The capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 17).

8. Social Architecture - That which provides context (or meaning) and commitment to its membership and stakeholders (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 112).

9. FIRO-B - An acronym for 'Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation - Behavior' which was developed by William Shutz (Shutz, 1958).

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this research study are found in design constraints. The constraints of this research are those of the sample population and the difficulty in generalizing the research conclusions to a larger population. Controlling for the multitude of situational

variables involved in studying an organization's population reduces the size of the sample.

Corporations are often involved in a variety of corporate-wide programs which confine the members to specific methods of training. Several of these programs dictate corporate values and missions as well as the means by which members will develop teams, what teams will be formed, and the mission of each team. A major component of this study involves team/leader interaction. Controlling for predetermined team mission consistency will necessitate the use of a population within one corporation. Corporate culture is another major influence on the team's development and the vision of the leader. The components of an organization's culture will vary from one corporation to another. Maintaining consistency of cultural influences and the definition of the culture will again confine the sample population to a single corporation. However, the resulting research of this study, with these considerations in mind, can be applied to similar situations involving teams.

Map For The Remainder Of The Dissertation

The remainder of the dissertation will focus on a review of the literature in Chapter II including both historical and current research on leadership, teams and leader vision alignment. Chapter III provides a framework for the methodology used for this study and the population

used in this research. Chapter IV will provide the findings
from interviews conducted with team members and the results
of their FIRO-B assessment. Chapter V will provide
conclusions, a summary, and recommendations for further
study.

Chapter II

Review of Related Literature

The purpose of this review of related literature is to investigate the interactive process between leaders and followers in an organization through an examination of the alignment of the leader's and followers' vision. Investigation of the current research on alignment will offer insights for a heightened understanding of the leader's interaction with the social structure of the organization. Vision and transformational power (Bennis, 1984) of the leader will be explored and the process of adopting this vision by the leader's team of followers through alignment of personal and leader vision will be examined. A more complete model of leadership may be developed which would be applicable in an organization and offer a stronger integration of leadership and social interaction within the organization. This alignment of vision has major implications for team functioning and team maintenance.

The literature is approached through three major components. The first area to be reviewed will be leadership and leader vision, the second will explore the

leader's team and team dynamics, finally, the third will review the alignment process in leadership and teams.

Leadership and Vision

Leadership is a topic which has maintained a prominent place in the literature of social psychology, sociology, organizational behavior, personnel psychology, and management development. It is a topic which claims to its credit an estimated 350 definitions (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 3). Quite possibly a definition exists for each researcher who has attempted to explain the subject. Over 40 years of research has offered little in the way of concreteness through definable boundaries and parameters within which one can lead others. The volumes of literature produced by the findings of leadership research has done little to narrow its definition. The research has not targeted an operational definition for use by those in organizations.

It is not, however, the goal of this review to explore the vast bulk of research on leadership. Rather, the goal is to review the leadership research found within a more recent philosophy which has attempted to distinguish between leadership and management. According to Foster (1986),

> ...the major charge leveled against these various
> theories of leadership is that they do not address
> leadership at all. They are essentially various
> theories on how to manage the firm. (p. 176)

Recent research in the study of leadership reveals several authors who have accepted the task of forging a distinction between management and leadership. Zaleznik (1977) develops a distinction between management and leadership. Managers are reactive within the organization and give priority to day-to-day issues and short term goals. Leaders, on the other hand:

> adopt a personal and active attitude toward goals. The influence a leader exerts in altering moods, evoking images and expectations, and in establishing specific drives and objectives determines the direction a business takes. The net result of this influence is to change the way people think about what is desirable, possible, and necessary. (p. 71)

Leadership within this framework involves the creation of a vision magnetizing a desirable future state and incorporating all members of the organization within its boundaries. This perception of leadership differs from the routine bureaucracy of the organization and mindless obedience to authority through exercising a process of influence between leader and follower. The process elicits a voluntary compliance toward goals which have been agreed upon by everyone affected.

A view which is closely related to that of Zaleznik is expressed by Bennis (1985):

> The leader must be a social architect who studies and stages what is called 'the culture of work'- those intangibles that are so hard to discern but so terribly important in governing the way people act, the

values and norms that are subtly transmitted to
individuals and groups and that tend to create binding
and bonding.   (p. 15)

This view of leadership defines the leader as one who

designs the organizational image and integrates the image

with a sense of direction. The political approach promoted

by Zaleznik in 1957 has been virtually ignored for over 30

years. The major components of his view, values promotion

and protection, and definition of organizational mission

have found support in more current research. Sergiovanni

(1984) concurs with this view of leadership when he adds,

The object of leadership is the stirring of human
consciousness, the interpretation and enhancement of
meanings, the articulation of key cultural strands, and
the linking of organizational members to them.   (p. 8)

Greenfield (1984) agrees with this view and offers

additional components concerning the values held by the

leader. He contends leaders advocate the values which they

believe to be in the best interest of all concerned. Unless

the values are within their personal belief system they have

difficulty encouraging others to adopt them. Morley (1984)

also finds the leader to determine the definition of current

reality and the person, who more so than any other member of

the organization, interprets the actions of others and

defines the situation for its members (p. 269).

The perception of leadership defined by Zaleznik and

Bennis also finds support among business leaders themselves.

John Opel, chairman of IBM, defines his function as that of
promoter of the value system (Peters and Waterman, 1982,
p. 89).

Interest in the values of the organization promoted by
this definition of leadership has caused many researchers to
develop an interest in "organizational culture". Bennis
and Nanus (1985) prefer "social architecture to culture."
As they describe:

> We prefer the word 'social architecture' because it
> conveys far more meaning than 'culture' -- the vaguest
> of terms- does, and it certainly relates meaning to
> organizational life. Social architecture is that which
> provides context (or meaning) and commitment to its
> membership. It presents a shared interpretation of
> organizational events, so that members know how they
> are expected to behave. It also generates commitment
> to the primary organizational values and philosophy -
> that is, the vision that employees feel they are
> working for and can believe in. (p. 112)

It has been strongly suggested by Waterman and Peters
(1982) upon examining a number of America's best-run
companies that organizational culture was a critical element
in "excellent companies." An understanding of the culture
is an enabling and empowering process for employees.
Actions are based upon explicit values, and everyday
decisions for each and every worker are expedient and clear.

Similar evidence was discovered by Vaill (1984) in a
study of "high-performing systems" in which he finds these
organizations to have a clear sense of direction, values,
and meanings. Bennis and Nanus (1985) concur from their

study of 80 chief executive officers that better leaders enmesh their organization with a sense of vision and purpose eliciting commitment and excellence.

Research which confirms the findings of Bennis and Nanus (1985) is that of Levinson and Rosenthal (1984). Six senior executives who had a major impact on successful organizations participated in extensive interviews with the two researchers. Through the information from these interviews, Levinson and Rosenthal found five specific patterns common in all cases which may have been responsible for the resulting positive achievements.

One common theme was that each leader was able to take charge of the organization with a new direction or vision which was adhered to unfalteringly. The vision was described to others through a clear and convicted means. This clarity created a common understanding throughout the organization.

A strong self-image was present in each case as well as high personal standards for self and others. Corporate values and traditions were urged by these leaders and in so doing brought people together. They encouraged the integration of the organizational values in the personal value system of each member.

Levinson and Rosenthal (1984) found that support for members of the organization was present and the leaders often used the word "we" in their communications. The

leader was aware of the need for the consent of members in favor of the vision for the organization.

The researchers also found that risk and effort were encouraged at every opportunity. Members were reminded of their part in building the organization through a socialization process which continually reinforced the current customs, values, and policies of the corporation.

All of the leaders studied were described as thinkers and doers. They gave meaning to the corporation by stressing a sense of purpose and a sense of shared ambitions and goals. The leader had a highly developed sense of abstraction and vision. The strength was present to take charge and pull the organization into the visualized future direction (Levinson and Rosenthal, 1984).

Neither of these studies explains how the achievement of the new focus or vision is developed by the leader. The communication of vision also lacks an explanation of means. A strategy for achieving a consensus among organizational groups and developing consistency are left unaddressed. The responsibility of motivating a member of the organization by means of inspiration is difficult at the very least, but there is no strategy offered by Bennis, Nanus, Levinson, or Rosenthal. The strategy for inspiring members of the organization is an area which is worthy of research.

As is evident from the research, leader as visionary is a rapidly growing area of investigation. The visionary

leader is becoming aligned with the idea of
organizational effectiveness. The research is moving toward
leadership "of" organizations rather than leadership "in"
organizations. The emphasis of this body of research,
viewing the leader as creator of culture is moving the focus
toward the organization as a whole, and leadership "of" the
organization.

Current trends of research in organizational leadership
are moving toward the concept of visionary leaders. This
trend may be due in large part to the necessity of the
leaders in organizations to turn their focus toward human
resources. Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985) explain the three
major current trends in our industrial society which will
have credible impact on corporations. These major changes
presently occurring in corporate America make the transition
from an industrial society based on financial resources to
an information society dependent upon human resources a
reality. Secondly, according to Naisbitt and Aburdene
(1985), the evidence is mounting to confirm the decreases in
the ranks of middle management. Finally, the labor
shortages of the 80s and 90s will create a critical market
for human resources and employees will have broader ranges
of career choices.

Moving from an information society will put an
increased emphasis on people as resources due to the fact,
they are the possessors of the information needed by the

organization. Competition for talented labor will increase in the 1990s as shortages will appear. Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985) view the more talented labor market as being drawn toward those organizations which are preferred environments in which to work. These preferred environments will offer opportunities for personal growth as well as opportunities for worker contributions to the corporation.

A major component of the "re-invented" corporation is that of a powerful vision. This vision becomes the centralized force around which revolves all activity in which people engage. The source of this vision is the leader. As Bennis (1985) defines vision:

> A leader must first have developed a mental image of a possible and desirable future state of the organization... it may be as vague as a dream or as precise as a goal or mission statement. A vision articulates a view of a realistic, credible, attractive future for the organization, a condition that is better in some important ways than what now exists... a target that beckons... the all-important bridge from the present to the future. (p. 89)

The vision is the link between the dream and the action of everyday duties and responsibilities. The visionary leader enables others to act. This vision is a deep and abiding belief held by members of the leaders team. The commitment to the vision by these members is gained by having a vision which contains components that add value to those who commit to it (Belasco, 1989, p. 60).

In a major study of 500 personal best leadership cases
of chief executive officers, Kouzes and Posner (1987) found
without exception each leader possesses a vision for the
organization. This research further explains four major
attributes of a leader's vision. The word vision is one
which creates images for others, mental pictures from which
to draw for decisions and work activities. Secondly, the
word suggests a view of the future, one which everyone can
work toward. Third, it alludes to perfection and
possibilities of excellence in performance. Finally,
visions are unique to the creators and those with whom it is
shared (p. 85). Their research also finds the long-term
vision to be the second most desirable trait of a leader by
the followers. The vision is secondary only to the traits
of honesty and integrity (p. 88).

A significant aspect of leader vision is intuition and
its creation from listening to the people in the
organization. Peters (1987) views vision as "creating
dangerously" (p. 484). The vision changes the entire
metabolism of the organization. Members are drawn to it
like metal to a magnet. Block (1987) adds to the idea of
vision with the belief that it will be good for the
individual, department, and community (p. 101). Belasco
(1989) concurs with this idea of vision stating that the
vision should focus on lofty aims with which everyone can
identify. The vision should be a rally point that touches

the hearts and souls of everyone and conveys a picture of
the desired future (p. 97).

Another dimension offered to the view of leader vision
is ElSawy's (1983) "one-way mirror hypothesis." He contends
that one makes sense of his/her world through hindsight.
Understandings are based on past experiences and the future
is constructed by first looking backward and then developing
an approach to the future. It may be relevant in developing
leader vision from this hypothesis to remain aware of past
experiences and enrich the future vision based on detailed
accounts of the past. ElSawy also contends that leaders may
have identical past experiences and opportunities but
completely different visions of the future. Perhaps one may
conclude past experiences are significant in the creation of
a vision, however the vision is not driven by past
experiences. Visions move organizations from probabilities
based on numbers and profits of the past toward
possibilities of what the organization wants to happen in
the future. Vision is optimism and hope and to be effective
it must be inspiring, not a revision of the past. Bennis
(1984) concurs with ElSawy's view stating, "The leader must
see the present in the past and the future in the present"
(p. 63).

Bennis (1976) states that the people in the
organization truly want affection, acceptance, and leaders
who believe in their ability to grow as well as an

opportunity to develop self-esteem. They stay with the corporation because they feel loved and competent.

A study of 12 CEOs by Tichy and Devanna (1986) revealed that a vision must inspire people with a view of the future which justifies the costs of change. Often people do not mind change, however their concern is more toward the impact of being changed themselves. Moving from the tried and true means of doing things requires inspiration as a predicate to perspiration. They also found that successful visions are seldom the creation of one individual. They are most often the result of an interactive process with key people in the organization who must incorporate the vision with their personal goals. It must also be a source of self-esteem and common purpose for members of the organization. The vision helps members develop a sense of purpose about their membership in the organization.

Charismatic/Transformational Leadership

The needs of a changing society from that of industrial to information may be best aligned with the characteristics of the transformational leader. Charisma is a major characteristic of this type of leader which distinguishes him/her from more traditional types of leaders. Hence many researchers use the terms charismatic leader and transformational leader interchangeably. Throughout history

these leaders have been associated with the forces of change.

The characteristics associated with this type of leader include unconventionality, vision, entrepreneurial spirit, creativity, and inspiration (Conger, 1989, p. 17). These leaders have a strong vision of the future state of the organization. Those considered to be charismatic tend to have an ability to see opportunities in the marketplace which are illusive to others. These leaders are more willing to take risks and change old patterns than other more traditional leaders. This charismatic leader is often viewed as a leader who is categorized by their followers who perceive them as charismatic.

Willner (1984) argued that certain types of behavior led people to develop a perception of the leader to be charismatic. This leader must possess characteristics which are relevant to the follower's current situation and set of circumstances. Their vision must match the aspirations of those followers to whom he/she is appealing or the leader is not likely to have a following (p. 17).

Conger (1989) identifies attribution theory as a probable explanation of the leader's appeal to their followers. He finds that the leader is thought to be charismatic when they exhibit behaviors followers have learned over time to associate with charismatic leaders (p. 46). House (1977) explains the attraction to these

charismatic leaders as the identification followers have with his/her abilities. These abilities may seem so extraordinary that people are naturally attracted to them. This attraction can lead to role identification and the internalization of the leader's values. This internalization allows one to adopt a similar vision and mission (Bennis, Berlew, Schien, and Steele, 1973).

The first stage of charismatic leadership is formulating a vision. These leaders have an extraordinary ability to see a constituent's needs as well as untapped opportunities for change and growth. The second aspect of this leadership style is to articulate the vision. Their followers are presented with utopian goals. These goals are accepted due to the mutual perception shared by both the follower and the leader. This leader creates a sense of dissatisfaction among his followers. Their vision is usually linked to the values of the followers, therefore change is not resisted as is often the case with followers in other situations. They appeal to the follower's need to make a contribution through their work and a contribution to society as a whole. This type of leader's enthusiasm and commitment is contagious.

Burns (1978) describes leadership as a process rather than any set of specific behaviors. Leadership is the process of influencing individuals and channeling energies toward shared goals between leader and follower.

Bass (1985) elaborates upon the effect of the transformational leader on followers. This type of leader motivates followers to invest more energy than they may have been actually expected to expend. A leader can transform his followers by enticing them to transcend their personal interests for the sake of the organization. Bass views charisma as an essential component of transformational leadership, however, it cannot facilitate the entirety of the transformational process. The transformational leader not only influences followers by identification with them, but also by their service as coach, teacher, and mentor. Yukl (1989) argues that through transformational leadership follower commitment can be exchanged for purpose and meaning deemed from the leader's vision.

Building upon the needs and values of the followers, this leader develops a strong sense of trust with his audience. Achievement of the vision is accomplished by having his followers believe strongly in their own ability to complete the task. Their follower's sense of self is incorporated into the completion of the goal. Maslow (1965) explains this type of incorporation of self:

> The task or problem, or purpose was totally introjected by everyone in the situation; that is to say that the task or duty was no longer something separate from the self, something out there, outside the person and different from him, but rather he identified with this task so strongly that he couldn't define his real self without including the task. (p. 39)

Teams

Creating a vision as the leader of an organization is an essential first step toward effective leadership. It seems apparent that visionary leadership is only as effective as the vision and the ability of the leader to attract followers who share the vision.

Belasco (1989) views the development of the vision as an interactive process between the leader and his organizational team which must also be linked to the team members' personal development. The leader should keep in mind the age old idea of "what's in it for me" and create a vision which has value for the community, the organization, and the individual. This type of vision can lead to high performing teamwork by followers. The members will use the vision to evaluate their behavior and make organizational decisions (p. 148).

Kouzes and Posner (1987) found a one word test of a good leader to be "we" (p. 10). They found the leader elicited teamwork and collaboration from his/her followers in 91 per cent of the 500 cases they studied (p. 10). Ranking the five most significant practices of a leader, followers consistently rated teamwork as the most significant. The leaders who maintained teamwork and collaboration also maintained a family feeling among highly committed and productive teams.

A study of peak performers in corporations by Garfield (1986) finds this type of performance is most often a collective act. He stated,

> They don't just lead the teams they build, they join them. They reason correctly that peak-performing teams inspire peak-performing individuals, and peak-performing individuals build peak-performing corporations. (p. 190)

The popular years of teamwork and teambuilding in research literature were during the 1960s and 1970s. The team concept of this period was dominated by sensitivity group training. Cooper and Mangham (1971) have shown both shortcomings and contributions of the sensitivity or T-group movement.

Adair (1986) defines a team as,

> a group in which individuals have a common aim where jobs and skills of each member fit in with those of others. (p. 95)

According to Adair (1986) teams provide employees with a series of unique opportunities to grow as a person. Part of the attraction one feels toward a team is membership in an effective team. He states,

> An effective team allows us to transcend our own individual limitations of knowledge, ability, and performance. This is the first step to transcending self-interest. (p. 50)

Members of the team develop individuality in the
interest of other members of the team. This view of team
purports a three part responsibility within the definition
of a leader. First, the leader must assist the team in
achieving the task at hand. Secondly, a provision must be
made for the development of the individual. Finally, the
leader is responsible for building and maintaining the team.
Adair (1986) refers to the needs of the group in relation to
the development of an effective team. The group has three
major needs. One of these is a task which allows one to
fulfill his/her need for accomplishment. Another need for
group members refers to the need of individuals to maintain
a work relationship among the organization's membership. A
third and final need refers to the individual's needs which
he/she brings to the group as a member. The membership
within a group fulfills various needs for each participant.
When self-esteem needs and self-actualization needs (Maslow,
1971) can be met along with, and not at the expense of, the
group's needs, the group tends to be more effective.
Identification with a cause greater than themselves within
the vision of the organization creates a situation wherein
working for the organization becomes a calling (Belasco,
1989).

Blake and Mouton (1987) agree with the view of leader
as the insurer of teamwork. Their research finds it
superior to elicit team participation in creating the vision

rather than impose a preconceived vision on the team. When this is done, team members are given proprietorship of the vision. It is important, in their view, to develop participation and legitimatize vision for without it "them-ism" may arise. The research of Blake and Mouton (1987) develops the concept of team interaction which stimulates a transcendent state that exceeds a contribution by any member alone or even the sum of all the component parts of the team. At this point, the team is said to have developed "synergy", a condition in which the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. The contribution of the team reaches beyond the individual contribution. As the significance of the team concept is viewed by Blake and Mouton,

> Team excellence is a joint effort that shows without the group. Humans find this kind of performance gratifying and satisfying. It reinforces a person's sense of self-value and creates a willingness to be supportive in future endeavors. (p. 9)

This type of "synergistic teamwork" could be the most effective use of human resources in any corporation. The synergy of the team necessitates a personal contribution and respect for the contribution of other team members which cannot be mandated by authority through blind obedience. Demanding compromise will destroy the synergy of the team. This synergy can only be maintained when the regard for the well being of the team is shown through trust and mutual

support. The vision and goals of the group are part of a shared responsibility.

Sibbet and Drexler (1987) designed a model for evaluating the development of team performance. They have designed seven stages through which teams progress as they move toward high performance. Each stage requires resolution of specific issues enabling the team to move through the creating stages into the sustaining stages of development. Stage one, the orientation stage, has as its core question, 'Why am I here?'. Members question if they belong with this group and examine the need to attain membership. The central issue is the assessment by the individual of the desire to be a part of the activity of this team. The member must find some meaning to team work and believe the team task is important to the organization and/or important to society. Additionally, the individual should believe the team can complete the task as well as, and preferably better, than the individual alone. If not, the team has no purpose. The member must be convinced that their skills will be used, their unique points of view will be heard, they will make a difference, and they will be able to influence the team's direction and outcome. Members become part of the team as provisional members. They are looking for a place in the organization and testing whether they are aligned with the team purpose. High performance can be established when all members perceive themselves as aligned

and contribute to a worthwhile purpose. On the other hand, when members do not perceive alignment between self and other members they may experience anxiety and fear becoming disconnected from the team. At this point, they may withdraw from the group, offer unsolicited criticism, or find no value to the team's work.

Stage two is a time for trust building and is crucial to all other task issues for the remaining stages. The central concern is the evaluation of other team members. A hidden concern is the expectations of other team members. It is essential during this stage for each member to understand other members of the team. The member has a need to explore the motives, skill level, commitment, and the confidentiality of other members. When these concerns are addressed and positively accepted by the members, trust is established and grows. If trust is not established the flow of information on tasks, goals, process, and means is significantly stilted. Communication among members is both calculated and measured. Information held by members may be withheld from other members or even distorted. The quality of work will suffer due to the absence of essential information.

Stage three is clarification of the team's goals. In most cases, the team has a broad purpose and the freedom to choose precisely what must be done to achieve this purpose. The agreement upon the task is based on the

information exchange among the members. The major concerns of this stage involve surfacing all options, identifying all issues, and the reasons for choosing these issues. The membership needs a consensus of purpose and clarification of team goals. When the purpose and goals are not clarified, bickering, arguments, apathy, and irrelevant competition will result. When members become disengaged and uninterested, the team needs to reconnect with the real task and develop a consensus about its work. The acknowledgement of the personal goals of members allows each member to devote energy toward goal achievement as opposed to hiding them. The agenda of the team should be defined and consensus should be reached. The common vision guides the organization of the team's work and energy can be directed toward task, creativity, and structure.

Stage four is a stage at which decisions are made regarding the direction of team work. The roles for each member are clarified and responsibilities divided among the membership. This clarification allows greater freedom for members as they progress toward the goal with an awareness of their responsibility in its accomplishment. The interdependence of members is defined during this stage. If the task does not require interdependence, it can be destructive to insist that it occur.

Stage five involves the implementation of the work to be completed by the team. The sequence of work and

commitment to a schedule is crucial. The challenge of the
implementation stage is to integrate the tasks of each team
member into a smooth operation. The work of the team should
be integrated and avoid being segmented by variations in
tasks. The leader's role is to insure that members do not
lose sight of the vision and that each member has a clear
picture of the overall process. The leader is also
responsible for each members's awareness of his part in the
sequence of work.

Stage six is a level of high performance. At this
stage, true synergy can occur. This stage is not logical
because the members are breaking individual limits and
boundaries. High performance can be achieved in one of two
ways. One way could be the synergistic performance is
brought about through a crisis. Because of the crisis
situation the team performs beyond expectations to control
the situation. The activities are focused and
coordinated. This high performance state is not constant
one. The second way of achieving high performance can be
accomplished by attaining an integration of tasks. During
this state everything is moving in the same direction and
the system is balanced. There is an anticipation of the
thoughts and needs of other members. This is a result of
the openness and consistency of behavior over time. A
synergy exists where individual members perform beyond
normal levels and the team accomplishes more than the sum of

the individual talents alone would suggest. The team may either do more than could be accomplished by individuals, or they may perform the task, with more quality or depth, than has been achieved previously. This type of performance may not be necessary if the work of the team is more maintenance focused. Finally, during stage seven the team approaches renewal. The team begins to question the need to continue as a group. Once the task is completed, the team must decide if anything is left to accomplish. At this time, the team renews the vision and returns to stage one.

These stages would seem to support Levinson's (1981) reference to a study by Daniel Yankleovich of college graduates. He describes the new worker as being in "a crisis of purpose" (p. 143). There seems to exist a disillusionment with the system whereby finding meaning and purpose in one's life through the traditional means of work is unsolved.

Alignment

As leaders enter a quest for the 1990s to develop an organization which attracts those workers in search of purpose and meaning, the visionary leader may find alignment of team members a superior and necessary tactic. Creating the vision and building the team are the first two steps toward a possible alternative to current worker disillusionment in organizations. A key and crucial element

necessary for effective leadership is that of 'alignment'.
Perhaps best described by Senge and Kiefer as quoted by
Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985):

> Every so often we hear of a group of people who....
> transcend their personal limitations and realize a
> collective synergy with results that far surpass
> expectations based on past performance... In sports,
> the 1980 U.S. Olympic Hockey Team stunned the world by
> winning the gold medal against the vastly more talented
> and experienced Russian and Finnish teams.....These
> occurrences, although unusual, are much more frequent
> in American business than is commonly suspected.
> (p. 24)

Alignment is a special type of "peak performance"
involving leadership vision. When individuals are producing
at their height, experiencing a bonding with other workers,
at the point all aspects of the work integrate even though a
formalized plan was not present, alignment is present.
Alignment is "transformational" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985)
because the leader vision becomes a shared corporate vision;
an integration of corporate and personal goals is created.
As Naisbitt (1985) explains once more:

> When you identify with your company's purpose,
> when you experience ownership in a shared vision, you
> find yourself doing your life's work instead of just
> doing time. (p. 26)

The individual's ability to realize personal goals becomes
intermeshed with those of the corporation, thereby the
realization of corporate vision entails realization of
personal vision. Senge and Keifer are referred to by

Naisbitt and Aburdene (1985) as contending that after people experience alignment they are symbolically addicted to the feeling and yearn for an opportunity to experience it again. Here may exist a wealth of human resource left almost totally untapped by corporations.

Senge (1990) has further developed the interactive process of vision asserting the concept of a shared vision. He contends vision is truly shared when both follower and leader have a similar mental picture of the vision and are committed to each realizing this mental image. The vision reflects personal vision, therefore, each person cares deeply for its accomplishment. As a sense of ownership is developed, "we" work toward "our" vision becoming a reality. When a vision of greatness is not present, petty issues become prevalent.

According to Senge, not having a personal vision can cause one to enroll in another person's vision, but he never truly commits to this vision. The corporate vision is developed within the minds of its members as each sees the organization at its best. Every member of a team shares a responsibility for the whole vision rather than only a small portion of it (p. 208).

Senge (1990) has postulated seven possible attitudes toward the organization's vision which can be applied to team members.

1. Commitment: The member wants the vision and will work to make it happen.

2. Enrollment: The member wants the vision and will do whatever can be done within the spirit of the law to make it happen.

3. Genuine Compliance: The member sees the benefits of the vision and does everything that is expected of him and more.

4. Formal Compliance: The member sees the benefits of the vision on the whole. He does what is expected of him and no more.

5. Grudging Compliance: The member does not see the benefits of the vision, however he does not want to lose his job. Therefore, he does enough of what is expected because he has to but he lets it be know he is not really on board.

6. Non-Compliance: The member does not see the benefits of the vision and he will not do what is expected of him.

7. Apathy: The member is neither for nor against the vision. They have neither interest nor energy to invest in the development of it (p. 209).

The committed team member brings a sense of energy, passion and excitement to the task. This individual becomes a team member who is not controlled by the "rules of the game, he is responsible for the game" (Senge, 1990, p. 221).

The synergy of the truly committed team member is described as "an awesome force" (Senge, 1990, p. 221). The truly enrolled and committed team member is one who has a strong desire to achieve the vision. Those who are genuinely compliant only accept the vision in order to gain something for themselves, however they do not want to achieve the vision for the sake of experiencing the realization of it. It becomes apparent the vision is not their own and true enrollment has not occurred.

Alignment is not truly achieved until a shared vision is established between workers and the leader. The shared vision connects with the personal visions of people throughout the organization (Senge, 1990, p. 214). Keifer (cited in Senge, 1990) refers to enrollment in the vision as choosing to be part of its fruition by choice. The vision then pulls the followers toward action and creates a unique and dynamic synergy through an aligned and enrolled team (p. 214).

The most effective corporate visions enmesh a worker's daily routine with his life purpose and therein establish alignment. Kouzes and Posner (1987), in their study referred to earlier, found alignment involves a common purpose. The followers of these leaders said, "they (leaders) tell us how we feel" (p. 114). Leaders do this by listening to their followers and knowing them. They enlist them in a common cause and show them how meeting the

cause can in turn meet their needs and dreams. The leader
holds a:

> mirror reflecting back to them what they say they
> most desire and when they see the reflection they
> recognize it and are immediately attracted to it.
> (p. 114)

Kouzes and Posner also find a deep desire on the part
of individuals to "make a difference" (p.114). Employees
desire a purpose to their existence and work can provide
that purpose. Work is becoming the arena of one's life
where they search for meaning and personal identity. The
followers will not follow until the vision is accepted as
their own (p. 9). Commitment cannot be commanded, only
inspired. Followers must know the leader can speak their
language. Another essential element for team leaders is
trust (p. 150). Trust increases openness and free
interchange of ideas and information. This study found
significant correlations between the trust level of the
leader and his team as related to employee satisfaction and
perceptions of leader effectiveness (p. 150).

A shared vision changes people's relationship with the
corporation. The company becomes "our company". This
shared vision creates a common identity. The shared sense
of purpose, vision, and operating values establishes a basic
level of commonality (Senge, 1990). As Maslow (1965)
studied high performing teams in organizations, he concurs

with Senge by also finding the most striking characteristics were those of shared vision and common purpose.

Vision and visionary leadership allows the alignment which gives meaning and purpose to the lives of employees. The organizational culture, the vision of the leader, the personal goals of the individual, and the contributions of the organization are quite possibly the pieces to the perpetually unsolved puzzle of worker satisfaction, worker motivation, and the role of the leader in the successful organization. Vision in leadership is a major component which can be integrated into employees' lives giving them purpose and meaning as well as providing the greatest efforts of human contribution to society at large.

Chapter III

Methodology

Population

The population chosen for this study consisted of
the management teams of a corporation which staffs
organizations with temporary workers. The corporation had
offices located in North and South Carolina. The corporate
management team for this company had experienced a turnover
rate of at least 34 per cent of its membership three times
in a seven month period. The membership of Team One
included two males and three females, Team Two included
three males and six females, and Team Three included six
females and two males.

Team One existed at the beginning of the company's
growth. This team included the corporate president,
operations manager, sales manager, administrative manager,
and service manager. Team Two was developed as the company
expanded and the sales manager as well as the administrative
manager were replaced. Team Two consisted of the corporate
president, general manager, personnel manager, central
division manager, northern division manager, southern
division manager, administrative manager, and administrative
assistant. Team Three was developed after the release of
the central division manager and the southern division

manager. This team consisted of the corporate president, general manager, northern division manager, central division sales manager, central division service manager, administrative manager, and administrative assistant.

The population for this research included one corporation to control for variations in management training programs which were employed by individual organizations. Investigation of several sample corporations indicated that particular management development programs were standard in corporations for every management group. The variations of such programs for those corporations caused concern for the impact those variations may have had on team functioning. The population was limited to one corporation, which allowed for consistency of training among the population of team members and team leaders. A single corporation allowed for consistency of leader vision in teams developed within the organization.

The restriction of the study population could restrict the generalization of the research findings to other populations. The reader will find the results valuable regardless of the limited population studied. Generalization was attributed more to situation similarity and perception of the researcher than to population size. The perception of the reader gleans that portion of the case which has applicational value to his or her research and should be left to the reader. It seemed plausible that all

research was of limited application regardless of the
population size and methodology. However, the impact of
various programs in management development upon team members
could cast undue doubt upon any resulting research findings
in the event such variables were not controlled.

Procedures and Instrumentation

The nature of this research required the use of a
qualitative methodology. The use of an interpretive inquiry
methodology was most appropriate due to the nature of the
subject researched. Leader vision and the incorporation of
this vision with employee teams was a process which was
understood more by conversing with the team members rather
than surveying those members. For this reason, interpretive
inquiry was employed for a major portion of this research.
This methodology required the use of in-depth interviews
with each team member to assess his perception and
understanding of the corporate vision of the leader.
Additionally, the interviews afforded an opportunity for the
researcher to identify member's awareness of corporate
vision and perceived alignment with his personal vision or
goals. The questions mentioned below were used to explore
the experience of being part of a corporate team and the
function of leader vision within this experience. The
characteristics examined are based on the view of this
researcher expressed previously in Chapter I.

The interviews examined the concept of team functioning and the necessary elements expressed by the participants to develop and maintain an effective team as well as issues which could have impeded this process. A key element for review was awareness and alignment of corporate and personal vision.

The focus questions used during these interviews were selected from, but not limited to the following:

1. What is your conception of a team in the workplace?

2. How do you contribute to the team?

3. What perception do you have of your current team experiences?

4. What attracted you to this company and how did you become a member?

5. Were/are the expectations of you as a member of this team clear?

6. What is the major function or role of this team within the company?

7. What do you see as your role on this team?

8. What do you see are your major contributions to this team?

9. Is trust an issue for you with this team?

10. What are your personal goals?

11. What are your professional goals?

12. How are these goals being met as a member of this team?

13. What is your understanding of the vision of the
    president of this corporation for this company?

14. Where is your trust level with the corporation at
    the current time?

15. What has been your perception of the teams within
    this company?

These questions were used in an attempt to understand in
greater depth the experience of team members, as well as the
frustrations which limited team development and hindered
team performance.

The major themes for inquiry during the interview
process and through the review of information were chosen
from the following:

1. What needs are satisfied for these team members
   through the team experience?

2. How do people function on teams in this
   corporation?

3. Can their personal goals be met through team
   membership?

4. Do these workers feel a need to make a contribution
   through their work?

5. Is trust vital to team members in this corporation
   for contribution to occur?

6. Is the experience of being part of a team important
   to these employees?

7. Is their understanding the corporate leader's vision aligned with their personal goals?

8. Are the team members knowledgeable of the vision of the corporate leader?

The interview data was applied by team to the Team Performance Model (Sibbet and Drexler, 1987) to assess the stage at which the team became dysfunctional and/or achieved a high level of performance. The operational leader vision was considered that of the corporate president.

Quantitative methodology was employed with the three team groups. Through the use of the FIRO-B, an acronym for Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior, assessment of team functioning was measured. The FIRO-B is a 54-item questionnaire based upon three fundamental interpersonal dimensions of the FIRO theory (Shutz, 1977). The FIRO-B is an instrument frequently used to measure group interaction and has been found to be effective in team development programs to enhance team building procedures (Patten, 1981). The theory behind the FIRO-B is that all human interaction can be divided into three categories: issues surrounding inclusion, those surrounding control, and those surrounding affection. These three types of needs pertain especially to team building. Shutz's theory of group development suggests that a group proceeds through inclusion issues into control issues, and finally into affection issues. Then, it recycles. The three issues have

some clear bearings on common experiences of group life.
Issues arise in all groups concerning those who are going to
be in or out (inclusion). Inclusion scores revealed the
degree to which a team member associated with other team
members. A low expressed score indicated a member would be
uncomfortable in social settings and would tend to move away
from them. A high expressed score indicated a member is
comfortable in social settings and would tend to move toward
other members. A low wanted score reflected a member's
selectiveness about with whom their associations took place.
High wanted scores indicated a strong need to belong and to
be accepted. Inclusion was related to the commitment of the
member to the team and their desire to participate. This
area generally regards the issue of a one to many
relationship. The relationships measured by inclusion were
more of a superficial type. The control issue was important
to group functioning as it related to decision-making and
power. This area measured the extent to which a person
assumed responsibility, made decisions or dominated people.
This area referred to leadership behavior. A low expressed
score indicated a person would avoid making decisions and
taking responsibility. A high expressed score showed a
person can and did take on the responsibilities involved in
a leadership role. Low wanted scores referred to the
member's need not to be controlled by others as opposed to a
high wanted scored which indicated a member was willing to

relinquish responsibility and accept control from others. The control area involved the decision making process between team members. This area also indicated a need to achieve, influence others, independence, and submission. Overall, this area dealt with a member's need to be at the top or the bottom of the hierarchy.

The affection issues were equally important to illustrate the extent to which a team could be integrated. The affection area measured the need for deep relationships rather than superficial ones. These relationships were normally one to one and related to team members interactions with each other. A low expressed score reflected a member was cautious in initiating close, intimate relationships. High expressed scores conversely indicated members can readily become emotionally involved. A low wanted score meant a member was very selective about with whom deep relationships were formed. High wanted scores showed members who preferred others to initiate a close intimate relationship. Overall, the affection area related to how close team members were and how willing they would have been to share personal confidences.

Thus, the FIRO theory offers insights into team development as the group moves from inclusion or boundary issues, to control, decision making, and power issues, and finally moves toward building an integration of the team members.

The following terms were used to examine the results of
the FIRO-B in the remainder of the research.

1.   Affection - The area measured by the FIRO-B
which reflects the degree to which a person becomes
emotionally involved with others (Ryan, 1977).

2.   Control - The area measured by the FIRO-B
which reflects the extent to which a person assumes
responsibility, makes decisions, or dominates people (Ryan,
1977).

3.   Expressed - The overt and observable behavior in
the three areas of the FIRO-B. These areas are inclusion,
control and affection (Ryan, 1977).

4.   FIRO-B - An acronym for Fundamental
Interpersonal Relations Orientation - Behavior as developed
by William Shutz (1958).

5.   Inclusion - The area measured by the FIRO-B
which assesses the degree to which a person associates with
others (Ryan, 1977).

6.   Wanted - The behavior individuals believe
others should exhibit and is wanted from other people. This
behavior is less observable than the expressed behavior.
The behavior is determined in the three areas of the FIRO-B
(Ryan, 1977).

The FIRO-B produced six scores; three scores on
behavior expressed towards others and three on behavior
wanted from others in the three areas described above. The

range of scores in each area was 0-9 for expressed scores
and 0-9 for wanted scores with a total for one area being a
maximum of eighteen. Extremely low scores were 0-1; 2-3 was
low; 4-5 borderline; 6-7 high; and 8-9 extremely high.
Among the 54 items, nine items are included for each of the
six scales with scores resulting from 0 to 54.

The FIRO-B, a group of six ordinal level Guttman
scales, does not measure quantity of behavior, but rather
kinds of behavior and range of behavior that the respondent
perceives as characteristic of the way he/she behaves. The
proper statistic for measuring consistency of a Guttman
Scale is the coefficient of reproducibility. To accept a
scale as reliable it must achieve a score of 0.9. The mean
reproducibility score for all scales was .94 based upon a
mean N of 1543. Test-retest reliability ranged from .71 to
.82 on the six scales (Ryan, 1977).

Chapter IV

Findings and Data Analysis

Introduction

The data presented in this chapter focused on understanding the power of leadership vision, how it was interpreted by and transformed the leader's management team into a synergistic force which produced more than the members could produce independently. In-depth interviews and relational assessment data sought a deeper understanding of the process through which teams achieved high performance. The role of leader vision in this process, involving the interaction between the management team and their leader, was explored. This data was compiled from research involving twelve members, who over the course of a six year period comprised the leadership team of a temporary employment firm. Three teams were established and dissolved during the last year of this six year period. The major areas of study for the success and disbandment of the teams were their interpretation of the leader's vision, their personal goals, and the interactive process between the leader and the team members as it relates to the corporate

vision. The longevity of these team members ranged from nine months to six years.

The data analyzed included interviews conducted with all of the past and present team members as well as their FIRO-B assessment results. The data analysis for each team focused upon the member's perception of the leader's vision, the leader's involvement with the team members, their personal goals in relation to the vision, and the identified components necessary in achieving an understanding of the leader's vision.

The identity of the corporation and the team members was protected throughout the data analysis. Factors which may identify the organization or its members were altered for this purpose. The actual names of participants, the corporation and geographic locations were not used and alternate identifiers were substituted for the purpose of anonymity.

Context

Situated in the Southeast, Alexis County is the sixth largest county in the state. Approximately 50% of the labor force is in manufacturing, primarily textiles. Mirroring national trends, there has been a growth in the number of jobs in the service industry. In the decade 1970-1980, the county population grew by 9.5%. Today, the approximate population is 170,000 and is expected to grow by 11% between

1980 and 2000. Bordering progressive Morrison County boasting Tarleton, the largest city in the state, Alexis County is an attractive 'bedroom' community. Residents can work in Tarleton, enjoy the cultural and entertainment benefits of the larger city, but escape city living and higher taxes.

Thomas Staffing is located on the main street of the largest city in Alexis County. The main office is housed in a striking historic building which the corporation renovated in an effort to revitalize the downtown area. The company boasts of nine other offices located within a 40 mile radius of the main office. Eight of the offices are located in towns smaller than the main office location. The locations were chosen with a downtown, main street preference near bus routes which offered convenience to temporary employee workers.

The corporation began as a permanent placement firm with the current president as one of the two active recruiters. The expansion into the temporary employment market had its beginning in 1984. The temporary component of the corporation recruited temporary employees and placed them in temporary positions with both manufacturing and service oriented industries. Sales representatives solicited job orders from organizations in the community. Job orders were requests for a certain number of temporaries needed to complete a particular job or staff a facility.

The per hour fee charged to the organization for the temporary's work was designed to include the fees for recruiting, payroll expenses, and benefits for the temporary workers in these positions. The temporary was actually employed by Thomas Staffing; therefore, benefits and liabilities of employment were absorbed by the temporary firm. Service coordinators recruited the temporary employees, conducted intake interviews, and determined their suitability for the job orders. The profitability of the corporation was based on the number of hours the temporaries worked in the other organizations. Thomas Staffing services two clients; the temporaries working for them who are placed in other companies and the organizations which buy the services of the temporary worker.

The company expanded from one main office to ten offices between 1984 and 1991. This expansion divided the corporation into three divisions. Each division had a division manager responsible for a geographic area and its development.

Corporate President

The President and Chief Executive Officer of Thomas Staffing began the corporation as a result of the development of differing visions between him and his partners in another permanent placement firm.

His idea was that temporary employees who could fill positions for short periods of time would be an answer to the peaks and valleys of production needs in manufacturing organizations. This vision was not shared by the team of which he was a member. He recalled his separation from the larger firm:

> When I was in the other firm, a minority stockholder, I saw and felt like temp was the coming thing, that it would iron out some of the peaks and valleys of the recruiting cycle as far as feast and famine on cash flows. That temps was a different business, but related enough and offered something that permanent does not. They compliment each other, even though most of those firms getting into temp are letting the perm part die. So that was a goal even before that. So when I left the other organization part of the plan was to have that type of business. The plan had changed in the course of that business. I just had a partnership that did not share my vision and whenever that became absolute, I left.

As his vision became increasingly different from other partners, he left the firm and moved to Alexis County where he began a new permanent placement firm with a new partner. He became an active recruiter for permanent placements in the manufacturing area.

He moved to a small town with close connection to a large metropolitan city some twenty miles away. Two years later he began his temporary employment business. He described the vision of his temporary employment firm as one which would be profitable:

> Make lots of money. I am clear about that. I think I am
> a pretty decent guy with a pretty decent value
> system. The bottom line in deciding whether or not
> you run a good business is whether you make money. You
> can service the poor, you can beneficial seven ways to
> Sunday, but if you do not make money then you do not
> get to operate. So I wanted to make money. As a matter
> of fact, that is a part of the drive now to expand the
> business. The plan has traditionally been to expand by
> reproducing which we have already done. If you add
> enough of those on you have a pretty decent business.

The vision he stated was a very concrete one, an organization which would be profitable. The measure of whether one was running a good business seemed to be measured in very concrete terms and focused on profits. Profits were measurable, and he viewed a vision as one which needed to be measured. His view of the current organization was that of a better organization than in the beginning because it was a more controlled and measured system.

> It is more measured, controlled, but it is not as
> much fun. This business can not survive with a run and
> gun attitude. You have got to have controls and you
> are giving up freedom and flexibility. But that is
> part of the trade-offs you have as you grow.

Transferring this vision of a temporary employee firm and creating this future state was a major function of the leader. A major role for the leader was to have the management team members understand the vision they were working toward. When he discussed how this vision was transferred to the team members, he appeared to have difficulty describing a specific process.

>That is one of those smoke and mirrors kind of
>things. It is a real soft kind of deal and it is not
>really measurable in my opinion. I think it is kind
>of like anything else, it is not so much what you
>say. I can tell you I stood up and showed them and
>mapped it out, that is nonsense. Vision is kind of
>like your Christian faith. If you have to tell
>somebody about it, it is not worth it. They see it
>in you, they know, they believe. You live it. It is
>not something where you put on your tool belt every
>day at 8:00 and you wash up and go home at 5:00. You
>live it. It is part of what you are and who you are;
>what you believe in. It is not something you can
>divorce yourself from or just take some time off.

His perception of the vision was something which must be experienced by the leader. He viewed it as analogous to faith. A concrete means by which the vision would be transferred to the team members did not seem evident. According to this leader, it would require the observation of behaviors, specifically, the leader's behaviors. It was evidenced in one's lifestyle. There was an integration of the vision and the self. Through the leader's interaction with others in the organization he demonstrated what he valued. The vision could not be "mapped out" eliminating a visual way for others to understand his vision.

The vision could only be believed and experienced by those with whom the leader interacted. The team with which he began the organization was one who seemed to understand and "buy in" to the vision. He did not, however, find the same type of "buy in" with the organization's team of today. This team was one which competed with other temporary organizations, moving the focus from their own organization

to the competitor. This created a situation dominated by a self-fulfilling prophecy. He saw the current organization as falling short of the "run and gun" team who could not be beaten. The focus of the first team was targeted on the corporate vision and the awareness of the competition was almost nonexistent. He described the first team as focused and determined.

> What we had was a bunch of people with an attitude
> of 'you could not get beat'. Somebody said we were
> a bunch of kamikaze pilots. We would fly against
> anything. I mean you could not kill us. And you
> could not because we did not know any better. We
> were just having so much fun we never knew that the
> rest of it was not just going fall right into place.

He described the first team as one which developed when he was directly involved in hiring and had high levels of interaction with them. During that time the focus was to hire those with similar values and ethics to those held by the organization. The goal was to add members who reflected his values and ethics, therein reflecting the values of the organization.

> I cannot be there with all of them and that is why
> it is important to hire people with the right kind of
> values. I want them to make decisions and not worry
> about the decision I would make. I want them to
> make their own decision. That is the issue of building
> the team. Building the team of quality and values.
> Quality of the individual and the values they bring. I
> look for quality of the individual, the attitude. If
> you have a good attitude and the desire, we can
> basically train what we need.

There also seemed to be a sense of independence. He wanted
team members who could think for themselves and make
decisions on their own. This attitude was essential for the
organization to cultivate the type of individual they
needed. The functional aspects of the job were not as
important to him as the attitude and values the member
brought to the organization. Hence, it seemed essential, if
one was to be successful in this company, that the values
upon which decisions were based were similar to those of the
leadership. The values expressed throughout the interview
were critical for understanding the demands of the leader.
There was an intolerance of diversity of values and ethics.
Several of the values discussed were related to
independence; independent thinking, independent action and
independent decision making. Examining the type of person
he looked for in his organization, he described a
combination of characteristics.

> .....it is a combination I admire in people in and
> out of the organization. That is independence and
> responsibility together. Independence of action and
> the responsibility for the consequences of that. I
> want to be independent and I am willing to be
> responsible. You can categorize it as hard heads. I
> like hard heads. You know where you stand with them.
> You have something to address. You can sit and talk to
> them about what's going on and why you differ and how
> you might be able to consense on a solution. I love
> hard heads. They think they have God's truth in their
> pocket and they tell you that and then take
> responsibility for their opinion.

There was no patience with the compliant members of the organization. There were appropriate times for compliance, but the member who simply wanted to follow orders was not tolerated.

> They are a bunch of lap dogs. They do anything to please, right or wrong, without any conviction or purpose. Just tell me what to do and I will do it. ......if you are part of this team.....you are going to have to jump out and make a decision.

The compliant members did not survive for a substantial length of time in this organization. The organization was based on a "bias toward action." Action was the focus in almost all situations and was highly valued by the leader. Processing was not valued over all, unless it lead to action in the present moment. Those who were active and constantly moving forward were of highest value. Creative members were also valued in contrast to those who chose to merely duplicate successful actions and relied on that type of assurance.

Membership on a team involved contribution and growth. "Becoming more and better" was a requirement for membership on this leader's team. The ability to reflect the leader's values was a demand and expectation on each member. These values included independence, creativity, action, growth, change, commitment, and quality. Membership on the corporate team required action and commitment, a commitment through "thick and thin." The commitment was extended

automatically. It was the responsibility of each member to
grow and become more and better. The type of commitment he
encouraged was toward both personal and professional growth.
Actually, he demanded it. Each member was expected to grow
toward "world class." He defined this as "constantly
improving." He continued to discuss the value of personal
growth and professional growth.

> I do not have jobs here. I have careers,
> opportunities. You have a right to talk about how
> this company should improve. You have a
> responsibility beyond the right to talk about it;
> attitudinally, functionally. You have a
> responsibility to continue your education. The right
> says you have the privilege, responsibility says you
> are supposed to do it. Responsibility demands action.

Change was part of the growth and the commitment to
becoming more and better. He referred to maintaining the
status quo as "negative."

> If you are not growing you are rotting. I don't
> understand status quo. The only thing I ever intend to
> institutionalize is change. Everything changes.

This leader was best characterized by references to the
values he expressed. Even though he demanded independence,
he was well in control of those who worked for him. He
demanded commitment; however, the commitment was to one's
personal growth and the organization would benefit as a
result.

As the teams are summarized in the following research, each will reference the values and key expectations of the leader and how those values were interpreted by team members. The vision of growth and profitability as well as becoming a world class organization seems to lack a concrete image and process with the exception of profit.

The essence of the vision was to fulfill a recognized market niche and create profits that allow the organization to continue to grow and duplicate. The missing element of this vision seemed to be the specific steps toward its accomplishment. This missing element would present a difficulty which was not easily overcome by the three teams he has led over the last six years.

A perception of the leader will be established through which each team's triumphs and perceived failures will be analyzed. Each team will be presented separately. However, it is necessary to point out that the teams were not disbanded in their entirety. Each team had members who remained becoming the foundation of the next team. As each team was examined, close attention was paid to four areas of their comments. These areas included their interpretation of the vision, their personal goals, their interaction with the leader, and their experience as a member of the team.

Team One

This team was the first team to be formed in the development of Thomas Staffing. All members of the team were in place by 1986. The membership included the corporate president, sales manager, service manager, operations manager, and administration manager. The length of time with the company ranged from three to eight years.

This team had the advantage of forging new ground as they began the growth of the temporary side of the organization. Two members began as members of the permanent part of the corporation, however, the temporary business was novel to all members.

The president described this first team and the vision they shared with him as one of commitment and desire.

> I think there was just a team that understood. There was a team that had their own vision of what the company ought to be like, what it ought to be doing, what the people in it ought to be able to do. There was a lot of buying in. There was a lot of belief in those people. There was a value system and a mutual community vision that was easy to buy in to. There was not a person in here that 90% of their time was spent thinking about what was going on or how to do it better. If you wanted a vision of a small based, world class, service organization, that is who we were. Everybody lived it.

This team exhibited the values, the creativity, and the belief in the vision the president expected of his team. His description confirmed the existence of individual visions. Each member held a mental picture of their desired

future state for themselves and the organization. The

president perceived the existence of a community vision

which was shared by his team.

The members commented on their individual

interpretation of the future state of the corporation.

> I think it was his vision to grow and make money,
> but he also wanted us to do what's right. His
> favorite saying is 'bias toward action'. If you do
> that then everything else is going to fall into
> place. He always encouraged us to make decisions. If
> you are out there on the firing line and you have got a
> decision to make you make it whether it is right or
> wrong. I am giving you the authority to make it. But
> you go ahead and do what you think is right and I will
> back you up.

This member referred to the vision as "his" vision and

how "he" preferred "his" team members to respond. Another

member's comments regarding the vision evidenced a greater

sense of ownership: "To build the company. We started this

small thing and we were going to build it." The growth

vision fulfilled personal needs for other members: "I

definitely adopted the growth vision as mine. I also wanted

to see it grow, but for different reasons." Another member

expresses the human element of the vision: "Growth. To

grow the company and the people. That was one of the things

the company did; grow people."

The vision of the leader was interpreted by the first

team as growth for the people and the company. The

profitability mentioned by the leader did not appear

predominant in the interpretation of the vision by the team members.

The interpretation of the vision was similar to the personal goals of the members. As one member expressed his personal goal:

> An opportunity to grow personally. To learn more about the way businesses operate, more about personnel, more about temps. In the back of my mind I had this goal that I'll have my own business one day too. I'll soak all this in to see how this gets done. The more the company grows the more I grow personally.

Another member saw an opportunity to be part of something successful:

> My goal has been to make this company successful and be proud of a company that I can say I work for. To see the growth and profitability. To be part of that.

Personal growth was important to another member:

> In looking at the company I saw an opportunity and room for growth. A lot of creativity. It may have been we were all doing this together.

The need to achieve and the need to be valued was a personal goal for another:

> To achieve. To seize whatever opportunity there is out there. I just want to grow to where I can be of some value in all areas of my life.

Another member saw an opportunity to use her talents:

> A freedom to use my own talents, but they contributed
> to the whole. You felt like you could sell the way you
> wanted to. If you had an idea you threw it out and you
> were not worried about being crashed on. You took it
> and ran with it.

These goals seemed to be closely connected with the
vision the members interpreted for the corporation. There
was a strong need to grow personally and professionally
through membership in the organization. These goals
reflected several qualities which the leader expressed as
being important for members of his team.

Initially, this team had a high level of involvement
with the corporate president. The company was small and the
team interacted with him frequently.

> At first he gave us freedom, backing and cheered us on.
> He joined in the success. He helped a lot. He led and
> he made you excited about the company.

This style of leadership seemed to have a positive effect on
the members of the team. As one member commented regarding
the impact of his interaction:

> He was the vision and the company. If you saw him
> and got to spend some time with him you knew what
> you were working toward. He did not get involved in
> the day to day. He had the bigger picture. He had
> to be there to stir the pot. Who you were came from
> him. He broke tension. He could just talk to everyone
> and it was the little dose everyone needed. He just
> spent some time talking and listening and everyone felt
> like all this sweat and blood was worth it.

A comment by the president confirmed this need for his involvement as the guardian of the vision. "They see it in you, they know, they believe. You live it. It is part of what you are and who you are."

A member of Team One commented on the need for the leader's focus,

> I think it was when (the president) was giving us our focus or he failed to give us our focus. When he stepped over and dabbled in other things that was when we lost it.

During this time of high leader involvement members saw their membership as "fun." A comment made several times by members was: "It was fun to be committed." As one member commented, "There was high energy, enthusiasm and commitment." Energy and feedback were echoed by another member,

> I liked the energy. You knew what to do and you did it. There was constant feedback. We could really generate it (energy) real well.

One member observed the cohesiveness of the team,

> It had closeness. The daily communication was there. Everybody pitched in. We knew where we wanted to go. It was fun. It was fun to be committed.

The high level of information flow was expressed by another member, "There was camaraderie. We talked all the time. We were open and free to talk to each other." The team was

energetic and enjoyed their membership. The "feedback was daily" and the "information was free flowing." One member referred to the members of the team as a group of "110 percenters." Another member referred to her membership as satisfying:

> It was fun. You enjoyed your work. It was a feeling of accomplishment. Every day and every week. There was a feeling of camaraderie. We released someone because she did not have the same goals as we did. She would leave with job orders unfilled and we just did not do that. She was an 8 to 5er.

The president became less involved with Team One as the team progressed with the vision of growth. The impact of his absence was expressed by one member as significant:

> When he stepped over and dabbled in other things, that is when we lost it (the focus). He was probably still giving it but we felt how did he know where we should go. You are just telling us to do that, you do not know.

Another member echoed the change which resulted from the president's absence:

> He stepped aside for a while. He got involved in other things. Part of the personality changed because he was not there. It just did not work as well because he was not there.

Another member perceived his absence as an interest in other areas:

> At that point he had his hands in a lot of other things
> as far as what he wanted to do. His interests were not
> just in the temporary business anymore. It showed me
> he had other interests and was not just there for us.
> At that point, it did not really affect me, but it made
> a difference. His not being there showed something.
> At least the way I felt about the team. In one way it
> was good because it cleared the way for us to grow more
> too. It seemed he was leaving this to us to do and he
> trusts us to do this and do it well.

The focus seemed more removed as one member commented:

> It (focus) had to have been side tracked. Just because
> it seemed more removed and that was different from
> earlier. There had been daily involvement. He was
> there to make sure it all went the way he wanted it to
> go.

The absence of the president had an impact on the team

in several areas. As one member commented:

> The time he was gone and doing other things hurt us.
> He brought some type of balance to the team. He did
> not restrict us or control us, his attitude and his
> energy just stirred it and give it energy. Not by
> being the head of the company, but his attitude. The
> way he leads. He led very informally. He led by
> setting the tone.

One member saw it as the beginning of a different team which

did not include the president and information was reserved

for members:

> I remember when we decided that we should not tell (the
> president) everything. I agreed we should not tell
> him, but that must have been a turning point. It was
> not strategic information, just irritating information.
> Maybe that was the beginning of a different team.
> Maybe the smaller team was not as risk taking as the
> one that included (the president). We knew that

certain things could not be said or done without some
type of repercussion.

Affection scores showed that the members preferred others to
initiate close confidential relationships. (See Table 3)
The need for these types of interaction appeared much
greater than for the superficial type indicated in the
inclusion area scores. The scores suggested that three team
members did not reveal the need for personal interaction in
their behavior toward others which may have been confusing
to other team members. A high level of caution in personal
areas was indicated by the low expressed scores. Trust
relating to personal issues was low. At the time the team
members resigned from the team, trust levels were low.
However, the trust level was higher if others initiated the
closeness.

Another member commented on the development of the new
team: "The four of us were kind of cocky. The idea was that
we can do it ourselves."

One vision became several visions as the new team
developed. One member commented on these differing visions:

> A lot of people had different visions as we got larger.
> Part of that might have been that it was obvious (the
> president) had separate visions. He had others.

The president reacted to these visions by becoming re-
involved with the team on a regular basis. As one member
commented: "We might have been yanked back a bit and he

said, 'No, we are going this way'." The re-involvement

brought about several changes. As one member commented

about the change in the vision:

> It became more you have to do this and it became more
> numbers. Numbers of what the company was doing.
> It was building a company that was more about income
> and outgo.

Another change was the difference in the freedom of the

team:

> It became more a feeling of a dictatorship. We would
> have meetings and go in to talk, then all the decisions
> would come from (the president). The freedom to do it
> our way was gone.

A strong similarity was evident among team members in

the area of control. (See Table 2) The scores suggested a

need to be at the upper end of the organizational hierarchy.

All members were willing to accept responsibility and

welcomed opportunities for leadership roles. The ability to

make decisions was high and a tendency toward dominating

others was indicated. The high scores suggested a need to

influence others and a high need to achieve among the

members. These scores indicated members had a strong need

to be in control of their own destiny. The scores showed a

high level of independence and suggested a high need for

autonomy.

Changes were evident in the area of accountability. A

team member commented:

> We talked about goals, but they were never on paper.
> The goals became demands. We lost something because we
> wrote everything down. Everything. I understand the
> need to do that, but that is when the company lost
> its personality. That is why we lost the drive,
> attitude and the energy to get there.

The changes in accountability also brought about

thoughts of failure. A team member commented:

> If we do not reach this by a certain point in time then
> you failed. We could not fail before. Being pulled by
> the positives is great fun, but when you work to avoid
> the bad it hurts and it did.

The goals became expectations by the president. This was

different than the goal orientation the team had become

accustomed to receiving from the president. Another member

commented: "An expectation is a demand, what you have to

do. A goal is something you go after."

The future vision also changed to a present moment

focus. One member commented:

> We were not concentrating on the future any more. The
> concentration was on the past. What went wrong, rather
> than how to do it better.

The changes increased accountability of members and added

structure to the team. The reinvolvement of the leader

focused on developing a present moment orientation for the

team. The demands of the president were stronger and more

overt. These demands on team members were more concrete;

relating to numbers of hours and profits. As one member
stated:

> There were all these creative minds with all this
> energy and survival was not what they thrived on. If
> you throw survival and numbers at them, they will roll
> over and die. But look at how they left, one right
> after another they quit. I do not know if you can
> recapture that energy ever again.

The reinvolvement of the president and the change in the
structure of the team created confusion among team members.
One member recalled:

> ....things started to change and I did not know where
> his goals were anymore. We were not quite sure how he
> would take things anymore. Maybe it was his
> frustration. He wanted something to happen and it was
> not happening as fast as he wanted.

Another member commented on the change:

> We were going downhill and gathering moss. The
> frustration caused turnover. The pressure cost us a
> lot of people. You set yourself and your team up for
> failure when the goal is to increase in a saturated
> market. I think the goals should have been changed.

The structuring of the team and the new focus cost the
president three of his four team members on the first team.
One member who left the company remarked:

> When people start telling me what to do and how to do
> it, then I start losing interest. I have had enough
> and I am ready to do something else. I felt like there
> was nothing there for me anymore and no where to go in
> the company. I was not having fun. I was not bringing
> anything to the table.

All three of the members who left Team One commented on the
lack of enjoyment they gained from being on the team.
Another member who resigned from the team commented:

> It got to the point it was not enjoyable to me. There
> was not a team I really felt a part of. It changed a
> lot. It changed from the 'go getter' small company to
> 'we are getting larger and we have to put this and that
> into place.' We need the money so we have to do this.
> It took a lot of fun out of it. Working twelve hours a
> day is no problem when you are having fun, but when you
> are not enjoying it and there is no one there to spur
> you on. It takes the enthusiasm out of it. ....things
> were bearable when we were all doing it together, but
> when we were not it made a difference.

The absence of a feeling of membership was confirmed by the
team's FIRO-B inclusion results which indicated the majority
of the respondents were very selective about with whom their
associations took place. (See Table 1) The need to belong
and participate in a team situation appeared borderline for
the majority of the members responding. The scores reflect
a borderline level of commitment to the team. The needs
expressed by these respondents indicated that the need for
membership and belonging was also borderline.

Summary

Team One initially had a higher level of involvement
with the president. He set the tone and gave direction.
The vision was clear in the minds of all of the members.
There was a high level of alignment between the leader's
vision and the personal visions of the team members. The

values which were stressed as important to the leader were all present in the members of Team One. These members were independent thinkers, took independent actions, made decisions independently, and were interested in their personal and professional growth. The members were innovative and creative and could be classified as the "hard heads." Being committed to themselves as well as the organization, these members were action oriented and thrived on change. The structuring of the organization did not allow the freedom which was conducive to this type of team. All but one member of Team One has left the corporation since the restructuring.

The FIRO-B results indicated the team members had a high need for control. Autonomy and independence were highly valued. The need to achieve and control over their own destiny was stifled by the renewed control of the leader.

Team One can best be summarized by a team member's comment concerning the team's interaction during the development of the mission statement:

> I remember we could not agree on anything when we worked on it. We wanted to communicate who we were and how we do it. We do it to make a profit and we do it because we enjoy it. I think it should have been shortened to we just do it to make a profit and if we have fun doing it that is great. The purpose of the mission statement was to show we have fun and yes we make money to boot. But that mission certainly changed. We are going to make money.

Team Two

The second team was a blend of old and new members.
The new members were the first to experience the process of
attaining membership in an ongoing established team. Two of
the six new members were not novices to the temporary
employment field. They had several years of experience in
the service industry, specifically temporary personnel.
They brought experience to the team but were new to the
Thomas Staffing team and the vision of its leader.

The team included the president, his administrative
assistant, operations manager, administrative manager, and
three area managers. The area managers were responsible for
three geographic areas in which the company had expanded
during the high growth period under the direction of the
first team. This team was described by the leader as one in
which the willingness to make decisions was less than
desired. The president commented on Team Two's decision
making:

> The ability to make decisions was a necessity and they
> could not do it. The members kept waiting for all the
> information out there before making a decision.

These team members needed a great deal of information by
which to make the "right" decision. They chose to wait for
all the information to be gathered before taking any action.

FIRO-B inclusion results indicated, overall, a high
need for membership and belonging. (See Table 1) Commitment

and participation needs tended to be high among this team. A high need for recognition among the team members was indicated along with a strong need to be accepted by other team members. This team seemed to be highly committed and ready to participate and become involved at all levels of the corporation. Two of the team members were more selective regarding with whom the interaction and participation took place. The needs for membership and belonging by the new members of Team Two were not met by the existing team members. As one member commented:

> I think there was a lot of resentment with the second team. The first team was such a close knit group and they protected each other so much that when the new ones came in they could not allow them in and it never got off to a good start. They had some good capabilities on the second team, but there was never acceptance. You resent the person who replaced the person you liked.

A "bias toward action", which was typical of this leader's style, did not allow time to gather the amount of data which would have been comfortable for Team Two members. The president commented on the area managers of this team:

> I never saw a commitment to the corporate vision. Individually yes, but corporately no. Retrospectively, I do not think they understood it, but they should have. Opportunity was there. Maybe we come from different directions and all that, but no matter. There was no innovation. There was major compliance. They did what they were told to do. They were quality people. Generally, we take a long time with those types. They ought to be able to carry the day, but do not.

The team members were somewhat diversified in their interpretations of the vision of the corporation and the president. One member commented:

> I have my way of trying to get to the ultimate vision of being profitable and successful, and he has his way of getting there. I do not know what his way of getting there is, but I see getting there through people.

Another member interpreted the vision as productivity:

> The focus is productivity. Pride. To do the right thing at the right time. Growing within the company as the company grows. To make the company the best it can be. I see him wanting to go into other areas and spin this off.

Another member shared the vision of moving the corporation in other directions: "To be profitable and debt free so he can go on with other ventures. He has new goals." However, another member did not have a clear sense of the vision:

> The big picture I heard was you have to cut costs, bring things in and get the hours up. I am sure the vision was getting the hours up. I was never clear on our vision for the future. If it was told to me I missed it. I needed details and the leadership may not have had a lot of patience with that. I never heard the 'how' or the 'what'.

Two other members shared a similar confusion about the vision for the future. One member commented,

> I do not know if I ever knew what the focus was. I do not know whether I did not understand what the focus was or I could not get a clear answer.

The vision was interpreted differently for each member of Team Two. The means by which the vision would be achieved was not evident. The vision was not clear for several members of the team. Profitability appeared often among the vision statements.

The interpretation of the vision by the members of Team Two seemed to guide their personal goals. One member expressed a need for a direction from the leader to define her personal goals:

> To get the office profitable as quickly as possible. I wanted to do whatever the president wanted me to do, honestly. To do a good job. My vision was, if that is what they need me to do then that is what I will do. Whatever it took to do a good job. If that was to go out and dig ditches, I would have to go out and dig ditches.

A sense of ownership was expressed by another:

> I have always wanted to have something that I felt like was a little bit of my own. I was not just working for someone else, that I was doing something for me. I get a sense of feeling good and that is important to me. It is like I know I am going to grow up someday, but I do not know what I am going to look like when I grow up. I know it is coming, but not what it will look like.

Another member wanted to be a part of the company's success:

> I look at the company as my company. So anything that happens affects me personally. I have no strong goals of moving up. I want to be there an be a vital part of the company. To be able to realize the success of the company. To be part of the company being successful. There is a self-gratification. It makes me feel good

for myself and the president. I feel I am doing it for him.

The goals seemed to be reconstructions of the members interpretation of the vision. There was a strong need for members to define themselves by the needs of the company. There was an overall compliance of members evident which reflected the will of the company. The need for a continual direction from the leader was evident among team members. The leader defined the goals for most of the members of Team Two.

This team's FIRO-B control results indicated a high need to lead, influence others, and take on responsibility through authority positions by two of its members. (See Table 2) The score was high enough to take on a compulsive quality. The results indicated the amount of control the membership overall was willing to allow others to have was low for half of the members. Three members were more willing to allow others to assume responsibility and avoid making decisions. Two members were more willing to share responsibility and control as indicated by the similarity of expressed and wanted scores.

The interaction with the president seemed to be a key factor in understanding the vision for Team Two. One member commented,

    I think the vision comes across verbally. He is so
    strong and believes so much in himself and what he is

doing that it comes across to other people. From there you know where he stands.

The verbal transference of the vision is evident from this member's observations. Another member expressed a similar need for interaction with the president:

> I did miss the weekly management meetings we had in his office. Those were stopped. But I had a better sense of what he wanted and how he wanted it done by those meetings with him. I got a much better sense of him then.

Another member observed the issue of time with the president:

> Because of the turnover it takes a while to understand what he really wants. There are some who have enough direct contact with him that they know.

The president had become reinvolved with Team One and remained involved until Team Two was intact and an active operations manager was in place. The operations manager was involved in the day to day functions of the corporation. The involvement with the leader, however, continued to seem vital to these team members.

When Team Two experienced the disengagement process from the president, they seemed to have difficulty identifying a framework for making decisions. One member recalled:

> All the numbers never made any sense to me. What it would take to make my division profitable never made

sense. ....nor do I know that (the president) ever said to me 'this is fine, let's go forward'. The hierarchy changed and there was very little contact with him.

Several members expressed similar comments regarding "doing the right thing." The "right thing" referred to what was right for the company and its clients. The president commented:

> Generally, if you are trying to sincerely do the right thing, errors are forgiven. Now, if you make an error four or five times it is probably not going to be forgiven that fourth or fifth time. Building the team of quality and value; quality of the individual and the values they bring.

The organization maintained its present moment focus which began with Team One. The vision statements echoed the attention given to hours, productivity, and profit. One member commented: "If the hours were up you were successful. If they were down you were not." Another member saw a similar focus:

> Survival more than anything. To take a piece of the market. Let's get it going now. It is a crisis for survival.

The vision became present moment focused rather than oriented toward developing a desirable future state. One member commented: "We concentrate on things needed right now and things that need to be worked on now." Similar

comments echoed this focus: "I am sure the focus was getting the hours up. I felt I was shoveling against the tide."

The president referred to this period as a time when "the vision had to be put on the back burner for a while." This diversion from the vision was interpreted by several members as a "lack of patience" on the part of the president. One member commented:

> I did not see this commitment to his people I saw before. If you made a mistake you were gone. I thought 'who is this guy, his patience with people mistakes is not too lengthy'. He was not giving the commitment to them. It tells them not to make any mistakes. Be careful.

Another member referred to the change in commitment: "We were not growing people anymore."

The FIRO-B affection results indicated the expressed need for close and intimate relationships was consistently low for this team. (See Table 3) The trust level of this team was low. The bonding of the team as related to sharing personal goals and future desires was low. However, wanted scores indicated a higher level of intimacy if the relationship was initiated by another team member. The low expressed need for closeness and the higher wanted need for closeness created some degree of confusion for other members. Overall, the cohesiveness of the team was low.

Summary

Team Two is best summarized as a compliant team.
Personal visions were defined by the corporate needs. The
consistent theme was survival. The "do it now" focus of the
leadership did not allow a patience for developing a
committed team and the bonding necessary for trust to
develop among the members. The team members who were new to
the corporation found it difficult to develop a clear sense
of the vision to guide their decision making process.

"Lots of procedures", was commented by one member as he
referred to the changes from Team One to Team Two. The
commitment was more company oriented rather than an
orientation toward camaraderie. The focus on the growth of
team members was reduced and patience was limited. This
lack of patience may have been attributed to the need of the
president "to get on with other things."

The "right thing" decision making orientation may have
been a hindrance to those with a high need for details and
information. The need for information, coupled with the
"fear of making any mistakes" may have resulted in the
thwarted decision process for this team.

These team members were committed to the company and
the vision was secondary to the commitment. This vision was
not a shared vision, rather, it was an accepted one. The
need for approval from the leader was a high motivator for
these members.

Contrasted with Team One, Team Two did not have the alignment or shared vision with the president. The involvement with the president was limited and the energy and enthusiasm was directly associated with the approval of the president. The structure which began at the later stages of Team One was fully functional with Team Two. The structured corporation attracted a new type of team member who enjoyed policy and procedure. The "run and gun" philosophy of Team One was replaced by structure and procedure. The president commented on this shift in philosophy:

> Sometimes when you change something the pendulum swings
> too far out and you become more driven by the process.
> My operations manager is more structured and this place
> is loaded with structured people. The run and gun
> of the small company will never be again.

Team Three

A few months prior to the release of two members of Team Two, the team had been restructured resulting in the creation of two teams. This restructuring created a corporate team and a management team. The corporate team included the president, the operations manager, the administrative manager, and an administrative assistant for the president. The management team was led by the operations manager and included the three regional managers. The corporate team was located in close proximity to the

president. The management team and the operations manager
were located on a separate floor. All members of the
corporate team included in Team Two remained through this
transition process.

The interaction with the president described by this
team was minimal. Two of the three managers were new to the
management team, however, they were not new to the company.
All of the managers had been part of the company during the
period of high involvement by the president. They had
experienced some degree of interaction with him over their
term with the company. This team was the first to
experience the complete restructuring of the hierarchy and
an almost complete absence of the president.

The vision of the corporation internalized by the
members of Team Three was varied in its interpretation. One
member was unclear about the vision:

> I am not sure what they want. I am not sure where they
> are going. There has been a void in this company.
> (Member of team one) was a doer. A helping hand for
> everyone. They made things happen. They gave us the
> steps. That was a key loss for them. You have to have
> someone who is not afraid to do things. To take a
> chance and make a decision. There is no follow up
> anymore.

The member of Team One referred to by this Team Three member
was mentioned by all three of the managers on this team.
Every member expressed a similar view of the loss of
direction and the action orientation. This team member

echoed the first evidence of a "we/they" concept in the
organization. Another member commented on her
interpretation of the vision,

> I think it has gotten lost somewhere. I do not think
> we have a direction right now except to survive. We do
> not know what to do. We are struggling along.

The new members showed both a need for direction and
information. FIRO-B inclusion results indicated half the
team needed a strong sense of belonging and togetherness.
(See Table 1) Their need for commitment and participation
was high and a great deal was gained from team interaction.
Two members indicated a general withdrawal from the team and
did not seem to want or need cohesiveness. The team members
with higher scores wanted to be included in as much of the
day to day operation of the business as possible. The need
to include others and share information was low for one half
of the team members.

Another member, who had been with the company during
the time of Team One, saw a vision for the company which was
more clearly defined:

> Growth and to open more offices. I think he has
> plans to go into other geographic areas and open
> offices. But growth is the vision I see with the
> company overall. The focus now is on what the company
> can produce.

The absence of the involvement with the president
appeared to have an effect on the team members. One member

commented:

> I do not ever see him anymore. He is upstairs. He has
> gotten away from it now. He was the excitement. You
> could tell if he was happy about things. He did not
> feel he was any better than I was. He could get on the
> level I was on. I appreciated that. I felt more
> equal. I do not think he knows the people now. He
> does me, but not the others. I do not know the ones
> upstairs. They are another department. The others
> downstairs do not feel part of the company. It is just
> a job for them.

The involvement of the president appeared to be valuable for

this team. The separation of the corporation by the

"upstairs" and "downstairs" departments was a issue for Team

Three members.

FIRO-B affection results indicated that the trust level

appeared consistently low on this team. (See Table 3)

Bonding had not occurred and the need for it did not appear

high. The personal levels of team membership, as in

personal goals or desires would not be shared. The scores

indicated a very cautious team in the development of

relationships with other team members. Most of the team was

very selective about whom they choose to develop deeper

relationships. The cohesiveness of the group was low and

the need for a change in the team was not evident from

wanted affection scores. The scores indicated a high level

of caution among team members and closeness of members was

not evident.

The transition in leadership was not complete for these team members. The vision from the operations manager was not clear and a sense direction continued to be sought from the corporate president.

The integration of the leader's vision and member's personal goals was apparent in the comment from one of the members:

> I believe in the company. I believe in the president's philosophy. The opportunity for growth. I like what I do. I like juggling different things. I like problem solving and growing. I like the challenge. Even when we are doing more hours, I still will not be satisfied. It is continued growth. Continuing to do more. I would not be happy if it were not that kind of attitude of more is better. It is what keeps me going. I have new opportunities for growth and education. Learning how to do my job better. Being able to make decisions and open more offices. I want an opportunity to grow in my area.

The other team members did not show this growth orientation or the integration of leader vision and personal goals.

FIRO-B control results indicated team members' scores were low with regard to the need for responsibility and the need to make decisions. (See Table 2) This created a dependent situation wherein half of the team depended on the other half of the team to decide and take responsibility for the consequences. A strong desire to be part of the leadership in the organization was expressed by one half of this team. The scores indicated a consistently low desire to be controlled by other members of the organization. Two

members indicated a high need to achieve while three other members showed a low need to achieve. Three members of this management team indicated a low need to hold a leadership position.

One member commented on her personal career goals:

> I want it for my own satisfaction. I will give 200%.
> I am committed. I want to make it go. It is not a job
> to me. It is a career. I treat it as if it was my own
> company. I believe people should do what needs to be
> done.

Another member commented on a more concrete personal goal, "I want to take a computer course. I want to learn more about the computer."

A need for information appeared to be an issue with Team Three. One member comments,

> No one tells them why it needs to be done. If it takes
> all day it has to be done. I do not understand when
> they see something needs to be done, just do it.

The need for information appears to have continued to be an issue for members of Team Three. The information needed to make decisions and take action appeared to be absent.

Summary

Team Three was seeking a direction from the leadership of the organization. The goal for the president was to restructure the organization moving the management team

under the leadership of the operations manager. The
operations manager, however, indicated some degree of
difficulty internalizing a mental picture of the president's
vision for the corporation. The operations manager was part
of the corporate team and received his focus from that team.
The vision was "placed on the back burner" and may not have
been available at the present time. The "do it now" focus
was the driving force of the corporate team and the "pull"
toward a desired future state was absent.

There had been neither the time nor the opportunity for
Team Three to venture further than the initial stages of
team development. They were not aware of the contribution
they could make to the company from a management
perspective. There was a sense of disorientation and even
though trust was evident on an individual level, the trust
within the team was not evident. Accepting responsibility
and the trust that these responsibilities would be followed
through had not developed.

Interaction with the president was completely absent in
Team Three. The transition in leadership from the president
to the operations manager had created confusion among team
members. The personal goals of Team Three members could not
be aligned due to the absence of an understanding of the
corporate vision.

Contrasting Team Three with the other two teams
revealed a need for information and an absence of

innovation. The lack of direction prevented the
independence required by the leader. The team was committed
to the corporation, however, it lacked enough identification
with, or understanding of, the vision to reach a committed
state. A general frustration among the members was becoming
evident. At the conclusion of this study, one member of
Team Three had resigned as a manager due to the confusion
and a perceived general apathy within the membership.

Findings

The results of this study revealed implications
regarding the stages of team performance outlined in Chapter
II. The findings of the three teams were processed through
these stages as a means of contrasting the three teams and
the overall research findings.

Team One, the first team formed in the corporation, had
an initially high level of involvement with the leader.
This team progressed through the six stages of team
performance. In the orientation stage, each member had a
high level of access to information and was aware of what
others were doing in the company. There was a feeling of
acceptance among all members and a sense of belonging. In
stage two, the members experienced a high level of group
trust, spontaneity, and data flow. The goals were clear,
options were clear, and the tasks were identified which led
to action. Stage four was evident from the role clarity,

decisions being made, and the beginning of teamwork. Progressively, Team One moved to stage five, implementation, where the sequence of work was clear. The work was creative and productive, obtained results, and the process was disciplined. Once it reached high performance in stage seven it was synergistic and communications were intuitive. However, upon reaching stage seven, renewal, the question arose as to why the team should continue. This stage was not resolved. The results were boredom and burnout. The members began to feel overworked and complained of boredom with the new structure and boundaries of the changing organization. Every member of Team One commented that the work ceased to be fun. It was apparent that Team One could have renewed and progressed through stage one again; however, they no longer knew why they were part of the corporation. They became disoriented, fearful of taking risks, making decisions, and experiencing failure. Mistrust developed as well as caution. Those members who remained longest began to experience feelings of apathy. This apathy contributed to irrelevant competitiveness among members. This was apparent from their comments regarding boundary issues, power issues, authority issues, fear of failure, and lack of communication.

Team Two did not progress beyond stage one. There was an apparent sense of disorientation regarding a purpose for team membership. Several members commented: "What are we

supposed to be doing?" There did not seem to be a feeling of acceptance and membership on the team. A fear of taking risks and making decisions was evident for new members. Existing team members were also disoriented when the new team formed. Trust of individuals was present, but a trust of the team as a whole did not develop. Therefore, decision making and goal clarification issues arose leading to the frustration of the leader. This was a probable reason for the dismissal of the new members of Team Two. It appeared likely that the leadership was anticipating stage six, high performance, from a team who did not progress beyond stage one of team performance.

Team Three followed a pattern similar to Team Two. The orientation stage could not be resolved and the leader's patience with the team's development through the other five stages was not evident. Goals were not clear; therefore, decision making was hampered.

The trust building of stage two was crucial to the progression through all remaining stages. The hidden concern in stage two was the expectations of other team members and more importantly the expectations of the leader. When the expectations were not clear, trust could not develop, causing information to be withheld and distorted.

It appears probable that Team One was attempting to find a new vision. The vision had been accomplished, they had grown as individuals and the organization had increased

from one office to ten offices in a wagon wheel fashion.
Once growth was achieved, these members needed a renewed
vision and a sense of direction for the team's work to
continue. The vision was not renewed. Rather, the vision
was obscured by a push to be profitable and to be stabile.
This focus with the present state of affairs and maintenance
of the vision did not provide the "pull" necessary for
members to develop a desirable future state. The sense of
vision from the leader was gone, or at the least his vision
had changed to an enhancement of the present. The need for
the vision to pull members forward and to maintain a purpose
for the individual members was dissolved. The members no
longer had a sense of purpose.

The shared vision had become individual visions in the
absence of a common purpose. A sense of competitiveness
arose among team members and trust dissipated. The issue of
ulterior motives and dedication to the task was unattended
and unresolved. The information flow was slowed, even
distorted, as the members began to distrust one another.
The motives of the leader were also suspect due in large
part to his absence and a sudden return to the team to take
charge of their direction. This return caused confusion
among the team members and there was a sense that he should
share their vision which had been continued in his absence.
The question, which the team yearned for an answer by the
leader was, "Who are you?." The team no longer had a sense

of who this leader was, what were his goals, and what did he expect from them. The communication suddenly became calculated and measured. Any information which members suspected may not gain his approval was withheld. A need to protect other members of the team developed and bonding among them became stronger. The leader did not undergo his rite of passage to rejoin the team, nor did he attempt to regain acceptance. As most leaders, he may have believed an automatic acceptance would be extended by the team. Perhaps he believed that, after all, this was his team and his company.

Lacking a purposeful way to relate to the team, members began to feel disconnected and became focused on the lack of connection. When boundaries developed and controls were tightened, members felt they were not trusted and responded with distrust toward the leader. Team members began to find no value in the team's work.

Summary

This research indicated six components which appeared to perpetuate a shared vision between the leader and his team members:

1. a high level of interaction between the leader and team members,

2. a visual means by which to picture the desired future state of the organization,

3. a need to understand how personal goals would be fulfilled through a commitment to the leader's vision,

4. a sense of mutual trust,

5. a need for information concerning the decisions of the organization,

6. a sense that the leader cared about the members as individuals.

The research findings suggested that cohesiveness was at a lower level when the leader's vision and the personal visions of the team members were not aligned. However, FIRO-B results did not show conclusive evidence of high cohesiveness among aligned members due to an absence of an aligned team. Team One was the only team with a significant number of members who had personal goal and leader vision alignment at any time. The FIRO-B results were obtained after Team One had been dissolved therefore, the scores may not be an accurate reflection of the team members needs at the time of the alignment. However, FIRO-B results indicated the need for control among members of Team One was higher than overall scores for any other team. The need for autonomy among Team One members was high as well as the need to achieve.

The research presented indicated those members who understood the leader's vision reported a high level of commitment to the organization. Team One reported a high level of commitment to the organization during the same

period they reported a high level of clarity of the leader's
vision. As the clarity of the leader's vision dissipated,
the commitment to the company decreased. As commitment
decreased, members began to resign from the corporation.
The clarity of the leader's vision was low for Team Two and
Team Three. Commitment to the organization was reported by
some of the members. However, the focus of the commitment
was following the specific directions of the leader and not
a commitment to making independent decisions and taking
responsibility for the actions and the consequences which
result from those decisions.

Table 1

<u>FIRO-B Assessment Inclusion Results For Three Teams</u>

Team	Expressed	Wanted
Team One		
1	0	0
2	7	5
3	4	0
4	4	4
Team Two		
1	0	0
2	3	6
3	4	1
4	7	6
5	7	8
6	7	5
Team Three		
1	0	0
2	4	1
3	7	8
4	7	6
5	0	0
6	7	7
7	4	7

Table 2

FIRO-B Assessment Control Results For Three Teams

Team	Expressed	Wanted
Team One		
1	6	4
2	5	6
3	4	4
4	6	2
Team Two		
1	4	1
2	1	3
3	1	1
4	4	4
5	2	3
6	6	5
Team Three		
1	4	1
2	1	1
3	2	3
4	4	4
5	2	1
6	3	3
7	1	4

Table 3

FIRO-B Assessment Affection Results For Three Teams

Team	Expressed	Wanted
Team One		
1	1	4
2	5	9
3	2	4
4	1	7
Team Two		
1	1	4
2	3	5
3	1	1
4	4	6
5	3	8
6	5	9
Team Three		
1	1	4
2	1	1
3	3	8
4	4	6
5	1	2
6	3	4
7	4	7

Chapter V

Summary, Conclusions and Implications,

and Recommendations for Further Study

Summary

The visionary component of leadership has played a

significant role in corporations over the last decade. The

visionary leader has gained both the attention and the

respect of corporate executives through the observation of

such leaders as Steven Jobs, CEO of Apple computer; Lee

Iococa, who pioneered the Chrysler comeback; and Ross Perot,

who leads EDS. The overwhelming success of these leaders

and the teams they developed to achieve their respective

visions was too obvious to be overlooked. In light of these

success stories, an increasing number of corporations began

to explore the value available to them through leader vision

and leadership teams who were willing to share that vision.

These visionaries are inspirational, transformational,

and successful by both financial and motivational measures.

The idea of a leader transformed from a belief "they were

born, not made", toward a more accepted concept advocating

that these leadership skills could be developed. The

possibility of acquiring the skills of visionary leadership

and becoming a visionary leader captured the attention of
the corporate world.

The corporate world began to take notice as the
Japanese concept of teamwork drove the country into an
economic giant which began to compete in almost every market
niche and produce a quality product competitive in any
market. Concurrently, American corporations began to
experience a decline of quality, worker productivity, worker
motivation, and job commitment. Increases in absenteeism and
turnover became more disturbing and costly. The competition
for quality employees increased and worker satisfaction
continually decreased. The extrinsic rewards did not seem
to impact the new work ethic nor the new American worker.
Competition in a global economy demanding a highly skilled
and highly committed workforce turned corporate executives
toward the evident success of the work team and the
visionary leader.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the
interactive process between leaders and followers in an
organization through an examination of the similarity of
their visions. Investigation of these visions offered
insight for a heightened understanding of the leader's
interaction with his team of followers. The vision of the
leader would be transferred and adopted by the leader's team
members through a shared personal vision with the leader.
The performance of the team would be enhanced by the

leader's vision becoming congruent with the personal vision of each team member. The interest of the team member and the interest of the leader could be better served enhancing the performance of the organization as a whole.

Research indicated that the vision was an essential component of leadership. Shared vision establishes an alignment between workers and leaders. This vision pulls followers toward action and creates a unique and dynamic synergy through an aligned and enrolled team. These committed members bring energy, passion and excitement to the team.

Three questions were addressed through this research:

1. Were there significant differences in a leadership team's cohesiveness as a function of leader vision alignment with the personal visions of team members as measured by the three areas of the FIRO-B?

2. What were the components necessary for the process of alignment or shared vision to occur between the management team members' vision and the leader's vision?

3. Did understanding of the corporate leader's vision impact employee commitment to the organization as reported by team members and measured by turnover among these members?

The population for this study consisted of three management teams in a temporary organization. Twelve team members were part of an in-depth interviewing process. The

study included all members of the corporation's three
different management teams existing since the foundation of
the corporation. Each team member was interviewed and asked
to complete a FIRO-B assessment. One of the twelve team
members chose not to return the FIRO-B assessment although
cooperation was encouraged.

The research sought to address an answer to three
questions. The findings of this research were organized by
answers to these questions.

1. Were there significant differences in a leadership
team's cohesiveness as a function of leader vision alignment
with the personal visions of team members as measured by the
three areas of the FIRO-B?

The findings indicated that an alignment of the
personal goals of team members and leader vision did not
exist with the exception of the early stages in the
development of Team One. The low inclusion and affection
scores from the FIRO-B indicated the cohesiveness of the
team was low. Consistently, for every member of the
leadership team, affection scores were borderline to low.
These scores indicated trust and cohesiveness were
consistently low on the three teams. Conversely, low
cohesiveness may be attributed to the absence of alignment.
Bonding and trust were crucial to the team achieving high
performance. Team Two and Team Three did not progress
beyond the issue of belonging. Although two members of Team

Two perceived alignment with the leader's vision, this
alignment was not the alignment defined by a desired future.
The alignment perceived was with the current day to day
operational needs of their job role and did not indicate the
future state of a corporate vision. The alignment seemed
confused with loyalty to the leader and with being whatever
they as followers needed to be responsively to the
organization. They were not aligned and did not understand
how they contributed to the team. The lack of alignment
between personal goals and leader vision created a situation
in which membership on the team had little meaning for
members. As reported by members of Team One, during the
period of high alignment of leader vision and member's
personal goals the cohesiveness and team performance were
high.

2. What are the components necessary for the process
of alignment or shared vision to occur between the
management team members' vision and the leader's vision?

The research revealed six components that were
significant in the creation of shared vision or alignment.
These components included interaction between the leader and
the team, satisfaction of personal goals, concreteness of
the vision, trust between the leader and the team, free flow
of information, and an expression of concern for the
individual by the leader.

Interaction between the leader and the team was one
component necessary for shared vision to occur. When the
interactions were high, during the early stages of Team One,
cohesiveness, commitment, and trust were also high as
reported by team members. As the interaction and
communication subsided, all three became areas of concern as
indicated by interview reports and FIRO-B results.

A second component needed for alignment was
concreteness. Members needed details and a visual means for
understanding the vision. The members also needed a step by
step process to move toward the accomplishment of the
vision. A mental picture of the realization of the vision
was needed by team members.

Third, members needed to understand how personal goals
would be met through commitment to the vision. It was
important to consider the needs of the team members
individually. They needed to know that their views would be
heard and team membership would be valuable for their
future.

A fourth component was an atmosphere of trust.
Insecurity led to lowered risk taking and an inability to
make decisions. The idea that there was a "right thing" to
do, an appropriate action, created a hesitancy on the part
of members to take action for fear of making mistakes.

Fifth, members had a need for information about the
status of the company. It was apparent that members were

not informed of why others had left the company or why
abrupt changes were made in company procedure and corporate
structure. The lack of information left interpretations to
the individual members who based their conclusions on
sketchy data. In turn, this led to inaccurate conclusions
causing insecurity and distrust.

Finally, the sixth component was knowing the leader
cared. Interaction with the team, even on a sporadic basis
conveyed this message. Asking opinions, ideas, and goals
had a positive effect on team members. This type of
interest would have allowed members to realize they were
appreciated and valued by the leader for their contribution
to the organization.

3. Does understanding of the corporate leader's vision
impact employee commitment to the organization as reported
by team members and measured by turnover among these
members?

The findings of the research suggested that employee
commitment was influenced by understanding the leader's
vision for the team and the organization. Team One was
highly committed until they no longer understood the vision
for the organization. This misunderstanding or lack of
understanding facilitated their departure from the
organization. Team Two had no clear concept of the vision,
therefore, there was not a template to use for decision
making. After approximately four months, the team had

changed membership for a second time. Team Three was also
unclear as to the specifics of the leader's vision. Several
members had their own interpretation of the vision, but
clarity was noticeably absent. At the time this research
was completed, Team Three had changed membership. One
member relinquished management duties, however, he remained
with the corporation. This change was after working only
one month with Team Three.

Lack of clarity regarding the vision created difficulty
for team members attempting to understand to what they were
committing. Team Three members who had remained through
Team Two had been those who had high loyalty to the company
or to the leader even though they were not clear as to the
specifics of the vision. These members had the highest
level of interaction with the leader and reported no
specific personal goals beyond the directions of the leader.
The interaction was daily due to their position in the
company and the location of their offices in close proximity
to the leader's.

As is often the case, the leader's vision was imposed
on the team and the overall organization. This type of
vision commands compliance, not commitment. Commitment
cannot be mandated, it must be solicited. This leader's
vision belonged to the leader. Soliciting support from
others to share the vision was a critical element which was
not addressed by the leader. The question "What's in it for

me?" was addressed to some extent with Team One, but not with the following teams. However, as Team One engaged in the shared vision and found a connection with their personal goals, they soon found the vision had changed or the means for achieving it had changed. The leader changed the direction of the vision without soliciting the support of Team One members. When the vision was accepted as a shared one the members may not have felt that the leader had the right to change the vision without their input and agreement. The growth phase was attended, members were dedicated, and their personal growth was enhanced. When the team entered the maintenance phase, their personal growth goals were in jeopardy. It was clear to members that the vision belonged to the leader. When he re-established control of the team, he forced a division of team and leader visions. Members began to see the company as "his" company and the vision as "his" vision.

A probable reason for the leader to retake control of Team One and the vision may have been justified due to the narrow focus of the vision. The growth vision had become so focused for the members that it was achieved without regard to the stabilization of prior growth.

The vision was to grow, which translated to Team One members as opening more offices. This growth was achieved at a cost to profitability. Growing was more important than stabilizing existing offices. The attention to fine tuning

previous growth was of low priority to the team members. The control behavior by the leader was perhaps an effort to stabilize the growth and focus more on his goal of profitability. Team One was not aware of his motivation and they interpreted the behavior as "being pulled back into line." This behavior was an example of the lack of information from the leader to team members. The absence of a need to explain his behavior to others may be attributed, to some degree, to his low inclusion scores. The need to include others in the process of making certain decisions was a low priority. This may not have been such a critical issue had trust been higher among Team One members and the leader. However, the trust level had dissipated during his absence and the leader may not have been aware of the lessened trust.

Commitment to the vision was an essential requirement for team members by the leader. However, he had not found a concrete means by which to transform these team members. The commitment was gained through interacting with him; hearing the "how" and the "what" of his vision. His inclusion scores suggested he was "out" of the team; therefore, the possibility of commitment was lessened. He was cautious in interpersonal relationships and selective of those with whom he shared his wishes and desires. It appeared he was also cautious with whom he shared his vision. This cautiousness may have contributed to

protecting his vision by not allowing others an opportunity to "buy in." The number of team members who were clear regarding the vision after the early stages of Team One was low. Most members of the organization did not understand the vision, sharing even less understanding of the "how" of the vision. There was a willingness to participate, but most members did not know how they could contribute, or what they could contribute that would be of value to the team's work. The inability of team members to contribute had played a critical role in the disbandment of the previous two teams. Once members understood and accepted the shared vision, they could have begun to integrate the vision with their personal vision. The means by which to contribute would have become clearer had this integration occurred.

Conclusions and Implications

The findings revealed several themes which offer insight into the relationship between teams and those who lead them. This research identified six components which seemed significant to the integration of leader and follower vision. These components allowed the vision to be shared and the personal goals of team members to be satisfied. The six components concur with the research of Senge (1990), Kouzes and Posner (1987), Tichy and Devanna (cited in Yukl, 1989) and others regarding the synergy, trust and sense of

purpose created by teams which shared the vision with their leader.

The findings concur with the stages of team performance developed by Sibbet and Drexler (1987). Team One progressed through the seven stages to a level of high performance. This level of performance led the team to question the purpose of continuing as a team. The members needed a common purpose and a means to achieve their individual goals in the process of achieving a new vision. The need for renewal was overlooked or postponed by the leader as he facilitated a period of stabilization.

Once Team One had experienced synergy and high performance, the feeling became similar to an addiction and they yearned to have it again. Immersing this team in a maintenance phase without a pull toward the future was disheartening for members. This finding concurs with the research of Senge and Keifer (cited in Naisbitt & Aburdene, 1985).

Ownership of the vision by the members of the team was important for high performance. Team One shared the vision with the leader in the initial stages of its development. During the time the vision was shared by team members, an integration with their personal goals was apparent. The integration led to a situation wherein achievement of the corporate vision was synonymous with achievement of the personal visions of the members. When integration was high

members were more committed to the organization and the vision. The members understood the framework used to make decisions and confidence was high. Ideas and contributions were valued by other members of the team. Risk taking was the norm and failure was not a part of their thinking process. These members were confident in their ability to lead and grow the organization.

The teams which followed lacked clarity of the leader's vision and did not experience the synergy of the previous team. Personal goals were absent or vague among team members. Risk taking among members was low and fear of failure was evident. The members were not clear how they contributed to the team. The decision making process was impeded by an absence of a framework to use for drawing conclusions. Work activity was slowed by the absence of a mental picture of the future to guide the work. These findings are confirmed in the research of Kouzes and Posner (1987) regarding leaders and their teams.

An essential element for the transference of the vision of the leader was interaction with the team members. The leader's vision for the future was better understood when he interfaced with the team members. It was essential that the leader verbally share his vision with team members and in turn, ask members to share in the realization of the vision. This is similar to the research findings of Senge (1990).

The shared vision did not occur with Team Two and Team Three and the longevity of these teams was relatively short.

The vision was changed during the term of Team One and their input was not solicited. The shared vision transformed into a solitary one belonging to the leader. This created difficulty for members of the first team because of the integration of the shared vision with their personal goals. The change was not solely a change for the corporation, but also for the members personally. Members no longer understood how team membership would be of value to them as individuals and how their goals could be realized through the team's work. This was also found in the research of Tichy and Devanna (1986), Garfield (1986), Belasco (1989), and Maslow (1965).

The new vision of the leader was exclusively present focused and did not pull members toward a more desirable future. Bennis (1985) concurs finding the need for the leader to develop a bridge from the present to the future necessary for the team members. The future vision was set aside and the focus was on profits and controls. It was unquestionable that both were important to the corporation, however, a desired future must remain in tact to attract members.

A major finding of this research regarded the maintenance of a high performing team. The essential elements in the development of high performance in a team

has been shown through the stages of team performance. Once
the team was achieving high performance maintaining this
synergistic team was essential for leaders and for the
corporation as a whole. Four critical guidelines emerged
from this research regarding the continuation of high
performing teams.

1.   The leader should join the team and remain at
least sporadically active.

2.   The vision should be integrated with team member's
personal goals becoming a shared vision with the leader.

3.   The shared vision can only be changed with the
permission of team members once the integration has
occurred.

4.   The team members need autonomy and independence
with regard to actions and decisions based upon the shared
vision.

Listening was an important aspect for the development
of the leader's vision for the corporation. Members needed
an awareness that their ideas, opinions and experiences had
value to the leader. This was similar to the findings of
Kouzes and Posner (1987). The team lost the sense of a
"family feeling" among the membership which remained absent
through the second and third teams. Members appeared to
need a sense of unity to feel valued, competent, and
accepted.

The vision of a corporation could be enhanced when it was created through team participation. The members of the first team experienced this type of participative vision development. When the participation was discontinued and the vision was imposed by the leader, the members did not have a sense of ownership. The lack of ownership led to a reduced personal investment in the success of the organization.

Changes were made abruptly and the need for the changes were not accepted by the first team. The vision should validate and justify the costs of change. Team members did not believe that the future would be enhanced as a result of the changes. The members interpreted the change as a personal change. They perceived a need to become more detailed and structured in response to the change in the vision. Members were not opposed to change, however they were opposed to being changed as individuals. This is confirmed by the findings related to change of Tichy and Devanna (1986).

As Garfield (1986) concurs the need existed for the leader not only to lead the team, but also join the team. The leader's absence from the first team created a void in the team which was not filled nor could be filled by any other member. The interaction with the leader was essential to understanding and maintaining the shared vision with the

team. When the leader returned, the team had developed a vision which they shared with one another.

Members through the second and third teams did not have a mental picture of the vision, therefore they could not draw conclusions and make decisions about work activities. The effect of the absence of a mental picture is similar to the findings of Kouzes and Posner (1987).

The results identified a difference in team member cohesiveness among the three teams when team members did not share the vision of the leader. The vision of the leader was not clear to a majority of the membership of any team. Individual FIRO-B assessment data indicated somewhat higher cohesiveness levels for those who reported understanding current needs and expressing loyalty to the leader, even though the vision was not clear. Those members with lower interaction levels indicated cohesiveness was low. However, the FIRO-B results for members who were no longer with the company were difficult to compare due to an apparent absence of interaction with the leader.

Reports from team members indicated higher levels of commitment by those who had a clearer understanding of the leader's needs. The degree of interaction between the leader and the team member was closely related to the level of clarity of leader vision. Overall, team members who found personal value in sharing the vision with the leader reported higher levels of commitment.

Recommendations For Further Study

This research indicated six components essential to the alignment process for a shared leader and follower vision. The results indicated team cohesiveness was lower for members who were not aligned with this vision. Finally, higher commitment levels were reported by members who understood the needs of the leader. The findings of this research generate several recommendations for further study.

Further studies could focus on the process of shared vision for the teams led by each member of the management team. The investigation of the process throughout an entire organizational framework would be valuable to developing an increased understanding of work teams.

An investigation of the need for a shared vision for the sixteen personality types of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator could expand one's understanding of the type of interaction with the leader needed to develop vision alignment. A particular personality type may be more effected by the need for a shared vision than are other types. The process of how vision is interpreted by the different personality types could further one's ability to effectively transform team member's through the shared vision. The knowledge of personality types would also assist leaders by showing the means by which followers interpret information. This would help leaders adapt the

verbalization and/or visualization of the vision to anticipate the needs of the follower.

An investigation of the effect a change in the team leader has on the shared leadership vision would be valuable to the research on leader vision. The ability of members to adapt to and adopt a the shared vision during this transition of leadership would be valuable. Organizations change leadership and management positions frequently. Research to understand the transition followers experience during this change of leadership could offer insight into the effect the change may have on the productivity of work teams, quality teams, or other established teams within the organization.

A framework could be developed to serve as a model for the concrete means by which the vision of a leader could be shared with team members. New (and established) team leaders need a step by step process for transferring their vision to a team of followers. The specific process for verbalization and visualization of the vision could be an asset to leaders in any institution. Part of this framework would include an evaluative measure to assess the level of vision understanding by followers.

The effect of shared vision and team performance could have strong implications for educational systems. The educational system would be a interesting arena for the study of the effect of a superintendent's vision on a school

system and how this vision is interpreted by principals as
well as teachers and parents. Alignment of the vision would
be interesting to assess among the followers of educational
leaders.

Bibliography

Adair, J. (1986). <u>Effective teambuilding</u>. England:
    Grower Publishing.

Adams, J. (1987). The role of a creative outlook on
    teambuilding. In W.B. Reddy, & K. Jamison (Eds.),
    <u>Teambuilding</u> (pp. 98-106). San Francisco: University
    Associates.

Bass, B.M. (1989). <u>Leadership: Good, better, best</u>.
    New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bass, B.M. (1985). <u>Leadership and performance beyond
    expectations</u>. New York: Free Press.

Belasco, J.A. (1990). <u>Teaching the elephant to dance</u>.
    New York: Crown Publishers.

Bennis, W. (1989). <u>On becoming a leader</u>. New York:
    Addison-Wesley Publishing.

Bennis, W. (1989). <u>Why leaders can't lead</u>. San
    Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bennis, W. (1976). <u>The unconscious conspiracy</u>. New York:
    Anacom.

Bennis, W. (1984). Where have all the leaders gone?
    In W. E. Rosenbach, & R. L. Taylor (Eds.),
    <u>Contemporary issues in leadership</u>. (pp. 234- 246).
    CO: Westview Press.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The
    strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper &
    Row.

Bennis, W.G.; Berlwe, D.E.; Schien, E.H.; & Steele,
    F.I. (1973). Interpersonal dynamics. IL:
    Dorsey Press.

Blake, R.; Mouton, J.; & Allen, R. (1987).
    Spectacular teamwork. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Blanchard, K.; Zigarmi, P.; & Zigarmi, D. (1985).
    Leadership and the one minute manager. New York:
    Morrow & Company.

Block, P. (1987). The empowered manager. San
    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bryman, A. (1986). Leadership and organizations.
    London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and
    Row.

Clemmens, J.K., & Mayer, D.F. (1987). The classic
    touch: Lessons in leadership from homer to
    hemmingway. IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Conger, J.A. (1989). The charismatic leader. San
    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1988). Charismatic
    leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cooper, C.L., & Magham, I.L. (1971). T-Groups: A survey
    of research. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

DePree, M. (1989). <u>Leadership is an art</u>. New York: Doubleday.

Drucker, P.F. (1989). <u>More doing than dash</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Drucker, P. (1967). <u>The effective executive</u>. New York: Harper and Row.

Eddy, W. B. (1985). <u>The manager and the working group</u>. New York: Praeger.

Foster, W. (1986). <u>Paradigms and promises</u>. New York: Prometheus Books.

Frohman, M.A., & Pascarella, P. (1989). <u>The purpose driven organization</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garfield, C. (1986). <u>Peak performers</u>. New York: Avon Books.

Goffman, E. (1959). <u>The presentation of self in everyday life</u>. New York: Doubleday.

Greenfield, T.B. (1984). Leaders and schools: Order in organizations. In T.J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), <u>Leadership and organizational culture</u>. (pp. 148-163). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J.G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), <u>Leadership: The cutting edge</u>. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). The change masters: Innovation for productivity in the american corporation. New York: Simon & Shuster.

Kotter, J. (1988). The leadership factor. New York: Free Press.

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1987). The leadership challenge. CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leavitt, H. (1986). Corporate pathfinders. IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Levinson, H., & Rosenthal, S. (1984). CEO: Corporate leadership in action. New York: Basic Books.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Maccoby, M. (1988). Why work? New York: Simon and Schuster.

Maccoby. M. (1981). The leader. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Maslow, A. (1965). Eupsychian management. IL: Irwin and Dorsey Press.

Maslow, A. (1971). The farther reaches of human nature. New York: Viking.

McCall, M.W.; Lombardo, M.M.; & Morrison, A.M. (1988). The lessons of experience. MA: Lexington Books.

Morley, I.E. (1984). On imagery and cycling of
decision-making. In J.G. Hunt, & C.A. Schriesheim
(Eds.), Leaders and managers: International
perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership.
(pp. 186- 202). New York: Pergamon.

Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1985). Re-inventing the
corporation. New York: Warner Books.

Nanus, B. (1989). The leader's edge. Chicago:
Comtemporary Books.

Napier, R.W., & Gershefeld, M.K. (1987). Leadership.
Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Owen, H. (1987). Spirit. Maryland: Abbott Publishing.

Peters, T. J. (1987). Thriving on chaos. New York:
Harper & Row.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of
excellence. New York: Harper & Row.

Peters, T. J., & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for
excellence. New York: Warner Books.

Portnoy, R.A. (1988). Leadership: What every leader
should know about people. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Robbins, S.P. (1988). Essentials of organizational
behavior. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ryan, L.R. (1977). Clinical interpretation of the FIRO-B.
CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Sashkin, M. (1989). The visionary leader. New York:
McGraw-Hill.

Sayles, L.R. (1989). Leadership: Managing in real organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Schiffer, I. (1973). Charisma. Toranto: University of Toranto Press.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Developing a relevant theory of and practice. In T. J. Sergiovanni, & J. E. Corbally, (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture. (pp. 275-292). IL: University of Illinois Press.

Shutz, W. (1966). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. CA: Shutz Associates, Inc.

Sibbet, D., & Drexler, A. B. (1987). A team performance model. In W.B. Reddy, & K. Jamison (Eds.), Teambuilding. (pp. 45-61). San Francisco: University Associates.

Tichy, N. M., & Devanna, M. A. (1986). The transformational leader. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Tucker, R. C. (1981). Politics in leadership. MO: University of Missouri Press.

Ulrich, D.O., & Tichy, N.M. (1987). The leadership challenge: A call for the transformational leader. New York: Facts On File Publications.

Willner, A.R. (1984). <u>The spellbinders: Charismatic political leadership</u>. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Yukl, G.A. (1989). <u>Leadership in organizations</u>. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Vaill, P.B. (1984). The purposing of high-performing systems. In T.J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), <u>Leadership and organizational culture</u>. (pp. 192- 313). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Zaleznik, A. (1983). Managers and leaders: Are they different? In W. C. Prentice, (Ed.), <u>Harvard business review: Executive success</u>. (pp. 140- 150). CT: John Wiley & Sons.

Zaleznik, A. (1989). <u>The managerial mystique</u>. New York: Harper and Row.