

The Three P's: Participation, Punishment & Professionalism

(Fundamentals Often Neglected in Basic Management Texts)

by

Richard A. Brunner*

Abstract

In the process of teaching the basic management course, time and text space constraints limit what can be covered. That said, many bits and pieces of some importance are often given short shrift. At times instructors and managers must step back and address some of the bigger and less addressed concepts. How many come to work merely because they need their

paycheck? Such people must believe that there is a much better way to spend one's life other than in the work place. Others may think that it does not take much more time or effort to decide to be the BEST at whatever they do. In other words, how many are true professionals? How many superiors may punish subordinates because it is their right or because they are upset? How many totally eschew punishment altogether because they do not like

*The author has a Bachelor of Science (Bus. Admin.) and MBA(Management) degrees from Golden Gate University, San Francisco. He served in the U.S. Air Force for 26 years. Presently he is a lecturer in the General Management Department, School of Business, Assumption University of Thailand; he has been teaching for the past 15 years.

confrontation? Punishment or discipline is something managers sometimes use when all other forms of motivation fail. If punishment is used, will it dampen efforts to fully make use of participation? Will it reach its key objective - - behavior modification? How many managers automatically assume that their subordinates will be excited to help them in reaching organizational goals? People can become very excited about reaching their own goals. Is it possible to develop mutually dependent organizational and professional goals that can help develop participation and the team commitment and motivation that come with it?

PUNISHMENT

Punishment was not a topic discussed in the last sixteen or more basic management textbooks that were used or considered for use at Assumption University. The only time the word 'punishment' was mentioned was when referring to Reinforcement Theory by B. F. Skinner (and that, only if the author discussed all four parts of the theory). Punishment, however, is as much a part of the study of management as power and empowerment. Punishment differs from negative reinforcement in that punishment is any process that is likely to decrease future behavior while negative reinforcement serves as a deterrent to punishment.

Reward and punishment - - positive and negative stimulus, or 'the Carrot and the Stick,' - are still strong motivators, regardless of the researches and theories of motivation. The problem is that, too often, everyone gets a 'carrot' that is not related to his performance. When this happens, no one gets motivated. The existence of the 'carrots' is then only what Herzberg would call "maintenance" or "hygiene" factors - remove them and dissatisfaction sets in.

The 'stick,' or fear of a negative stimulus; e.g., loss of income, job, or face, is a strong motivator, but may very well bring on defensive or counter productive behavior, or even dishonesty. It does not matter whether one is a c.e.o. or first line supervisor, position power that grants a supervisor the ability to give rewards and punishment also gives them the power to control. It should not surprise anyone that this leads to managers that cannot recognize that they are surrounded by sycophants, or 'yes men.'

Today it is probably reasonable to assume that the traditional negative view of punishment or 'discipline' is outdated. Even though basic management text books, for the most part, eschew the issue of punishment or discipline, people still need to be encouraged to do their best and there is definitely a need to deal with problem employees before the problems get out

of hand. In the U.S., employee litigation is commonplace and the old ideas expressed in some basic management texts that the only punishment that should be used is dismissal is not always a satisfactory or even a feasible alternative.

In some countries, managers still have a strong hand and they can probably follow the old dictates, but even in many of these countries, cultural constraints and other impediments may make it difficult to dismiss problem employees that do not measure up.

What is needed today is not an elimination of punishment, but a 'progressive' disciplinary program. Address the problem employees and situations before they become out of control. Some books have been written that addressing the issue and even providing a structured format on how the process can be implemented. Paul Falcone's book *101 Simple Write-Ups for Documenting Employee Performance Problems* by Amacom in 1999 is a good book for every manager to read and a very good book to help the Human Resource Management (HRM) staff in drawing up and explaining the various types of progressive or escalating warnings that normally begin with verbal or non-written admonitions, then move to coaching, and, if need be, on to written warnings and, finally, end with dismissal.

Of course, an immediate discharge is warranted for violations such as illegal activities and gross insubordination. One of the few times I witnessed immediate dismissal in Thailand was when an instructor verbally abused a Catholic Priest and followed up his verbal assault by physically kicking the Priest. Surprisingly, there were some in authority that wanted to wait a month and let the fellow go at the end of his contract. The President would have none of it - - the offensive boor was taken to the airport in a matter of hours.

The process of progressive discipline does not simply mean good documentation even though it is necessary if the process is to be effective. The written process may well include a mutually agreed to performance plan and concrete statements of positive and negative outcomes and consequences. Normally, the employee will have an opportunity to make comment or rebut the disciplinary document. Good communications, good will and a sincere desire to help the person with the disciplinary problem overcome it are essential for any constructive system if it is to function properly. One of Fayol's principles, the Principle of Discipline, declares that the need for good superiors all the way up the line is still apropos. This principle is still valid and good superiors need to be more than directors - - they need to be leaders.

To demonstrate: Being late for one's class or dismissing the class early are not signs of professionalism in the teaching corps; actions need to be taken to correct, when possible, those who abuse the system. Assume the university has a policy of tolerating no more than three late arrivals, or three early dismissals, or any combination of these thereof per semester before the first letter of warning is issued. Also assume an instructor has been late twice and had dismissed one class early. This situation calls for an initial letter of warning. Paul Falcone's book gives 101 sample write-ups that cover most disciplinary type of letters and memos, and can serve as a guide as to the procedures to be used. The department chair's write-up may look something like:

Maliwan,

Timeliness is a condition of employment. In order to set the example for students and to insure good class discipline, instructors must be on time. Dismissing class early is normally a sign of unpreparedness. Both being late to class and early class dismissal are signs of unprofessionalism.

The University has paid sick leave and a nurse available should an instructor's health prevent him from meeting the class schedules. There are no indications that you were ill as you did not apply for sick leave or visit the nurse. Moreover, you

checked in present for work on one of the days that you were late to class an hour before the scheduled class. You have incurred two reported incidents of lateness and one of dismissing your class early. The dates and times are:

*2/6/00 0820 L
3/9/00 0850 E
4/6/00 0950 L (reported
present at 0845)*

These incidents have set bad examples for students and fellow instructors and cast the department in a bad light with the Dean. As you should be aware, any combination of three incidents of late class starts and/or early class dismissals in a semester fails to meet University's standards and conduct policies for classroom teachers (Faculty Manual chap. 5, paragraphs 1-4).

Performance Improvement Plans:

- *Measurable goals. Maliwan, I expect you to immediately improve your tardiness to class and early class dismissal performance.*
- *A copy of pertinent policies is attached. Please read them and should there be any question, I will be pleased to answer them tomorrow.*
- *Interim Performance Report. None is required as your annual performance evaluation is due in three months' time.*

- *Should you have any ideas as to how to improve your time problem, I hope you will share them with me.*

Outcomes and Consequences

Positive: *If you meet the attendance goals, no further action will be taken as it pertains to this issue. Your efforts and improvement will not only help you, but they will help our department set an example for our students and other faculties.*

Negative: *You are now being placed on notice that, according to University Policy, should you reach, in any combination, five incidents of tardiness or early dismissal of class over a two consecutive semester period, you will be given a second warning. A seventh incident over a three consecutive semester period will result in immediate dismissal. In addition, an instructor who has been given the second warning will not be eligible for the annual salary adjustment.*

Scheduled Review Date: *none*

Instructor's Comments and/or Rebuttal:

Instructor's Signature

Of course, different organizations will have different procedures and policies concerning the disciplinary process. In today's litigating climate, world organizations need to take actions to lessen the likelihood of their having to face lawsuits. Even in Thailand, the land of non-confrontation, employee vs. employer cases have ended up with some regularity in Labor Court.

Keeping the disciplinary actions secret may have value, especially in cultures where face is a primary value, but there are times when the disciplinary measures need to be more formal or even open. If an employee constantly breaks an attendance or tardiness rule and others think that there is no action being taken against the offender, they may also think that the offender is above the law, or that the organization does not care so they may do likewise.

It should go without saying that a manager should not punish or fire anyone or take any other action when he is angry. The only smart thing a manager can do if he gets angry is to get away from the scene. If a manager has to fire someone, he may need to 'drag his feet.' He will need to get his facts straight before he acts. He should also give the other subordinates a chance to see that the person under review is being treated fairly, but needs to be fired.

A manager may never fire anyone. Dismissal is usually the severest form of punishment. Other forms of punishment may include: pay cuts, suspension, demotion, and reprimand. A simple rule: If punishment is to be used, use a rifle and not a shotgun. A rifle is aimed directly at the target but a shotgun can hurt innocent people. Often, new restrictions are placed on everyone because someone abused the system and the managers want to avoid confrontation.

(On memos or letters of reprimand on record used by three senior managers, only one of them used it correctly. The other two managers started out correctly with memos and meetings, but had turned the memos into threats addressed to everyone. Soon after the first memo was written, they announced that 'the memo was issued to record some poor behavior, but it does not really mean anything. However, if someone gets two such letters, that person will be dismissed.' A secret memo is useful in that it is completely secret. The manager and the subordinate can maintain a reasonable working relationship. When managers use threats to control their employees, imagine the damage that is done to work environments.

PARTICIPATION

In participation, as with punishment, culture plays a role in determining whether or not it will be accepted or rejected or resented by the

employees themselves. Workers may see their involvement in setting goals and making decisions as illegitimate. Reading Victor H. Vroom and Arthur G. Jago's book *The New Leadership: Managing Participation in Organizations*, Prentice Hall 1988, two cases were noticed concerning this issue. The first, an experiment in the U.S., showed that resistance to change in work methods could be reduced by having those involved in the process participate in coming up with a solution. A later effort to replicate the U.S. experiment in Norway failed. The second was a U.S. firm that opened a new plant in Puerto Rico and implemented its highly successful U.S. participatory practices only to see them fail. From exit interviews, they learnt that the employees thought that the practices reflected unfavorably on the capability of the leaders, and that requiring them to participate in goal setting and decision making was illegitimate. In Thailand, many will see participation as illegitimate. Some would think that the manager is weak and wants them to do his job for him without his pay and perks. Thus, even managers who believe in participation may find that it is not as easy to implement such a system as they may believe. That said, participation has become a hot topic and "Team" management and implementation texts abound.

Nearly a century ago, Henri Fayol wrote *the Principle of Esprit de Corps* regarding the importance of pride and

individual commitment within a unit and the power of cooperation among the unit members. Fayol emphasized the need for teamwork and the importance of communication. Since that time, others including Mary Parker Follett have recognized and taught the importance of the individual. Fred E. Fiedler's *Contingency Theory of Leadership* states that leaders would be most effective in average situations if they were oriented toward people and relationships rather than the task. (*The writer finds most management situations to be in the 'average' category.*) One of the easiest methods that almost all managers can use to create *esprit de corps* and a people orientation is through *participation* ... for a shop or a corporation (or any unit in between).

The concept of teamwork today is quite different from that of two decades ago. One needs to get people to 'willingly' strive to achieve organizational goals. Ordering people to do this or that is out or on the way out. Managers need skills that allow them to take into account team member needs rather than his and her needs. Even though participation and teamwork are widely discussed in some of these textbooks, they have not yet been put into practice in many situations that would seem to call for them. It appears that in many situations, 'Empowerment' and 'Teamwork' can be truly and effectively used. Bossy bosses are going out of fashion. Participatory bosses, however, need to

hold McGregor's Theory "Y" views of man. In short, these views hold that given the right conditions man is by nature creative and is willing to work, accept and even seek responsibility to achieve meaningful (to him) goals. The ideas expressed in these books may appear radical to some, and may even be unacceptable to others. That said, when a company makes the determination to change to the *new, modern management* of teams, managers will need to change their autocratic ways or they may find themselves suddenly retired. They must learn how to effectively use participation. Managers who can effectively implement the system when the situation calls for it will get better results from their efforts, and will insure themselves a place in the future management hierarchy.

The participation concept works as well in the old style of management as it does with the newest style. As a matter of fact, participation in the decision making process has been around a long time. Back in 529 A.D., St. Benedict wrote what has become known as the 'Benedictine Rule.' He spoke of group consultation, and also recognized the importance of the situation that may require a more restrictive or selective decision making process or group.

Without participation, subordinates are told to work harder by the boss, so the boss can reach his or her objectives. Ideally, with participation, we can make

use of expectancy theory. If *'we' work together, 'we' can reach 'our' mutually inclusive objectives*. Everyone who has worked for a boss in any organization will agree that the most important person to everyone in the organization is his or her boss. The question here is: Who is the more important, the manager or his staff? If the subordinates do a good job, the manager will be promoted. If the subordinates do a poor job, the manager may be fired or moved.

Clearly, the subordinates are more important. How does the manager see it? Many may, in their most secret of thoughts, still harbor the view that they are more important. They will need to get over this belief, or they will be rolled over by the wheels of progress. To be effective, he has to make one simple but thorough mental adjustment. He must come to grips with the fact that his subordinates are the most important to organizational and hence to his own success. If he only pays lip service to participation and teamwork, his subordinate team members will quickly see through the façade.

One only need think of a coach team situation. Some years ago, the author often used the Lincoln Electric Company case in class because it clearly demonstrated the company's strong integrated and intense culture, a culture that included a strong trust relationship between management and the work force. In the 1984 case, prepared by Arthur D. Sharplin of

McNeese State University, the President of Lincoln is quoted as saying: "... management is the coach that must be obeyed. The men, however, are the players who alone can win the game." In that same case, another executive of Lincoln is quoted as saying, "When you use 'participation,' put quotes around it. Because we believe that each person should participate only in those decisions he is most knowledgeable about. I don't think production employees should control the decisions of Bill Irrgang. They don't know as much as he about the decisions he is involved in." It may appear that there was no participation at Lincoln but they had many ways that were very effective in which everyone could participate. The case indicated that morale was very high, labor turnover was almost nonexistent as no union could ever get a toe hold in Lincoln. Its productivity was second to none in the industry. The salaries of the men were twice those of the industry? Herzberg in his Two Factor Theory said that money was not a motivator and James Lincoln would agree since he said that money was only an indicator of other values such as status. James Lincoln said, "Status is of great importance in all human relationship. The greatest incentive that money has, usually, is that it is a symbol of success."

The Lincoln case management, regardless of their self-proclaimed autocratic style of leadership, seems to hold to most of the underlying

assumptions of McGregor theory 'Y' views. How else was it possible that spans of management reach 100 at Lincoln? Simply because the men are trained, accept responsibility, and are self-controlled.

Fiedler's model would indicate that the Lincoln situation was highly favorable to management and that, in turn, would dictate, according to Fiedler's Model, that a task oriented leadership style will yield the best result. Lincoln was certainly task oriented.

Assuming the situation does call for team decision making and that the manager has made the permanent adjustment to his psyche and understands the truth about who is more important, the groundwork is prepared for participation. If he really cares for and respects his subordinates, they will know it. Trust is sacred. Trust is earned and trust must be mutual. To gain subordinates' trust, a manager does not have to party with his employees all the time or even buy their lunches. What is needed is a good committed leader, a shared vision, open communications and trust. Stephen George's book *Uncommon Sense: Creating Business Excellence in Your Organization*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 1997 makes interesting reading for many reasons, one of which is its chapter on *Lead by Serving* and its references to trust.

Simple examples: One of the subordinates makes a huge mistake.

When the big boss finds out, he comes into the office (in front of all of the subordinates) with an angry red face. Does the manager try to escape by pointing his finger at another? (Would it lessen the boss' anger? No.) Finger pointing, blaming others or making excuses are signs of fear, not trust. When one of the subordinates has a great idea and the big boss comes into the office smiling and tells the manager how wonderful it is, does he tell the boss "Thank you," or "We thank you."? Taking credit for achievements is a sign of a fear environment; sharing credit is a sign of trust. If the manager shields his subordinates when they are wrong and praises them in front of the big boss when they are right, trust relationships can flourish. Restricting and protecting information is a sign of fear. Sharing information with those who need it is a sign of trust. In this trust environment, Esprit de Corps will soar.

Many, if not most, managers have a terrible performance history in their handling of suggestions. People resist change. A suggestion from a subordinate is a recommendation to change something. *If someone has studied management, he should know that when a subordinate makes a suggestion, the manager should: (1) listen, (2) thank him, (3) use the suggestion if it is good, and (4) explain why the suggestion cannot be used. Listening and thanking are easy, if sincere. Using a suggestion, that is making a change that was not the manager's idea may also be resisted by*

nonprofessional and autocratic managers. Explaining why a good idea is not going to be used is often difficult but necessary. Often, many managers will make it clear through verbal and nonverbal means that they do not want to listen to suggestions. But if 'we' are a team, suggestions will help us reach 'our' objectives better and faster. The best and most useful suggestions for increasing efficiency or effectiveness will come from the people who actually do the work. Managers need all the suggestions they can get from their subordinates to increase efficiency and meet performance goals. A manager who is both receptive and responsive to subordinates' suggestions is almost guaranteed that their subordinates will feel important and excited about their work, and having this trait will go a long way to insure participation. The Lincoln Electric Company made excellent use of its suggestion system. A system that was also tied into its incentive/performance evaluation system.

Another area that needs some attention is the managers often get upset when a subordinate complains. We learn a lot more from those who complain than those who sit quietly and never voice any opinion other than that given by the boss. A trust relationship exists when subordinates voice their criticisms, concerns and ideas. In a fear environment, subordinates keep their opinion to themselves. One of the biggest jobs the 'team leader' (boss) has

is to help solve the problems of the subordinates. Often, these problems are not work related but they impact on the work situation. If a subordinate has a significant problem, too much of his time and thinking is devoted to his problem, not to productive work. If the subordinates do not have any major problems, they are free to do their work best.

Assuming that the managers can make the mental adjustment regarding the importance and true value of their subordinates and subordinates are ready to participate, participation is a relatively easy state to achieve. Managers need to give them recognition and praise, and to protect them and to listen to their suggestions and complaints. The subordinates may need training. It is the manager's prime task to create a positive and constructive work environment. Today he needs to create a learning environment. Managers need to learn as well. To establish a learning environment, they need to set standards, measure, and track the learning process. They also need to actively engage their subordinates at every opportunity. When managers have their subordinates participate to achieve the unit objectives, they can use the best techniques of the old management, in combination with some or all of the modern management. They have the best chance to *get the best performance from their subordinates*, and that is *the Name of the Game*.

PROFESSIONALISM

Professionals in business are the ones who earn their pay and more. They also earn the respect of almost everyone they contact. They dedicate their lives to doing the best at whatever they do and to the success of the organization in which they work because they fully appreciate that their success depends, in large measure, on that of the organization they represent and work for. The Professionals stand out in a group, and they look as if they have a mission. *They have a mission.* Most employees are dedicated to finishing the day and getting on with their evening and weekend plans.

Punctuality is a key point. This is for managers and employees who are 'on the way up.' Punctuality represents an attitude - - a winning attitude. In general, we know that participation increases the time needed to make a decision. Mintzberg reported decades ago that managers spend more than half of their time attending scheduled and unscheduled meetings. Visualize an embarrassed manager waiting for a subordinate at an important meeting. The subordinate has shown that he is not a professional (at whatever he is doing). The opposite is also true, subordinates who have been waiting for the manager/big boss to show up for a meeting are rightfully disturbed; the boss has knowingly or unknowingly sent a message to his subordinates that may be interpreted by them as indicating: how busy he is, or

how important he is, or how little he really respects them. If employees are paid 200 baht per hour and their manager wastes an hour of working time for 20 of them with some meeting plus delays, the manager wastes 40,000 baht. When a manager keeps employees waiting, even accidentally, he wastes organization time and money. We should not needlessly add to cost by tardiness. *This article is not specifically intended to criticize the lack of punctuality. In many cultures punctuality is not considered critical. In Thailand, most of South America and elsewhere for examples, in most business encounters, many people do not arrive on time. The winners seem to be on time. Most people are not winners.*

Punctuality is but one simple indicator of someone's integrity. The Professionals always do whatever they said they would do, including being on time. Integrity is critical to business success. Fifty years ago, when children in grammar school said, "I give you my word I will do it (something)," the child was making a commitment to do something; his integrity was on the line. People do not pledge their 'word' very much any more because when someone says he will do something, he is using his 'words' to say it. When a businessman tells an associate that he will do something by Friday morning at 10:00, that associate does not need an excuse on Friday morning; he needs the thing that was promised. Never promise what you cannot deliver. When

someone 'breaks his word,' he has no integrity. People will tell their friends and associates about it. If there is any doubt as to whether or not a manager can do something, he does NOT give his word. He can promise to do his best, but he cannot promise things that he does not have control over. For example, a copy of a completed report can be promised because all elements are in that person's control. A replacement part being shipped from another company cannot be promised at a certain time because the other company and shipping factors are not under his direct control.

One of the easiest and most reliable techniques a person can use to help maintain his integrity is to keep a diary/notebook. Every morning, when a manager arrives at work, he restarts his notebook before he does anything else. Under today's date he writes a short note from his notes of yesterday that he did not finish. He keeps the notebook with him all day. He can keep anything in it that he finds useful, of course, like phone numbers, email addresses, etc. These can later be transcribed to a more permanent record if need be, but the main reason for the notebook is to record oral communication. When a superior makes a request of a manager, the manager makes a note. One of the most important uses of the notebook is to record the promises made to other professionals. The professionals in an organization become known to other professionals. They form the most

important segment of the teams that are tasked to solve company problems and to make company plans. When one of the professionals from Marketing, for example, asks a professional from Engineering for a copy of the specifications of a new product, the engineer can and will help. He wants to help because he knows that the other side will do the same for him in time of need. Professionals must do whatever they promise, or they 'break their word.' A professional who 'breaks his word' once too often is no longer considered a professional.

Going hand in hand with integrity is honesty. Intellectual honesty may be the most difficult trait to acquire. People do not seem to like to say 'I don't know.' Professionals are honest. Imagine someone trying to work with others that they cannot trust. Professional managers do not realize that their subordinates are watching them very carefully. A manager might get away with an expedient lie to subordinates for a while, but their staff will eventually find out. These lies do not help in building trust relationships. When someone tells a lie, no matter how minor, to someone, another lie is often required to cover up the first - - then another, etc. Managers need to be open and honest. Even acts of omission, or professions of "I don't know" when they, in fact, 'do' know, must be very carefully and infrequently used. If a trust relationship does exist a simple "I'm not at liberty to say" is a lot better than a lie. Managing a group of people

while fitting in with the organization and coordinating with others is complicated enough. Lies, secrets and manipulation are sure trouble.

Of course, there is a cultural element even to intellectual honesty. A friend of mine, teaching an MBA class in Organization Behavior to a group of Asian students, once gave an 'I don't know' (he was not sure) answer to a student. The student was aghast and sputtered out loud, "But you're the teacher!" My friend laughed and asked if he was supposed to know everything. No response came from that student but the class seemed to get the message that he was trying to send. Later, the lecturer ran into the President of the University, who said that a student told him that he (the lecturer) did not know anything. This lecturer enjoys telling students that he does not know something when he is not sure as it always evokes interesting students' responses that are very reflective of the culture from whence they come.

Professional managers are eclectic, voracious readers and practice counter-attitudinal listening, especially in highly charged or emotional situations. This in part is why professionals are normally the best at whatever they do. If a Professional is not the 'best,' he or she is working and learning to be the best.

SUMMARY

People can be the best at whatever they do. They can develop the attitude

of a winner. They can punish a subordinate when necessary, but they need to do it carefully, fairly constructively and sometimes secretly. They must consider the future performance of all their subordinates. If managers can develop a true team, they can reap the benefits of good Esprit de Corps and Empowerment.

A good way to sum up may be by relating a recent conversation with a friend and a colleague of the author. He was invited by an Organization's c.o.o. to guest lecture at the initial meeting of the Human Resource Management Development Programs. He was asked to speak to first line department heads and their assistants. There were 30 to 40 participants. In order to get a feel for the situation - - the organization, its environment and members - - early in his talk he asked a series of questions. Included among those questions and response indicators were the following:

1. How many of you are satisfied with all your subordinates?
 - Comment: Just about everyone indicated, without hesitation, that they had problem people.
2. How many of you have recommended subordinates for no annual pay increase?
 - Comment: Only one Head said that she did. She went on to say that she wished she had not. Her body language, tone

and tenor of her voice, and facial expressions made it quite clear that she felt that it was she who was punished.

3. How many of you have written letters of reprimand?

- Comment: Only one responded in the affirmative. The same Head that mentioned she had recommended someone for no annual salary adjustment.

4. How many of you have subordinates who come to you and ask for feedback?

- Comment: Only one or two said that they had - - one being the same person that said yes to no pay raise and the letter of reprimand.

5. How many of you have gone to your superior to ask for feedback?

- Comment: None answered in the affirmative.

6. How many of you discuss (show) your annual evaluations with your subordinates?

- Comment: The organization required an annual review. Only one said yes ... the same person mentioned previously.

7. How many of you have seen your own annual evaluation by your supervisors?

- Comment: None were shown their evaluations.

From these responses and others, it was rather clear to my colleague why the c.o.o. bypassed his immediate subordinates and took personal charge of running the newly created management human resource development program. It appears that the c.o.o. knows that his first line supervisors are far from the professionals that he needs and wants. My colleague knows that participation within this organization, another of the c.o.o. desired goals, is not going on in any meaningful manner. The c.o.o. must certainly know that overt punishment is rarely used. My colleague, however, believes that punishment is, in fact, used. To him, the situation appears to be one of a classic fear driven organization. He suspects it is used in the form of favoritism in job assignments and favorable scheduling, two step "non"-performance pay raises for the "in-group" and the like. There is also a highly developed Thai punishment technique associated with social slights, innuendoes and back biting and all are very likely used. In short, my colleague surmises that these Department Heads are only office holders who were promoted because they were sycophantic loyalist to their immediate supervisors. Their leadership styles are most likely laissez-faire or

autocratic. They are certainly not participatory managers, nor are they maximizers. The c.o.o. probably knows that he has a very difficult road ahead as he works toward trying to build professionalism and participation all the way up the chain of command. My colleague believes that the current effort of the c.o.o., while heroic, is doomed to failure because the root causes of the problem lie higher up in the organization's chain of command.

CONCLUSION

Managers are voracious readers and each of the topics so briefly discussed in this short paper are covered in books in much greater depth and scope. The author views management from a situational or contingency perspective.

Punishment is but a simple tool that can and has been effectively used but it requires a system that is open, fair and just. It must have an element that can elicit a favorable response in bringing problem subordinates into the mainstream and on to the team.

Participation is a highly complex process as are the situations and environments in which they may be effectively used. Participation and the degree to which it is used must consider the total situation. One only needs to reflect on the old adage: "A camel is a

horse designed by a committee." Or, Robert Thorndike's simple experiment conducted in 1938 that clearly showed groups being much superior to individuals when it came to crossword puzzle solving, but not when it came to crossword puzzle construction.

Professionalism is a quality that we hope all our colleagues and managers possess. A real challenge in today's world of interdependence and globalization is the need to recognize the constraints and limitations brought about by situational factor of which 'culture' plays an important role. Designing participatory and performance problem systems in multicultural settings requires a great deal of knowledge and the creation of corporate cultures that inculcates, blends and synthesizes some highly complex and diverse cultural systems into a unifying entity. Changing a culture through an evolutionary process is a long and difficult process. It may take years or even a decade. The c.o.o. of the organization in the summary of this article is trying to do this but his organization is facing a severe crisis and it is doubtful that he will have or be given the time needed to carry out his program. The U.S. motto "E Pluribus Unum" - - out of many, one - - seems apropos, but to bring this about is truly a challenge for real professionals, especially those working in multicultural environments.

Reference

1. Bateman, Thomas S. and Snell, Scott A., *Management, Building Competitive Advantage*, 4 ed. Irwin/McGraw-Hill, 1999
 2. Belbin, R. Meredith, *Why They Succeed or Fail*, 1981, reprinted 1994
 3. Cleland, David I., *Strategic Management of Teams*, John Wiley & Sons, 1996
 4. Dubrin, Andrew J., *The Complete Idiot's Guide to Leadership*, 2nd ed., Alpha Books, 2000
 5. Falcone, Paul, *101 Sample Write-Ups Documenting Employee Performance Problems: a guide to progressive discipline and termination*, 1st ed., Amacom, 1999
 6. George, Stephen, *Uncommon Sense: creating business excellence in your organization*, J. Wiley, 1997
 7. Koonze, Harold, O'RDonnell, Cyril and Weihrich, *Management*, 8th ed., McGraw Hill, 1984
 8. Sherriton, Jocalyn and Stern, James L., "Corporate Culture/Team Culture: Removing the hidden barriers to team success", *Corporate Management Developers*, 1997
 9. Spitzer, Quinn and Evans, Ron, *Heads You Win! How the best companies think*, Simon and Schuster, 1997
 10. Vroom, Victor H. and Jago, Arthur G., *The New Leadership: managing participation in organizations*, Prentice Hall, 1988
 11. Sharplin, Arthur D., *The Lincoln Electric Company 1984*, McNesse State University
-