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Introduction

It's hard to imagine how anyone could figure it out, but American business spends over $40 billion annually to "educate" more than 8 million "students" (Short, 1987). Training and Development Journal noted that "One out of every eight working Americans participates in a formal training course each year" (Short, 1987, p. 24). There can be no question that formal programs play a significant part in corporate education in general and management development in particular. In response to a query on its investment in developing managerial talent, a common corporate answer is the expense of internal and external training programs.

How effectively training programs develop managerial talent remains difficult to gauge. In a recent study of 15 firms with outstanding reputations for management practices, John Kotter observed that "...as important as formal training can be, it never seems to be the central ingredient in development at these firms" (Kotter, in press). In fact, Kotter notes, it was executives from "firms with reputations for poor leadership [who] often said the main way they developed managers was by means of training" (Kotter, in press).

If training is not the centerpiece of development, then we must look at where people spend 99% of their working time--on the job. Indeed, as Kotter (in press) studied the 15 great-reputation firms, a major theme was the use of challenging job opportunities to develop high-potential managers. There seemed to be no simple formula for this, other than stretching people, challenging them to lead. Various companies created high-responsibility jobs for younger managers, purposefully kept or built large numbers of small but challenging general manager jobs, or encouraged numerous new ventures with leadership challenges. Many found ways to add to challenge by enlarging jobs, creating special developmental jobs, or assigning people to task forces. Some made sure that challenging opportunities were available by forcing "churn," moving people out who blocked key assignments.

These results are not surprising to anyone who has worked with good corporations. Executives may be inclined to view such challenges as "testing grounds" rather than developmental opportunities, but they see to it that their promising young managers face significant job challenges. What is surprising is that so little systematic research attention has been devoted to learning on the job. A recent review of such research (McCauley, 1986) turned up a relatively small number of studies and none that took a
comprehensive look at development through experience. This might not matter if using challenging jobs for development were obvious and straightforward. Many important questions remain unanswered. What, for example, are the work experiences that make the most difference? Is Kotter's list comprehensive, or are there other things to add to it? Exactly what is it that one should add to a job to make it developmentally challenging? If I want to "create" a special job for a high-potential candidate, what elements should be included for developmental impact? Most important, perhaps, what might I expect someone to learn from one of these experiences? What could a young manager learn from leading a small new venture...and is that different than what is learned from the responsibilities of a small general management job?

This book provides some answers to these kinds of questions. It organizes information from 191 high-potential and successful executives from 6 major corporations who described for us "key events" in their careers (things that led to lasting change in them as managers), and who told us what exactly they learned from those events. These exceptional people gave us 616 stories of pivotal developmental experiences, and 1,547 lessons they said they learned from those experiences. Through an elaborate and painstaking process (described in detail in White and Lombardo, 1986), this raw material was sorted by similarity into 16 kinds of experiences ("events") and 34 categories of learning ("lessons") that constitute the core of this book. Additional analyses examined what these various kinds of experiences had in common (the "core elements," if you will, that made each kind of event unique).
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH METHOD

Original Inquiry

How do we develop adequate depth in executive talent to run
the business in the years to come?

Sample

191 executives considered by their corporations to be high
potential or to have lived up to their full potential. These
people came from 6 corporations (5 of them were Fortune 50
firms, the last was a major subsidiary of a large Canadian
corporation) and ranged from high-level functional or general
managers through chief executive (the definition of executive
varies from firm to firm).

Data Collection

Interviews were conducted with 86 hand-picked executives in
3 corporations (usable n=79).

Three additional studies using an open-ended survey developed
from the interviews were carried out in three different
corporations (usable n=112).

Primary Question

This report deals primarily with executives' responses to the
following question (from the interview format; appropriate
alterations were made for the open-ended survey):

When you think about your career as a manager, certain
events or episodes probably stand out in your mind--
things that led to a lasting change in you as a manager.
Please jot down some notes for yourself identifying at
least three "key events" in your career: things that
made a difference in the way you manage now.
1. What happened?
2. What did you learn from it (for better or
   worse)?

Raw Data Pool

616 descriptions of key events
1,547 descriptions of lessons learned from those events
Identification of Categories

The 16 event categories and the original 31 lesson categories were independently and inductively derived from the interview data. These were then tested for adequacy by using them to code data from the open-ended surveys, resulting in identification of event subcategories and significant expansion of the lesson definition and subcategories, addition of 1 new lesson category, and revision of overall lesson categories to the 34 reported here.

Core elements were developed from a content analysis of all 616 events.

Coding and Statistical Analysis

All events and lessons were assigned to a single category by trained coders. Disagreements were resolved by small group consensus. Overall rater agreement was approximately 75%. Chi square analyses (described in detail later on and reported in tables in this manual) were conducted, but the primary statistic used was the percentage of people who said they learned the same specific lesson from the same specific event. This is a very conservative index because none of the executives were given a list of lessons and asked if they learned them from the event.

Additional Detail

A detailed report on the methods used in the initial phase of this study is available. See White and Lombardo, 1986.
Organization and Use of this Book

What we have produced is a technical manual that should be of use to anyone seriously concerned with the development of executive talent (their own or others') through the judicious use of job experience. Hardly light reading on a Sunday afternoon, Part I of Key Events in Executives' Lives describes in great detail each of the 16 events reported, its subtypes (if any), the core elements that define it, the lessons people said they learned from it, and some ideas on how such an experience might be used developmentally.

As it turns out, subsets of the 16 types of experience are related. We have organized this part of the book to reflect similarities among events, beginning with five specific "assignments" these executives had, followed by five events that are all "hardships" of one kind or another, two events focused primarily on "other people" (almost always superiors), and finally four "other significant events" that, while developmentally potent, did not fit easily into the other categories.

Part I, then, is driven by experiences--what they are, what makes them potent, and what they teach. It should be useful to readers whose issues involve:

-- contrasting or evaluating jobs in terms of their developmental potential
-- assessing what a person might learn from a certain type of experience
-- figuring out what elements might be added to a job to increase its developmental potential
-- guidance in creating developmental opportunities that may not now exist
-- getting some ideas on how an organization might make use of a certain kind of experience

Part II of the book provides equally great detail on each of the 34 lessons including definitions, subcategories, examples, and the events with the highest probability of teaching them.

Part II is particularly useful if one is trying to develop a specific skill or ability and would like to know where executives said they learned it. Reviewing the list of lessons might provide a useful means of assessing the developmental progress or needs of individuals. Knowing the lessons and their sources also helps with assessment of career histories, especially in determining whether an individual has had the appropriate opportunities to develop specific skills.
Finding Relevant Information

The key to making effective use of any reference manual is understanding how to find what you are looking for. There were many ways we might have organized this material, so the final outcome has to be somewhat arbitrary. To help you get the information you need and learn how to use the manual, we've listed below some of the questions we are most frequently asked. Under each, we suggest how you might find relevant information.

Q. I have a high-potential manager who's ready for her next developmental move. Two jobs are available, one involving a start up, the other requiring a manager to turn the business around. What are the differences between the two in terms of what this person might learn?

A. In Part I, look up "Starting from Scratch" and "Fix-It" in the Assignments section. Verify that each job meets the requirements of its type by reading the definition, subtypes, and core elements (if a job does not fit exactly, you may need to take that into account). Compare the lessons described for each of the jobs. Finally, compare the potential lessons to an assessment of what the candidate can already do. This should give you an idea of the potential learning for this person from either type of experience.

Q. Several people, including Kotter (in press), have said that a stint in a staff job can be a valuable experience. I have a talented young manager I'd like to expose to corporate staff, but he's resistant to the idea. Are all staff jobs created equal and what can I tell him that will make him see this as a developmental opportunity (if it is!)?

A. Line executives often find the shift into a staff job to be very frustrating. Therefore, a move like this can be risky and it's important to consider both the type of staff job and the potential benefits.

In Part I, Assignments, Line to Staff shifts are described. Look closely at the core elements and examples, and consider whether you have or can create a developmentally rich opportunity. Consider the suggestions and caveats from the "Impressions" section.

Q. Our corporation is determined to implement a new set of corporate values and has carefully drafted a values statement. How do we get our managers, especially the high potentials, to incorporate these new values?
A. Questions of values can be approached through either Part I (Other People—"Values Playing Out") or Part II (lessons on "Management Values" and "Human Values"). Reviewing both will yield additional references (e.g., "Role Models" in Part I, "Politics" in Part II). Among them will emerge a picture of the kinds of events that teach value-related lessons and some of the pivotal elements that generate positive or negative lessons.

Q. Lots of research indicates that early job challenge is important to development. What constitutes challenge early in a career? What is it that people learn from it that's important later?

A. Obviously any of the experiences in Part I might happen early in a career, but the most likely candidates are found under Other Significant Events, "Early Work" and "First Supervision." Because the executives we studied averaged 46 years old, their recollections of the early events were sometimes dim, although first supervisory jobs were often crystal clear. It may be, especially for technical people, that their first time as a manager is a critical developmental event.

Q. I'm responsible for a high potential who is great at motivating people who work for him and at solving operational problems. I'm concerned, though, about his ability to work upward and to see the bigger picture. What kind of an assignment might give him the opportunity to develop those skills?

A. Among the lessons in Part II are at least three possibilities: "How to Work With Executives," "Seeing Organizations as Systems," and "What Executives Are Like." Any of these (or others that may look promising) can refer you to experiences described in Part I that might be relevant.

Q. Obviously formal courses have a place in executive development, but there seems to be a lot of controversy about what kinds of programs make the most sense. What did your executives say?

A. As you can see (Part I, Other Significant Events), "Coursework" was indeed important to many of these executives. The description says why, and what they learned.

Q. We've been considering putting in a formal mentoring system, but I notice you don't have an experience labelled "mentors." What gives?
A. You can tackle this in one of two ways. Part I, Other People, contains two events in which executives focused on the impact of bosses, with "Role Models" sounding most relevant. The second option is to look up (in Part II) the lessons of mentors and see what kinds of experience taught them.

Q. Some of the better companies studied by Kotter (in press) say they give young managers small general manager jobs to develop them. What is the advantage?

A. A general manager job involving broad responsibility (even a little one) is most likely what we called "Change in Scope" (see Part I, Assignments). As you can see, the lessons learned from these kinds of experiences cover a broad range of important managerial skills unlikely to be developed in a functionally or technically narrow position.

Q. I've got a talented manager but no promotions right now. How can I spice up her current job to make it more challenging?

A. You may want to start in Part II, looking at the kinds of lessons you'd like to see this manager learn. Look then at the specific experiences that teach those lessons and see if any of their "core elements" might be added to her job. Another option is to consider a temporary project or staff job (see Part I, Assignments).

Q. One of our most promising young executives just made a very expensive business mistake. What can I do to help him learn from it?

A. In Part I, Hardships, "Business Failures and Mistakes," you'll see what other executives have gleaned from their errors and what helped them learn. You'll have to figure out for yourself what strategy will work best with this individual.

Q. I'd like to get a broad view of how experiences can be used for development. How can I do that without getting bogged down in detail?

A. At the end of each description of an event in Part I is a section entitled "Impressions." If you read all of these, you'll get a non-technical overview of what these experiences are and how they might be used. A second option is to read the non-technical companion book, The Lessons of Experience (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, in press).
Development...or Selection

One executive, whom we respect greatly, to this day does not believe our results. It's not that the events aren't real. It's not that the skills, abilities, values, and knowledge we call "lessons" aren't important. But Gene Cattabiani believes that leadership is in large part a gift and that the ability to lead is not easily developed. These events, Gene believes, simply allowed abilities that were already there to show up. People may say they learned it there, but what they mean is they discovered they had a talent.

We will not enter the nature or nurture debate here, except to suggest that no one is born knowing how to market a steam turbine generator to the Chinese. No doubt leadership has part of its roots in genetics, part in childhood experience in the home and school, and part in adult experience. But even if one believes that selecting "natural" (but presumably incognito) leaders is the best approach, the data in this book can be useful.

If Gene is right and executives have told us about discovering abilities from these events (instead of developing them there), then people trying to identify executive talent should also be able to "discover" it in those events. Thus, some readers may want to view the experiences described here as "testing grounds," and what we have called "lessons" as assessment dimensions. Instead of being an opportunity to develop "toughness," for example, a fix-it job might be seen as an opportunity to assess just how tough a manager is.

The last thing we want to do is give corporations yet another excuse to ignore leadership development. In our opinion, much of the turmoil in business today is the result of a failure to develop leadership and a naive belief that the cream (presumably already Grade A when it floated in) inevitably rises. The research reported here was not designed to validate executive selection practices or devices. Legal guidelines for validity evidence in selection procedures require additional research before the findings reported here can be used for formal selection purposes.

In short, we encourage use of these data as an aid to developing high-potential managers into effective top executives. They provide some guidance in how to look at career experience and how to assess developmental progress. They suggest concrete kinds of assignments that might help a manager develop specific skills. They raise questions about common practices (such as job rotation and coaching) and suggest some ways to improve developmental activities. Because there are no simple formulas for developing executive skills does not mean they cannot be developed.
Caveats, Warnings, and Disclaimers

This book accurately describes what 191 top-flight executives told us about the experiences that made a developmental difference in their lives. Obviously their stories could have been sorted into different categories, called different things, and looked at in other ways, but we are confident that we have preserved the heart of the message. There are, however, a number of reasons to view the results with some caution:

-- This sample of 191 executives from 6 corporations may not be representative of all executives, all companies, or all industries.

-- The experiences and their lessons as perceived by successful executives may not be the same as those for less senior managers or less successful executives.²

-- All of these data were self-report—that is, what people told us in response to a question. We have no way of knowing for sure that the events happened as they were described, or that the executives actually learned what they claimed. It is also possible that memories sometimes failed or that the past was sometimes reconstructed in self-serving ways.

-- There could be (and have been) arguments about things like whether some category names are accurate, whether one or another event or lesson should be coded here or there, and whether certain lessons categories are really all that different from certain others. We hope we've settled such issues reasonably, but such things are often arbitrary.

-- There well may be other events or lessons that we didn't learn about that are very important.

The list could go on, but we obviously didn't spend five years doing research we believed was negated by its methodological shortcomings. Truth is, the collective wisdom of 191 executives provides a useful guide to an area about which little is known. In countless presentations to managers and executives we haven't heard, for example, that a "Fix-It" isn't as tough as we say, or that you don't learn something about leadership from a start-up.

So we encourage healthy skepticism of the results we report, but at the same time, these findings are a reasonable starting point for making better use of experience in developing executive potential. Attempts to make use of these results and future research on similar topics will no doubt improve our understanding.
NOTES

1The companion to this volume, The Lessons of Experience, (McCall, Lombardo, & Morrison, in press) tells the story without the technical detail. The reader who would like an overview of the findings is referred to that volume.

2In fact, comparison of data collected in two companies on an additional 200 executives (not reported here) not considered high potentials at the time of the survey show a significant difference in the order of both their events and their lessons learned and the order of the events and lessons reported by high potentials.
PART I

THE KEY EVENTS
Developmental Assignments
THE DEVELOPMENTAL ASSIGNMENTS

Almost all of the developmental experiences that executives told us about occurred at work. When we tried to cluster them on the basis of similarity, we looked closely at which aspects of the particular experience were central and which were context. For example, many executives described bosses they had worked for, events in which the relationship with the boss was the central theme and the job, if mentioned at all, a background feature. Mistakes executives described were another example, with the faux pas at center stage and the job in the background.

Not surprisingly, the focus of a substantial number of significant developmental experiences was a specific kind of assignment. In these tales, executives described the managerial challenges they had faced, not just the position or their title, and our coding scheme reflects this emphasis: starting an operation from scratch, turning an ailing operation around, carrying out a special project or serving on a project task force, managing an operation of significant scope, and switching from a line job to a staff assignment. In our vernacular, these became, respectively, "Starting from Scratch," "Fix-It," "Project/Task Force," "Change in Scope," and "Line to Staff Switch."

The assignments, then, can be seen as a catalog of what job challenge means to a talented manager. Rising to the occasion meant successfully playing for big stakes in full view of higher management; influencing groups of people never worked with before; coping with unbelievable hours, strain, and stress; building new skills on the run; or constantly dealing with and making decisions about things only partially understood.

Meeting such challenges, according to the executives who lived through them, required learning hand-over-fist. It was on-line that executives said they learned, in essence, the lessons of leadership: the toughness and independence to make decisions; the interpersonal skill to get cooperation from people who had no reason to be cooperative; enough knowledge of the intricacies of the business to take intelligent action; and the stamina to cope with ambiguity, stress, and complexity.

The following section provides a detailed description of each of the five assignments. First is a definition derived from executives' descriptions of the similar events. Included here are any subtypes that may have emerged, for example the three different kinds of start-ups described under "Starting from Scratch." The second part of the description contains
the "core elements" of the event, which can be seen as the
demands and challenges that assignments of this particular
type have in common. This is followed by additional elements
that are common in this kind of assignment, though not always
present.

The third part of the event description lays out the lessons
for which this event was a major source,* providing specific
examples and formal definitions of these lessons. The final
section, titled "Impressions," speculates on how
organizations might use assignments like this in developing
executive talent.

Because the assignments are potent teachers, it is tempting
to assume they tell most of the story. But for all the
lessons they seem to teach, other areas remain for other
events. Values, for example, are primarily the province of
other people. Perspective on one's self is a lesson of
hardships. It is true, however, that the assignments are the
largest block of events that an organization can directly
control.

*Criteria for major sources of lesson categories:

1. The event category (the source) had one of the three
   highest proportions of associations, or co-occurrence,
   with the lesson category,

   and/or

2. The event/lesson association occurred more than would
   be predicted by chance (p<.05) (see Appendix, p. 337).
FORGING NEW DIRECTIONS: STARTING FROM SCRATCH

\[ \begin{align*}
N \text{ events} &= 34 \\
(5.5\% \text{ of all events}) \\
N \text{ lessons} &= 104 \\
(6.7\% \text{ of all lessons}) \\
N \text{ managers} &= 32 \\
(16.8\% \text{ of all managers})
\end{align*} \]

STARTING FROM SCRATCH: DEFINITION

Starting from Scratch is exactly that: building something from nothing or from almost nothing. Organizational strategies for growth and expansion were met through such assignments as building a plant, creating a new department or subsidiary, opening up a new market, or introducing a new product line.

In start-up operations, most managers were geographically distant from corporate headquarters and were on their own with little supervision or support. Achieving their goals almost invariably demanded that they initiate all staffing, training, and team building needed to get the operation up and running. In the midst of all this, managers were plagued with problems over and above the central business challenge. Whether the challenge was battling with a history of the failed start-ups of previous managers, building a town to accommodate the new plant, creating new policies, coping with severe physical environments, or solving social/business/cultural problems, it created havoc on top of an already demanding assignment.

Three types of Starting from Scratch assignments emerged from managers' descriptions: Building, Hiring, and Managing; and Heading Something New.

Building, Hiring, and Managing

These start-ups required building both facility and staff from nothing. Relocation was almost always a prerequisite and was usually overseas, exposing social, political, economic, and cultural differences to be recognized and reckoned with. Relocation within the States imposed similar constraints, sending managers to "graveyard" areas where regional allegiance to certain companies or accepted social and organizational practices were firmly established. Overseas or in the U.S., managers charged with these start-up operations had to hire and train local people despite these and other obstacles such as language barriers. Most of these managers had previously built neither plant nor staff.

"I was assigned to build, start-up, and manage a new plant which was to be a seven-day operation in a
southern location where all industry worked only a five-day week. This was another assignment in which I had no previous experience—the design, construction and operation of a plant geographically located away from the home office."

* * *

"I was sent to South Africa as Managing Director of a new company. It was a tremendous challenge—there were lots of things I'd never done before. I was totally on my own and responsible for construction, building a community, facing and solving political and social issues. I had to bring primitive and professional people together, counter to cultural norms. I had limited resources but was expected to set and maintain excellent standards. I also had many concerns for my family."

**Hiring and Managing**

These start-ups demanded staffing and getting operations up and running in an intact facility. Some managers had to find a building to use but they were spared supervising its construction. These start-ups often resulted from newly purchased businesses or plants. Relocation was usual and almost exclusively overseas. Hiring was often of local, inexperienced people. They suffered from lack of corporate guidance, requiring that managers create their own policies and procedures.

"I accepted a position as manager of a new southern sales division for the company. No division existed so both staff and procedures had to be started from scratch. The South was the worst developed area for the company and taking another, more prestigious division had been offered as an alternative that I refused."

* * *

"After three months with the company, I was sent to Malaysia. All I did was travel and make cold calls. Then I had been so successful that they put me in charge—I had gotten so many contracts they had to! They gave me carte blanche and absolutely no guidance. I had to do it all from scratch—find an office, hire a secretary, accept P&L responsibility. All this was the core of any organization and I was very young and inexperienced."
Heading Something New

Start-ups in this category represented a variety of organizational ventures (e.g., new product lines, expansion of an operation through acquisition and integration, starting new functions or groups, or developing new plans or concepts for an organization). Compared with the other two Starting from Scratch categories, this group was more diverse in nature and less demanding in terms of enormity of challenge.

Most of these start-ups were in the U.S. and imposed additional challenges of either departmental skepticism or a "history of failure" syndrome. Hiring and policy-making existed, typically consisting of hiring professionals and building a team to get a new product, a national sales force, a new business function, or some other new operation off the ground.

"I led my division into a new business opportunity—a new industry. This process involved:

(a) extensive strategic and economic analysis;
(b) formal recommendation to corporate;
(c) an acquisition of a small company;
(d) integration into our division; and
(e) a full development plan/execution of broad scale expansion."

* * *

"The company wanted to launch a product in a new channel of distribution, but provided no resources. In order to succeed, I had to 'borrow' a product destined from another channel for test purposes, run a small test market without management approval, prepare for incremental back-up production without approval, and eventually set up a parallel sales force against the will of a firmly entrenched national sales force. New channel sales eventually exceeded traditional channel sales."

STARTING FROM SCRATCH: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. Organizational growth/expansion was the root of these assignments.

2. Forging ahead was required: moving the organization into new, uncharted areas or business arenas.

3. Creating/establishing new policies and/or procedures for hiring and/or for operations.
4. Leading others/building a working team was an arduous task (inexperienced subordinates, usually with a language barrier or competent professionals who mixed like oil and water with each other or with subordinates).

5. Solving problems that were over and above the central business challenge. Examples:

- dealing with the impact of serious social problems (e.g., riots, race relations, alien values such as non work ethic and bribery).
- finding or constructing physical facilities (or even a town).
- coping with a hostile physical environment (e.g., Arctic, Amazon).
- overcoming disadvantage within the corporate structure (e.g., considered a secondary business, home office skeptical, acting despite the status quo).
- personal stress (not speaking the language, family stress).
- handling relations with a foreign (often hostile) government (e.g., left-wing dictatorship).
- having to get government (U.S.) approval.

Additional core elements

In addition to the generic core, one or more of these was almost always present in a Starting from Scratch event.

1. Geographically distant from headquarters and/or major operations. Almost always a core to two types of Scratch events: Building, Hiring, and Managing and Hiring and Managing, and usually out of the country (South Africa, Malaysia, the Amazon, the Arctic, Mexico, Canada, Brazil, etc.).

2. The manager was basically unsupervised, either because the boss was geographically distant or because there was virtually no direction from above. This meant that the manager was on his own and had a lot of discretion, whether he wanted it or not. (This does not mean that the job was "invisible"; in many cases executives were watching closely to see how it came out.)

3. The manager was inexperienced--often his first time at hiring and/or at construction or he was new to the business function itself or to a major piece of the function like product development.
4. Accepting the job in the first place carried some kind of stigma ("building a plant is a graveyard,\" "the South is a graveyard for our company,\" "going overseas had a stigma,\" "others more qualified wouldn't take it").

STARTING FROM SCRATCH: MAJOR LESSONS

From 34 Starting from Scratch events described by 32 managers came lessons of leadership: accepting full risk and responsibility, building the necessary teams and bridges, and gaining the knowledge necessary to get the job done.

Lessons in context of the type of Start-Up:

Building, Hiring, and Managing a small subsidiary in a foreign country:

"I learned to take risks on people and to keep my cool as a leader. I learned the importance of a leader's ceremonial role to subordinates and troops, how to manage a large team harmoniously, and the importance of a company 'culture.'"

Hiring and Managing a plant that was just starting up in Brazil--with no policy or procedures and with a stigma attached:
"I was inexperienced but my naiveté wasn't fatal—I used common sense and whatever I had at hand. The Brazilians weren't as sophisticated as us so I could get away with things I couldn't do here. Made a lot of mistakes (without much help) but I could learn from them without losing my job."

**Heading Something New** (the development, execution, and launch of a major product):

"I learned how to quickly adapt to a new system—I had to learn to work with two customer systems and sales forces almost overnight. I learned how to balance the needs of the company with risk to the project and to myself, how to manage upward effectively, and how to build and maintain a motivated team. This experience built my self-confidence and respect within the company."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Starting from Scratch assignments

1. Direct and Motivate

Direct and motivate encompasses the staffing, managing, and directing required in building a working organization. Delegation, sharing responsibility, building competence, team building, and leadership roles are predominant topics.

32.4% of the Starting from Scratch assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Start-Up assignments on how to direct and motivate span the following:

**Staffing** focuses on learning the importance of hiring good people.

"I learned to take risks on people."

* * * * *

"When hiring, if you can't get experience, go for intelligence, drive, interest. They will learn from mistakes."

**Directing** strategies are what the name implies: ways to enjoin subordinates. The theme of these lessons is that instrumental behaviors are sometimes needed to accomplish a task through others.
"I learned how to manage a large team harmoniously."

"People management--I learned to work effectively with large, diverse groups of people with different goals and risk-taking profiles than my own."

"I learned how important a leader's ceremonial role is to subordinates and troops."

Starting From Scratch and Other Major Sources of Direct and Motivate

![Graph showing Direct and Motivate](image)

2. Standing Alone

**Standing alone**, taking full responsibility, assuming the risk for the group is the essence of this category.

Learning how to make decisions and take the actions required.

29.4% of the Starting from Scratch assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Start-Up assignments on standing alone:

"I developed a real bias for action. It was a true line experience with final authority."
"I learned patience in explaining circumstances; keeping people busy to keep friction down and the importance of pitching in with the men."

Starting from Scratch and Other Major Sources of Standing Alone

3. How the Business Works

How the business works is exactly that: learning about one's area (division, function) or organization. Included in this category are subjects (e.g., the organization's products, structure, financial or commercial practices, markets) and functions (e.g., marketing, operations, research, manufacturing).

20.6% of the Starting from Scratch assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Start-Up assignments on learning how the business works:

"I was exposed to marketing and sales for the first time."

*I*  
*I*  
*I*

"I was exposed to many new activities--acquisition analysis, new industry, a small entrepreneurial company,
and volatile financial movement."

Starting from Scratch and Other Major Sources of How the Business Works

![How the Business Works](chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Getting Lateral Cooperation

Getting lateral cooperation, getting cooperation in non-authority relationships, lateral relationships and others.

Overall, this category states that to get things done one must be able to involve many others over whom one has no direct authority or control. Several elements are present in this category: how to do it, the importance of doing it, and the diplomacy/human aspect. Within the how to arena are skills in persuasion, selling, participation, bridge building, and cajoling.

20.6% of the Starting from Scratch assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Start-Up assignments on getting lateral cooperation:

"I learned to build bridges with all (strong and weak) support groups."

* * * *

"I learned to build trust levels with two constituencies based on demonstration of the unit's ability to add value."

5. Dealing with People

Dealing with people other than one's peers, bosses, and subordinates requires understanding their perspectives, speaking their language. These languages emphasize the notion that people are different and that to be successful in dealing or communicating with them, one must be sensitive to these differences and act in accordance. Strategies suggested include the following: get inside people's knickers, help others look good; one must be low key; keep a finger on the group's pulse; know when to turn people on and off and put oneself in other's place before acting.

17.6% of the Starting from Scratch assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Start-Up assignments in how to deal with people:

"Basic communication skills are essential. I learned to deal with cultural differences and their effect on work habits and thinking."

* * * *
"When moving into an unfamiliar area or function, you must look at your customer from his perspective to clearly understand the issues."

Starting from Scratch and Other Major Sources of Dealing with People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Discovering What You Really Want To Do

Discovering what you really want to do, what really excites you, is coming to the realization that one has found something which is exciting and worth doing on its own merit. This something can be a subject area, working with others, a lifestyle, or a contribution to something larger than one's self.

11.8% of the Starting from Scratch assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Start-Up assignments on discovering what one likes:

"I discovered that I enjoy working hard, and gain satisfaction from this hard work."

* * * * *

"I had a real sense of accomplishment in going from 'the organization concept to reality' due to my new department's ability to impact the business and be perceived as a key contributor to the total department's success. It was very gratifying."
Starting from Scratch and Other Major Sources of Discovering What You Really Want To Do

IMPRESSIONS: STARTING FROM SCRATCH AND DEVELOPMENT

What it isn't

Almost by definition, something is there for the learning when someone brings something new into existence. But the primary lessons of start-up assignments involve leadership, and the forces driving powerful lessons are hardly modest. This means that a highly developmental start-up assignment does not contain "substitutes" for individual leadership. Substitutes are things that replace individual initiative—that put responsibility for deciding what should be done, and how, somewhere else. Starting something from scratch becomes less potent when 1) there is a well-oiled, highly skilled implementation team sent to implement a well-defined plan (the manager has "experts" to decide); 2) the new thing has been done before and has well-defined procedures and steps—the manager can follow a cookbook (e.g., procedures manual); 3) the start-up is closely supervised from the home office and/or by corporate staff, who either tell the manager what to do or seriously constrain his/her action by requiring sign-offs, authorization, approvals; 4) when the manager's own experience is so complete that he/she thoroughly knows all that must be done.

What it is

The essence of Starting from Scratch is taking action under
high uncertainty and inspiring others to believe in those actions. This is essentially what the core elements demand: Taking action implies authority—either directly given or assumed by virtue of isolation ("There wasn't time to check with corporate"). High uncertainty implies adversity which, in scratch, takes many forms. The manager may now know if the new thing can be done at all, or the context in which it must be done may be so adverse that even things done before are still risky. What's interesting is that the adversity, unlike that in Fix-It events, is primarily external; a strong "we against the elements" flavor. The staff may be inexperienced but they look to the manager for leadership. Developmental Starting from Scratch events are characterized by making do, scrambling, giving up "the book," doing whatever must be done (the manager might be seen digging a ditch if that was the pressing need), and sometimes high personal risk when, to get the thing done, the manager has to ignore policy or directions.

**Strategic uses of Start-Up assignments**

Mature corporations often have a shortage of big time start-up assignments, but they are one of the most potent experiences a seasoned manager can have. If something valuable is rare, the best strategy is to use it carefully.

Fortunately, elements of these assignments are common in other kinds of assignments, so managers can get some exposure to start-ups. Many big scope jobs, for example, have start-up components. It's common to see project teams assigned to roll out a new product or start up a new plant, or cultivate a new market. Some companies routinely introduce or change products and services. The unfortunate side of modest start-ups is that they don't demand the leadership of a full-blown "scratch."

Some companies try to hire managers who have started their own businesses, presumably demonstrating this particular entrepreneurial leadership ability. While this may be the only option for some corporations, there is substantial risk that such a manager will have difficulty adjusting to the constraints of a corporate setting. Starting something from scratch can be one of the most exciting, demanding, exhilarating events in a managerial career—one that makes other assignments look sedate. Thus, the major corporate backfire from hiring or developing strong individual leaders is that they must then tolerate and prize them within a bureaucratic setting.

**What to look for**

The demands of Starting from Scratch are such that a manager
must demonstrate specific abilities. Primary among them are:

Out of a thousand things to be done, grabbing hold of a few priorities and getting on with it.

Ability to make quick decisions under high uncertainty, without undue dependence on corporate approval or policy.

Problem focusing par excellence; ability to solve problems across a wide variety of domains—"doing whatever it takes." This means putting what needs to get done ahead of managerial status or functions.

Inspiring others—building a team from inexperienced people, providing them a sense of mission and progress, leading them through setbacks, maintaining their confidence.
REORGANIZATIONS: FIX-IT

N events = 67
(10.9% of all events)

N lessons = 225
(14.5% of all lessons)

N managers = 56
(29.3% of all managers)

FIX-IT: DEFINITION

Fixing and stabilizing, turning around a failing operation was the key to successful completion of a Fix-It assignment. Stabilizing "operations gone haywire" required managers to dismantle and reconstruct existing operations that were blatantly characterized by poor business performance and, almost always, by resistant, demoralized, or incompetent staffs. Due to the need to simultaneously tear down and build up staff and systems, managers were forced to exhibit oppositeness in their behavior—toughness and structuring behaviors had to be counterbalanced with persuasion and a light touch.

Although the core problems were fairly clear, Fix-It managers usually discovered unexpected problems and obstacles for which they were often unprepared. Restoring long-lost credibility with corporate headquarters coupled with high visibility and pressure was often reported in line Fix-Its. Staff position and product fixes typically placed managers in situations in which they lacked authority over people (e.g., management, customers) whose support they needed. In addition to these obstacles, some Fix-It managers found themselves in new cultures or business arenas or as replacements for well-liked managers.

Fix-It conditions were sometimes created by re-organizations following mergers, sometimes mandated by corporate, and sometimes discovered by managers upon a transfer or promotion.

Three types of Fix-It situations prevailed: Saving the Titanic, Patching Up Holes, and Fixing with Limited Authority.

Saving the Titanic

Managers who took command of these sinking ships walked into organizational pandemonium. These were real messes with consistently lousy business performance records and an abundant supply of people problems (incompetent and/or resistant and/or demoralized staff.) The operations often had lost all credibility and were still losing ground. There were managers who described theft, sabotage, customer
hostility, and strikes against them ranging from age and background to being in an unfamiliar business arena they had to learn about as well as fix. While firing people was almost always an element of these kinds of Fix-Its, occasionally it was the crux of the event: in a few cases the mission was to sink the ship.

"I was transferred from a position as a division service manager to production superintendent of the division's largest plant. The person I replaced was made plant manager. The employee relations were horrible. There were threats, bodily injury, sabotage, refusals of promotions to supervision from the hourly ranks, the total plant performance was under capacity, and there were two hundred outstanding grievances against us. The new plant manager had been superintendent of the plant for thirty-two years. Gradually, plant performance improved and began setting the pace for the whole division. The VP of Manufacturing provided reinforcement. Education and training programs were initiated for all employees--hourly and salary. Ours became a model plant for visits from our other plants and from outside companies."

* * *

"I was assigned to an overseas location where we had major profit problems and receivables exposure. We and our customers were losing money. Two major customers (40% of our volume) went out of business; others were on the brink. There were major labor problems: high unemployment, a communist union, a 'multinational' company. Customers were hostile. They blamed us for their problems. I had to develop a plan to restructure operations and financing, and secure its agreement and implementation by customers, unions, and our own company."

* * *

"I was sent to South America to run and then to sell a company. The company had $26 million sales and 600 employees. I was an ex-consultant who had entered through a staff job."

Patching Up Holes

Fix-Its of this nature revolved around stabilizing ailing products through reorganization and relaunch. Regardless of the age of the product, it was failing in the market and expensive to the company and the manager's mission was to save it. Managers in these turn-around situations faced
resistance from people whose support they needed to get the job done: customers, management, marketing, and sales. Those brands that had a history of failure had the additional obstacles of lack of credibility and no corporate support.

"(A new product) disappointed management when it underwent an authorized change. A major investment had been made but brought in a poor return due to lack of our customers' support. I took over the situation and identified the need to reformulate the product again and relaunch it as soon as possible. New product, advertising, and packaging led to its immediate acceptance by customers and double digit growth for the next three years."

* * *

"I was given a brand to manage that was large but had lost shares every year for twenty years. Management saw it as a cash cow—not where the action was. Over a two-year period, I showed management it could be turned around. Finally, by hook and crook, I got the funding, grew shares by 50%, and doubled the profit."

**Fixing with Limited Authority**

Some Fix-It managers found themselves turning something around in high-risk, high-exposure situations with limited authority. When these events stemmed from a mandate to change something at the top of the organization (e.g., policies or procedures, correcting an ailing staff function), the trick was accomplishing the task without creating adversarial relationships. When they stemmed from being "second in command" in a line turn-around, the major obstacle was the boss and the trick became going around him to get the job done. Regardless of the cause of the authority limitation, managers were forced to overcome it...gingerly.

"My task was to implement change in management philosophy and practice through the president's staff. I had gone into corporate staff as a manager in the organization-systems division. My job was to bring together a new management system after the merger. This meant a change from familial to professional management. I had to deal with the highest level managers in the company without much authority myself. I was dealing in a highly unstructured environment. It was a high-risk/high-exposure situation and I had to get things done without creating adversarial relationships."

* * *
"I was promoted to Executive Vice President of Marketing and Sales. The organization was disassembled and under unprecedented attack by competition. The President was a charismatic leader with the outside world, but not a team-builder, and not focused on installing integrative management processes. Consequently, we had lost initiative and credibility with customers—the critical local marketing and distribution mass. The challenge demanded rebuilding the sales and marketing organizations while simultaneously working with our customer network to restore confidence and investment spending behind a dramatic new strategy. Execution of this was frustrating, because the President did not understand his own shortcomings and these changes required undoing and changing his prior direction. Secondly, it required influencing independent businessmen to upgrade the activity and spending behind a new strategy."

**FIX-IT: CORE ELEMENTS**

The common core of these events

1. The operation was a mess and had to be cleaned up.

2. Habitual problems such as consistent money losses or other obvious declines that indicated poor business performances were evident.

3. People problems were prevalent: the staff was incompetent or resistant or there were resistant lateral or top management people to be dealt with.

**Additional core elements**

In addition to the generic core elements, the following were often reported as core to individual events.

1. Poor strategies or operations in place.

2. Lack of credibility of operation or product had to be overcome.

3. Severe morale problems.

4. Strikes against the new manager (age, education, background, replaced a liked manager, new business arena).

5. Needed support from people over whom manager has no authority.

7. Tough external obstacles with customers who were hostile or had described them.

**FIX-IT: MAJOR LESSONS**

From 67 Fix-It events, 56 managers listed a variety of lessons. The themes covered areas of organizational skills, leadership and attitude skills, and persevering through many tough situations.

### Fix-It/Turn It Around

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mtvte</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Coop*</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Bus Wks</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standg Alone</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Systems*</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persevering</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubPerfProbrm</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extnl Negotn</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altrnt Sltns</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Prs&amp;Boss</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lessons in context of the type of Fix-It:

**Saving the Titanic** (from being assigned to turn around ailing businesses where both operations and people problems were abundant):

"I learned the importance of making decisions versus procrastinating with leadership. I learned to make tough people decisions. I discovered my most effective management style and developed skills in delegation, hiring and selection, and motivating employees three to four levels removed."
Patching a Hole in a product line:

"I learned how to sell--management didn't want to spend any time or money on the brand; how to stick to my guns--most of the time, only I and my core team believed but my conviction plus proof made it work; and how to build commitment--other projects had the limelight. I had to cajole/convince people to share my vision."

Fixing With Limited Authority (working in a matrixed position and very unwelcome):

"I learned to operate by sheer force of logic because no one reported to me. It was a very worthwhile experience, but I had to learn to live with it. Had to get inside people's knickers by understanding their problems and bringing them help. I couldn't dictate to them. I found that you're more welcome if you can bring something to the party--help them look good instead of playing auditor and pointing out their mistakes."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Fix-It assignments

1. Direct and Motivate

Direct and motivate encompasses the staffing, managing, and directing required in building a working organization. Delegation, sharing responsibility, building competence, team building, and leadership roles are predominant topics.

34.3% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments span the following:

Staffing carefully focuses on learning the importance of hiring good people.

"Finding good people is very time consuming."

*  *  *

"It's critical to set and stick with high standards for hiring."

As most Fix-Its called for re-arranging staff, for firing some and keeping others on, many Fix-It staffing lessons bore out a theme of principles to use when selecting who to keep and who to fire from an intact staff such as:
"To identify the best people and keep them in their jobs or increase their responsibility by absorbing more functions."

* * * *

"I had to select the best people within a large group."

* * * *

"To build a team involving diverse levels of skills and personality characteristics."

Managing describes ways to encourage and motivate subordinates describing the following:

"Being able to call upon various previous experiences, particularly in dealing with people, is essential."

* * * *

"Understanding why and how the business at hand evolved is very important in dealing with new or old employees to bring about the changes desired."

* * * *

"Reorganizing without convincing people does not work. Especially without a good new leader."

* * * *

"How to build commitment--other projects had the limelight."

* * * *

"I had to cajole/convince people to share my vision."

Directing strategies are what the name implies: ways to enjoin subordinates. The theme of these lessons is that instrumental behaviors are sometimes needed to accomplish a task through others.

"It is crucial that I maneuver ideas, designs, controls, etc., around so that it comes from them. This gets the job done, with their help and satisfaction."
Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Direct and Motivate

2. Getting Lateral Cooperation

Getting lateral cooperation is getting cooperation in non-authority relations, both lateral relationships and others. Overall, this category states that to get things done one must be able to involve many others over whom one has no direct authority or control. Several elements are present in this category: how to do it, the importance of doing it, and the diplomacy involved. Within the "how to" arena are skills in persuasion, selling, participation, bridge-building, and cajoling.

23.9% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments on getting lateral cooperation:

"Our major customers (and customers in general) are more motivated by quality of professional thinking and execution than by comfort with old ways and familiar people."

* * * *

"Importance of relationships and support of other parts of the organization since all elements (product, advertising, and graphics) came from other groups."
Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Getting Lateral Cooperation

3. How the Business Works

How the business works is exactly that: learning about one's area (division, function) or organization. Included in this category are subjects (e.g., the organization's products, structure, financial or commercial practices, markets) and functions (e.g., marketing, operations, research, manufacturing).

20.9% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments on how the business works are:

"I learned the importance of sound execution in two key functional areas of our business."

* * * * *

"I learned firsthand the necessary business functions and their interactions."
Fix-It and Other Major Sources of How the Business Works

How the Business Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Standing Alone

Standing alone, taking full responsibility, assuming the risk for the group is the essence of this category.

19.4% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments on standing alone:

"I learned the importance of making decisions versus procrastinating leadership."

"I learned to take a high profile, proactive leadership role in a business, beyond my functional accountability."
Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Standing Alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Sup</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How to Build and/or Use Structure and Control Systems

How to build and/or use structure and control systems is filled with examples of learning to manage without being involved in every phase of day-to-day operations by setting up structures and systems which control work processes. Building and controlling systems so they can run without the manager, changing structure rather than people allows managing by remote control.

14.9% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments on building or using systems:

"Leadership requires tight integration of all functions against a few major business-building programs."

* * *

"Coordinate action by elimination of repetitive tasks."
Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Building/Using Structure

6. Learning To Be Tough

Learning to be tough is developing the strength to do what must be done in the service of the organization, even though it may involve a human cost. Being tough requires the ability to stand fast (resist pressure to back off) and to move ahead (grit one's teeth although the action to be taken has the potential of hurting others). This lesson involves learning that, even when an action may hurt someone, to procrastinate is harmful.

14.9% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments on learning to be tough:

"I experienced the great difficulty of making decisions which significantly affect an individual. How little basis a company has to make decisions sometimes."

*     *     *

"I learned to make tough people calls."
7. Persevering Under Adverse Conditions

Persevering under adverse conditions means developing ways to accomplish one's goals in the face of obstacles, recognizing that difficult situations are often not out of one's control, and acting on them. Three types of perseverance were described: standing up for beliefs, moving ahead, and surviving tough times.

13.4% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments on persevering span the following:

Standing up for beliefs: even when personal risk is involved, knowing the importance of standing up for one's beliefs despite opposition.

"How to manage an ineffective boss without alienating him."

Moving ahead: accomplishing the goals of one's assignment despite obstacles and detours; hanging in and moving ahead.

"How to stick to my guns--most of the time, only I and my core team believed, but my conviction plus proof made it work."
"Hang in--persevere--and use common sense."

Surviving tough times: fighting for survival by waiting to come back up after a lost battle or big mistake.

"There can be 'life' after 'death'--comebacks are possible. (I'm still around.)"

"Don't be overwhelmed by the seeming odds against fixing a situation."

Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Persevering Under Adverse Conditions

8. Needing to Act on or Confront a Subordinate Performance Problem

Acting on a subordinate performance problem is one of the more difficult tasks for the manager. The underlying learning is that it's more important to make the move quickly, and at the same time make sure one has adequate staffing to pick up the slack if the decision is a move to terminate.

11.9% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.
Examples of Fix-It assignments or confronting subordinate problems are:

"I can let people go--but it is tough emotionally."

* * *

"Addressing personnel problems early on allowed for a change in leadership that contributed greatly to the successful turn-around."

Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Acting on a Subordinate Performance Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate Performance Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Strategy and Tactics of Negotiation

Strategy and tactics of negotiation encompasses learning to deal with various types of external groups (i.e., clients, governments, competitors, or partners) in situations involving formal negotiation. These include adversarial, collaborative and customer/client relationships.

10.4% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments on negotiation tactics are:

"To deal with unions and to convince them of the need to work for the true well-being of workers."

* * *
"Top-to-top building of proprietary relationships with major customers is necessary."

* * * *

"How to sell a company transaction— it was a ten figure sale— I was lead representative."

Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Strategy and Tactics of Negotiation With External Parties

![Graph: Negotiation with External Parties]

10. Finding Alternatives in Solving and Framing Problems

Finding alternatives are lessons in the art of problem solving, in transcending habitual ways of thinking about problems.

9.1% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Fix-It assignments on finding alternatives include:

"Focus on the one or two key elements that will give the project its chance for success."

* * * *

"When problems hit, quality staff were recruited, systems analyzed, alternatives sought, and the best solutions were implemented."
Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Finding Alternatives in Solving and Framing Problems

![Bar Chart]

11. Managing Former Peers or Bosses

Managing former peers or bosses contains lessons that managers learn as they begin to be promoted over their peers and bosses and must deal with them in a different role. Stressed are the importance of light-handedness and knowing that one can neither make everyone happy nor always win.

4.5% of the Fix-It assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Example from Fix-It assignments on managing former peers or bosses:

"I learned the art of changing and motivating existing managers (most older than I am)."
Fix-It and Other Major Sources of Managing Former Peers or Bosses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Supervisor</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope*</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Other lessons from Fix-It

- Fix-It was a major source (not more than expected) of Use and Abuse of Power; however, only eight lessons were reported in this category from all events.

- Fix-It was a major source of Can't Manage it Alone; however, only two lessons were reported, and they were not more than expected by chance.

IMPRESSIONS: FIX-IT AND DEVELOPMENT

What it isn't

A developmental Fix-It is not minor surgery. The problems that must be faced do not come from a single source (e.g., recessionary pressures) and are not amenable to a single cure (e.g., better control systems). In spite of the complexity, developmental Fix-Its do not allow solutions to emerge at a leisurely pace—there is an urgency that belies the complexity. Finally, the manager does not walk in with a restoration plan ordained by corporate.

What it is

Potent Fix-Its are in fact real messes. The manager is sent
in to resurrect an operation besieged with problems internally and externally, with no obvious single cure, and is under considerable pressure to work a miracle fast ("if it's not turned around in six months, we'll sell that dog"). Usually the decline has been underway for sometime, meaning that downward momentum is established. Action on at least two fronts is required, both of which can be sticky indeed. The inherited staff is, as the core elements show, resistant or incompetent or both. Various bodies outside of the unit are at best leery if not downright hostile, forcing the manager to persuade, cajole, win back any of a number of constituencies (clients, suppliers, other divisions, top executives, unions, whatever). No amount of authority will assure the cooperation of these outside bodies; and while authority is important downward, it alone isn't enough. As one manager put it, "you can't fire everyone." In its most developmental form, a Fix-It carries with it formal authority to act.

**Strategic uses of Fix-It assignments**

A major turn-around is no job for a rookie and may well be the toughest assignment a manager can face. Still, in a real mess almost anything a manager does will improve something, so a key developmental strategy is to keep the manager in the job long enough to see if the Fix-It sticks. As Gabarro (1987) has documented, the initial actions may only clear away enough junk for the real problems to appear. It may take three years before the long-term effectiveness can be determined.

Milder Fix-It exposures for less senior managers are developmental and easily available. There are always countless parts of an organization not performing up to par. Common strategies include assigning people to fix a particular piece of something either as a manager (e.g., turning around a department or small unit), as a trouble shooter, in a staff assignment, or as a member of a task force or project team.

**What to look for**

A big time Fix-It is one of the most revealing assignments in that it requires such a broad range of skills. The variety of staffing problems demands multiple strategies for handling subordinates: firing, intensive one-on-one feedback and counselling, reorganization, morale boosting, coaching. An effective manager will not blindly adhere to one approach (fire everybody) in all cases. Obvious here is the manager's ability to use authority sensitively and effectively.
Equally demanding is the variety of external relations in need of repair. It is a real test of a manager's finesse, ability to establish credibility, and persuade others who have no reason to be persuaded.

Above all, perhaps, a Fix-It demands the utmost in diagnostic skill. Individuals must be "sized up" (who's demotivated, incompetent, salvageable). Multiple causes of poor performance must be unpacked (is it marketing, manufacturing, technology, shipping, invoicing, control?), multiple outside constituencies must be understood (each may be alienated for different reasons). The diagnostic demands are confounded by two major complicating forces: the confusion of cause versus symptom and the need for quick improvement versus longer term fixes. This requires an ability to apply effective band aids while at the same time working toward more permanent solutions (and underlines the need to keep the manager in the job long enough to observe the longer term strategy).

Finally, the adversity of the situation ("I was as welcome as a skunk in church") tests the manager's ability to shoulder responsibility and to make tough decisions--all the while rebuilding confidence within and outside of the operation. It's important to note that such situations can reveal whether the tough decisions that must be made can be carried out with compassion.
ORGANIZATIONAL TESTING GROUNDS: PROJECT/TASK FORCE

N events = 76  N lessons = 204  N managers = 55
(12.3% of all events)  (13.2% of all lessons)  (28.8% of all managers)

PROJECT/TASK FORCE: DEFINITION

Project/Task Force assignments were discrete projects or temporary assignments, done alone or as part of a team or task force. Aimed at specific outcomes, they brought deadlines and high visibility. They typically involved grasping new content areas or activities and grappling with new relationships. The Project and Task Force assignments were typically taken on as short-term assignments rather than as new jobs per se. Often they were extracurricular to a manager's job, creating additional demands on a manager's time.

Whatever the type, duration, or complexity of the assignment, Projects/Task Forces were begun to meet a particular organizational goal. More than other assignments, these had expected and recognizable endpoints indicated by the failure or success of a project. Three types of Project/Task Force assignments were described: Breaking New Ground, Formal Negotiations, and Troubleshooting.

Breaking New Ground

These Projects/Task Forces focused on trying out new ideas, products, or systems for the organization. The major objective of individual "start-up" projects was among the following: product research and/or development, installation of new systems, joint ventures, licensing program start-ups, launching new products, and starting up operations in newly acquired plants.

"A few months after I came to the company, I was faced with the challenge of having to develop, and sell to our own field people, a new advertising campaign for international use. There was little centralized management support for requiring the field to use a fine finished product and there existed a tendency toward fiefdoms that minimized the campaign's utilization and possible success."

* * *

"I was a member of a new plant start-up team whose mission was to take a new plant operation/operating
philosophy from the equipment installation and personnel hiring phase to the completely operational phase in the targeted time line. I was exposed to the numerous trials of making new equipment and programs work as designed."

**Formal Negotiations**

The goal of these Project/Task Force assignments was to facilitate enactment of organization decisions through negotiation with external parties. Types of negotiations described revolved around one of these objectives: negotiation of acquisitions or divestitures, formal agreements with local, U.S., foreign governments, or with labor unions.

"Negotiated a significant wage and benefit reduction with the steel workers for employees at a plant that was losing money because of non-competitive labor costs. If the union and employees had not agreed to the reductions, the plant would have been shut down. Four hundred employees would have been out of work. Our approach to convince the union and employees involved months of honest communication and discussions. We also opened our books to the steel workers to prove we were losing money."

* * *

"During my tenure in public accounting, a large commercial bank was about to terminate us due to poor service. I was assigned to save the office's largest client. This difficult challenge required selecting the right staff, negotiating the services with the client and ensuring top quality work. The end result was that the bank stayed and we were able to receive significant add-on services."

**Troubleshooting**

Troubleshooting Project/Task Force assignments were created to investigate or to get rid of a problem. Investigation of failures, accidents, or suspected illegalities, or fixing a plant by turning it around or shutting it down were the goals of troubleshooting projects.

"I was assigned project management responsibility for a $120,000 research study with a one-year time frame. I was to use staff resources at three geographic locations to research and solve problems at a fourth location. The project had six or seven sub-studies, and there were only four people assigned to the project team. Project team members were my age (27) and educational level
peers, and the key client contact was a close associate of my superior."

* * * *

"I was responsible for uncovering a major ($174 million) accounting fraud that involved a corporate vice-president and resulted in numerous terminations. The detection and development of this fraud required a great deal of judgment and sensitivity. Also, there was a substantial career risk in the event our facts were incorrect or could not be proved. Senior management interest and pressure to establish the extent of the fraud were intense."

* * * *

"Over an eighteen month period of time, I had to manage the shutdown of three electronics plants from an industrial relations standpoint. I had to manage local management as an 'outsider' as well as manage local unions and local community issues."

PROJECT/TASK FORCE: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

Five elements distinguish Project/Task Force from the other assignments.

1. Discrete, temporary assignments created to meet specific organizational goals.

2. Demanded quickly building a working repertoire of the basics: skills or processes.

3. Success or failure clearly marked the end of the assignment.

4. High visibility during and after completion.

5. Dealing with other people was required to accomplish the task, whether they were working with or against the effort.

Additional core elements

In addition to the generic elements, individual event descriptions contained some combination of the following core elements:
1. The assignment involved at least one new kind of activity for the manager.

2. The assignment was additional to the manager's existing job.

3. The assignment was a full-time temporary job.

4. The project took place off-site, demanding travel or relocation.

5. The manager was alone; had full responsibility for project completion.

6. The manager had to accomplish the task with a team.

7. Serving as "the expert" member of a study team.

8. Dealing with external parties whose allegiance was elsewhere.

9. Dealing with lateral relationships whose cooperation was needed. Regardless of the type, each Project/Task Force assignment may as well have been labeled: this is a test. These assignments propelled managers into an alien world in which their old skills meant very little or in which others knew much more than they.

PROJECT/TASK FORCE: MAJOR LESSONS

From 76 Project/Task Force events described by 55 managers came lessons appropriate to meet the demands of the job. The major themes of the lessons were in ways of dealing with many types of people, acting with incomplete knowledge, and gaining self-confidence from successful efforts.
Lessons in context of the type of Project/Task Force:

**Breaking New Ground** (building a licensing program):

"I learned I could cope with many different kinds of people and job problems. Most of my growth was in interpersonal skills--almost everyone doing something for me outranked me or reported to someone else. I learned more and more to control what was going on. Built my confidence that I could accomplish something."

**Formal Negotiations** (selling a plant):

"I learned to put myself in the other guy's shoes. Talked about how they were different than us, why they could produce the product cheaper than us. I learned not to assume that business is linear--that you're either in it or out of it. I also learned the value of initiative and leadership--I took over the negotiation when I recognized that time was short and, if we were going to do it, we had to move."

**Troubleshooting** (a plant shutdown):

"I was exposed to new areas I would never have gotten into. I learned what it means for a 20-year man to have the rug pulled out from under him. The job involved high risk for me. I'd never been in a plant before--it built my confidence."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Project/Task Force assignments

1. **Self-Confidence**

Self-confidence lessons are statements of self-trust, knowing oneself, and arrogance. They span trust in one's own competence (e.g., in one's skills, ability, judgment, intuition). Faith in one's ability to take risks, handle tough situations, and be successful.

26.3% of Project/Task Force assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Project/Task Force assignments on gaining confidence are:

Knowing oneself is just what the name implies--learning to assess oneself, to sort strengths from weaknesses.

"I could learn the language and techniques of a whole new area (pension investment) quickly and make a contribution quickly."
"Be a firm advocate of what you believe."

Project/Task Force and Other Major Sources of Self-Confidence

2. Strategy and Tactics of Negotiation

Strategy and tactics of negotiation encompasses learning to deal with various types of external groups (i.e., clients, governments, competitors, or partners) in situations involving formal negotiation. These include adversarial, collaborative and customer/client relationships.

21.1% of the Project/Task Force assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Project/Task Force assignments on negotiation tactics are:

"How to deal with unions and to convince them of the need to work for the true well-being of workers."

"Top-to-top building of proprietary relationships with major customers is necessary."
"How to sell a company transaction--it was a ten figure sale--I was lead representative."

Project/Task Force and Other Major Sources of Strategy and Tactics of Negotiation with External Parties

3. Comfort with Ambiguity, Stress, or Uncertainty

Comfort with ambiguity, stress, or uncertainty is discovering that one has the capacity to manage in an ambiguous situation. This category includes two major kinds of learnings: that even with incomplete knowledge one has the ability to act in a turbulent context, putting out brushfires while learning the job; and that learning on the run is one way to learn new skills while using old ones.

15.8% of the Project/Task Force assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Project/Task Force assignments are:

Putting out brushfires focuses on the ability to sense which of several brushfires may become forest fires and extinguishing them. Learning that one can roll with the punches, learn from mistakes, and be flexible are examples of this lesson.

"I learned to react quickly to changes in facts on management direction."

* * * *
"On-the-spot judgment was critical--no time for analysis."

* * * *

"Need to occasionally decide on instinct when local professional advice seemed intuitively incorrect."

Learning on the run essentially describes how to apply previously used skills or knowledge to a new, unfamiliar situation and move ahead despite a lack of skills or knowledge.

"How to cover for staff until they catch up on needed skills."

* * * *

"How to quickly learn the skills needed to finish a task."

Project/Task Force and Other Major Sources of Comfort with Ambiguity, Stress or Uncertainty

![Bar chart showing comfort with ambiguity]

4. How to Work with Executives

How to work with executives in various contexts, from how to present ideas to them to the importance of impressing and not antagonizing them. This category contains critical deportment and skills and the art of cajoling.
13.2% of the Project/Task Force assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Project/Task Force assignments on how to work with executives:

Department and skills focuses on proper demeanor, presentation style that are critical in dealing with executives.

"Reporting facts in a manner which points to the appropriate actions will often result in approval of the recommended action."

"Do your homework. Never make a proposal that hasn't been thoroughly analyzed."

Cajoling contains the subtle tweaking and nudging required to lead bosses in one's own direction.

"I used specialized skills to lead and direct top management."

"It takes careful handling of executives with delicate but forceful egos."

Project/Task Force and Other Major Sources of How to Work with Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff*</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Task Fc</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
5. Dealing with Conflict

Dealing with conflict is recognizing and learning that conflict is endemic, that one can deal with conflict or learn to deal with it by reducing, resolving, or avoiding it.

6.6% of the Project/Task Force assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Project/Task Force assignments on dealing with conflict:

"Management decision making could be a relatively rational process if conflicts were faced openly and objectively."

* * * *

"Areas of conflict can be diffused to the point of not being totally dependent upon a department or individuals who stand to make a personal gain. When done successfully, the efficiency of the whole operation is increased. Both quality and cost reduction are attained with the least amount of energy needed to run process."

NOTE: One corporation supplied the lesson "Doing It Beats Thinking About It"...only reported three times in total, two of the three came from Project/Task Force assignments.

Project/Task Force and Other Major Sources of Dealing with Conflict

![Dealing With Conflict Chart]
IMPRESSIONS: PROJECT/TASK FORCE AND DEVELOPMENT

What they aren't

Project/Task Force assignments appear deceptively simple—throw a few people together, give them a task, and wait for individuals to blossom. While Project/Task Force is one of the more flexible developmental assignments, it is also one of the easiest to mishandle. Most organizations are constantly spinning out committees, ad hoc task forces, study teams, and the like, most of which are only marginally developmental or, at worst, aggravating wastes of a manager's time. What characteristics effectively neutralize their development potential?

1. Trivial problems. Task forces often emerge as a means to carry out projects that no one wants to do, usually of an administrative or otherwise routine nature. The less significant the issue to the organization's primary function, the less developmental the experience would be. Deadly projects include redesigning the performance appraisal system, fleshing out personnel policy, handling festive occasions, reorganizing clerical and support functions, coordinating purchasing activities, allocating office space.

2. Undefined problems. Vague, amorphous, philosophical projects also tend to flop. Examples include defining corporate values, speculating on future states (more than a few years out), or other activities with no direct action implications.

3. Unbounded time frames. A project so ill-defined or confounded that it has no meaningful deadline is a dead giveaway. Either no one really cares about the outcome or there is no real action required within a foreseeable future. At worst, the task force may evolve into a standing committee.

4. Unaccountable. Task forces that are not responsible for an outcome or do not report to a significant manager/executive lose developmental potential.

5. Politically staffed. Task forces where membership is based on political as opposed to problem-solving grounds (division x has to be represented) run afoul for numerous reasons: irrelevant members are disruptive, or at least distracting, and stacking makes groups cumbersomely large.
What they are

Effective Projects/Task Forces are driven primarily by the nature of the project or problem. Usually because what must be done is very significant to the business, other necessary characteristics follow. The task is focused, a specific outcome is demanded, the seriousness of the issue mandates a deadline, and important managers/executives are in charge. If the project requires a team, membership is based on the need for individual skills or knowledge that no single individual has. This latter element means members of the team will have to develop an understanding of what other members know or can do.

Examples of potent projects/problems are mergers, acquisitions, divestitures, major reorganizations, cutbacks, crises, joint ventures, labor negotiations, major contracts, new product roll-out, new technology, new markets, plant closings, diagnosing major disasters or failures.

Strategic uses of Project/Task Force assignments

Potent Projects/Task Forces are extremely flexible developmental experiences. A primary advantage of their short-term, critical-problem focus is that managers gain broad (and sometimes in-depth) knowledge of the content area the project addresses in a very short time. Depending on the problem and the other members, Projects/Task Forces can expose a manager to product lines, technology, different divisions; to functional specialties (e.g., finance, legal, planning, marketing, manufacturing); to external groups (e.g., government, clients, unions, suppliers); to various executives (up to and including the board). Not only is there content learning, there can be significant exposure to how other people from different specialties or backgrounds think about problems and issues, and how the various perspectives came together to bear on a larger issue.

Because no manager can work in every division and function of a large corporation, Projects/Task Forces can be extremely useful ways to gain understanding of other parts of the organization without permanent assignment to them.

Projects/Task Forces can be used in addition to a manager's full-time assignment or as a temporary assignment. The former has advantages because the focused, intense project time forces the manager to learn ways of delegating more of the current job to have time for the project. The latter is useful for a manager between permanent jobs (rather than allowing stagnation). It can be extremely powerful if a project is undertaken while at the same time returning to school in a relevant area (e.g., taking a finance course while serving on an acquisition task force).
Projects/Task Forces are easily manipulated to provide important opportunities for either inexperienced or experienced managers. Varying the importance of the problem, areas spanned by members, etc., can significantly reduce or enhance the demands of the experience. Less mature managers can experience elements of Fix-It and Starting from Scratch assignments by working on project teams—at relatively low individual risk.

Some projects involve a manager working alone on a problem. The ability to get cooperation from people over whom there is no formal authority is still demanded, however, and may be even more difficult when those people aren't serving on the task force.

In short, Projects/Task Forces and staff assignments are major vehicles for exposing managers to various parts of the business and getting them to focus broadly on a limited problem. They are also primary exposure areas to working with executives, especially in an advisory role.

What to look for

Projects/Task Forces focused on an important problem within a tight deadline test numerous abilities. Primary among them are 1) the ability to grasp, quickly, the parameters of a problem; 2) the ability to draw on the expertise of others and integrate their perspectives into a broader understanding of both the problem and its solution; and 3) to come up with a recommendation and present it to critical executives. Depending on the area of focus, specific skills (e.g., negotiation) may also be seen.

Particularly visible in Projects/Task Forces are the inabilities to handle crucial aspects. For example, a manager may seek a technical haven, contributing only his/her expertise and not integrating that knowledge with other people's. At the other extreme, a task force member may effectively grandstand, not listen to others and, once again, fail to integrate diverse perspectives.

Also visible is how the person deals with executives, both in ability to package a lot of work into a short presentation (or report) and to deliver it in a way that executives can understand. Then is the crucial test of whether the person can defend the recommendation in the face of criticism.

Because Projects/Task Forces often involve negotiation (with a union, a partner, another organization), it can be a significant test of a person's ability to really understand someone else's point of view (a key in effective negotiation).
At its heart, then, Project/Task Force is all about a manager's ability to solve a problem, working with and through people over whom he/she has no control, and selling and defending the solution to people who have a great deal of control over the manager.
MANAGEMENT TRANSITIONS: CHANGE IN SCOPE

N events = 104  (16.9% of all events)
N lessons = 281  (18.2% of all lessons)
N managers = 78  (40.8% of all managers)

CHANGE IN SCOPE: DEFINITION

The word Scope supplied its own definition: an increase in responsibility that was both broader and different from what had gone before. Changes in Scope included switching to new businesses and massive increases in numbers of people, dollars and functions to manage. In Scope changes, managers coped with numerous problems: the enormity of the job, pressure from top management, staffing and P & L problems, and unfamiliarity with the products, the business, etc.

In all Scope changes, managers were confronted with a new situation in which their knowledge was, in some way, incomplete. While directing others and seeing that operations ran smoothly, they had to learn essential parts of their job "on the run." "Getting their arms around the job" was the consistent theme of this event. Jobs that were changes, Scope jobs required managers to cope by relying on structures and other people to help get the job under control. For some successful executives it was the first time they had run up against a job that was larger than they were.

Scope events represented job changes with minor to huge significant increases in responsibilities and/or demands. These are two broad types of Scope: Huge Change in Scope (Lateral Jump Shifts and Large Promotions) and Minor Change in Scope (Sideways Moves and Functional Transfers or Small Promotions).

Huge Change in Scope

Those changes of level and/or function were both large and extreme, calling for major transformation in work roles. Many of the elements of the work and the skills required to do the job changed. These Scope changes were more likely to be sudden or unexpected than were small Scopes. The managers were more likely to have "total responsibility," and the jobs were often too big for one person. These factors sparked personal realizations that "they couldn't do it all" and how imperative it was for them to refine their management techniques. Directing people was no longer enough: They had to learn to develop subordinates and create an atmosphere where they could continue to grow. They had to become
accustomed to building systems and work processes to get things done instead of doing the job themselves. Moreover, they needed to be able to sort out brushfires, decide what was most important and move people towards that goal.

Lateral Jump Shifts

The largest and most overwhelming leap in Scope was sometimes referred to as a "lateral jump shift." It was both a promotion and a change in function or business. In these instances executives faced more responsibility, increased size, more people to manage, unfamiliarity with business or technology, and a need for a dramatic change of skills. These types of Scopes were associated with more core elements than other types.

"I accepted a job overseas (moved from marketing to manufacturing). It was a traumatic experience just to move to another country. I was not able to speak the language. My family had a tough transition. I was leaving the mainstream of the division. It was the first time I had full responsibility: I had never been a plant manager, I had always been "assistant to." I had to get manufacturing people to do what needed to be done. A lot of coordination was required. I was in charge of 7 plants in 7 countries—all of which had their own ideas. I had to make decisions when to expand and when to cut back."

Large Promotions

Another physically and intellectually demanding Scope move was a large promotion. The distinction between this and "lateral jump shift" was that the large promotion did not include a change in business or function. It was a change that was described as being a direct expansion from the previous job. In large promotions managers were often asked to take their boss's place and, in some cases, a position that was higher than their superior. Despite the "linear" nature of the move, the change of level was very large and dramatic; a major transformation of work role. These Scope jobs often placed a severe challenge on managers to make the transition smoothly.

"I was promoted to replace my boss after two months with the company. I took over two new departments as well. One department, marketing research, was poorly staffed and ineffective. The Research Director quit almost immediately. I had to run the department myself (while familiar with research, I knew less than my subordinates) plus two other departments while charting a new course and building a new organization. I had to
fire several people, keep good people motivated and integrate new staff smoothly."

* * *

"I was promoted to Executive V.P. for a holding company in charge of all functions and reported to the president and CEO. I was being 'groomed for the president position.'"

**Minor Change in Scope**

Those changes of level, function or both, being relatively minor, were more alterations than transformations of the manager's work roles. The majority of the elements of the work stayed the same. Many skills from previous jobs could be used on the new one, and these moves were likely to be at lower levels in the organization than large-scale jumps.

**Sideways Move**

Even a "sideways" move (i.e., a change of function or business; no promotion) can be extremely demanding if the elements of size and complexity increase dramatically.

"Changed companies, moved from Plant Manager at [co.] to Plant Manager at [co.]. It was a larger plant with a history of performance problems. I followed an excellent individual who had started a positive turnaround of the plant. I had to negotiate a union contract nine months after assuming this position. Previous negotiations had all resulted in strikes. There were major management performance issues that needed to be dealt with. I did not have personal technical competence with products."

**Functional Transfers or Small Promotions**

Many managers reported functional transfers and promotions in which the demands placed on them were more modest. In these cases the change of level, function or both was relatively small. A few, but not most, of the elements of their work changed, and frequently skills used in previous jobs were transferable to the new ones. Some found themselves learning a new product line:

"In 1980 I was transferred to a plant with a totally different product line. This plant manufactures general products for the industry. P & L is a local-level responsibility. After one and one-half years in this assignment, I was transferred back into the mainstream division."
Some faced a similar, but larger job.

"I changed companies--from a smaller to larger food manufacturer. I entered at similar position--region sales manager with development plan for rapid growth. I gained exposure to more professional marketing and financial discipline."

And still others took on increased responsibilities that provided new challenges at a manageable level:

"I relocated, and at the same time, took on the Accounting responsibilities for our division. I had the fun of working out all the day-to-day arrangements of setting up and maintaining a new office."

CHANGE IN SCOPE: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. An increase in job responsibilities from previous experiences the manager had had. This increase was described in one or both of the following elements. The variables that comprised additional core elements are listed under the two basic types of responsibility increases reported, size and complexity."

Size. The size of the job increased moderately, to dramatically, depending on these core elements:

1. more people to manage
2. larger sites
3. more sites
4. more groups
5. more functions
6. more areas
7. more clients
8. bigger budgets

Complexity. The complexity of Scope events increased as managers had to cope with one or more of the following variables.

1. Unfamiliarity with content
   a. technology
   b. products
   c. business

2. Suddeness, unexpected change. (Scope events
were frequently precipitated by a superior
leaving abruptly, sometimes due to death or
illness.)

3. Increased visibility, pressure and exposure to
top management.

4. Bottom line responsibility.

According to the managers who reported a Scope change, these
core elements listed were the most salient factors for this
event. However, not all of these elements appeared in all
Scope events. As would be expected, the larger and more
challenging jobs had more of the size and/or complexity
variables present than did the smaller moves.

CHANGE IN SCOPE: MAJOR LESSONS

Seventy-eight managers described 104 events that were
classified as Scope assignments. Change in Scope, being the
largest of the 16 event categories, contained a very diverse
group of jobs. It is not surprising, then, that managers
reported learning all types of lessons. Thirty-one of the 32
lesson categories are represented in Scope events. There are
certain learning themes that stand out as being essential for
coping with the demands of a Change in Scope but, as with the
core elements, the lessons that managers reported depended,
to some extent, on the scale of the type of Change in Scope
they were facing.

Change in Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mtvte</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Manage</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Dif Tec</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devlop People</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MgmtPrs&amp;Boss</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bldg Systems</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons in context of the degree of Scope change:

Huge Change in Scope—a promotion to the top personnel slot:

"I learned to look, act, and think older. That management was much more complex than in theory. Treatment of subordinates involves deft touch. I learned how to manage multiple and conflictive responsibilities, and I learned the complexities of international culture differences."

First major multi-functional experience:

"I learned how critical having the right people are, not only in the technical sense but also in the sense of working hard and pulling as a team. I had to give difficult performance appraisals and keep up motivation. I learned how to manage new functions without being a technical expert and, in fact, bringing insight and innovation to those functions. I learned of the importance of bench strength because you can't possibly fill in for all the open slots and, finally, if you don't manage your peers, your staff suffers."

Minor Change in Scope—changed companies (same job):

"I learned about more professional/disciplined system of sales management, high standards in a system of personnel management. I learned sales merchandising and promotional development and was exposed to more professional marketing and financial discipline than before."

Relocation and exposure to new area:

"I learned a lot about our accounting practices and enjoyed the task of training the office team to handle all our business activities efficiently. I learned to be very self-sufficient."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Change in Scope assignments

1. Direct and Motivate

Direct and motivate encompasses the staffing, managing, and directing required in building a working organization. Delegation, sharing responsibility, building competence, team building, and leadership roles are predominant topics.

31.7% of the Change in Scope assignments had at least one of these lessons:
Examples from Change in Scope assignments on how to direct and motivate span the following:

**Staffing** focuses on learning the importance of hiring good people.

"Improved my hiring skills."

* * *

"I learned about the importance of high-quality support in a leanly staffed organization."

* * *

"How critical having the right people is, not only in the technical sense, but also in the sense of working hard and pulling as a team."

**Managing** describes ways to encourage and motivate subordinates describing the following:

"Most employee morale problems can be solved by better communication and making people feel they are a part of the operation."

* * *

"One of the prime management tenets—push decision making to the lowest possible level and develop the employees' confidence in their ability to make their decisions."

**Directing** strategies are what the name implies: ways to enjoin subordinates. The theme of these lessons is that instrumental behaviors are sometimes needed to accomplish a task through others.

"How to measure people and upgrade staff."

* * *

"How to organize staff and meet objectives."

* * *

"Making employees work is an art that, if correctly applied, can provide superior results."
Change in Scope and Other Major Sources of Direct and Motivate

2. Can't Manage It All By Yourself

Can't manage it all by yourself is exactly that: the discovery that, by its very nature, the managerial job cannot be done alone; that delegation and reliance on others are crucial components of the job. Realizing that the scope is too large to handle alone and that one's managerial success requires building teams and relationships and reliance on others exemplified this category.

11.5% of the Change in Scope assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Change in Scope assignments:

"I realized that you can't manage another thing just because you can manage one thing. I went from fighting frogs to fighting elephants."

* * * *

"I was shocked that I couldn't do everything."

* * * *

"I saw the importance of bench strength because you can't possibly fill in for all the open slots."
"You can't do it all by yourself."

Change in Scope is the only Noteworthy Source of this Lesson

3. Develop Your People

Develop your people describes learning that part of dealing with subordinates is developing them. This includes understanding that people can be helped to change and learn if the "right" environment (challenges, opportunity) is provided, and that individual growth benefits the organization.

7.7% of the Change in Scope assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Change in Scope assignments in developing others are:

"Need to develop people through cross-fertilization."

"As you increase your job level, you are less involved with the front end of the operation, and more with developing and counselling people."
"I learned how to take control of a new acquisition and make the key players feel proud to be a part of a larger organization and convince them that they would be a part of strengthening it."

Change in Scope and Other Major Sources of Developing Your People

![Bar Chart]

4. Managing Former Peers or Bosses

Managing former peers or bosses contains lessons that managers learn as they begin to be promoted over their peers and bosses and must deal with them in a different role. Stressed are the importance of light-handedness and knowing that one can neither make everyone happy nor always win.

7.7% of the Change in Scope assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Change in Scope assignments on managing former peers or bosses:

"I learned to look, act, and think older."

* * * *

"I learned how to manage a difficult role reversal and still hold close friendships."
5. Management is Different from Technical

Learning that management is different from technical in terms of both requirements and challenges entails a shift in focus from individual task performance to managing people in order to accomplish a task. This category contains the recognition that people are key, that they can contribute either to accomplishments or to roadblocks, and the realizations that management is a separate skill, that one must leave the nitty gritty of technical work behind, that technical competence is no longer enough, and that management requires reliance on and working through others.

7.7% of the Change in Scope assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Change in Scope assignments are:

"Management was much more complex than in theory; treatment of subordinates involves a deft touch."

* * * * *

"Need to earn respect by who I was versus just technical skills."

* * * * *
"Recognized the human input in business--appreciation for people's contribution."

Change in Scope and Other Major Sources of Management is Different from Technical

6. How to Build and/or Use Structure and Control Systems

How to build and/or use structure and control systems is filled with examples of learning to manage without being involved in every phase of day-to-day operations by setting up structures and systems which control work processes. Building and controlling systems so they can run without the manager, changing structure rather than people allows managing by remote control.

6.7% of the Change in Scope assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Example from Change in Scope assignments on building or using systems:

"When the chief financial officer died, I was promoted from a function where I knew almost everyone to one with 1,400 people. I had to learn to trust, delegate, focus upward and build systems to run what was below me."
Change in Scope and Other Major Sources of How to Build and/or Use Structure and Control Systems

**How to Build or Use Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPRESSIONS: CHANGE IN SCOPE AND DEVELOPMENT**

**What they aren't**

Change in Scope assignments are both frequent and varied, but they share the common attribute of managing an organization that's doing reasonably well. Some aspects of the business may have problems (elements of Fix-It) and some aspects may be starting up (elements of Starting from Scratch), but the focus in Change in Scope is on maintaining and/or moving forward. As suggested by the name itself, Change in Scope implies larger responsibility. Developmentally viewed, meaningful Changes in Scope are not:

1. Just a little bit more of the same. Modest jumps, such as straight line promotions with a few more people, etc., don't pack much wallop.

2. Temporary assignments. Impact comes from being in charge—brief rotational assignments have little developmental pay-off, especially in Scope changes. Because the business is doing all right, it takes time to hurt or help it.

3. Diffuse in accountability. Being part of a management team with shared responsibility or being second-in-command negates the developmental potential of Scope.
What they are

Change in Scope assignments with high developmental impact have three core features. They force the manager to cope with scale, in either a relative or an absolute sense. They put the manager in charge of a whole something, in its purest sense, "the bottom-line." They demand that the manager learn something new; a new function or product line or site(s). At the highest developmental level, we are talking about being responsible for an operation whose scale is beyond the manager's ability to stay on top of everything. The demand is learning how to manage when you are responsible for results but you can't do it all yourself.

Strategic uses of Change in Scope

The many forms of Scope, from single promotion to gargantuan leaps, make it a versatile developmental tool. These assignments lend themselves to the gradual stretching approach, where a manager can be given successively larger pieces to handle. In addition, increased scale permits sprinkling of other developmental elements such as turning around a piece of the operation. As mentioned earlier, however, the key to these assignments is staying in them long enough to have an impact (probably 2-3 years). This means that there can be only a few Scope changes in a career if a manager is to have diversity in developmental assignments. One way to get maximum advantage is to view the use of Scope changes against two separate developmental goals. One is managing the whole, being responsible for a significant piece. The other is confronting scale (in an absolute sense) in terms of numbers of people, dollars, sites, functions, and the like. This way of thinking leads to a strategy of putting young managers in charge of a small operation as early as possible (but after the first supervisory job), dealing later in their careers with issues of scale. Some organizations find ways of getting this early exposure through international assignments (where operations are often smaller and consolidated) or through assignment to small businesses or operations (sometimes acquired deliberately for developmental purposes).

It was suggested earlier that scale is both relative and absolute. That is, increases in responsibility are relative depending on what the manager has done previously and absolute in terms of sheer magnitude. Experience with scale increases are also embedded in Fix-It, Starting from Scratch, and sometimes staff jobs. It is inefficient developmentally to use Scope assignments alone to gradually expand a manager's exposure.
What to look for

A Change in Scope job of any magnitude tests several major attributes essential to executive leadership. Foremost among them is the ability to manage things with which the manager is unfamiliar (e.g., new functions, sites, business, people). This "ability" has many components, including sizing up the staff, delegating responsibility, identifying trouble spots, developing competent subordinates to manage pieces of the operation, etc. This constellation was best described by an executive as "learning to manage by remote control." At a psychological level, Change in Scope requires accepting responsibility for outcomes which are largely determined by the work of others. Thus, the major demands are downward.

Scope changes are also revealing because, by definition, the operation is doing well when the manager enters it. This means that the manager has to improve it some (which may be hard to do) while at the same time not destroy it. This requires both diagnostic skill and an ability to judge the reasons things are going well. Whatever changes are made must be carried out without disembowelling the reasons for success to date.
PERIODS OF TRANSITION: LINE TO STAFF SWITCH

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
N \text{ events} &=& 13 \\
(2.1\% \text{ of all events}) & & N \text{ lessons} &=& 47 \\
& & (3.0\% \text{ of all lessons}) & & N \text{ managers} &=& 13 \\
& & (6.8\% \text{ of all managers})
\end{array}
\]

LINE TO STAFF SWITCH: DEFINITION

These events involved managers who moved (not always by choice) from line operations to corporate staff roles. The purpose of these assignments was to teach managers the "other side" of the business and expose them to corporate strategies and culture, but the jobs themselves varied greatly. Unlike many other events, Line to Staff switches do not fall into neat subcategories: The assigned areas encompassed planning, financial analysis, general administration, R & D management, training and human resources, and productivity improvement. There was also wide variation in the length of assignment (nine-month stint to permanent job) and level of the manager (entry level to VP).

The nature of these events appears company-specific although that may be due to the small number of reported Line to Staff events; they are presented as company-specific for purposes of this technical report.

Company A

This company's Line to Staff events involved moving to a job with a discrete mission (e.g., forming a new function or department, reorganizing a function or department, and administration of several departments). These jobs offered the advantage of high visibility coupled with challenge: They often provided initiation into the world of corporate headquarters and demanded new skills and ways of thinking that were foreign to line managers.

"Promoted to run headquarters personnel staff (and to simultaneously go to Columbia University Executive MBA program). My experience was largely executional, this job almost purely strategic/conceptual. Staff needed complete reshaping as many open jobs and poor performers. Time critical issue as absent all day Fridays due to school and had thirty hours per week of out-of-class work."

Company B

Company B's managers typically found themselves thrown into high-visibility jobs and exposed to corporate headquarters
for the first time. They reported to senior executives (as many as four levels up) and operated in technical areas (business/financial analyst was most common) where they lacked theoretical and practical knowledge.

"Assignment to business analyst position. Jumped into whole new thing. Boss pushed me for it. Worked for Division VP and dealt almost daily with things he worked on."

* * *

"Assignment in corporate. Totally different environment. First staff position; never before in a position with no bottom line. Intellectually demanding. I had trouble accepting the sterility of the analysis— it was dehumanizing. I did not enjoy the job, although I had a good boss and an exciting chance to work with top brass."

Other Companies

Three other companies each had one manager report a Line to Staff switch.

"I was offered within the same company a job change requiring a move from Operation (Plant) Management to Marketing Management. I was pleased to be given the opportunity to broaden my business knowledge, but I underestimated the difficulty in adapting to a new environment."

* * *

"Was given a short nine-month special assignment working in the office of Vice President of Corporate Manufacturing. This was a job which allowed access to how the company is operated at the top levels."

* * *

"I was offered a job as division HR manager at NDE in Houston; traumatic and kind of tough. Uprooted the family and I traveled about 50% of the time. Frustrating management style totally different from HQ. All staff reported to someone else. Generalist position."
LINE TO STAFF SWITCH: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

Despite the organizational differences, these Line to Staff events have several elements in common.

1. New environment/new ways of thinking.
2. Intellectually challenging/demanding.

Additional core elements

While not present in all the events, some combination of the following elements appeared in individual Line to Staff switches.

1. Exposure to high-level executives.
2. The job was "highly recommended," not sought (e.g., I was "selected" or "pushed").
3. Had to relocate to corporate headquarters.
4. High degree of frustration/no bottom line.

Line managers accustomed to finite jobs and tangible results had to readjust their thinking in order to tackle the more conceptual and strategic staff role. Moreover, they had to make this mental transition while struggling with new technical areas and being watched by high-level executives. These events were depicted as intellectually challenging, but fraught with tension and frustration. Many of the managers did not enjoy their staff jobs, but all learned valuable lessons regarding executives and their organizations.

LINE TO STAFF SWITCH: MAJOR LESSONS

From these 13 staff assignments, managers gained insights into the norms and values of their organizations. The aura and mystique surrounding executives began to evaporate as the managers were exposed to executives and learned how they thought about issues and planned strategies. They came to understand the broader context in which decisions must be made as they picked up new technical expertise and learned how a business must respond to the external environment. Finally, they came to accept that ambiguity is going to be present when constructing strategies for future events.
Lessons in context (of the company in which the Line to Staff switch occurred):

Company A:

"I learned to work with all corporate functional groups, and I better understand the needs and problems of other functional groups. I learned to look at each of the businesses in a much broader perspective and how to administer, too, and communicate with the international operation. I am learning to be more patient."

Company B:

"The aura and mystique of executives vanished—I was treated as an equal. Each other manager was distinct—I learned as much about what not to do as to do. I found that I could think strategically and that my logic was acceptable to upper levels. I discovered I was smart enough to play with the big guys and that I could take on the unfamiliar without fear."

The Other Companies:

"It was a further broadening experience. I had access to financial information on capital spending and could observe firsthand how the company was controlled. It also gave me an opportunity to meet a lot of people as
they were called into the Vice President's office."

* * *

"Initially I operated with a low knowledge base of marketing, and this, combined with routine exposure to several levels of senior management, made the early months very difficult. I learned a new aspect of business. It broadened me and made me realize a General Management career was what I wanted. It also gave me a better appreciation of differences and difficulties between Staff (Marketing) and Line (Sales) responsibilities and the need for effective interaction. Also with the change to a completely new job in terms of daily activities and knowledge base, it necessitated a more effective planning of my own time, forcing self-discipline in time management."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Line to Staff assignments

1. Specific Technical Knowledge

Specific technical knowledge lessons are statements of new content in a well-defined technical area. This category includes learning technical or business content areas such as finance, strategic planning, computers, budgeting, and law.

53.9% of the Line to Staff assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Line to Staff switches in technical content:

"Painfully, I acquired technical breadth and strategic thinking skills."

* * *

"I learned to understand discounted cash flows."

* * *

"Learned strategic planning, forecasting and budgeting."
Line to Staff and Other Major Sources of Specific Technical Knowledge

2. How the Business Works

How the business works is exactly that: learning about one's area (division, function) or organization. Included in this category are subjects (e.g., the organization's products, structure, financial or commercial practices, markets) and functions (e.g., marketing, operations, research, manufacturing).

38.5% of the Line to Staff assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Line to Staff switches in business knowledge:

"I learned a new line of business (beverages) as my first five years had been spent in the snack food business."

* * *

"I was exposed to marketing, operations, research, manufacturing and sales."

* * *

"I learned a new aspect of business. It broadened me and made me realize a General Management career was what I wanted. It also gave me a better appreciation of
differences and difficulties between Staff (Marketing) and Line (Sales) responsibilities and the need for effective interaction."

Line to Staff and Other Major Sources of How the Business Works

3. Comfort with Ambiguity, Stress, or Uncertainty

Comfort with ambiguity, stress, or uncertainty is discovering that one has the capacity to manage in an ambiguous situation. This category includes two major kinds of learnings: that even with incomplete knowledge one has the ability to act in a turbulent context, putting out brushfires while learning the job, and that learning on the run is one way to learn new skills while using old ones.

30.8% of the Line to Staff assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Line to Staff switches in dealing with ambiguity, stress, or uncertainty are:

Putting out brushfires focuses on the ability to sense which of several brushfires may become forest fires and extinguishing them. Learning that one can roll with the punches, learn from mistakes, and be flexible are examples of this lesson.

"Prioritization is critical as one can't do everything at once."
PERIODS OF TRANSITION: LINE TO STAFF SWITCH

N events = 13  N lessons = 47  N managers = 13
(2.1% of all events) (3.0% of all lessons) (6.8% of all managers)

LINE TO STAFF SWITCH: DEFINITION

These events involved managers who moved (not always by choice) from line operations to corporate staff roles. The purpose of these assignments was to teach managers the "other side" of the business and expose them to corporate strategies and culture, but the jobs themselves varied greatly. Unlike many other events, Line to Staff switches do not fall into neat subcategories: The assigned areas encompassed planning, financial analysis, general administration, R & D management, training and human resources, and productivity improvement. There was also wide variation in the length of assignment (nine-month stint to permanent job) and level of the manager (entry level to VP).

The nature of these events appears company-specific although that may be due to the small number of reported Line to Staff events; they are presented as company-specific for purposes of this technical report.

**Company A**

This company's Line to Staff events involved moving to a job with a discrete mission (e.g., forming a new function or department, reorganizing a function or department, and administration of several departments). These jobs offered the advantage of high visibility coupled with challenge: They often provided initiation into the world of corporate headquarters and demanded new skills and ways of thinking that were foreign to line managers.

"Promoted to run headquarters personnel staff (and to simultaneously go to Columbia University Executive MBA program). My experience was largely executional, this job almost purely strategic/conceptual. Staff needed complete reshaping as many open jobs and poor performers. Time critical issue as absent all day Fridays due to school and had thirty hours per week of out-of-class work."

**Company B**

Company B's managers typically found themselves thrown into high-visibility jobs and exposed to corporate headquarters
LINE TO STAFF SWITCH: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

Despite the organizational differences, these Line to Staff events have several elements in common.

1. New environment/new ways of thinking.
2. Intellectually challenging/demanding.

Additional core elements

While not present in all the events, some combination of the following elements appeared in individual Line to Staff switches.

1. Exposure to high-level executives.
2. The job was "highly recommended," not sought (e.g., I was "selected" or "pushed").
3. Had to relocate to corporate headquarters.
4. High degree of frustration/no bottom line.

Line managers accustomed to finite jobs and tangible results had to readjust their thinking in order to tackle the more conceptual and strategic staff role. Moreover, they had to make this mental transition while struggling with new technical areas and being watched by high-level executives. These events were depicted as intellectually challenging, but fraught with tension and frustration. Many of the managers did not enjoy their staff jobs, but all learned valuable lessons regarding executives and their organizations.

LINE TO STAFF SWITCH: MAJOR LESSONS

From these 13 staff assignments, managers gained insights into the norms and values of their organizations. The aura and mystique surrounding executives began to evaporate as the managers were exposed to executives and learned how they thought about issues and planned strategies. They came to understand the broader context in which decisions must be made as they picked up new technical expertise and learned how a business must respond to the external environment. Finally, they came to accept that ambiguity is going to be present when constructing strategies for future events.
they were called into the Vice President's office."

* * *

"Initially I operated with a low knowledge base of marketing, and this, combined with routine exposure to several levels of senior management, made the early months very difficult. I learned a new aspect of business. It broadened me and made me realize a General Management career was what I wanted. It also gave me a better appreciation of differences and difficulties between Staff (Marketing) and Line (Sales) responsibilities and the need for effective interaction. Also with the change to a completely new job in terms of daily activities and knowledge base, it necessitated a more effective planning of my own time, forcing self-discipline in time management."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Line to Staff assignments

1. Specific Technical Knowledge

Specific technical knowledge lessons are statements of new content in a well-defined technical area. This category includes learning technical or business content areas such as finance, strategic planning, computers, budgeting, and law.

53.9% of the Line to Staff assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Line to Staff switches in technical content:

"Painfully, I acquired technical breadth and strategic thinking skills."

* * *

"I learned to understand discounted cash flows."

* * *

"Learned strategic planning, forecasting and budgeting."
differences and difficulties between Staff (Marketing) and Line (Sales) responsibilities and the need for effective interaction."

Line to Staff and Other Major Sources of How the Business Works

3. Comfort with Ambiguity, Stress, or Uncertainty

Comfort with ambiguity, stress, or uncertainty is discovering that one has the capacity to manage in an ambiguous situation. This category includes two major kinds of learnings: that even with incomplete knowledge one has the ability to act in a turbulent context, putting out brushfires while learning the job, and that learning on the run is one way to learn new skills while using old ones.

30.8% of the Line to Staff assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Line to Staff switches in dealing with ambiguity, stress, or uncertainty are:

Putting out brushfires focuses on the ability to sense which of several brushfires may become forest fires and extinguishing them. Learning that one can roll with the punches, learn from mistakes, and be flexible are examples of this lesson.

"Prioritization is critical as one can't do everything at once."
"Affirmed I could take on the unfamiliar without fear."
"Got feel from execs how to stay cool and roll with the punches."

Learning on the run essentially describes how to apply previously used skills or knowledge to a new, unfamiliar situation and move ahead despite a lack of skills or knowledge.

(Only one example from Line to Staff):

"With the change to a completely new job in terms of daily activity and knowledge base, it necessitated a more effective planning of my own time, forcing self-discipline in time management."

Line to Staff and Other Major Sources of Comfort with Ambiguity, Stress, or Uncertainty

![Bar chart showing comfort with ambiguity]

4. Seeing Organization as Systems

Seeing organization as systems comprises the ability to learn to rise above day-to-day operations, to take a corporate view, and gain a broader perspective. This
represents the transition from a short-term, smaller-scope view of the organization to being able to look at the "big picture," seeing both a longer time frame and a broader organizational scope. Developing a longer time frame strategic perspective involves looking at the corporation as a whole, thinking about its mission and direction. Seeing a broader organizational scope also involves looking at the organization with respect to its environment, legislation, and international issues.

30.8% of the Line to Staff assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Line to Staff switches in seeing organization as systems:

"How to rise above the day-to-day operating problems."

* * * *

"I learned to look at each of the businesses in a much broader perspective."

* * *

"I learned how to think strategically."

Line to Staff and Other Major Sources of Seeing Organization as Systems
5. What Executives are Like

Learning what executives are like, both the positives and the negatives, demystifies the executive aura. This category describes executives as human beings as well as what executives value, how they operate, and how they see things.

30.8% of the Line to Staff assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Line to Staff switches on what executives are like:

The positives include learning that executives are just people and watching and picking up their values.

"The aura and mystiques of executives vanished. I was treated as an equal."

*             *             *

"Learned directly how top executives operate."

The negatives include learning that executives are human and some of the less desirable habits of executives:

(Only one example from Line to Staff)

"Each manager was distinct. I learned a lot about what not to do."

Line to Staff and Other Major Sources of What Executives are Like

![Chart showing the percent of co-occurrence for different sources of what executives are like. The chart shows Line Staff at 30.8%, Role Model at 8.7%, and BF&M at 5.3%.]
6. How to Work with Executives

How to work with executives in various contexts, from how to present ideas to them to the importance of impressing and not antagonizing them. This category contains critical deportment and skills and the art of cajoling.

30.8% of Line to Staff assignments had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Line to Staff switches in how to work with executives:

Deportment and skills focuses on proper demeanor and presentation style that are critical in dealing with executives:

"Found I could think in ways that were acceptable to upper levels."

* * *

"It gave me good experience in adapting to and dealing with the working environment in purchase headquarters."

* * *

"Learned to present to management."

Line to Staff and Other Major Sources of How to Work with Executives

---

![Diagram showing percent of co-occurrence for various events related to working with executives.]

- Line Staff: 30.8%
- BF&M: 16.7%
- Proj Task Fc: 13.2%

Percent of Co-Occurrence: p < .05
Note: Other lessons from Line to Staff

- Line to Staff was a major source of these lessons:

  Getting Lateral Cooperation, Discovering What You Like To Do, You Have to Take Control of Your Own Career, Can't Manage It All By Yourself, and Dealing with Conflict. However, Line to Staff only had two lessons in the first two categories, and only one in the latter three, none of which occurred more than expected by chance.

IMPRESSIONS: LINE TO STAFF SWITCH AND DEVELOPMENT

What they aren't

We have no way of knowing whether the infrequent appearance of this assignment as a developmental event is due to a paucity of staff jobs or to a lack of developmental impact (i.e., whether executives seldom have such jobs or they have them but don't get much out of them). Probably both are true, but making a staff assignment challenging to a line manager is not an easy trick.

As was true for Projects/Task Forces, a developmental staff assignment is clearly not:

1. A trivial job in terms of major corporate mission.

2. Buried in obscurity, with little or no involvement from important executives.

3. Undemanding intellectually, for example, with a manager serving only support or advisory roles.

What they are

The most potent developmental staff assignments have the following key elements:

Involve analysis of a major product or business—somehow forces the manager to analyze a whole piece in a way he/she couldn't normally do it (this might be formal analytic models, involve projecting the future, strategic analysis, financial analysis, etc.).

Change of venue. Moving to corporate (or divisional headquarters) from another part of the organization carries with it exposure to different norms and perhaps culture.

Working for (or at least reporting to) executives, preferably several levels higher.
Strategic uses of Line to Staff switches

Like Project/Task Force assignments, staff jobs are flexible. They can serve their developmental purpose in a short period of time (about a year), can be sandwiched in between line jobs (but preferably after a manager has held significant line jobs), and juxtaposed with formal training. More effective posts we've heard about include positions as a staff planner, financial analyst, business analyst, market analyst, and assistant to an executive. Such jobs can be high in exposure to different functions, divisions, products as well as to techniques.

For some line managers, the absence of bottom-line responsibility and of subordinates makes a staff stint very frustrating. For this reason, it is wise to time limit the assignment and to inform the manager of the developmental purposes for the move.

It should be noted that staff jobs dealing with routine administration, personnel, training and the like were notably rare as developmental events. Clearly, analysis of a business, product, market, etc., as sterile as it was often seen, provided a strategic thinking experience of value. This, coupled with having to submit one's findings to executives, gave the assignment its punch.

What to look for

Don't expect a line executive placed in a staff role to like it or want to stay in it. But do look for ability to deal with abstraction, to learn the tools necessary for the kind of analysis involved, and evidence of the all important ability to think strategically. Far and away the most prominent learning from a staff job involves technical and business knowledge, the acquisition of which should reflect itself in a strategic perspective. This is coupled with working effectively with executives. And, because many staff jobs (e.g., business analyst) are mystifying to line types, it's a good place to see how well they handle themselves under ambiguity.
Hardships
INTRODUCTION TO THE HARDSHIPS

There is no question that many of the assignments executives described were tough, sometimes even traumatic. But these trials by fire, demanding as they were, ended in the exhilaration of success. Their lessons, too, were those of success, of overcoming the odds, of meeting the challenge. But the successful executives we studied did not have lives of unbroken victories. Like the rest of us, they faced setbacks and outright failures. They blew it—on the job, in their personal lives, in their climb up the corporate ladder. We identified five kinds of events that we grouped together as Hardships: "Business Failures and Mistakes," "Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs," "Breaking a Rut," "Subordinate Performance Problems," and "Personal Trauma."

From the labels we gave them, it's clear that the Hardships were a mixed bag. They range from severe personal traumas like death and divorce to events with happy conclusions (like the discovery of a new career after the ordeal of giving up the old one). As different as they were from one another, they shared three characteristics: Managers accepted appropriate personal responsibility for the mess they were in; during the worst of it, they experienced a strong sense of aloneness or lack of control over events; and the situation forced them to confront themselves. It was this struggle with "who (or what) am I" that made these events unique and triggered intensely personal learning. Indeed it was from the Hardships that executives recognized their personal limits (sometimes obscured by long strings of success) and developed strategies for coping with events beyond their control.

The Hardships as a group of developmental events are problematic. The idea of deliberately manipulating failure or trauma, even for development, raises serious moral and ethical issues. Preparing people for possible hardships, or helping them cope with them, is perhaps useful, but the biggest challenge may lie in helping people learn from them when they do occur. Just because an experience is painful does not mean that learning from it is automatic. It was in the stories of Hardships that we saw cynicism and bitterness in many of the lessons. Furthermore, Hardships lose their teaching potential if people are not realistic about their responsibility for what happens, and some organizational cultures encourage denial. Perhaps the keys to development from Hardships are bipolar. On one hand, such learning is an intensely personal (and private) confrontation with self, an event that the organization has only limited right to be involved with. On the other hand, learning from setbacks can be a cultural issue, having to do with the climate an
organization fosters. When people make mistakes, can they admit them, learn from them, and move past them?
BUSINESS FAILURES AND MISTAKES

N events = 24
(3.9% of all events)

N lessons = 56
(3.6% of all lessons)

N managers = 21
(11% of all managers)

BUSINESS FAILURES AND MISTAKES: DEFINITION

Business Failures and Mistakes are stories of managerial shortcomings that derailed goals. Errors were made in dealing with people critical to a project's success. Failure to give or obtain necessary information, support, or agreement on specific issues curtailed plans and collapsed business ventures.

Business Failures and Mistakes include ideas that didn't fly, conflicts that got out of hand, deals that fell through, and failures to make the most of opportunities. Although specific outcomes were diverse, these events were united by two themes: The outcomes were unsatisfactory to the manager involved and they stemmed from mistakes in dealing with key people.

The relationship between these key people and the executive was the variable in the type of error made. The three groups of people with whom mistakes were made were Superiors, Subordinates, and Outsiders or Peers.

Dealing with Superiors

Failure to play by the rules with superiors thwarted great plans. Bosses didn't like and wouldn't support surprises. Surprises, or mistakes, that halted progress stemmed from managers' neglect to inform and pre-sell their ideas to bosses before presenting their results. Managers who went so far as to overstep their authority and make something happen faced threats of being fired.

"During my first management job I undertook an in-depth analysis of a business area of great interest to a V.P. I came out with strong observations and conclusions. The V.P. agreed and reported my findings to the Group V.P. It was his introduction to the study and the 'shit hit the fan.' The group V.P. cornered me and said I'd be fired if I worked for him. The V.P. bawled me out outside of work and rejected the report categorically."

"*

*I spearheaded a huge purchase that meant millions after
taxes to the company. But I had exceeded my authority and three layers of management took credit for the deal and threatened to fire me. I got them together and told them what I thought--got an average PA rating after that."

**Dealing with Subordinates**

Some plans failed because managers had misjudged the importance of their subordinates. Usually these errors were in underestimating their subordinates' value, by expecting to achieve results without enlisting their support, or by displaying arrogance in dealing with them. Less frequently they overemphasized an individual's value, mistakenly promoting him/her into a position which he (she) handled poorly.

"Got the chance early on to test my management abilities and start a research program on my own. I was intolerant of incompetence, was impetuous, and if I didn't think someone was as good as he should have been, treated him brashly. It was a big surprise to me when my plans for diversification failed. It was an even bigger surprise that, when I decided to leave the company, the President said they really didn't want me around for a separation period."

* * *

"I had recommended the wrong person as my replacement. I learned that he was having such difficulty that there was a union organizing campaign by my former employees. I was asked to return to assist the company in defeating the campaign. The point to which the business had moved since I left was shocking. The individual's credibility was almost non-existent as a result of his failure to adapt to the position and maintain adequate controls/contact."

**Dealing with Outsiders or Peers**

Failure to get adequate information, support, or agreement from external parties created the big financial losses. Managers trusted too much in themselves or in others or were blind to the need to understand the values and mentality of partners or clients. No matter what part luck and timing played in the failure, these managers made mistakes in dealing with critical components of a project's success--other people.

"I estimated a large engineering project at a plant, prepared limited engineering drawings and specs and
negotiated with a well-known construction contractor to perform work on cost plus 10%. The contractor was to submit daily labor and material for approval and accounting by the plant manager. Instead the plant manager did not keep records and the contractors overran the cost. When I discovered the extent of overrun, it was too late to take corrective action."

*     *     *

"The company went into a joint venture in the middle east. We held the minority interest but had contracted to manage the whole business. I was regional director. It was the most profitable component we ever had or will have in the world. This thing collapsed. We were kidding ourselves to think we could manage a business with minority interest, manipulating the money of a partner whose mentality or culture we didn't vaguely understand."

BUSINESS FAILURES AND MISTAKES: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. Misjudging the importance of other people to one's success.

2. An inability to deal effectively with another party or parties--neglecting to give or obtain information, support, or agreement needed to accomplish a task.

   a. superior
   b. subordinate
   c. outsider or peers

3. A specific, discrete event with an outcome that was both clear and unsatisfactory to the manager.

4. The manager admitted/accepted minor to total responsibility for the failure.

Additional core elements

Some combination of the following elements was also core to individual events:

1. The manager was under additional pressures from his visibility when the mistake was made.

2. The business suffered as a result of the mistake.
3. The business wasn't harmed, but the manager was reprimanded or punished.

4. Neither business nor manager was directly harmed but the outcome was embarrassing.

5. It was a first management job.

BUSINESS FAILURES AND MISTAKES: MAJOR LESSONS

The lessons associated with these 24 stories of failures and derailed goals brought to light a variety of personal and interpersonal incompetencies. The theme of the lessons is one of shortsightedness or blindness to reality that did these executives in. Although some were observations of personal limits or flaws, most lessons were insights into the important roles other people play within the organization.

![Business Failures & Mistakes](image)

Lessons in context of the type of Business Failures and Mistakes:

Mishandling Superiors (taking a transfer to a new function in a new region and suggesting a reorganization to a new boss):

"I learned sensitivity regarding the impact of my behavior on others and the need to expand my range of
behaviors in interacting with others. Different situations/relationships demand different behavior/strategies/approaches. Don't attempt to overpower others with fact, intellect, rationale as this may only threaten them and inhibit cooperation/progress. Build strength in others as a means of making things happen through them."

**Mishandling Subordinates** (setting goals without inclusion/commitment of key subordinates):

"Instead of concentrating on my understanding of business and goals, I should have spent more time with people, getting them to understand. (Part of this was their challenging of me, with no background.)"

**Mistake With an Outsider** (not following the company's past history in avoiding deals with a particular franchise—negotiating with the group to expand volume and losing on the deal):

"There was a reason for the historically bad relationship. One must iron-clad everything with a man like him. In addition, I learned the significant danger at long-term investment overseas, leading to a policy of up-front payment for investments in volatile economies to avoid auctioning future investment capability by saddling future years with the write-off of bad investments from the past."

**Definitions and examples of the lessons of Business Failures and Mistakes**

1. **Recognition of Personal Limits and Weaknesses**

Recognition of personal limits and weaknesses in managing often stemmed from lack of time and/or expertise to accomplish alone the variety of tasks necessary to be successful. Sometimes, managers seemed to know their limits before the fact and, sometimes, after.

25% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on recognition of personal weaknesses:

After the fact that they should have recognized their limits earlier. These are statements of what the manager should have or should not have done.
"Don't accept increased responsibility until you are ready, no matter how attractive/ego-building/lucrative."

* * * *

"To have a healthy skepticism for so-called expert opinion."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of Recognition of Personal Weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousy Job</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Politics is Part of Organizational Life

Politics encompasses both realization that organizations are, in part, political systems and recommendations for dealing within them. For example, a recognition of the political component in decision making may result in the discovery that one needs to make a personal choice regarding the use of politics to achieve a goal--to sell a point, idea, or project. Political insights fall into three broad categories: naive, cynical, and pragmatic.

20.8% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on politics is part of organizational life:

Naive statements sound like first glimpses into the existence of politics in organizations.
"Some people are men of principle, some are chameleons."

* * *

"Top management sometimes doesn't always listen to subordinates and can be wrong."

Cynical statements resemble retaliatory actions like: don't be candid, bypass bosses, flash wins, mask creativity and intelligence because it intimidates others.

"I should have bypassed the chain of command and requested help from the CEO. He, I understood, had business relations with a key board member of the client company."

Pragmatic statements deal with a realization of how to use the system: the importance of learning the ropes, selling up, working within to get things done; having no hidden agendas; fighting with facts.

"I learned that internal political moves are required to get a capital commitment from the Board."

* * *

"Using 'strong armed' tactics in a functional organization can derail potentially beneficial tactics."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of Politics is Part of Organizational Life
3. Dealing with People

Dealing with people other than one's peers, bosses, and subordinates requires understanding their perspectives, speaking their language. These lessons emphasize the notion that people are different and that to be successful in dealing or communicating with them, one must be sensitive to these differences and act in accordance. Strategies suggested include the following: get inside people's knickers, help others look good; one must be low key; keep a finger on the group's pulse, know what turns people on and off and put oneself in other's place before acting.

20.8% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on dealing with people:

"Never underestimate the value of communication with employees and understand the trauma associated with change."

* * * * *

"Different situations/relationships demand different behavior/strategies/approaches."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of Dealing with People
4. How to Work with Executives

How to work with executives in various contexts, from how to present ideas to them to the importance of impressing and not antagonizing them. This category contains critical deportment and skills and the art of cajoling.

16.7% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on how to work with executives:

Deportment and skills focuses on proper demeanor, presentation styles that are critical in dealing with executives.

"Show management you are in charge."

Cajoling contains the subtle tweaking and nudging required to lead bosses in one's own direction.

"Do your homework: Never make a proposal that hasn't been thoroughly analyzed."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of How to Work with Executives
5. Strategies for Coping with Situations Beyond Your Control

Strategies for coping with situations beyond your control contain both pragmatic and cynical statements. Both come from the recognition that there are times when one faces a situation that one can do nothing to change; that some situations are influenced by factors outside of the manager's control such as luck, others' performance, and unrealistic expectations. Coping with such situations requires ways of dealing with or making the best of the uncontrollable situations by changing goals, being patient or optimistic, distancing oneself, or redefining the situations.

12.5% of Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on coping with situations beyond your control:

Pragmatic statements focus on accepting that life has good and bad times to offer and that keeping a stiff upper lip in hard times is important.

"Handling the major disappointment of the 11th hour collapse of my program."

* * *

"How to accept the defeat and the death of an emotional idea I had had since a child."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of Strategies for Coping with Situations Beyond Your Control

![Coping with Situations Chart]

- Lousy Job*: 44.4
- Trauma*: 27.3
- BF&M: 12.5

Percent of Co-Occurrence: $p < .05$
6. What Executives are Like

Learning what executives are like, both the positives and the negatives, demystifies the executive aura. This category describes executives as human beings as well as what executives value, how they operate, and how they see things.

8.3% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on what executives are like:

The positives include learning that executives are just people and watching and picking up their values.

"Top management sets direction for the division. People in the division must rely on top management and get direction from them."

The negatives include learning that executives are human as well as describing some of the less desirable habits of executives.

"Top management ain't always right."

"Can't assume from a person's title that he/she is capable."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of What Executives are Like

![What Executives Are Like](image-url)
7. Develop Your People

Develop your people describes learning that part of dealing with subordinates is developing them. This includes understanding that people can be helped to change and learn if the "right" environment (challenges, opportunity) is provided, and that individual growth benefits the organization.

8.3% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on developing your people:

"Be patient and allow good people a chance to develop."

*                     *

"Individual development of subordinates corresponds to firm, consistent management."

*                     *

"Train for the long term."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of Developing Your People

![Graph showing the percent of co-occurrence for different events related to developing your people. Trauma has 9.1%, BF&M has 8.3%, and Scope has 7.7%. The x-axis represents the percent of co-occurrence with a range from 0 to 30%.]
8. Perspective on Life and Work

Perspective on life and work encompasses the kinds of examining, re-evaluating and prioritizing that managers experience in balancing their work and personal life. Key within this category are recognizing the value of life outside work and discovering the importance of slowing down and relaxing in one's work life.

8.3% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on perspective on life and work:

"Care must be taken to maintain balance."

* * *

"Review job responsibilities and commitment and family responsibilities and commitment."

* * *

"I discovered the importance my family played in my life and how to balance family and company."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of Perspective on Life and Work
IMPRESSIONS: BUSINESS FAILURES AND MISTAKES AND DEVELOPMENT

What they aren't

Business Failures and Mistakes are not the grist of manipulation. While organizations must allow people to make mistakes, deliberate setting of traps is not a wise strategy. The impact of failure results from recognizing one's own blunders, and organizational connivance could allow a manager to put the blame elsewhere.

Developmental failures weren't minor affairs. They were visible and important, involving important people and leaving little place for the manager to hide.

What they are

Business Failures and Mistakes are serious blunders almost always involving a manager's ability to deal effectively with someone. Their learning potential hinges on the blunderer's willingness to accept responsibility for the error, which underlines the importance of the organization giving high-potential managers responsibility and accountability for their actions. Failures and mistakes, while not programmable, can be critical events for a developing manager, particularly one with a history of successes. These jolts can open a door to learning that may have been closed by overconfidence.

Strategic uses of Business Failures and Mistakes

As mentioned, failures and mistakes are not amenable to direct manipulation. But they happen to everyone, so the essential ingredient is an organizational environment that allows managers to make mistakes without decapitation. A first prerequisite, then, is a managerial culture in which mistakes are not fatal. The second prerequisite is that responsibility is clear -- learning will be negated if a manager can blame his/her mistakes on others or on "circumstances."

As with the other Hardships, learning from Business Failures and Mistakes is largely dependent on the manager's internal confrontation with self. The organization has no control over the internal process, but it can influence both the likelihood of accepting responsibility and the possibility of learning how to do things differently next time. The former is in part a result of a culture that accepts mistakes when people learn from them (e.g., the famous story of the manager who offered his resignation after a $100,000 mistake -- his boss replied, "Why should I let you resign when I've just invested $100,000 in developing you?") but also depends on
clarity in accountability. Projects (especially when carried out by teams), matrix structures, and fuzzy responsibility all create settings where blaming others for one's mistakes is relatively easy. So there is no substitute for clarity before a mistake.

The second piece, of course, is information on what went wrong and what might be done differently. A sufficiently insightful manager may glean this for him/herself, but feedback from the other party or the boss can be crucial here. After a faux pas is a critical time to be sure that the manager is learning the appropriate lessons.

**What to look for**

In our study of derailed executives, we found that one factor that distinguished them from their more successful counterparts was how they handled mistakes. Where the derailed were prone to either blame others or to keep the error under wraps while they tried to fix it, the more successful executives 1) forewarned others, 2) did what they could to fix it, and 3) put it behind them and got on with business. Managerial mistakes may be one of the most revealing events in a career. First and foremost is the manager's willingness to accept responsibility for the mistake (without which there can be little forewarning of others or even corrective action). Second, having "fessed up," is the manager's ability to learn something from it—can he or she understand what was done wrong and how it might be handled differently? Third is the resilience to bounce back, keep on going, "get back on the horse."

In the best of all worlds, mistakes don't unduly rock the confidence of a developing manager but do serve as reminders that we all blunder from time to time. This not only keeps a person open to learning ("every time I make a mistake I learn something that will help me win next time") but also, as a manager, helps him/her accept the mistakes of others.
CAREER CRISIS EVENTS: DEMOTIONS/MISSED PROMOTIONS/LOUSY JOBS

N events = 27  N lessons = 71  N managers = 23
(4.4% of all  (4.6% of all  (12% of all
events)  lessons)  managers)

DEMOCTIONS/MISSED PROMOTIONS/LOUSY JOBS: DEFINITION

These events are cases of a job-person mismatch, in which something about the manager's position was regarded as a career setback. These managers described how they had been demoted, exiled to crummy jobs, or had seen a badly wanted promotion given to someone else. The common theme is that the job did not suit perceived skills or aspirations. The circumstances leading up to the setbacks ranged from being in the wrong place during a reorganization to personal mistakes; but regardless of the nature or cause of these events, troublesome circumstances had occurred or accrued and managers, recognizing an incongruity, felt stuck...or stung.

Demotions

Managers were forced out of their positions into jobs that were not challenging their skills or did not meet their aspirations, or both. Often the result of a change in top management, these job changes were sometimes described as penalties. Often with them came a strong sense that the manager was betrayed by an individual or by the organization and a sense of being stuck or dead-ended.

"I got kicked out of my job. Through a dull conflict I earned ill will from my boss's boss. He decided I needed a purely administrative, trivial job--one with no impact on the organization. It was an extremely difficult time for me. It affected my attitude toward organizations and showed me the insignificance of individuals to them."

Expected/Missed Promotions

An expected promotion did not occur. The managers felt that their skills or aspirations were greater than the job demanded and that they were not given adequate recognition for their accomplishments. Sometimes they felt betrayed by a person who was holding them back for his own benefit. In cases of promised, but not granted promotions, the managers felt betrayed by the organization.

"I was employed by an international accounting firm. After 'paying my dues,' so to speak, I was not admitted
INTRODUCTION TO THE HARDSHIPS

There is no question that many of the assignments executives described were tough, sometimes even traumatic. But these trials by fire, demanding as they were, ended in the exhilaration of success. Their lessons, too, were those of success, of overcoming the odds, of meeting the challenge. But the successful executives we studied did not have lives of unbroken victories. Like the rest of us, they faced setbacks and outright failures. They blew it—on the job, in their personal lives, in their climb up the corporate ladder. We identified five kinds of events that we grouped together as Hardships: "Business Failures and Mistakes," "Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs," "Breaking a Rut," "Subordinate Performance Problems," and "Personal Trauma."

From the labels we gave them, it's clear that the Hardships were a mixed bag. They range from severe personal traumas like death and divorce to events with happy conclusions (like the discovery of a new career after the ordeal of giving up the old one). As different as they were from one another, they shared three characteristics: Managers accepted appropriate personal responsibility for the mess they were in; during the worst of it, they experienced a strong sense of aloneness or lack of control over events; and the situation forced them to confront themselves. It was this struggle with "who (or what) am I" that made these events unique and triggered intensely personal learning. Indeed it was from the Hardships that executives recognized their personal limits (sometimes obscured by long strings of success) and developed strategies for coping with events beyond their control.

The Hardships as a group of developmental events are problematic. The idea of deliberately manipulating failure or trauma, even for development, raises serious moral and ethical issues. Preparing people for possible hardships, or helping them cope with them, is perhaps useful, but the biggest challenge may lie in helping people learn from them when they do occur. Just because an experience is painful does not mean that learning from it is automatic. It was in the stories of Hardships that we saw cynicism and bitterness in many of the lessons. Furthermore, Hardships lose their teaching potential if people are not realistic about their responsibility for what happens, and some organizational cultures encourage denial. Perhaps the keys to development from Hardships are bipolar. On one hand, such learning is an intensely personal (and private) confrontation with self, an event that the organization has only limited right to be involved with. On the other hand, learning from setbacks can be a cultural issue, having to do with the climate an
BUSINESS FAILURES AND MISTAKES

N events = 24  N lessons = 56  N managers = 21
(3.9% of all events)  (3.6% of all lessons)  (11% of all managers)

BUSINESS FAILURES AND MISTAKES: DEFINITION

Business Failures and Mistakes are stories of managerial shortcomings that derailed goals. Errors were made in dealing with people critical to a project's success. Failure to give or obtain necessary information, support, or agreement on specific issues curtailed plans and collapsed business ventures.

Business Failures and Mistakes include ideas that didn't fly, conflicts that got out of hand, deals that fell through, and failures to make the most of opportunities. Although specific outcomes were diverse, these events were united by two themes: The outcomes were unsatisfactory to the manager involved and they stemmed from mistakes in dealing with key people.

The relationship between these key people and the executive was the variable in the type of error made. The three groups of people with whom mistakes were made were Superiors, Subordinates, and Outsiders or Peers.

Dealing with Superiors

Failure to play by the rules with superiors thwarted great plans. Bosses didn't like and wouldn't support surprises. Surprises, or mistakes, that halted progress stemmed from managers' neglect to inform and pre-sell their ideas to bosses before presenting their results. Managers who went so far as to overstep their authority and make something happen faced threats of being fired.

"During my first management job I undertook an in-depth analysis of a business area of great interest to a V.P. I came out with strong observations and conclusions. The V.P. agreed and reported my findings to the Group V.P. It was his introduction to the study and the 'shit hit the fan.' The group V.P. cornered me and said I'd be fired if I worked for him. The V.P. bawled me out outside of work and rejected the report categorically."

* * * *

"I spearheaded a huge purchase that meant millions after
negotiated with a well-known construction contractor to perform work on cost plus 10%. The contractor was to submit daily labor and material for approval and accounting by the plant manager. Instead the plant manager did not keep records and the contractors overran the cost. When I discovered the extent of overrun, it was too late to take corrective action."

"The company went into a joint venture in the middle east. We held the minority interest but had contracted to manage the whole business. I was regional director. It was the most profitable component we ever had or will have in the world. This thing collapsed. We were kidding ourselves to think we could manage a business with minority interest, manipulating the money of a partner whose mentality or culture we didn't vaguely understand."

BUSINESS FAILURES AND MISTAKES: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. Misjudging the importance of other people to one's success.

2. An inability to deal effectively with another party or parties—neglecting to give or obtain information, support, or agreement needed to accomplish a task.
   a. superior
   b. subordinate
   c. outsider or peers

3. A specific, discrete event with an outcome that was both clear and unsatisfactory to the manager.

4. The manager admitted/accepted minor to total responsibility for the failure.

Additional core elements

Some combination of the following elements was also core to individual events:

1. The manager was under additional pressures from his visibility when the mistake was made.

2. The business suffered as a result of the mistake.
behaviors in interacting with others. Different situations/relationships demand different behavior/strategies/approaches. Don't attempt to overpower others with fact, intellect, rationale as this may only threaten them and inhibit cooperation/progress. Build strength in others as a means of making things happen through them."

**Mishandling Subordinates** (setting goals without inclusion/commitment of key subordinates):

"Instead of concentrating on my understanding of business and goals, I should have spent more time with people, getting them to understand. (Part of this was their challenging of me, with no background.)"

**Mistake With an Outsider** (not following the company's past history in avoiding deals with a particular franchise--negotiating with the group to expand volume and losing on the deal):

"There was a reason for the historically bad relationship. One must iron-clad everything with a man like him. In addition, I learned the significant danger at long-term investment overseas, leading to a policy of up-front payment for investments in volatile economies to avoid auctioning future investment capability by saddling future years with the write-off of bad investments from the past."

**Definitions and examples of the lessons of Business Failures and Mistakes**

1. **Recognition of Personal Limits and Weaknesses**

Recognition of personal limits and weaknesses in managing often stemmed from lack of time and/or expertise to accomplish alone the variety of tasks necessary to be successful. Sometimes, managers seemed to know their limits before the fact and, sometimes, after.

25% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on recognition of personal weaknesses:

After the fact that they should have recognized their limits earlier. These are statements of what the manager should have or should not have done.
"Some people are men of principle, some are chameleons."

* * *

"Top management sometimes doesn't always listen to subordinates and can be wrong."

Cynical statements resemble retaliatory actions like: don't be candid, bypass bosses, flash wins, mask creativity and intelligence because it intimidates others.

"I should have bypassed the chain of command and requested help from the CEO. He, I understood, had business relations with a key board member of the client company."

Pragmatic statements deal with a realization of how to use the system: the importance of learning the ropes, selling up, working within to get things done; having no hidden agendas; fighting with facts.

"I learned that internal political moves are required to get a capital commitment from the Board."

* * *

"Using 'strong armed' tactics in a functional organization can derail potentially beneficial tactics."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of Politics is Part of Organizational Life

![Bar Chart: Politics is Part of Organizational Life]

- Lousy Job+: 33.3%
- BF&M+: 20.5%
- VPO+: 18.5%

* p < .05
4. How to Work with Executives

How to work with executives in various contexts, from how to present ideas to them to the importance of impressing and not antagonizing them. This category contains critical deportment and skills and the art of cajoling.

16.7% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on how to work with executives:

Deportment and skills focuses on proper demeanor, presentation styles that are critical in dealing with executives.

"Show management you are in charge."

Cajoling contains the subtle tweaking and nudging required to lead bosses in one's own direction.

"Do your homework: Never make a proposal that hasn't been thoroughly analyzed."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of How to Work with Executives
6. What Executives are Like

Learning what executives are like, both the positives and the negatives, demystifies the executive aura. This category describes executives as human beings as well as what executives value, how they operate, and how they see things.

8.3% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on what executives are like:

The positives include learning that executives are just people and watching and picking up their values.

"Top management sets direction for the division. People in the division must rely on top management and get direction from them."

The negatives include learning that executives are human as well as describing some of the less desirable habits of executives.

"Top management ain't always right."

"Can't assume from a person's title that he/she is capable."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of What Executives are Like
8. Perspective on Life and Work

Perspective on life and work encompasses the kinds of examining, re-evaluating and prioritizing that managers experience in balancing their work and personal life. Key within this category are recognizing the value of life outside work and discovering the importance of slowing down and relaxing in one's work life.

8.3% of the Business Failures and Mistakes had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Business Failures and Mistakes on perspective on life and work:

"Care must be taken to maintain balance."

"Review job responsibilities and commitment and family responsibilities and commitment."

"I discovered the importance my family played in my life and how to balance family and company."

Business Failures and Mistakes and Other Major Sources of Perspective on Life and Work
clarity in accountability. Projects (especially when carried out by teams), matrix structures, and fuzzy responsibility all create settings where blaming others for one's mistakes is relatively easy. So there is no substitute for clarity before a mistake.

The second piece, of course, is information on what went wrong and what might be done differently. A sufficiently insightful manager may glean this for him/herself, but feedback from the other party or the boss can be crucial here. After a faux pas is a critical time to be sure that the manager is learning the appropriate lessons.

What to look for

In our study of derailed executives, we found that one factor that distinguished them from their more successful counterparts was how they handled mistakes. Where the derailed were prone to either blame others or to keep the error under wraps while they tried to fix it, the more successful executives 1) forewarned others, 2) did what they could to fix it, and 3) put it behind them and got on with business. Managerial mistakes may be one of the most revealing events in a career. First and foremost is the manager's willingness to accept responsibility for the mistake (without which there can be little forewarning of others or even corrective action). Second, having "fessed up," is the manager's ability to learn something from it--can he or she understand what was done wrong and how it might be handled differently? Third is the resilience to bounce back, keep on going, "get back on the horse."

In the best of all worlds, mistakes don't unduly rock the confidence of a developing manager but do serve as reminders that we all blunder from time to time. This not only keeps a person open to learning ("every time I make a mistake I learn something that will help me win next time") but also, as a manager, helps him/her accept the mistakes of others.
CAREER CRISIS EVENTS: DEMOTIONS/MISSED PROMOTIONS/LOUSY JOBS

N events = 27  
(4.4% of all events)

N lessons = 71  
(4.6% of all lessons)

N managers = 23  
(12% of all managers)

DEMOTIONS/MISSED PROMOTIONS/LOUSY JOBS: DEFINITION

These events are cases of a job-person mismatch, in which something about the manager's position was regarded as a career setback. These managers described how they had been demoted, exiled to crummy jobs, or had seen a badly wanted promotion given to someone else. The common theme is that the job did not suit perceived skills or aspirations. The circumstances leading up to the setbacks ranged from being in the wrong place during a reorganization to personal mistakes; but regardless of the nature or cause of these events, troublesome circumstances had occurred or accrued and managers, recognizing an incongruity, felt stuck...or stung.

Demotions

Managers were forced out of their positions into jobs that were not challenging their skills or did not meet their aspirations, or both. Often the result of a change in top management, these job changes were sometimes described as penalties. Often with them came a strong sense that the manager was betrayed by an individual or by the organization and a sense of being stuck or dead-ended.

"I got kicked out of my job. Through a dull conflict I earned ill will from my boss's boss. He decided I needed a purely administrative, trivial job—one with no impact on the organization. It was an extremely difficult time for me. It affected my attitude toward organizations and showed me the insignificance of individuals to them."

Expected/Missed Promotions

An expected promotion did not occur. The managers felt that their skills or aspirations were greater than the job demanded and that they were not given adequate recognition for their accomplishments. Sometimes they felt betrayed by a person who was holding them back for his own benefit. In cases of promised, but not granted promotions, the managers felt betrayed by the organization.

"I was employed by an international accounting firm. After 'paying my dues,' so to speak, I was not admitted
into the firm's partnership. This occurred after both oral and written documentation indicating admittance had been endorsed by all and continuing to do a good job was (supposedly) the only remaining hurdle."

**Lousy Jobs**

These jobs were accepted but different from what the managers had anticipated or wanted. Their old skills often did not apply—they were sometimes fish out of water—and their career dreams were side-tracked. Often, the job was difficult due to failings of a predecessor or poor organizational strategy. In two of these descriptions the jobs were accepted when an expected promotion was missed; in another, the job was too challenging for the manager who subsequently split his responsibilities with someone.

"I accepted a new job with a new company and relocated from Seattle to Vienna, Austria. The deeper I dug the worse the situation appeared. The five million dollar budget I inherited was three quarters spent by the end of the first quarter (the time I arrived), there was evidence of graft, my predecessor had promised the world to my staff and I didn't speak a word of German."

**Demotions, Missed Promotions, Lousy Jobs were career crises. Uncertainty about professional fate was part of career crisis whether an executive had hung onto an undesirable job, had taken an objectionable position, or had missed getting a coveted one.**

Precipitating Demotions, Missed Promotions, and Lousy Jobs were missed expected promotions, expected dismissals, broken organizational promises, blackballing by an individual, poor organizational strategies/environments, infusion of a new management layer between the incumbent and the top, or a sought and won position that did not meet expectations.

**DEMOIONS/MISSED PROMOTIONS/LOUSY JOBS: CORE ELEMENTS**

The common core of these events

Whether a Demotion, a Missed Promotion, or a Lousy Job, the core elements of these events were psychologically demanding. They stemmed from the manager's negative perceptions of a job or set of circumstances:

1. Perception of the job as unmatched with aspirations or skills: This perception resulted from a mismatch based either on a manager's aspirations and skills being much greater than those provided/demanded by
the job (a Demotion or a Missed Promotion) or on a
manager's aspirations and skills being very
different from those provided/demanded by the job (a
Lousy Job).

2. Perception of the situation as difficult or
oppressive: This perception stemmed either from a
recent job change (Demotion/some Lousy Jobs) or from
no change in job (Missed Promotion/some Lousy Jobs).
When a job change had occurred, the perception was
influenced by whether the change was forced on the
manager (Demotion) or the manager requested or
willingly accepted the change (Lousy Jobs--recent
change).

Additional core elements

The following list of core elements shows additional
psychological demands. One or more of these was usually
present in an event description:

1. States of mind.
   a. sense of lack of recognition for hard work and
      success.
   b. sense of having been betrayed or not supported
      by an individual or by the organization.
   c. sense of being too long in the same job.
   d. sense of being tied to a boss or group who fell
      from grace.
   e. sense of being dead-ended or derailed.
   f. sense that the job was a penalty.

2. Concrete elements.
   a. negative working environment and/or challenge
      over and above offensive part of the job.
   b. bad conditions due to predecessor or
      organizational strategy.
   c. conflict with superior or group had occurred.
   d. job was a penalty.
   e. new management had been brought in.
   f. the manager admitted a personal flaw or
      mistake.

DEMOTIONS/MISSED PROMOTIONS/LOUSY JOBS: MAJOR LESSONS

Twenty-three managers described 27 events that fell into the
category Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs. The lessons
from these events focused on survival. This survival theme
was borne out in strategies for coping with those oppressive
Lessons in context of the type of career setback:

Demotion from getting kicked out of a job by the boss's boss:

"Recognizing my real insignificance to the organization I had to learn ways to cope with it. I learned to put distance between where I live and my job. I created an 'arm's length' relationship with my job and was able to stop caring about it on an emotional level. At the same time I learned not to expect my boss's friendship to matter under circumstances such as these. Since then, I have developed a more relaxed attitude toward work and find that my sense of insignificance makes my career more enjoyable."

Missed Promotion after paying dues to an accounting firm:

"I learned what really matters for promotions--it isn't the day-to-day work or the contracts or skills one

or political situations over which managers had no control, and in strategies for surviving those situations through recognizing limits, persevering, and taking control of one's own career. Lessons from the event examples that opened this section are illustrative of this "survival training."
What often determines success is one-time meetings, projects, and the first impressions of the decision makers. I realized people feel that their pet project or clients are the most important and that you must set your priorities within this scheme even if your own priorities become secondary. I learned the importance of taking care of family and friends—they're what pull you through tough times."

**A Lousy Job** following a switch to a misrepresented job in Austria:

"I learned enough German to get by, the importance of establishing good budgeting and controlling systems, and a lot about management. I learned to work through others to accomplish objectives, the use of delegation and control thereof, and to be a 'harder' manager."

**Definitions and examples of the lessons from Demotions/ Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs**

1. **Strategies for Coping with Situations Beyond Your Control**

Strategies for coping with situations beyond your control contains both pragmatic and cynical statements. Both come from the recognition that there are times when one faces a situation that one can do nothing to change; that some situations are influenced by factors outside of the manager's control such as luck, others' performance, and unrealistic expectations. Coping with such situations requires ways of dealing with or making the best of the uncontrollable situations by changing goals, being patient or optimistic, distancing oneself, or redefining the situations.

44.4% of the Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs on how to cope with situations beyond your control span the following:

**Pragmatic** statements focus on accepting that life has good and bad times to offer and that keeping a stiff upper lip in hard times is important.

"Fate and timing play a role--this belief diluted my self-pity."

* * *
"Couldn't become company president now. Should I stay? I changed my goals."

Cynical statements project blame for circumstances onto others, including the bureaucracy.

"Stay hard at your job and avoid the corporate B.S."

Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs and Other Major Sources of Coping with Situations Beyond Your Control

2. Politics is Part of Organizational Life

Politics encompasses both realization that organizations are, in part, political systems and recommendations for dealing within them. For example, a recognition of the political component in decision making may result in the discovery that one needs to make a personal choice regarding the use of politics to achieve a goal—to sell a point, idea, or project. Political insights fall into three broad categories: naive, cynical, and pragmatic.

33.3% of the Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs on politics is part of organizational life:

Naive statements sound like first glimpses into the existence of politics in organizations.
"Performance is not the only criteria for promotion."

"Maturity, seasoning, and who you know are key elements for promotion to senior management positions."

Cynical statements resemble retaliatory actions like: don't be candid, bypass bosses, flash wins, mask creativity and intelligence because it intimidates others.

"Never trust the corporation."

Pragmatic statements deal with realizations of how to use the system: the importance of learning the ropes, selling up, working within to get things done; having no hidden agendas; fighting with facts.

"How you do things is easily as important as what you do. Ensure that the corporation does not closely associate you with others whose performance, competence, work, or integrity may be detrimental to your reputation."

"Senior management has to be receptive to new ideas."

Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs and Other Major Sources of Politics is Part of Organizational Life
3. You Have to Take Control of Your Own Career

You have to take control of your own career contains variations on the theme of how to take charge of the situation one is currently in, such as:

Realizing that you are the only one who can manage your career. Set your own pace, broaden if it gets too easy, get out of the box, find your high gear, use contacts, mentors, set goals and go.

18.5% of the Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs on how to take control of your career:

"Don't accept an untenable boss/subordinate relationship in which you're often trying hard to resolve differences."

Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs and Other Major Sources of You Have to Take Control of Your Own Career

4. Recognition of Personal Limits and Weaknesses

Recognition of personal limits and weaknesses in managing often stemmed from lack of time and/or expertise to accomplish alone the variety of tasks necessary to be successful. Sometimes, managers seemed to know their limits before the fact and, sometimes, after.
18.5% of the Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs on recognition of personal limits and weaknesses:

After the fact:

"Analyze long-term as well as short-term implications for a decision."

* * *

"Work as if your job depends on it because it probably does."

Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs and Other Major Sources of Recognition of Personal Weaknesses

![Recognition of Personal Limits](image)

5. Persevering Under Adverse Conditions: Singleness of Purpose

Persevering under adverse conditions means developing ways to accomplish one's goals in the face of obstacles, recognizing that difficult situations are often not out of one's control, and acting on them. Three types of perseverance were described: standing up for beliefs, moving ahead, and surviving tough times.

18.5% of Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs had at least one of these lessons.
Examples from Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs on persevering under adverse conditions:

**Standing up for beliefs:** even when personal risk is involved, knowing the importance of standing up for one's beliefs despite opposition.

"I learned to set my own agenda in the context of business plans and needs and then to sell it."

**Moving ahead:** accomplishing the goals of one's assignment despite obstacles and detours; hanging in and moving ahead.

"I learned I could keep my head up, dig in, and accomplish my goals."

**Surviving tough times:** fighting for survival by waiting to come back up after a lost battle or mistake.

"Concentrate single-mindedly on your own responsibilities. Assuming other responsibilities will only dilute effectiveness in one's own area."

Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs and Other Major Sources of Persevering Under Adverse Conditions

![Persevering Under Adverse Conditions](image)

Note: Other lessons from Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs

- Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs was a major
source of learning to be tough; however, only three lessons were reported, and they were not more than expected by chance.

IMPRESSIONS: DEMOTIONS/MISSED PROMOTIONS/LOUSY JOBS AND DEVELOPMENT

What they aren't

These career setbacks are not modest events that are easily rationalized away or dismissed. And, while all three subtypes share the "career setback" quality, they are not equivalent events: A demotion is quite different from missing a promotion or finding oneself in a lousy job.

What they are

These career setbacks are stunning surprises, heavily laced with embarrassment (if not downright humiliation). Typically, the setback manager has been quite successful and, even if a problem has been mentioned before, the actual event comes as a shock. The real issue here is how a manager deals with the setback, which in turn depends upon the manager's willingness to accept at least some responsibility for his/her fate.

Many of the setbacks were, in fact, punishments. But many of them were simply circumstances (a random shuffling in the chaos of a merger or reorganization) or were actually developmental assignments that no one bothered to explain as such. Regardless of organizational motive, the manager saw the action as a slap in the face.

Strategic uses of Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs

Because of their potency, deliberate use of setbacks can be a risky business. What may be intended as a slap on the wrist could cause a high-potential manager to quit outright or to turn cynical toward the organization. On the other hand, a setback accompanied by detailed feedback may teach lessons that could enhance potential for the future. We, therefore, suggest a conservative strategy. The manager should be given detailed feedback first, in hopes that a warning (or two) will result in the desired change. If this has no effect, and if the flaw is a serious one, then a setback accompanied by feedback may be a last resort. Missed Promotions and Lousy Jobs are milder than Demotions, but the psychological impact is strong regardless.

Some organizations cushion setbacks by incorporating them into the culture. Being exiled to a lousy job for a period
of time is viewed as being put in "the penalty box" rather than banished forever. Still a harsh remedy, temporary exile that is acknowledged as such and accompanied by specific feedback can be a potent agent of behavioral change.

One of the serious dangers is that what a manager perceives as a setback is not intended to be one, for example when a lateral or (perceived) downward move is made for developmental reasons. It is very important at such times to explain the circumstances to the manager (as simple as that sounds, it's amazing how often it isn't done). The same is true if someone else is promoted to a slot a manager covets—if the reasons a manager missed out are not intended as a message, they should be clarified. Because the lessons from a setback can be cynical, it's important that organizations be sensitive to inadvertent messages it sends.

What to look for

When a setback is intentional, the obvious goal is to see a manager change his/her behavior in the desired direction. After "serving time" in the penalty box, the slate is clean and things return to normal. But as we've seen, the lessons from setbacks can be cynical or negatively political. When this happens, the manager may have a serious negative affect on the organization and further action may be required. It is a matter of judgment, because the first reaction to a setback is frequently bitterness or anger. After a period of time to work this through, though, there should be a recognition of the problem and an attempt to change. Thus the main thing to look for is emergence from depression or bitterness into positive action to improve.
TAking Charge Events: Breaking a Rut

N events = 24  N lessons = 56  N managers = 20
(3.9% of all  (3.6% of all  (10.5% of all
  events)     lessons)      managers)

Breaking a Rut: Definition

Breaking a Rut is about changing careers. In these events executives traded in successful (or at least known) careers for a chance at something new. These moves were preceded by discontent and accompanied by a willingness to take risks. Some managers insisted on being transferred to new areas while others left companies they had been with for over a decade. The tactics varied, but their goals were the same: to find new business challenges with continued career growth.

Transfers Within the Company

In these cases managers took lateral moves (and sometimes demotions) to get into another part of the business. While a few requested transfers, the majority threatened to quit if they were not reassigned. In many instances they asked for positions where their expertise and/or training was limited at best.

"Requested transfer from Marketing Research Department to Product Management for which responsibility I had no previous experience or training. The action words were, 'If I can't do the job successfully in six months, fire me.'"

* * *

"I was in R&D and had had six assignments in five years. My supervisor left, and I expected the phone to ring for ten days. I didn't get the job, and I couldn't believe it. I went to the head of R&D, and he told me I was great, but I needed seven to eight years more seasoning. He told me I could only work in R&D because, after all, I was a chemical engineer, and there were not other openings. I didn't believe him. I quit--and reapplied (to the company) and was interviewed by someone I knew. I got to pick my own job in operations."

Leaving the Corporation

These events are similar to the transfer cases in that the managers had become disgruntled (or bored) with the lack of
challenge in their jobs and wanted to be where the action was. However, unlike others, they did not feel that their company could offer them what they were looking for. A few were approached by search firms, but the majority created their own opportunities for new career directions.

"After 13 years of business in a structured, highly resourced and sophisticated manufacturing marketing company environment, I moved jobs to a small, high-powered advertising agency in the key role of leading Client Services. The agency was extremely entrepreneurial in orientation, composed primarily of senior/experienced principals with minimum staff support. Aggressive business growth goals had a high dependency on each team member working in a hands-on, self-supporting and self-directing manner."

* * *

"After five years of successful brand management experience with a company in Mexico and Cincinnati, I decided to run a risk and joined a snack foods company in Mexico as marketing manager. I say it was a risk because until then marketing had never received sufficient recognition/support. Marketing was seen as a "glamorous thing," responsible for development of TV ads and P.O.P. material only. The true business building potential of a complete marketing function had never been present here. Hence, the opportunity for significant contributions was evident. The risk was that before me, two former marketing managers had failed to overcome their subordination to a sales director, one who supposedly knew everything about marketing."

BREAKING A RUT: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. The job change was a voluntary action. All of the managers chose to move (rather than being assigned) and, with the exception of the few who were approached by search firms, aggressively sought out the new opportunity.

2. The move was a major job change. The resultant job represented a substantial transformation of work roles. The most common new demands were:
   a. added dimensions
   b. new content
   c. cultural change (e.g., new company, relocated overseas)
3. Preceding discontent. Prior to Breaking a Rut, managers reported being dissatisfied with their jobs due to:

a. not enough challenge
b. thought they had been passed over for a promotion
c. did not feel that they were in the "mainstream"
d. were uncomfortable with changes that took place during a reorganization

4. Risk. These managers realized that they had to let go of their security to find the excitement and challenge they were craving. They were willing to gamble on the unknown and could not be certain that they would not fail.

Additional core elements

In addition to the generic core, there were two elements that appear in a large portion of the events.

1. Had been at job/company for a long time prior to Breaking a Rut. In general, these managers were not "job hoppers." Of those who mentioned a time frame (approx. half), virtually all had been with their prior employer anywhere from 5 to 13 years.

2. Positive outcome. For the most part, it would appear that managers who reported Breaking a Rut were successful in changing their career direction. Viewed retrospectively, the act of Breaking a Rut itself taught valuable lessons. As for the jobs themselves, for many it was a start of something big, but others had more than one Breaking a Rut.

BREAKING A RUT: MAJOR LESSONS

The major lesson theme associated with these 24 events is that one has to be responsible for one's own career. Along with this realization managers learned to take advantage of opportunities, to know what they wanted (or didn't want) from their careers and, most important, to know when to stay with a job and when it was best to try something new.
Breaking a Rut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cntrl Career*</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Knowldg</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Like Do*</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Prepared*</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lessons in context of the type of Breaking a Rut:

Transfer Within the Company from Marketing Research to Product Management:

"Patience, preparation and timing of career requests are most important. If appropriately presented, with sensitivity to the environment, you will get successful results. I learned personal alertness and recognition of opportunities for career advancement."

Leaving the Corporation after 13 years to accept a job with a large New York corporation:

"Especially when you're younger, if you see an opportunity that is a challenge, have the courage to give it a try."

...deciding to go into industry rather than academia:

"I learned that I didn't want academia, and I didn't want to do technical work. Discovered my personality was such that I wanted to do a lot of things and enjoyed creating new ideas for others to carry out."
Definitions and examples of the lessons of Breaking a Rut

1. You Have to Take Control of Your Own Career

You have to take control of your own career contains variations on the theme of how to take charge of the situation one is currently in such as:

Realizing that you are the only one who can manage your career, set own pace, broaden if it gets too easy, get out of the box, find your high gear, use contacts, mentors, set goals and go.

41.7% of Breaking a Rut events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Breaking a Rut events on how to take control of your career:

"Seek something broader when it gets easy."

"Have the courage to take challenges (especially while you're young)."

"Patience, preparation and timing of career results are most important."

Breaking a Rut and Other Major Sources of You Have to Take Control of Your Own Career

![Diagram: Take Control of Your Own Career]

- Break a Rut: 41.7%
- Lousy Job: 18.5%

Percent of Co-Occurrence: P < .05
2. Discovering What You Really Want To Do, What Really Excites You

The realization that one has found something one likes, which is exciting and worth doing on its own merit, or something one dislikes and will seek to avoid. This something can be a subject area, working with others, a lifestyle, or a contribution to something larger than one's self.

20.8% of the Breaking a Rut events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Breaking a Rut on discovering what you really want to do:

"The challenge was to attack an insoluble problem, ...that appealed to me."

* * *

"I preferred managing to technical work."

* * *

"This period (about 10 months) made it abundantly clear to me that a stimulating job is a necessity."

Breaking a Rut and Other Major Sources of Discovering What You Really Want To Do, What Really Excites You

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break a Rut</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Specific Technical Knowledge

Specific technical knowledge lessons are statements of new content in a well-defined technical area. This category includes learning technical or business content areas such as finance, strategic planning, computers, budgeting, law.

20.8% of the Breaking a Rut events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Breaking a Rut on specific technical knowledge:

"Learned finance."

"Basic approaches to productivity improvement programs and labor relations."

"Understanding the critical role of cash flow, receivables, overhead cost management—the impact of these factors, and balance sheet, are not readily perceivable to middle management in a decentralized manufacturing profit center."

Breaking a Rut and Other Major Sources of Specific Technical Knowledge

![Specific Technical Knowledge Chart]

- **Line Staff**: 53.9%
- **Coursework**: 26.3%
- **Break a Rut**: 20.8%

*Percent of Co-Occurrence*
4. Be Ready to Take Opportunities (Be Prepared)

Be prepared espouses the notion that much of what happens is serendipitous; that one must be prepared to take advantage of opportunities as they arise. Examples span:

Seize opportunities, prepare for the unexpected, don't assume time/opportunities are unlimited, plan ahead, develop a second skill.

8.3% of the Breaking a Rut events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Breaking a Rut on being ready to take opportunities:

"Personal alertness and recognition of opportunities for career advancement."

* * *

"Second skills necessary."

Breaking a Rut and Other Major Sources of Be Ready to Take Opportunities

IMPRESSIONS: BREAKING A RUT AND DEVELOPMENT

What it's not

Breaking a Rut is not a modest career change. It is a major
shift, but not one initiated by the "pull" of a new career. Rather it is precipitated by the push of discontent and accompanied by high risk. Notably these breaks did not fail; they were, in retrospect, for the best.

What they are

Clearly, Breaking a Rut events were total career changes prompted by intolerable job situations and laden with personal risk. Often the move was made at a time when other circumstances made it even scarier—"my wife was pregnant, we'd just bought a new house..." Even though the change was made at the manager's initiative, there was no way at the time of the decision to know if it would work out.

Speculations on use

There's not much an organization can do to control these extremely personal decisions. In spite of the learning that can result from a career change, the organization hardly benefits when a high-potential manager quits. One way to look at rut-breaking is to view it as an extension of a Demotion/Missed Promotion/Lousy Job: instead of bouncing back, the manager bounces out. Thus the main implication is to prevent the discontent that leads to turnover of desirable people, and to provide opportunities for talented people to switch careers within the organization. Leading sources of discontent are intolerable bosses, lack of challenge in a job, lateral and downward moves, lack of authority or responsibility.

It's interesting to note that nearly all lessons about controlling one's own career came from successfully broken ruts. This suggests that organizations might do more to make managers aware of their own responsibility for their careers. It's one thing to make opportunities available, but quite another to get people to take them. Once again, candid career counselling can make all the difference in explaining why a certain move might be useful or why a possibility is an opportunity to be taken seriously.

What to look for

It takes courage to change, and people who do it successfully sometimes find what they want to do. They may also learn to be more proactive in their own career choices. Perhaps the important place to look is at the situation prior to the jump: not only the nature of the discontent but what the person tried to do to deal with it. Sometimes running away, even if courageous, indicates an inability to handle problems head on.
Once the break is made, of course, a central issue is how the person adapts to the new career, how effectively he or she gets on top of the new content and establishes new relationships.

Over the course of a career, numerous career shifts may not be a good sign. Research indicates that knowledge of the business accumulated over time is a factor in executive success and that many effective executives spent a substantial part of their career mastering a specific function or profession. A person who has totally switched careers several times might not have the necessary depth in any of them.
MANAGING PEOPLE: SUBORDINATE PERFORMANCE PROBLEMS

N events = 21
(3.4% of all events)

N lessons = 40
(2.6% of all lessons)

N managers = 20
(10.5% of all managers)

SUBORDINATE PERFORMANCE PROBLEMS: DEFINITION

In these events managers had to confront a subordinate with a problem that was performance related. The problems revolved around ineptness, alcoholism, and older managers who had let technology pass them by. A personality conflict was never reported as the origin of the problem.

According to these executives, trouble with subordinates was common in many of their job assignments, but not the focus of the event. When managers recounted subordinate performance problems, the nature of the assignment was rarely mentioned and the context of their jobs was irrelevant. These hardship events were distinguished by the one-on-one confrontation with the problem individual. Managers had to deal with the failure and mistakes of subordinates while genuinely upset over the pathos of the situation.

Two types of actions were taken in these situations. First, the manager would usually try to salvage the situation through counseling and development. If the subordinate did not respond (or the situation was hopeless), managers were forced to fire the person.

Salvaging the Situation

The vast majority of managers tried to develop poor performers and counsel talented, but troubled employees. Some went far beyond what was expected of them; several rehabilitated alcoholics and one moved an epileptic to a job where his condition would not endanger others.

At other times a tougher approach was called for in order to salvage the situation. Managers were often faced with older employees who resented their youth and position, or were merely trying to see how much they could get away with. In these instances executives concentrated on not being manipulated and developing techniques to motivate and earn the respect of their subordinates.

"At a plant where I was manager, one of the truck drivers, with 25 years service, had an alcohol problem. Two or three warnings had been given and he was put on notice the next time he was under the influence on the
job he would be fired. This was more or less company policy and was the no-risk, easy solution to the problem. When he reported to work under the influence shortly thereafter, he was sent home by his supervisor and told his employment was terminated. After a discussion I decided to postpone his termination and, instead, have him take his vacation. During his vacation, he had to do some positive acts to overcome his problem—one of which was to attend an AA meeting each week. If he could satisfy me that he had control of his situation, I would intercede on his behalf to get his job back. At the conclusion of his vacation period, he reported back that he had met all conditions and, in fact, was instrumental in setting up a branch of AA in the small town he lived in. He got his job back, he was a model employee and citizen until he retired some 17 years later."

* * *

"While I was assistant treasurer I had an old-timer reporting to me. He'd been passed over several times and forgotten more than I knew. He knew how to manipulate bosses and would push me to the limit. He would just be ornery—somewhat bitter—and wanted to show me ('the young fellow they brought in') that I wasn't so great after all. It was my first run-in with someone really tough to manage."

Firing a Subordinate

Most of the executives agreed that firing a subordinate, even one who deserved it, was among the most dreaded management acts. While, intellectually, managers could accept the need to terminate someone, they still felt bad about it. The vast majority had inherited the subordinate from predecessors who had avoided confronting the problem. Some of the people had no idea they were considered problem employees. Despite gut-wrenching circumstances managers were compelled to act, and in doing so, to learn the best way to confront people, and the most humane way to fire them.

"As a plant manager, I had a key staff member (Production Manager) not performing. A man with 35+ years of service. Production was in trouble and this individual was not capable of handling the job. All his past job appraisals were listing him as 'a good employee.' It was obvious from his history that he had been shuffled into many jobs for all the wrong reasons. No one ever told him that his performance was not adequate. I got stuck with the distasteful job of removing him from his position and giving him the honest reason why: poor performance!"
"I had to fire an employee—a new fellow just out of training. He was assigned to me when I became a manager. I didn't feel his personality fit sales (e.g., he would kid customers about how they looked before he had a rapport with them). After I tried several times to get him to stop I terminated him. I believed it was better to let him go early, but I didn't handle it well. I could have been more humane: I didn't choose the right setting—efficiency drove out humanity. I wanted to get it over with, so I was impulsive. I should have thought about it more. He was surprised and bewildered (he didn't believe it; he hadn't heard my earlier comments)."

SUBORDINATE PERFORMANCE PROBLEMS: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

Regardless of whether the manager fired a subordinate or worked through the problem, these situations had two elements in common:

1. All of the cases involved performance-related problems. No one reported a personality conflict as the origin of the problem.

2. None of the managers had hired the person they were having trouble with. Typically the subordinate was inherited from a predecessor(s) who had avoided dealing with the situation.

Additional core elements

Some combination of the following core elements were present in individual events, creating a variety of tough situations that managers had to deal with.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Manager</th>
<th>The Subordinate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The manager was upset over pathos of the situation (several described it as traumatic).</td>
<td>1. The subordinate was inept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It was the first time the manager had dealt with a problem subordinate and/or it was the manager's first supervisory job.</td>
<td>2. The subordinate had other problems that affected performance (e.g., talented but alcoholic, unsuitable personality for the job).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. It was the manager's first assignment with the company.
3. The subordinate was older/had been with the company for a long time.
4. The manager procrastinated and/or didn't handle the situation well.
4. The subordinate was affecting department morale.
5. The manager did not have authority over the problem person, but had to deal with the situation nevertheless.

The fact that these executives had not initially hired the problem individual did not make it any more palatable: inherited or not, they still had to do something about the situation. They were forced to realize that their "business" decisions affected people's lives.

As it has been said, most managers tried the development route: sometimes it worked, but in many cases it didn't. They could neither repair the omissions of their predecessor nor force unwilling subordinates to change. The one thing they could do was to move beyond focusing on their own performance issues and adopt an attitude toward the mistakes and failures of their subordinates in order to help them and to run an efficient organization.

SUBORDINATE PERFORMANCE PROBLEMS: MAJOR LESSONS

Twenty-one Subordinate Performance Problems were described that yielded a number of realizations about managing people under difficult conditions. While these lessons can be simply stated, they embody the essence of treating people with dignity and consideration.
Lessons in context of the type of Subordinate Performance Problems:

Salvaging the Situation (rehiring, after firing, a 25-year employee with alcohol problems who wanted to change):

"It's worth taking risks to salvage an experienced employee. Employees know when you care."

Firing a Subordinate who was an "inherited problem":

"Once you know what has to be done, trust your judgment and do it. I had been too awed by his position and by the failure of my predecessors to make changes."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Subordinate Performance Problems

1. Needing to Act on or Confront a Subordinate Performance Problem

Acting on a subordinate performance problem is one of the more difficult tasks for the manager. The underlying learning is that it's more important to make the move quickly, and at the same time make sure one has adequate staffing to pick up the slack if the decision is made to terminate.
85.7% of the Subordinate Performance Problems had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Subordinate Performance Problems on how to act on or confront problem people:

"Don't replace a two of clubs with a four of clubs, take the time to do it right."

* * *

"Sometimes it is better to replace problem people than keep them around—better for the people as well as the company."

Subordinate Performance Problems and Other Major Sources of Needing to Act on or Confront Problem People

---

2. Human Values: Sensitivity to Human Needs

Human values are fundamental assumptions of one's values about human beings. This category contains statements of warmth and caring and of insights into human nature. The fact that people are the business and have needs and lives which go beyond the day-to-day functions they perform lends awareness to the importance of sensitivity to others. In this category fall insights into how people should be treated and why.

Warmth and caring statements are empathic in nature while human nature statements tend to be lessons in basic human nature.
11.3% of Subordinate Performance Problems had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Subordinate Performance Problems on human values:

**Warmth and caring**

"The difficulty involved in separating a long service employee, especially in the absence of good performance feedback over the years."

* * *

"The importance of personal dignity (theirs)."

**Human nature**

"Learned patience in working with others."

Subordinate Performance Problems and Other Major Sources of Human Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Sup*</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Perf Pr*</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO*</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPRESSIONS: SUBORDINATE PERFORMANCE PROBLEMS AND DEVELOPMENT**

**What they aren't**

The problems reported here weren't the run-of-the-mill performance confrontations that come with the turf of the managerial job. Nor were they matters of personal chemistry, where a boss and a subordinate just couldn't get along.
What they are

Subordinate Performance Problems were definitely major events. An inherited subordinate was a serious performance problem, and the buck had been passed to the current manager. Usually the impact of poor performance was compounded by circumstances that generated pathos: the employee was a long-service person, or had personal problems, or had come on hard times. What made them difficult, in short, was the emotional overlay on the need to act. Typically this resulted in a personal commitment on the part of the manager to do everything possible to turn the situation around. Because it had been ignored for so long, salvage was a long shot. If efforts failed, there was the final option to be faced: dismissal.

Confronting these situations forced a manager to come to grips with several very tough issues. First is recognizing that something had to be done—the problem couldn't be ignored. Second was the emotional and personal involvement in trying to do something about it. Finally came the realization that avoiding the problem did no one any good—manager, employee, organization unit.

Strategic uses of Subordinate Performance Problems

As is true of many hardship events, this is not something to manipulate. In an ideal world, with effective appraisal and feedback systems, problems like these would not arise. But the world is imperfect and for many managers this event will occur sooner or later. As is often the case, it boils down to how the manager handles it or what he/she learns from it. It is one of those times, however, when the organization can be an invaluable resource. Organizations which take seriously their commitment to employees provide special programs for retraining, medical and counseling services, outplacement, and the like. In a nutshell, they provide services that help a manager in the salvage attempt. If reasonable attempts have been made, the organization should back the manager's decision to terminate.

What to look for

Even though the event is not manipulated, the organization can learn a great deal from it. The first lesson comes from the fact that the problem arises in the first place. These cases were inherited—the organization might reasonably ask why previous managers failed to act.

The things to look for in the current manager's actions have already been mentioned but bear repeating:
• The courage to act where others haven't.
• The compassion to invest significant time and energy in turning it around.
• The wisdom to recognize when it's a lost cause and to stop.
• The toughness to terminate.
• If it's mishandled, learning that procrastination does no one any good.

Events like these also reveal, often starkly, the organization's own values regarding its people. Is the organization willing to invest its resources to save its people and, if so, are there adequate support systems to call upon?

A final note: Organizations with extensive support systems (e.g., counseling, rehabilitation, retraining, outplacement) need to be alert to an unintended effect. A manager faced with a subordinate performance problem may in effect pass the buck by turning it over to one of the support groups ("you fix it"). The central theme remains the same--the boss has to handle it.
LIFE AT ITS EXTREME: PERSONAL TRAUMA

N events = 11  N lessons = 25  N managers = 11
(1.8% of all  (1.6% of all  (5.8% of all
events)  lessons)  managers)

PERSONAL TRAUMA: DEFINITION

Personal Traumas are crisis experiences with a powerful emotional impact. Executives described events in which their families, health, even their lives, were threatened by unanticipated tragedies. These traumas stemmed from both work and personal life and include personal injury or illness, the death of others, divorce, and combat duty.

The consequences of these trauma events were profound and far reaching. Managers were forced to re-evaluate aspects of their lives that they had previously taken for granted, and in many cases, the trauma's impact was compounded by other life events. In order to overcome the effects of these hardships managers often found it necessary to make lasting changes in their behavior and attitudes.

These events and their traumatic effects varied in severity and degree of suddenness, but, regardless of the specific nature of the event, all had a profound and personal impact.

"I was an athlete, severely injured at 16, and told I'd never play again. My whole life changed. Being an athlete had created for me my whole sense of purpose--to have a goal that's tough to reach. The doctor spent a lot of time helping me with the psychological implications, showing me that I had to find another way to excel."

* * *

"One month before a major labor agreement expired the Director of Labor Relations died. The job was handed to me. I felt helpless: I had lost a friend, was trying to help his widow, deal with my own wife, and leading the function was a significant challenge."

PERSONAL TRAUMA: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. The event had a profound personal and emotional impact, whether the event itself was work related or personal.
2. The event made the manager's previous behavior impossible, unadaptive or undesirable.

Additional core elements

In addition to the generic core, one or more of the following elements was present, depending on the nature (e.g., work, health) of the event.

1. With the exception of military combat duty, these traumas were unanticipated and very sudden.

2. The event led to a lasting change in the manager's life—however long ago the trauma occurred, its consequences have been sustained.

3. The effects of the trauma spilled over into other areas of the manager's life—a personal event influencing work behaviors was most frequently mentioned.

4. The managers realized that their behavior caused or contributed to the trauma.

5. In some cases, the trauma was particularly overwhelming because it was compounded by other life events.

PERSONAL TRAUMA: MAJOR LESSONS

These 11 traumatic events yielded lessons that were personal and often painful. The severity of the situations forced managers to question and re-evaluate their priorities, while finding ways to survive and function under extremely adverse conditions.
Lessons in context of the type of Personal Trauma:

A Manager Who had Heart Surgery at age 38:

"I knew I had to slow down. I backed up and took a look at my responsibilities. I realized I couldn't do everything myself: I had to use my people better (I knew how to do everything). I changed my management style and shortened my hours--down from 24."

Command and Combat Duty in Vietnam:

"I learned the absolute necessity of knowledge of the people under you--I had been a hot shot who tried to do it all. I also learned to play mental tricks on myself to keep myself sane (e.g., there's nothing anybody can do to me that's worse than this). Finally, I had absolute power, so I had to be careful: I was making life and death decisions."

A Wife Threatened Divorce Due to Transfer:

"I learned that crisis experiences and their traumatic effects could be better surmounted with patience, affection, understanding and logic. Whatever the circumstances, emotions should never prevail over good common sense."
Definitions and examples of the lessons of Personal Trauma

1. Perspective on Life and Work

Perspective on life and work encompasses the kinds of examining, re-evaluating and prioritizing that managers experience in balancing their work and personal life. Key within this category are recognizing the value of life outside work and discovering the importance of slowing down and relaxing in one's work life.

45.5% of Personal Trauma events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Personal Trauma on perspective on life and work:

"Better perspective on work and life--was over-intense, now I'm reasonable."

*   *   *   *

"Must order priorities--can't separate business and personal."

*   *   *   *

"Empathy for family members."

Personal Trauma and Other Major Sources of Perspective on Life and Work

![Bar chart showing the percent of co-occurrence of trauma, coursework, and BF&M events.](chart.png)
2. Strategies for Coping with Situations Beyond Your Control

Strategies for coping with situations beyond your control contain both pragmatic and cynical statements. Both come from the recognition that there are times when one faces a situation that one can do nothing to change that; some situations are influenced by factors outside of the manager's control such as luck, others' performance, and unrealistic expectations. Coping with such situations requires ways of dealing with or making the best of the uncontrollable situations by changing goals, being patient or optimistic, distancing oneself, or redefining the situations.

27.3% of Personal Trauma events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Personal Trauma on coping with situations beyond your control:

Pragmatic statements focus on accepting that life has good and bad times to offer and that keeping a stiff upper lip in hard times is important.

"I learned to be both tolerant and patient to survive as an individual."

* * *

"Don't second guess past decisions."

* * *

"How to play mental tricks on yourself to stay sane."

Personal Trauma and Other Sources of Coping with Situations Beyond Your Control
3. Persevering Under Adverse Conditions: Singleness of Purpose

Persevering under adverse conditions means developing ways to accomplish one's goals in the face of obstacles, recognizing that difficult situations are often not out of one's control, and acting on them. Three types of perseverance were described: standing up for beliefs, moving ahead, and surviving tough times.

27.3% of Personal Trauma events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Personal Trauma on persevering under adverse conditions:

Standing up for beliefs: Even when personal risk is involved, knowing the importance of standing up for one's beliefs despite opposition.

"I learned that, whatever the circumstances, emotions should never prevail over good common sense."

Moving ahead: Accomplishing the goals of one's assignment despite obstacles and detours; hanging in and moving ahead.

"Keep moving in the same direction until you have evidence another is better."

Surviving tough times: Fighting for survival by waiting to come back up after a lost battle or big mistake.

"I was able to focus on what was most important in spite of personal pressures."

Personal Traumas and Other Major Sources of Persevering Under Adverse Conditions

![Bar Chart: Persevering Under Adverse Conditions]

- Trauma: 27.3%
- Lousy Job: 18.5%
- Fix-It: 13.4%
4. Human Values: Sensitivity to Human Needs

*Human values* are fundamental assumptions of one's values about human beings. This category contains statements of *warmth and caring* and of insights of *human nature*. The fact that people are the business and have needs and lives which go beyond the day-to-day functions they perform lends awareness to the importance of sensitivity to others. In this category fall insights into how people should be treated and why.

*Warmth and caring* statements are empathic in nature while *human nature* statements tend to be lessons in basic human nature.

18.2% of Personal Trauma events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Personal Trauma on human values:

*Warmth and caring*

"I felt a tremendous emotional impact. I undertook a major reassessment of my priorities about people."

*Human nature*

"Only push people as fast as they can go...don't press too hard."

**Personal Trauma and Other Major Sources of Human Values**
5. Recognition of Personal Limits and Weaknesses

Recognition of personal limits and weaknesses in managing often stemmed from lack of time and/or expertise to accomplish alone the variety of tasks necessary to be successful. Sometimes, managers seemed to know their limits before the fact and, sometimes, after.

18.2% of Personal Trauma events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Personal Trauma on recognizing personal limits and weaknesses:

After the fact that they should have recognized their limits earlier. These are statements of what the manager should have or should not have done.

"Taught me I couldn't do everything myself--I had to start using my people better."

Personal Trauma and Other Major Sources of Recognition of Personal Limits and Weaknesses

![Recognition of Personal Limits](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M*</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousy Job*</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Other lessons from Personal Trauma

- Trauma was a major source (although more than expected by chance, only one lesson was reported) of Use and Abuse of Power; however, only eight lessons were reported in this category from all events.
Trauma was a major source of Develop Your People; however, only one lesson was reported, and it was not more than expected by chance.

IMPRESSIONS: PERSONAL TRAUMA AND DEVELOPMENT

There seems little to say about events of this magnitude. Certainly no one would wish traumatic events on someone else. There seem to be two critical implications for organizations to consider: 1) people can learn incredibly significant lessons from traumatic events, and 2) people may need considerable help and support during them. These translate into three specific actions an organization can take to help people through traumas and to learn something from them.

First, the organization can try to create a climate in which people aren't automatically blacklisted as a result of disasters in their lives. We have encountered cultures in which it is assumed "that an executive who can't manage his personal life can't manage a business." Things like divorces or delinquent kids are, in some places, career threatening. We hope that the evidence of growth from trauma is sufficient to dispel such organizational reactions. The last thing a person facing a traumatic situation needs is the additional fear that his/her job is on the line as well. It is useful to remember that disaster can strike anyone.

Second, an organization that cares about its people will help them in times of crisis. Recognizing that individuals react differently to traumatic events, the best strategy appears to be making resources available to help people through the hard times. For some people availability of counseling, financial help, time off, etc., may make all the difference. For others, the key may lie in continuing their work or even in additional work challenge as a way of getting back in control. Organizational flexibility, not paternalism or pretending nothing has happened, seems essential.

This brings us to the third aspect, the role of the immediate boss. There is no reason to believe that bosses are any more comfortable than the rest of us in dealing with people undergoing a traumatic life event. Yet in terms of implementing an organizational response, the boss is the primary figure. This suggests that managers should receive some training in helping their people deal with trauma and helping them find the resources they need to cope. It is as important for the boss to have access to professional guidance as it is for the person involved.

The long and short of it is that terrible things can happen to people. How they handle it and what they learn from it is
largely up to them. But organizations can play a role in helping people through tough times, and it's in their own interest to do what they can to help talented employees get through terrible situations.
Other People
WHEN OTHER PEOPLE ARE DEVELOPMENTAL

Dealing with other people is at the very heart of the managerial job, and it figured prominently in the stories executives told us. Customers, bosses, suppliers, negotiators, subordinates, managerial peers, politicians, regulators—there were no bounds on who might be involved in a developmental event. But the fact that almost all developmental events involved other people did not mean that those people, in and of themselves and independent of the event, "taught" the executives anything.

There were, however, two kinds of events in which other people were the central feature, not just part of the context. In retrospect, perhaps we misnamed these two events because, in most cases, these significant other people were superiors (not peers or subordinates), and in virtually all cases these events involved a hierarchical relationship. We might better have called this section "bosses," for that's what they were.

The two kinds of events that constitute Other People are "Role Models" and "Values Playing Out." Unlike "Starting from Scratch" or "Business Failures," these labels are not self-evident. While both Other People events involved an exceptional person (or behavior) to which the manager reacted strongly and which forced a confrontation with basic values, the nature of the interaction differed substantially. Role Models were bosses (or higher level superiors) with whom the manager worked for a period of time (usually between six months and three years). In contrast, the events we called Values Playing Out were usually brief episodes in which superiors (or the managers themselves) demonstrated their values by doing something spectacularly bad or good to someone else.

Whether from a more lengthy association with a particular boss or brief vignette, the lessons produced were similar. They dealt with values—human, managerial, or political. From observing behavior and its impact, especially the behavior of senior managers, one's own values as well as the "values in action" of the organization came under scrutiny.
ROLE MODELS: THE GOOD, THE BAD & THE UGLY

N events = 46  N lessons = 81  N managers = 35
(7.5% of all  (5.2% of all  (18.3% of all
  events)  lessons)  managers)

ROLE MODELS: DEFINITION

Role Models were superiors that managers interacted with, or observed, during the course of their careers. Some of these models were characterized as possessing exceptional skills or attributes. Others were remembered for their weaknesses and the impact it had on people. But, regardless of whether the Role Model was positive, negative, or a little of both, each case described a person who profoundly influenced the executive's approach to management.

Positive Role Models

Positive Role Models were usually described in superlative terms. They were characterized as good delegators, warm, supportive, patient and offering wise counsel. In a number of cases, the model became a friend as well as a teacher. Some were instrumental in helping a manager through transition periods in his career.

"After 11 years with three in one location on training assignments and eight in another, in a variety of production management positions, I was transferred to a new site to serve as Production Manager for a wonderful individual. He was and is a plant manager who received respect and loyalty from his subordinates. He delegated responsibility and authority, continually pushed the people and the plant to higher performance levels, and was always ready to accept change and new challenges."

* * *

"My manager in 1966 probably had the most to do with making me a manager. He encouraged creativity, would sacrifice himself for his people and let them in the limelight. He was very professional."

Negative Role Models

Negative Role Models were almost always described in scathing terms. They were most often remembered for their lack of trustworthiness, not giving proper credit to subordinates, and their insensitive and/or abrasive treatment of others (especially subordinates).
"I was living under a Theory X manager: He was dictatorial, vindictive; he had to wipe out 1,000 jobs so he had to be tough, but he only wanted 'yes' men. He got no cooperation, people would sabotage him, crews wouldn't work overtime."

* * *

"I joined a major corporation in a relatively junior management position, reporting to a Vice-President/General Manager. Prior to this, I had worked only for small organizations. The Vice-President's business practices and principles were distinctly different from what I had learned and believed to be sound. For the first year or so in my job, this greatly troubled me and affected my confidence in my judgment. Subsequent events proved the VP was off base (he was relieved of his position)."

Positive/Negative Role Model

This model was characterized as having a balance of both positive and negative traits. They tended to be tragic figures in the morality play tradition. These Role Models possessed strengths which managers could easily identify; however, over time, they also revealed serious shortcomings. In some cases, the manager witnessed the model's downfall.

"Good mentor-professor. He gave lots of credit, made me visible. But the guy failed—he was too smart—made his peers feel stupid by having to prove their intelligence. He made people feel important if he liked them. He dealt well with subordinates, but was terrible with peers and bosses."

* * *

"My boss was a tremendously talented technical person with problems. He was a superb planner and all heart, but he didn't tell people what would help them develop, and he wouldn't give negative feedback. He would let things build up until his face would get purple—one time a subordinate wasn't answering his questions and he stood up and swore at him."

ROLE MODELS: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

There are only two core elements which are present in all Role Model descriptions.
1. The Role Model was a superior, usually in a corporate setting. While there was one military model and one college professor described, there was no mention of family members or friends.

2. They all had exceptional attributes:
   a. The positive and positive/negative Role Models were characterized by some exceptional skill, attribute or talent (e.g., "demanding, energetic, approachable personality, logical, rational, delegated wonderfully").
   b. The negative Role Models were characterized as having attributes that managers wanted to avoid at all costs (e.g., "never gave credit...pompous bully, vindictive").

Additional core elements

In addition to the generic elements of Role Models, individual descriptions sometimes contained the following element as well:

1. The model was presented as a conspicuous failure or success.
   a. The model was either "derailed" or failed (e.g., "he was later relieved of his position"; "he was eventually fired"; "people sabotaged him").
   b. The model reached the executive suite (e.g., COO or CEO).

While a few managers reported having worked with (or for) their Role Models for many years, others described people they had only known briefly, and the majority did not mention the length of their relationship at all. The focus of these events was not on how well or how long they had known the model; it was on the actions taken by the models and the effect it had on these managers and others around them.

ROLE MODELS: MAJOR LESSONS

Forty-six Role Models were described as being both the best and the worst superiors these managers had ever encountered. By observing and interacting with these people, executives internalized values regarding appropriate and ethical behavior to be expected from a manager. Through firsthand experience, they learned the importance of integrity and the consequences of insensitivity.
Lessons in context of the type of Role Models:

Positive Role Model:

"Just because you're a manager, you don't forget about everyone else. Your people really appreciate knowing where they stand and when they do a good job."

Negative Role Model:

"Learned how not to manage from a 'Theory X' boss. The guy had no cooperation and sabotage was common (he plateaued at this time)."

Positive/Negative Role Model:

"Be sensitive in using power--domination stifles creativity. Don't make people feel at risk for asking questions or disagreeing. People need to know the strategy behind the specifics."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Role Models

1. Basic Management Values

Basic management values includes statements of ideal values and practices and undesirable practices of management values or principles that guide appropriate, ethical behavior as a manager. Most of the lessons in this category are examples of the integrity, trust, and credibility a manager must exemplify.
26.1% of Role Models had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Role Models on basic management values:

Ideal values and practices describe specific examples of value-laden standards to imitate.

"[I learned] why this particular manager was highly regarded throughout the organization. It [the critique] was done thoroughly and was time consuming on his part. I was surprised there were managers about that have a global concern for people development for the total company—not just their own department or division."

* * *

"Don't make people feel at risk for asking questions, disagreeing."

* * *

"Always give credit."

Undesirable practices are statements of exactly that.

"When questioned, the boss blew up, said there wouldn't be any lay-offs. Lay-offs were later announced, but my boss never admitted it--Integrity."

Role Models and Other Major Sources of Basic Management Values

![Basic Management Values Chart]

- VPO: 30.8%
- Role Model: 26.1%
- Personal: 25%

* p < .05
2. Human Values: Sensitivity to Human Needs

Human values are fundamental assumptions of one's values about human beings. This category contains statements of warmth and caring and of insights of human nature. The fact that people are the business and have needs and lives which go beyond the day-to-day functions they perform lends awareness to the importance of sensitivity to others. In this category fall insights into how people should be treated and why.

Warmth and caring statements are empathic in nature while human nature statements tend to be lessons in basic human nature.

13.0% of Role Models had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Role Models on human values:

**Warmth and caring**

"Sensitivity to people's problems."

* * *

"Just because you're a manager, you don't forget about everyone else."

**Human nature**

"Deliver good news and bad news with grace (sometimes people miss the point)."

* * *

"People perform much better when they appreciate the individual for whom they work."
Role Models and Other Major Sources of Human Values

![Bar chart showing percent of co-occurrence for different events.]

3. What Executives are Like

Learning what executives are like, both the positives and the negatives, demystifies the executive aura. This category describes executives as human beings as well as what executives value, how they operate, and how they see things.

8.7% of Role Models had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Role Models on what executives are like:

The positives include learning that executives are just people, and watching and picking up their values.

"Businessmen are concerned about many things that have little to do with business."

* * *

"What senior managers in the company valued: dedication to the jobs, creativity and innovation."

* * *

"Acts like regular person--nice to all kinds of people."
Role Models and Other Major Sources of What Executives Are Like

![Bar Chart]

**What Executives Are Like**

- Line Staff: 30.8%
- Role Model: 8.7%
- BF&M: 8.3%

% Percent of Co-Occurrence

**IMPRESSIONS: ROLE MODELS AND DEVELOPMENT**

**What they aren't**

Role Models and mentors have received a lot of research attention and have become a focal point for advice on managerial development. But the Role Models who made a difference to these executives differed in many respects from common folklore. For example, there was little evidence of mentors--defined as long-term, apprentice relationships. Nor were the Role Models singularly good at coaching, giving feedback, providing "street savvy." Some were, many were not. Further, Role Models were hardly all positive--bad bosses taught poignant lessons, too (about 1/3 of the Role Models were ogres).

**What they are**

Role Models who made a lasting difference were at once very similar and very different. They were alike in being exceptional in some way, but what was exceptional varied all over the lot. They may have been outstanding at doing something (motivating, business analysis, delegation, giving feedback, opening doors, etc., etc.), or horrible at it.

They were alike in being a superior in the hierarchy, either an immediate boss or maybe two or more levels higher (peers, friends, colleagues, subordinates, families were never mentioned). They were also similar in that the relationship was relatively short, usually 1-3 years.
So basically significant Role Models were exceptionally good or bad bosses, sometimes all the more noteworthy because they became conspicuous successes or failures later in their careers.

**Strategic uses of Role Models**

The basic strategy for exposing developing executives to Role Models is diversity over the course of a career. This means trying to expose a manager to bosses with a variety of exceptional skills and a variety of styles. Such exposures can be relatively short (long-term relationships defeat the purpose and, as we know, can even derail a manager). Variety over time allows the manager to see excellence in several different skill areas and requires the manager to adapt to bosses with different styles. Obviously we do not advocate assigning a manager to an ogre of a boss—but this is likely to happen by chance during a career, and there may be times when an outside intervention may be needed to help the manager through them.

Teaching bosses to be better coaches might be useful to the organization as a whole, but coaching skills are not the critical aspect of Role Models. What is critical is that the boss be exceptional in some area—a mediocre boss who has some training in coaching skills is unlikely to make much difference. Formal mentoring programs also may be an inefficient use of resources, particularly if "mentor" is defined narrowly (e.g., a person with a special coaching/teaching ability). In short, it is one thing to assign a developing manager to a variety of exceptional bosses but quite another to try to force a particular relationship.

Achieving variety may mean that managers receive some assignments more for exposure to a certain boss than for the job itself. It is also true that the presence of a positive boss seems more beneficial in some kinds of assignments than others, notably in the first supervisory job and when huge increases in scope occur.

Another key to effective use of Role Models is what the organization does to the exceptionally good and bad bosses. In an ideal world, the good are recognized and promoted, while the bad eventually "get theirs." In the ideal world, observer-managers learn positive values from both events. When the bad are rewarded, cynicism may result. But the world is seldom uncomplicated, so particularly potent lessons are conveyed by what happens to bosses with an exceptional talent and a glaring flaw. When the boss is rewarded, the message is that the flaw is okay. A common example was the boss who "got results" but got them at the expense of his
people. The value transmitted by what happens to such a boss is powerful--either "results are all that matters" or "no matter how good you are, you must treat people decently to succeed." In the long run, the most important use of Role Models may be the setting of organizational values through example.

**What to look for**

Learning from a Role Model is somewhat complex. When a manager is working for a boss who is exceptional at something, he/she must recognize the exceptional talent, observe how the boss does it, figure out how that might fit with his/her own style, and finally incorporate the relevant parts. This may make it easier to see and avoid weaknesses: managers who try to imitate the boss in a lock-stock-and-barrel way, or who fail to recognize that there's anything to learn are probably at risk of failure themselves.

A very revealing and critical event is when a developing manager is assigned to a boss with a very different style (e.g., a go-go marketing manager gets a slower paced boss) or to an ogre. Such occasions require considerable adaptation (discussed more fully in Lombardo and McCall, 1984).

Over time and bosses, one hopes to see evidence that the manager has learned a variety of new skills and that content has been incorporated into his/her own behavior. One also hopes to see that the manager has learned to accept that there is no one way to lead and to adapt effectively to the styles of many types of bosses.
SHORT-LIVED EVENTS: VALUES PLAYING OUT

N events = 65  N lessons = 136  N managers = 47
(10.6% of all  (8.8% of all  (24.6% of all
events)  lessons)  managers)

VALUES PLAYING OUT: DEFINITION

Values Playing Out were snapshots of behavior occurring at
work. These were short-lived events involving a person (or
persons) doing something to another person (or persons) that
had a visible impact. The manager, as an actor in the scene
or as an observer of it, drew a value-laden conclusion from
it. Events of this type almost always were of short
duration, occurred in chain-of-command relationships, and
were discussed "out of context"—that is, the "snapshot" had
survived while the larger scenario in which it happened had
dimmed. The values conveyed were primarily what one ought or
ought not to do in dealing with other people.

Whether these snapshots recalled one's own or another's
behavior, they left imprints of very negative or very
positive episodes and of behaviors to emulate or to avoid.

Negative Episodes

The negative descriptions almost always resulted from
watching someone else do something the manager considered
wrong. The managers were sometimes victims of the behavior
and sometimes simply observers:

"I was sent to purgatory—to a new business arena with
no explanation as to why. It felt like a demotion. I
was angry enough to leave the company and would have if
a major disaster hadn't struck my personal life. Only
later did I learn that this job was marked as an
interim, developmental step for me. The situation was
handled very poorly— I should have been given an
explanation."

*   *   *   *

"Thirty years ago—a batch of material was ruined.
There was an investigation that turned up a mistake a
guy had made. I saw the foreman chew him out—
for thinking! I was appalled."

Occasionally managers described these negative events as
their fault:
"In conjunction with a consultant I did an extensive survey of my subordinate staff to assess professional climate. The results were horrible. I re-surveyed approximately nine months later and the results were significantly improved. This was an important event to me as it shattered many of my perceptions/illusions about my management style. (This feedback has allowed me to reshape my approach to management and get significantly better results.)"

Some of these events involved watching someone do himself in within the organization:

"Early in my career I was promoted over a fellow who felt he deserved the promotion. He complained to the Division Director that he was better qualified for the job than I was. That really hurt him—he's still below the level where he could be."

* * * * *

"I counseled a manager on a situation which called for a business risk on a legal issue. It was not, nor is it my practice to put such matters in writing. When the manager's decision did not pan out, he denied ever having received the initial advice, characterizing our discussion as unqualified approval (which assertion I will now charitably characterize as 'factually not accurate')."

**Positive Episodes**

The positive descriptions almost always resulted from managers' recall of their own actions.

There were several positive descriptions of something the manager completed successfully:

"There was a wildcat strike. I was on an international assignment. One night my supervisor called me at home to inform me of a total plant two-week strike. The strike was due to a wage issue that did not involve my division. I asked my supervisor to stay on the job with his workers until I could get to the factory. When I arrived, I found that all gates had been closed by the strikers. I managed to enter the plant premises. My division agreed to continue work if I could convince the other two shifts to come in. I walked outside the main gate among the mob, explained to them that the strike had nothing to do with my division and led my people in. I did this for two weeks, and we never lost a pound of production."
Others were descriptions of the manager's positive behavior toward another person or persons.

"I turned over complete responsibility for development of the R&D strategy and program for a major division to a junior level staff member. Contrary to his previous managers, I felt he was a strong leader. He produced a good program and sold it to the division. He was off and running from then on."

Positive episodes also triggered memories of times the manager was well-treated by others:

"I felt I was fumbling in my new function and was insecure with my management style. In an annual appraisal my managers completed an appraisal form on me. They said I delegated well, gave credit, allowed others to present up, was honest and fair. Coupled with my boss's assessment, this reinforcement pushed me to overcome my insecurity and chart my future direction."

* * * * *

"I've watched (from afar) management change a function. They brought in the change at the top. They were direct and got the results they wanted without losing sensitivity to people's needs--they moved out the status quo types but found meaningful jobs for them. Then they shared their objectives, strategies, and philosophy with people to give us a sense of what we were about."

VALUES PLAYING OUT: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

Regardless of the type of Values Playing Out event or the lead actor in the scene, these behaviorally-based events had three elements in common:

1. Vivid recall of a behavior that had a lasting impact on the manager.

2. The outcome of the action was visible and concrete—there was a clear cause and effect relationship between a person's action and its impact.

3. The behavior was assimilated as the acting out of a value.
Additional core elements

Some combination of the following core elements was present in given events, creating the variations from positive to negative descriptions and from observation of others to self-initiated actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Observation of Others' Actions</th>
<th>2. Observation of Self as Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. a negative behavior toward another person or group</td>
<td>a. a negative behavior toward another person or group (rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. a negative behavior toward the manager or the manager and others</td>
<td>b. participating in a negative behavior toward another person or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. a positive behavior toward another person or group</td>
<td>c. a positive behavior toward another person or group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. a positive behavior toward the manager or the manager and others</td>
<td>d. successful resolution of a new or problematic situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The impact of the behavior was objectively verifiable (e.g., demotion, promotion, reprimand, success).

4. The impact of the behavior was subjectively judged by the manager.

5. The scenario occurred on the job and the actors were in a hierarchical relationship to one another (almost always).

   a. boss to subordinates
   b. boss to the manager
   c. the manager to a boss
   d. subordinates to a boss
   e. the manager to subordinates

6. The scenario occurred off-site with family and friends (rarely found).

7. A discrete, short-duration event--a snapshot--rather than a contextually rich, extended episode.
8. The story unfolded over time from a series of independent snapshots accumulated over the years that resulted in a "truism."

VALUES PLAYING OUT: MAJOR LESSONS

Forty-seven managers gave 65 descriptions of Values Playing Out events. The name for these snapshot events came partly from the value-laden insights the managers drew from these episodes. On a personal side, the lessons are statements of values to have, keep, or avoid. In terms of the organization, the lessons are statements of insights into the political infrastructures and the values of top management.

Lessons in context of the type of Values Playing Out:

Negative Episodes (watching a business go downhill):

"It was an eye-opener to me—shallow promises and corporate politics play a major role in organizations. Manufacturing people are at the bottom of the pecking order here—marketing is at the top. The president (who considered himself a marketing guy) was put in because he was a friend of the owner."

(being removed from a position after following wrong directions)

"I made a vow to myself never to let anyone take the blame for something I did or told someone else to do.
This I have always adhered to. You have to accept the consequences of your actions--don't pass the buck. Hard work and applying your abilities will enable you to obtain your goals."

Note: He was subsequently promoted.

Positive Episodes (standing firm and proving abilities despite president's opposition):

"My opinion was not required and to voice an objection was a career risk. It was important to me to offer my best professional advice. Better managed companies (successful ones) operate in an environment where opinion can be expressed and this will be allowed to happen."

Trying a new management style that worked:

"This new management technique turned out to be the key: meet together, plan and commit together. It's the only way to manage."

Definitions and examples of Values Playing Out events

1. Basic Management Values

Basic management values includes statements of ideal values and practices and undesirable practices of management values or principles that guide appropriate, ethical behavior as a manager. Most of the lessons in this category are examples of the integrity, trust, and credibility a manager must exemplify.

30.8% of the Values Playing Out events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Values Playing Out on basic management values:

Ideal values and practices describes specific examples of value-laden standards to imitate:

"Don't compromise personal integrity."

* * *

"Teamwork--we, the firm, made the error and we had to correct it."

Undesirable practices are statements of exactly that:
"I learned how the 'new broom can sweep clean' syndrome can supersede business sense and experience... disastrous results notwithstanding."

* * *

"Corporate objectives far outweigh people's lives."

* * *

"My personal integrity soared among the Canadians involved as they had expected me to conduct biased research to prove that Headquarters was right."

Values Playing Out and Other Major Sources of Basic Management Values

2. Politics is Part of Organizational Life

Politics encompasses both realization that organizations are, in part, political systems and recommendations for dealing within them. For example, a recognition of the political component in decision making may result in the discovery that one needs to make a personal choice regarding the use of politics to achieve a goal—to sell a point, idea, or project. Political insights fall into three broad categories: naive, cynical, and pragmatic.

18.5% of the Values Playing Out events had at least one of these lessons.
Examples from Values Playing Out on politics is part of organizational life:

**Naive** statements sound like first glimpses into the existence of politics in organizations.

"All is not fair in business."

* * * *

"Helped me realize that not all authority (boss) is honest or appropriately motivated--helped me grow up--overcome naivety."

**Cynical** statements resemble retaliatory actions.

"[My organization] is an overly political place in which politics supersedes substance."

"Ten years of excellent performance can be destroyed by events over which you have no control. Excellent performance is not relevant to success."

**Pragmatic** statements deal with realization of how to use the system.

"The value of understanding the political system."

* * * *

"In large 'political' organizations, you must manage many, sometimes competing, constituencies constructively, positively, diplomatically, and you can accomplish your objectives."

Values Playing Out and Other Major Sources of Politics is Part of Organizational Life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lousy Job+</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M*</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO+</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
3. Human Values: Sensitivity to Human Needs

Human values are fundamental assumptions of one's values about human beings. This category contains statements of warmth and caring and of insights of human nature. The fact that people are the business and have needs and lives which go beyond the day-to-day functions they perform lends awareness to the importance of sensitivity to others. In this category fall insights into how people should be treated and why.

Warmth and caring statements are empathic in nature while human nature statements tend to be lessons in basic human nature.

12.3% of the Values Playing Out events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Values Playing Out on human values:

Warmth and caring

"To be more compassionate with fellow co-workers."

*     *     *

"I learned the importance of managing subordinates with candor and sensitivity to their domestic lives during a period of excessive stress and disruption."

Human nature

"That people who work hard never get enough recognition."

*     *     *

"That people need to feel you care about them as a manager."

*     *     *

"Resistance to change is often a function of ignorance/insufficient understanding."
Values Playing Out and Other Major Sources of Human Values

![Human Values Chart]

**Impressions: Values Playing Out and Development**

**What they aren't**

The main thing about these values vignettes is that they are almost totally beyond an organization's control. They aren't orchestrated events.

**What they are**

Because these slices of life occur au naturel, they are potent communicators of values. They are the symbolic acts which demonstrate to the developing manager what the corporation stands for. They seem to occur in greatest number when the organization faces important challenges that test its values—reorganizations, mergers, reduction-in-force, plant closings, catastrophes, and the like. Will managers, in the face of pressure, hang on to their values—or is it just hot air?

**Strategic Uses of Values Playing Out**

The event itself is beyond the organization's control, but what happens afterward is not. After all, it's how the observer-manager interprets the vignette that makes the lasting impression. A foreman chews out a worker for thinking. Does the foreman get reprimanded? Rewarded? Nothing happens to him? There's the message, and, as we saw
with Role Models, the issue is how seriously the organization takes the values it espouses.

Part of this, of course, depends on how well an organization clarifies its values, communicates them to its managers, and deals with those who fail to live up to them. Many managers fail to realize the symbolic impact of their role, especially events as they unfold in the day-to-day enactment of their jobs. There is perhaps a role here for training courses that clarify values and prepare managers to handle values-testing events. There also may be value in training experiences where managers are allowed to share their personal values vignettes—both good and bad—as an exercise in values clarification.

Organizations with no clear value system may suffer negative consequences when values play out within the group. Culture will be transmitted by the individual acts of managers with no context for interpretation. Organizations that espouse a value system (through credos, codes of conduct, and the like) but do not enforce it will suffer perhaps the most. In these cases, the context blares hypocrisy. It is no small thing to attempt to manipulate symbols, and it is folly to do so if the values beliefs are not bone deep.

**What to look for**

Values vignettes will happen. What matters for development is how the developing manager interprets them and incorporates their lessons. Even from the most appalling scenes can come affirmation of positive values, of learning what not to do from the travesties of others. On the other hand, cynicism and political gamesmanship can also be learned. What to look for is not just the stories managers tell, but the morals that they draw. Just as developing managers take values lessons from the acts of others, their own actions reflect their values. The ways they treat others, how they respond to pressure and deal with tough situations, are the telltale signs.
Other

Significant Events
OTHER SIGNIFICANT EVENTS

There is always a danger in clumping the "leftovers" together. These four events might be seen as the residual, or miscellaneous, or more accurately "a bunch of things we weren't quite sure what to do with." While they do not have a particular thing in common, they were just as important as any other event to the executives who described them.

Because they have no single thing in common, we won't summarize here the elements of these experiences and the lessons they teach. Each of the events deserves scrutiny in its own right.

The category "Coursework," for example, is actually one of the most frequently reported (over 6% of all events). Containing formal educational programs, this kind of experience will be of particular interest to those who design managerial training.

"Early Work" and "First Supervision" might have been included in the Assignments section, for both pertain to jobs these executives held. While Early Work experiences were incredibly diverse, as were the unquestionably valuable lessons they taught, in contrast the first supervisory job, almost regardless of its context, taught an amazingly uniform set of lessons.

The final category, "Purely Personal," is exactly what the name implies. A diverse array of off-the-job experiences, they provided relevant lessons in an idiosyncratic but important way.

Clearly three of the four events in this section are amenable to organizational manipulation. Formal courses, whether developed internally or provided by outside vendors, have been a mainstay of managerial development for many years. Early Work experiences, including First-Time Supervision, have been recognized as critically important times to challenge talented young employees. Because these kinds of experiences have received relatively more attention in other research, we have paid relatively less attention to them here.
LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES: COURSEWORK EVENTS

N events = 38  N lessons = 75  N managers = 35
(6.2% of all events)  (4.9% of all lessons)  (18.3% of all managers)

COURSEWORK: DEFINITION

Coursework, as one would expect, refers to the formal training and academic programs attended by managers. The specific purpose of these events is to provide managers the opportunity to obtain information and experiences not available from their day-to-day jobs.

While Coursework events encompass a wide variety of learning situations, all the cases fall into four basic categories: long-term university programs, short-term university programs, in-house programs, and outside non-university programs.

Long-Term University Programs

One-third of the executives who reported a Coursework event entered long-term (one year or more) university programs seeking additional academic credentials. While the vast majority of these managers received MBA's (MIT's Sloan program was most often mentioned), one person went back to school for an undergraduate degree and another was recognized as a C.I.M. (Canadian Industrial Manager).

"Spent a year at MIT as a Sloan Fellow. The big one, a life changing experience in every sense. Family, career, everything."

* * * *

"Was at Harvard for an MBA. Saw talent and brainpower in classmates (after 4-1/2 years in the navy!). Convinced me, if this is my competition in the business world, I'd better get to work."

Short-Term University Programs

Some executives availed themselves of the shorter management programs offered by universities, such as Harvard's AMP. The courses ranged from two weeks to a year. Course content was geared specifically toward the problems executives face. They also offered the opportunity to interact with senior managers from other organizations.
"I went to a management course at Harvard. The information in the course material was relevant to my growth. More important...Harvard taught me to question authority, to trust my instincts, and to mistrust people's competence...I was exposed to the brightest people I'd ever known."

* * * *

"In 1979 I was selected to attend a nine-week program for executives at Carnegie Mellon. There I was exposed to a multi-faceted group of people gathered from all types of industries worldwide. A tremendous learning experience through combined group participation and course study."

In-House Programs

The seminars provided for managers by their own companies mainly focused on improving interpersonal skills and management styles. The goal of these programs was to teach people about their strengths and weaknesses and that managerial work involved different requirements and challenges than technical work.

"My company provides various management seminars. Two of these dealt with motivation of people and management by goals and objectives. Up to that point in time, I think I dealt entirely with factual engineering data for management of projects. I was ignorant of the human factors required for successful engineering management."

* * * *

"As a recently appointed (in 1963) manager of Special Products Development, I was selected to attend a four-week in-house 'Management Training' program. Both corporate and outside consultants were assembled as resources. There were about 40 other managers worldwide. Participants learned and lived together during the four weeks. Experiences and time spent as managers were a slice across the corporation. There was a great deal of class interplay and participation and team sponsorship."

Outside Non-University Programs

While the majority of courses taken outside the organization were held at universities, there were other options that managers took advantage of. These programs varied greatly and included the Levinson Institute Stress Reduction Program, a Communispond course, and Outward Bound.
"It was the first time I'd ever had a department and subordinates. In looking for a management development program, I attended Outward Bound...right after that, I went to a seminar on career development, which had me rank life goals. The combination got me and my mind together. I found balance in my business and personal life."

* * * *

"This is more a personal key event. I had been progressing well, building the business for which I was responsible. But my management style had some of the proverbial rough edges. My employer sponsored me for a seminar at the Menninger Foundation and it fundamentally changed me."

COURSEWORK: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. All the courses mentioned are formal training or academic programs. The outside instruction was provided by university professors and other accredited professionals. In-house programs were run by highly trained staff members.

2. All the courses exposed managers to information and experiences that were not available to them on their jobs. The vast majority of the programs emphasized general management and business, or focused on process/self-analysis. Only two events were limited to specific technical areas.

3. All courses were conducted away from day-to-day operations. Non-corporate programs were held at outside institutions (over half at universities). The in-house courses were run in facilities designed specifically for their training programs.

Additional core elements

In addition to the common elements, individual Coursework events usually contained one or more of the following elements as well.

1. Company support. In at least 70% of the cases managers were allowed to take time off from their jobs to attend classes. Only four managers mentioned attending night school (all were for university degrees), and they were clearly the
exception rather than the rule. Corporations showed their support through their investment of time (and often direct funding) for the education of their managers.

2. Voluntary events. For the most part, managers sought out these learning opportunities as opposed to being "pushed" into them. The motivating factor for many was the desire to improve and broaden their managerial skills. Others specifically stated that it was considered an honor to be chosen to participate in advanced management programs (e.g., Sloan Fellow).

3. Exposure to other people. Interacting with managers from other companies, community leaders and high-level executives from within their own companies was often cited as the highlight of Coursework events.

**COURSEWORK: MAJOR LESSONS**

While these 38 events cover a broad spectrum of educational experiences, the lessons associated with them are of a similar nature and quite specific. Managers gained knowledge about specific technical areas and were exposed to new management theories. They were also able to increase self-confidence through positive comparisons with peers. Finally, by stepping outside their normal work routine, many found new insights into themselves, their careers and other people.
Lessons in context of the type of Coursework:

Long-Term University Program (MIT Sloan Program):

"I learned about how finance and law interacts with government and industry leaders—that added reality to what leaders do. I learned about the assumptions management makes about what releases the energies of people. So I've spent my time trying to unlock the energy that is available, but seldom tapped in organizations."

Short-Term University Management Program (Harvard Executive Program):

"Learned accounting, finance, marketing, etc., and met an incredible group of people. I learned important content but, also, I hadn't realized prior to the course how much general business knowledge I had picked up managing a technical function. It convinced me I could take a marketing job sans experience—managing marketing managers."

In-House Program Provided by Companies:

"The most important lessons learned, in retrospect, came from associations with other participants. The informal passage of experience from successful managers provided alternative managing styles. A second category of lessons came from the visits to the classes by the corporate officers and the observations of their conduct."

Non-University Outside Courses (Menninger Foundation):

"You can't separate professional and personal life into two totally separate parts; they are interrelated and behavior in one is influenced by the other. I had been overcompensating for previous failures and thinking over—worrying—about not repeating the same mistakes. I learned to close the door on previous chapters in my life and move forward with the result of being a more relaxed and sensitive (to where others are coming from) manager."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Coursework events

1. Self-Confidence

Self-confidence lessons are statements of self-trust,
knowing oneself, and arrogance. They span trust in one's own competence (e.g., in one's skills, ability, judgment, intuition) and faith in one's ability to take risks, handle tough situations, and be successful.

29.0% of the Coursework events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Coursework events on self-confidence span the following:

Self-trust contains lessons of self-competence.

"Confidence in myself in dealing with people at higher levels."

* * *

"You're as good as you think you are--comparison with others."

* * *

"I gained the confidence to explore non-marketing parts of the business."

Knowing oneself is just what the name implies--learning to assess oneself, to sort strengths from weaknesses.

"While lacking experience, I still understood the concepts as well as the more senior managers (experience and understanding are different)."

* * *

"People had a greater respect for my opinions than I believed, and that I could be much more effective with an earlier contribution to group discussion."

Arrogance surfaces in some of the statements when self-confidence approaches self-deception.

"Intellectual challenges: I could take on the best people around."
2. Specific Technical Knowledge

Specific technical knowledge lessons are statements of new content in a well-defined technical area. This category includes learning technical or business content areas such as finance, strategic planning, computers, budgeting, law.

26.3% of the Coursework events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Coursework events on learning specific technical knowledge:

"I saw the impact of finance and economics on world systems."

* * * *

"Learned a great deal more about financial management and expanded the ability to qualify many events."

* * * *

"As my work responsibilities are specialized, I felt it necessary to broaden my scope. The course involved many areas in which my experience had been very limited—accounting, business law, statistics, personnel, problem solving, industrial engineering, manufacturing controls, marketing, etc."
Coursework and Other Major Sources of Specific Technical Knowledge

3. Management Models

Management models contain formal management theories or processes learned during the course of a career.

13.2% of the Coursework events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Coursework events on management models:

"Saw management could be viewed as a profession."

* * *

"Focus on process of managing."

* * *

"Passage of experience from successful managers provided alternative management styles."
4. Finding Alternatives in Solving and Framing Problems

Finding alternatives are lessons in the art of problem solving, in transcending habitual ways of thinking about problems.

10.5% of the Coursework events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Coursework events on finding alternatives include:

"There are lots of ways to attack problems (from managers of other companies)."

*   *   *

"Always 'ask the next question.'"
Coursework and Other Major Sources of Finding Alternatives in Solving and Framing Problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Work</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-it</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Perspective on Life and Work

Perspective on life and work encompasses the kinds of examining, re-evaluating and prioritizing that managers experience in balancing their work and personal life. Key within this category are recognizing the value of life outside work and discovering the importance of slowing down and relaxing in one's work life.

10.5% of the Coursework events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Coursework events on perspective on life and work:

"I learned how to say no--put perspective on my job in life."

*   *   *   *

"I found balance in life; pushed myself beyond my limits."

*   *   *   *

"You can't separate professional and personal life into two totally separate parts; they are interrelated and behavior in one is influenced by the other."
Coursework and Other Major Sources of Perspective on Life and Work

![Perspective on Life and Work chart]

IMPRESSIONS: COURSEWORK AND DEVELOPMENT

What it isn't

Courses that made a big difference usually weren't routine: they weren't in the normal, straight-through educational process (undergraduate and graduate work done contiguously); from the individual's perspective they weren't run-of-the-mill regular courses; they weren't unconnected from work or career relevant issues.

What it is

Coursework is work needed that makes a big difference because it deals with a relevant and important issue and occurs at a good time for the manager. Ironically, the major outcome is not the content, but the confidence engendered by the experience. This took several forms:

- Self-confidence resulting from being chosen for a plum—an exclusive or high prestige cause (e.g., Harvard, Sloan, etc.).

- Confidence from discovering that one knew more about some area than one thought (e.g., a manager who learned finance on the job and discovered that he/she knew what the course covered).
Confidence from discovering that the manager was as capable as managers from other firms who also attended the course.

The content itself made the biggest difference when the manager needed it at once back on the job. For example, one manager took a course in organizational design while assigned to a task force to redesign the corporation. Another attended a workshop on stress during a particularly stressful time.

While the kinds of courses that mattered included both internal and external programs, advanced management programs at "big-name" schools were common: Harvard, Dartmouth, MIT, and Wharton in particular.

**Strategic uses of Coursework**

Clearly, the highest impact came when a course came later in a career (after some managerial experience and success), involved other capable managers who also were successful, and dealt with issues relevant to the job. In a sense, timing and colleagues were everything. This does not mean that other kinds of courses have no value, but it does suggest that some common practices may have less impact for high-potential managers. Among them:

1. lock-step course sequences for all managers at a given stage (e.g., middle management entree)
2. courses with no prestige factor (highly heterogeneous mixes of talent, success among participants)
3. courses whose content has little connection with the work the manager is doing (e.g., abstractions like managerial style or content unrelated to the job or general models that hold little specific utility)
4. courses whose instructors lack credibility—whose experience or capability is inferior to that of the manager
5. remedial or forced courses, where a manager has to attend against his/her own desires or needs

Like other experiences that make a difference, high impact courses had an element of a test. Am I as good as executives from a renowned company? Do I know as much about "x" as the experts (where "x" might be marketing or finance or global competition)? Can I handle the intellectual demands of a Harvard? Can I deal with a full-time job, school, and family all at the same time?
Of course, as executives ascend and their responsibilities grow, finding time and inclination to invest in courses becomes more difficult. One strategy is to couple such experiences with staff or project assignments where a manager is more likely to focus on a task from which course content would be useful. Another strategy is to design courses to coincide with difficult transitions, for example taking charge of a general manager job for the first time (à la Gabarro's work).

**What to look for**

The theme of Coursework learning was confidence, and that's what should be expected. But it should be kept in perspective, not unqualified arrogance. At their best, courses provide insight into strengths and areas in which a manager might improve or try new things. So look for increased self-confidence coupled with experimentation: trying something different on return. A little like learning from Role Models, the issue is not straight transfer of learning. The manager needs to pick and choose from the content platter, then modify to fit with his/her own style and issues. A manager who totally rejects the course, or who attempts to apply it lock, stock, and barrel, is raising a red flag.
MANAGEMENT TRAINING: EARLY WORK EXPERIENCES

N events = 20  
(3.2% of all events)

N lessons = 45  
(2.9% of all lessons)

N managers = 19  
(9.9% of all managers)

EARLY WORK EXPERIENCES: DEFINITION

These events represent important work experiences that took place early in the managers' careers. In most cases these were non-management jobs that introduced the aspiring manager to new environments, cultures and management philosophies. Through this exposure, the would-be executives were given some of their first opportunities to successfully meet the requirements and challenges of the business world.

While many different kinds of jobs were described (e.g., sales, engineering, accounting), there appear to be three broad types of Early Work events: the first job out of school, the exposure to a new part of the business, and the "broadening experience."

The First Job

Managers who described their first job as a key event focused on the rude awakening they had in making the transition from student to employee.

"The only early goal I had was to do well at what I was doing--but work was a rude shock. In college, if I made an 86 on an exam, I did it myself. Since grades were independent I thought I was too. I found out that knowing the right answer was only 10% of the battle: Working with people was the other 90%."  

*       *       *

"I worked for three years with a firm of Chartered Accountants after leaving the university and received my CA designation after writing the uniform formal examinations. I had to move from the pure academic, which I really enjoyed, to an environment of high pressure, long hours, resentment and some abuse from senior people. It was like being educated all over again. At times, it was a very frustrating experience."

New Part of the Business

In these events young managers had a few years of work
experience, but their exposure was still limited. By moving to new jobs or areas they increased their knowledge and opportunities.

"I changed jobs--from national defense industry to consumer goods. From a structured, slow-moving pace with limited opportunity to an unstructured, fast-paced, creative environment with more obvious opportunity. I was exposed to totally different management philosophies and people. I was a financial analyst."

* * *

"I moved from plant to customer technical service (production to marketing). I was exposed to what makes the business tick--I got to sell the product. Selling is not easy. You've got to deal with tough people situations."

The Broadening Experience

While all of the Early Work events were broadening experiences, the events that fall into this category were a little larger in scale. Several managers described overseas experiences where they were exposed to new cultures and life styles. Others were given major projects at an early age.

"I was given a major development project three months after hiring into a company as a development engineer. The project was designing a vibration isolation system for separating jet engine vibrations from aircraft carrier ship vibrations. I had the opportunity to work with other divisions in my company plus the U.S. Navy."

* * *

"I spent four years (from age 18-23 years) in the Navy, mostly out of the country. It opened my eyes to different cultures and life styles. I spent two years in Salzburg, Austria, and it helped me decide what to do with my life. The people I worked with were leadership/officer types: All my close friends were educated professionals--they set an example. I decided I needed education to have that kind of life style. I went to college afterwards."

EARLY WORK EXPERIENCES: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. Almost always a non-management job. While some of
the positions described as Early Work experiences may sound like one of the assignments defined earlier, they usually lacked the complex dimension of supervising others.

2. a. New challenges. In all cases the would-be managers faced situations in which they had no previous experience.
b. By meeting the challenges they faced, these individuals discovered they had the capacity to deal with tough and unfamiliar situations.

EARLY WORK EXPERIENCES: MAJOR LESSONS

These Early Work experiences yielded 45 lessons about how to survive and prosper in a business environment. Unlike most event categories, Early Work does not appear to have a major lesson theme, and the learnings associated with these experiences had many other sources. Nevertheless, the lessons that came from Early Work events are important in that they came at the beginning of the manager's career and helped set the ground work for future challenges and learnings.
Lessons in context of the type of Early Work experience:

A First Job Out of School:

"I learned how to handle and not to handle people--to be as honest as possible. I also learned how to be flexible and practical to get the job done. And, finally, that people, in general, need encouragement, direction and a feeling of security--you only wave the stick of authority when all else fails."

A New Aspect of Business (moving from defense industry to consumer goods):

"I learned the dynamics of a new business and what it took to survive and prosper--to adapt and become more flexible. Unstructured environments place greater emphasis on people skills and self-initiative. Rewards did begin to match results and this provided additional motivation.

A Broadening Experience (given a major development project):

"I carried the project through to a successful completion. I installed the system on two aircraft carriers. I learned that doing an outstanding job early in my career gained me recognition with the then plant manager who went on to become president of the company. I think my career has been aided by having that kind of person pulling for me."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Early Work experiences

1. Comfort with Ambiguity, Stress or Uncertainty

Comfort with ambiguity, stress, or uncertainty is discovering that one has the capacity to manage in an ambiguous situation. This category includes two major kinds of learnings: that even with incomplete knowledge one has the ability to act in a turbulent context, putting out brushfires while learning the job, and that learning on the run is one way to learn new skills while using old ones.

20.0% of the Early Work experiences had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Early Work on comfort with ambiguity:
Putting out brushfires focuses on the ability to sense which of several brushfires may become forest fires and extinguishing them. Learning that one can roll with the punches, learn from mistakes, and be flexible are examples of this lesson.

"I learned to adapt--became more flexible."

* * *

"I learned how to manage my own time."

Early Work Experiences and Other Major Sources of Comfort With Ambiguity

![Bar Chart: Comfort With Ambiguity]

2. Seeing Organization as Systems

Seeing organization as systems comprises the ability to learn to rise above day-to-day operations, to take a corporate view, and gain a broader perspective. This represents the transition from a short-term, smaller-scope view of the organization to being able to look at the "big picture," seeing both a longer time frame and a broader organizational scope. Developing a strategic perspective involves looking at the corporation as a whole, thinking about its mission and direction. Seeing a broader organizational scope also involves looking at the organization with respect to its environment, legislation, international issues.

15.0% of Early Work experiences had at least one of these lessons.
Examples from Early Work on seeing organization as systems:

"Big companies operate differently than small ones. They often do not really understand the business they are acquiring and decisions are made more slowly. Conversely, large companies bring a certain planning and financial discipline to the business and can open new opportunities."

*I * * *

"I learned an ability to deal from a broad perspective."

Early Work Experiences and Other Major Sources of Seeing Organization as Systems

![Graph showing Seeing Organization as Systems]

3. Learning to be Tough

Learning to be tough is developing the strength to do what must be done in the service of the organization, even though it may involve a human cost. Being tough requires the ability to stand fast (resist pressure to back off) and to move ahead (grit one's teeth although the action to be taken has the potential of hurting others). This lesson involves learning that, even when an action may hurt someone, to procrastinate is harmful.

15.0% of Early Work experiences had at least one of these lessons.
Examples from Early Work on learning to be tough:

"Learned I could make tough and expensive decisions."

* * * *

"Gamesman attitude: no emotional commitment, just want to win (see this as negative)."

Early Work Experiences and Other Major Sources of Learning to be Tough

![Graph showing the percentage of co-occurrence for Early Work and Fix-It events.]

4. Finding Alternatives in Solving and Framing Problems

Finding alternatives are lessons in the art of problem solving, in transcending habitual ways of thinking about problems.

15.0% of the Early Work experiences had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Early Work on finding alternatives in solving problems:

"Most problems have a best solution."

* * * *

"Emphasis on doing things on purpose--attention to detail--leave nothing to chance. Question everything. Remember to ask 'why' as well as 'what.'"
5. Management is Different from Technical; People are Important and Problematic

Learning that management is different from technical in terms of both requirements and challenges entails a shift in focus from individual task performance to managing people in order to accomplish a task. This category contains the recognition that people are key, that they can contribute either to accomplishments or to roadblocks, and the realizations that management is a separate skill, that one must leave the nitty gritty of technical work behind, that technical competence is no longer enough, and that management requires reliance on and working through others.

10.0% of the Early Work experiences had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Early Work on management is different from technical:

"As a manager, you are only as good as the people that work with you in your department."

* * *

"Learned knowing the right answer is 10%; working with people, 90%."

Early Work Experiences and Other Major Sources of Finding Alternatives in Solving and Framing Problems
Early Work Experiences and Other Major Sources of Management is Different from Technical Work

6. Strategy and Tactics of Negotiation with External Parties

Strategy and tactics of negotiation encompasses learning to deal with various types of external groups (i.e., clients, governments, competitors, or partners) in situations involving formal negotiation. These include adversarial, collaborative and customer/client relationships.

10.0% of the Early Work experiences had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Early Work on external negotiations:

"How to be aggressive and concise without flaunting ego."

* * * *

"Negotiation and sensitivity. You have to convince clients. You are not in line."
Early Work Experiences and Other Major Sources of Strategy and Tactics of Negotiation with External Parties

Note: Other lessons from Early Work experiences

Early Work is a major source of three other lesson categories: Dealing with Conflict, Needing to Act on or Confront a Subordinate Performance Problem, and Be Ready to Take Opportunities (Be Prepared). However, due to the small size of both Early Work events and these lesson categories, only one occurrence of each lesson was found. This is less than expected by chance.

IMPRESSIONS: EARLY WORK AND DEVELOPMENT

What they are and what they aren't

Early work experiences were debuts in the world of work. Whether in sales, engineering, accounting, or the military, three aspects characterized these experiences: there was a "first time exposure" to the realities of an organization or, at least, to a part of one; there was some kind of confrontation with these realities, especially those aspects of work other than one's technical specialty; and there was a decided emphasis on discovering that working with other people (customers, colleagues, bosses) was problematic.

Diversity was the rule in these events, but degree of challenge seemed related to depth of learning. More potent
experiences involved major projects, overseas assignments, and dealings with major customers. These had in common that they pushed individuals beyond their formal training. In contrast to First Supervision, where helpful bosses were often important to the new manager, bosses in Early Work were typically just another part of the perplexing new world.

**Strategic uses of Early Work**

More than other events, the importance of early job challenge has been documented in numerous research studies. That clearly seems to be the case here. While much of the challenge they described had to do with the specialty area involved, it also included working with people different from themselves and struggling with the vagaries of getting things done in a complex (and baffling) organizational environment.

In some respects, Early Work and First Supervision have similar effects. Both potentially teach fundamental lessons critical to later managerial development. The former is broadly focused on working with other people and with organizational dynamics, the latter with the more narrowly defined arena of supervising others. It would appear that there is considerable merit in keeping the events separated; specifically, not making the first job in an organization a managerial job. Something seems to be gained from trying to apply one's technical training in the organization, focusing on that context without the additional complexity of supervising at the same time. Our guess is that a fundamental understanding of how difficult it can be to get things done as an individual contributor is important to later development as a supervisor of individual contributors.

Because this understanding seems so fundamental to later development, it makes sense to have this Early Work in some core aspect of the business. In a large organization, high-potential managers often move quickly through the managerial levels. Early Work may be the major opportunity to teach what it takes to get the job done in this particular business, whether selling a customer, designing a piece of equipment, or handling financial transactions.

**What to look for**

If the reasoning above is true, Early Work is a time to look for adaptability. Early Work experiences pale compared to later challenges, but they are, nonetheless, critical transitions: from school to work, from one kind of organization to another, from working alone to working with others. The lessons reflect two major themes of organizational life: learning to deal with organizations and
with dependency on other people. Correspondingly, Early Work is revealing in that the individual must adapt to get the job done. The learning involves gaining comfort in ambiguity, finding alternatives in solving problems, grasping the organizational "rules of the game," and finding ways to work with and through other people.
DISCOVERING PEOPLE PROBLEMS: FIRST SUPERVISION

N events = 30  
(4.9% of all events)

N lessons = 68  
(4.4% of all lessons)

N managers = 30  
(15.7% of all managers)

FIRST SUPERVISION: DEFINITION

First Supervision assignments welcomed these executives to the world of management and a new realm of problems: people. Whether based in corporate or military life, descriptions of first management experiences centered on the discovery that most managerial problems were people, not technical, issues. The corresponding insight, that managerial success would largely depend on the ability to build solid relationships with subordinates, eventually paved the road to success in management for these executives. That insight seemed to begin in these events.

First Supervision events portrayed young managers in tough new situations. The types of situations these managers found themselves in over and above what the title implies were largely dependent on where the event occurred: in military or corporate life.

In the Military

These events occurred when managers were typically very young (21-24), had been trained as engineers, but had no leadership training. They got their leadership training supervising older, more experienced men, often during wartime. They had to learn to simultaneously lead others and to deal with sad problems.

"My first supervisory experience came at age 21, when I was made section leader for 18 people--nearly all my senior in age, expertise, and seniority in the Navy. At first, I tried to lead...it was a catastrophe. It took me about a year to learn that a leader is there to serve the people who work for him. It took me about a year to learn this, and I lost some friends in the process. This experience did more than anything since to shape my attitude toward leadership."

*     *     *

"I was appointed company commander of a fairly large unit at age 22--the Army Corps of Engineers. I managed equipment and people. Ninety-nine percent of my subordinates were older than I was. It was quite an
opportunity to have such a large amount of responsibility at that early age. Challenges since have been small by comparison."

**In the Corporation**

These events followed a promotion. Sudden or expected, the promotion entailed surprise. These managers made leaps in their scope of responsibility—in accountability for both business segments and people. Ages ranged from early twenties to early thirties.

"Early in my career I was promoted to supervisor of Cost and General Accounting. I was 23 years old and suddenly was faced with managing 45 hourly union employees ranging in age from 30 to 65 years of age. In addition, the manager I replaced had been in the position for over ten years."

* * *

"At age 24 I was promoted, with no advance notice—not even a hint it was to happen—to my first managerial position (Credit Manager and Office Services Manager). I replaced an individual who had had a heart attack. He had held the position for 15+ years. This was the only 'field' credit function in a large corporation. It had 'inherited' large receivables due to a closing of part of the business. I had no experience in credit or managing. The office services function took care of a 600 person manufacturing plant. I gained exposure to Corporate Headquarters."

**FIRST SUPERVISION: CORE ELEMENTS**

The common core of these events

1. A big change in scope for the manager.
   a. It was the change in scope that first put the executive into the management arena.
   b. The change was in both size and complexity. It was the first job that added the responsibility for other people to the responsibility for a business/technical job.

**Additional core elements**

In addition to the generic core, one or more of the following was almost always present in a First Supervision event.
1. Tough problems with subordinates.

This was nearly always present in an event description, taking the form of at least one of the following:

a. Former peers were now subordinates.
   b. Subordinates were older, wiser, etc., than new manager.
   c. The last manager had taken the subordinates' allegiance with him (her).

2. Managers were green and in their twenties.

3. Tough business problems to overcome.

FIRST SUPERVISION: MAJOR LESSONS

From 30 First Supervision events described by an equal number of managers predominantly came realizations about people: the problems they have, the problems they impose, and the need to deal with them.

![First Supervision Diagram]

- **Mgmt Dif Tec**: 26.7
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*Percent of Co-Occurrence = p < .05*
Lessons in context of the type of First Supervision:

In the Military:

"Just because I had been taught by the book didn't mean I had to go by the book. An officer of 35 years helped me—he taught me that rules are OK, but you need to consider the impact in human terms—don't take everything at face value."

In the Corporation:

"I learned how to gain people's confidence and respect through working with them and having them teach me. I learned how to quickly deal with people of all ages, to be fair and objective in dealing with subordinates, and how to deal with union representatives regarding work issues."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of First Supervision

1. Management is Different From Technical; People are Important and Problematic

Learning that management is different from technical in terms of both requirements and challenges entails a shift in focus from individual task performance to managing people in order to accomplish a task. This category contains the recognition that people are key, that they can contribute either to accomplishments or to roadblocks, and the realizations that management is a separate skill, that one must leave the nitty gritty of technical work behind, that technical competence is no longer enough, and that management requires reliance on and working through others.

26.7% of the First Supervision events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from First Supervision on management is different from technical:

"Professional competence is not enough—it's almost as important to be nice to people."

*       *       *

"Supervising others is a real challenge."

*       *       *
"I learned to switch from solo to leader."

First Supervision and Other Major Sources of Management is Different From Technical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Supervision</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Work</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Human Values: Sensitivity to Human Needs

Human values are fundamental assumptions of one's values about human beings. This category contains statements of warmth and caring and of insights of human nature. The fact that people are the business and have needs and lives which go beyond the day-to-day functions they perform lends awareness to the importance of sensitivity to others. In this category fall insights into how people should be treated and why.

Warmth and caring statements are empathic in nature while human nature statements tend to be lessons in basic human nature.

23.3% of the First Supervision events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from First Supervision on human values:

Warmth and caring

"Rules need to be considered in human terms."

*     *     *
"How to preserve an older employee's dignity while requiring high standards."

Human nature

"I learned a lot more about people, and how to deal with their successes and failures."

First Supervision and Other Major Sources of Human Values

![Human Values Diagram]

3. Managing Former Peers or Bosses (How to Manage People Who Have More Experience Than You or Who Used to be Your Peer or Boss)

Managing former peers or bosses contains lessons that managers learn as they begin to be promoted over their peers and bosses and must deal with them in a different role. Stressed are the importance of light-handedness and knowing that one can neither make everyone happy nor always win.

13.3% of the First Supervision events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from First Supervision on managing former peers and bosses:

"I learned patience in dealing with a staff that had mixed loyalties towards me due to the fact that their previous manager had become my assistant."
"With intellectual leadership, age becomes a non-issue in supervising people."

First Supervision and Other Major Sources of Managing Former Peers and Bosses

Manage People With More Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Sup</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Standing Alone

Standing alone, taking full responsibility, assuming the risk for the group is the essence of this category.

13.3% of the First Supervision events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from First Supervision on standing alone:

"I learned to accept and manage responsibility and accountability."
5. Seeing Organization as Systems

Seeing organization as systems comprises the ability to learn to rise above day-to-day operations, to take a corporate view, and gain a broader perspective. This represents the transition from a short-term, smaller-scope view of the organization to being able to look at the "big picture," seeing both a longer time frame and a broader organizational scope. Developing a strategic perspective involves looking at the corporation as a whole, thinking about its mission and direction. Seeing a broader organizational scope also involves looking at the organization with respect to its environment, legislation, and international issues.

10.0% of the First Supervision events had at least one of these lessons.

Example from First Supervision on seeing organization as systems:

"I was given a much broader scope of responsibility in the smaller plant--a small plant is a great place to learn the total plant operation."
First Supervision and Other Major Sources of Seeing Organization as Systems

**IMPRESSIONS: FIRST SUPERVISION AND DEVELOPMENT**

**What it isn't**

First of all, the first supervisory job isn't a forgettable event. Even after the intervening years and tough assignments, a large number of executives still listed First Supervision as a key event. These were not jobs where technical expertise alone could carry the day, nor were they jobs where supervision took care of itself.

**What it is**

First, supervision is fundamentally an encounter with people in which the new supervisor discovers that there's more to this managing business than meets the eye. The potent First Supervision experiences occurred relatively early in a career, involved direct supervision of non-managerial employees, and the supervisor was accountable for a unit. Often there was a kindly boss to whom the supervisor could go for advice or counsel. Like most other events, First Supervision was often laced with adversity. In its most severe form, the adversity came in life and death decisions in combat. Milder forms included having to "lead" former peers and older or more experienced people or to face tough business conditions.
The essence of the event is surprise. Whether that supervision requires going beyond procedure manuals or acknowledging that the technical/rational answer doesn't assure compliance, supervisors discovered that managing people was a whole new ballgame. In addition, carrying responsibility for linking a group to the larger organization forced them to see the world from a different (and broader) perspective.

Strategic uses of First Supervision

Numerous prior studies have emphasized the importance of early job challenge in general and the first supervisory job in particular. There was considerable diversity in the kinds of experiences described by the executives we studied, but the more developmental first supervisory jobs were similar to later Scope assignments (see that chapter), only on a smaller scale. Where possible, they should have the following characteristics:

- occur early in a career. (When First Supervision occurred later, mid-thirties or so, it usually came as a large-scale change. Unfortunately, the learning reported was still primarily the lessons of First Supervision rather than the lessons of Scope. For this reason, it seems a wise strategy to expose people to supervision at an early age and a lower level.)

- involve exposure to a situation that requires active supervision of others; where technical knowledge or procedures will not be enough. (A unit that "runs itself" is a poor bet for development.)

- involve accountability for at least a modest level of achievement under at least moderately adverse conditions.

- provide as a boss someone who is sensitive to the inevitable mistakes of a first-time supervisor and able to provide constructive feedback and counsel. (But who won't over-manage--it's important that the new supervisor be able to make some basic mistakes.)

What to look for

The lessons of First Supervision are management fundamentals. They involve a modest lifting of blinders as one moves from individual contributor to manager. It is a job in which mistakes are common, but from them should emerge two realizations that set the stage for future development.
First is that managing people is different from technical or individual work. People have different needs, frames of reference, and values that must be considered. Second is the realization of how various activities fit into a larger organizational system, what some executives describe as "seeing the broader view" or realizing how the various parts fit together.

In short, development in the first supervisory jobs is overcoming the myopia of the individual contributor/specialist and devoting energy to understanding how to get people to do what needs to be done. At this early stage of a career one should see the beginnings of sensitivity to human needs and willingness to deal with individuals as individuals.
PURELY PERSONAL EVENTS

N events = 16  N lessons = 33  N managers = 16
(2.6% of all  (2.1% of all  (8.4% of all
 events)      lessons)      managers)

PURELY PERSONAL: DEFINITION

Purely Personal events covered a range of experiences outside
the workplace that contributed to managers' development. The
experiences described had occurred in family, school, community: life in general. Their occurrence ranged in time
from childhood to the present, and they varied in nature from
difficult situations to inspirational ones. These Purely
Personal experiences tended to be prolonged circumstances or
roles in which the individual developed in some way.

Although they varied widely and could be classified by
several types (e.g., family, school, community, religious, etc.), they will be treated as a whole in this description
due to their very personal, individual nature.

Examples of Purely Personal Events

"I was fortunate to have been born to hard-working
immigrants who taught me right from wrong, etc. This,
coupled with a college education (church school), a
stint in the Marine Corps (five and one-half years--
returned Lt. Colonel), a bride of 40 years, along with
four beautiful children who have had their heads screwed
on right, all shaped me during my life."

* * *

"We purchased our first home in a new town and I joined
a community group, the Junior Chamber of Commerce
(Jaycees). For six years I worked with young men on
both community and self-development projects. I was
very active at the local unit level, regional, and
national levels. I started a new unit in a neighboring
community; held various offices on Boards of Directors,
was awarded a senatorship and a life membership. Some
projects succeeded--some failed."

PURELY PERSONAL: CORE ELEMENTS

The common core of these events

1. The event occurred outside the workplace.
2. The event had consequences relevant to work: influenced the individual in general, and specifically as a manager.

3. The event was not discrete, but rather was a prolonged experience or role for the individual, rather than a discrete occurrence.

Additional core elements

In addition to the generic core, one or more of these was almost always present in an event.

1. Another person or group of people was involved in creating the experience or making it significant.

2. It was a difficult, stressful experience.

3. It was a positive, self-enhancing, inspirational experience.

4. An event may include both 2 and 3: For example, a difficult event often transcended or turned into a positive one.

5. The experience sometimes involved the individual taking on a leadership role.

PURELY PERSONAL: MAJOR LESSONS

From 16 Purely Personal events described by 16 managers came lessons almost as varied as event descriptions. The lessons sound very event-driven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Values</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confidence</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal W/People</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Values</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons in context of the type of Purely Personal events:

Being a Mayor for Five Years:

"How hard it is to deal with the public. Everyone expects so much--no one can deliver it all. I learned to be flexible and saw how angry people can get with you."

Playing Athletics as a Young Person:

"I was not athletic but learned two important lessons: my own limits and what competition means and that you've got to persevere to succeed."

Definitions and examples of the lessons of Purely Personal events

1. Self-confidence

Self-confidence lessons are statements of self-trust, knowing oneself, and arrogance. They span trust in one's own competence (e.g., in one's skills, ability, judgment, intuition). Faith in one's ability to take risks, handle tough situations, and be successful.

25.0% of the Purely Personal events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Purely Personal events on self-confidence:

Self-trust contains lessons of self-competence.

"I was immediately immersed in a totally 'foreign' environment demanding that I acclimatize quickly. Developed self-confidence and became more aware of people's differences."
2. Basic Management Values

Basic management values includes statements of ideal values and practices and undesirable practices of management values or principles that guide appropriate, ethical behavior as a manager. Most of the lessons in this category are examples of the integrity, trust, and credibility a manager must exemplify.

25.0% of the Purely Personal events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples of Purely Personal events on basic management values:

Ideal values and practices describes specific examples of value-laden standards to imitate.

"A lot of effort can compensate for a lack of experience."
Purely Personal Events and Other Major Sources of Basic Management Values

3. Human Values: Sensitivity to Human Needs

Human values are fundamental assumptions of one's values about human beings. This category contains statements of warmth and caring and of insights of human nature. The fact that people are the business and have needs and lives which go beyond the day-to-day functions they perform lends awareness to the importance of sensitivity to others. In this category fall insights into how people should be treated and why.

Warmth and caring statements are empathic in nature while human nature statements tend to be lessons in basic human nature.

18.8% of the Purely Personal events had at least one of these lessons.

Examples from Purely Personal events on human values:

Warmth and caring

"I learned the importance of exercising compassion and patience in managing difficult/testing personnel problems. To appreciate and respect the significance of an individual's worklife in relation to their total life."
Purely Personal Events and Other Major Sources of Human Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Sup*</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Perf Pr*</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model*</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO*</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Dealing With People

Dealing with people, other than one's peers, bosses, and subordinates, requires understanding their perspectives, speaking their language. These lessons emphasize the notion that people are different and that to be successful in dealing or communicating with them, one must be sensitive to these differences and act in accordance. Strategies suggested include the following: get inside people's knickers, help others look good; one must be low key; keep a finger on the group's pulse, know what turns people on and off and put oneself in others' place before acting.

18.8% of the Purely Personal events had at least one of these lessons.

Example from Purely Personal events on dealing with people:

"Living in the downtown core, I became exposed to a great cross section of people, increasing my understanding of some of the underlying causes of the social and economic rifts in our society."
Purely Personal Events and Other Major Sources of Dealing With People

Note: Other lessons from Purely Personal events

Purely Personal events are also a major source of Use and Abuse of Power and Be Ready to Take Opportunities (Be Prepared). However, due to the small size of both Purely Personal events and these lesson categories, only one occurrence of each lesson was found. This is less than expected by chance.

IMPRESSIONS: PURELY PERSONAL EVENTS AND DEVELOPMENT

What they are and what they aren't

The emphasis in our research has been on on-the-job experiences, but it is simply not true that the workplace is the sole source of development. Life offers many choices and opportunities, and other research has demonstrated that executive development is a life-long proposition. Personal events, outside of the organization, shaped many of the executives. While the specific events run the gamut—from athletics to politics, from early family life to running volunteer organizations, from private inspiration to military leadership—the developmentally significant personal events shared the same characteristics as job-related ones: diversity, working with other people, getting a job done in the face of obstacles.
Strategic uses of Purely Personal events

Because these experiences occur away from the workplace, there is little the organization can do to shape them. Some organizations have a norm of community involvement, others simply allow people time to get involved, and still others actively discourage it. The last would appear a self-defeating stance, since the lessons of experience may be found outside as well as inside the organization.

Our personal view is a philosophical one, rather than research-based. A managerial career is an extremely demanding one, and one of the dangers of immersion is a resulting narrowness. We believe that exposure and involvement outside of the organization plays an important part in helping an individual gain perspective, especially on him/herself as an individual. The lessons taken from such experiences reflect these perspectives, including confidence in one's self, formation of basic values, and understanding of the perspectives of others.

What to look for

There is some research indicating that success in leadership roles in school is related to later successes on the job. Perhaps the major implication of Purely Personal events lies in recognizing that activities away from the job can be developmental and can provide important perspective. However, the organization's intervention in or manipulation of experience outside of work raises important ethical questions. Perhaps the domain of Purely Personal events should remain exactly that. The organization stands to gain from encouraging and supporting its people's involvement outside of work, but attempting to face it or manipulate it is another matter entirely.
PART II
THE LESSONS OF EXPERIENCE
Introduction

Part I focused on events. Part II focuses on the lessons executives said they learned from potent developmental experiences--1,547 lessons, to be precise. Whether growing a thick skin or learning to turn off their hostility at the cocktail party, these executives had to learn new things or fail at something that mattered to them.

The lessons are interesting in their own right. They might be seen as a developmental catalog, containing the potpourri of skills, abilities, knowledge, values, and insights available in experience. The implication is that these are things managers aren't born with and don't automatically bring with them to the job. Executives don't say "I learned to be intelligent." They say they learned ways to deal with a huge variety of people. Instead of learning to be charismatic, they learn how to direct and motivate the people who work for them.

It took us 34 buckets to hold these hundreds of lessons, and these categories are defined and elaborated on in the following pages. These are the things executives say they learned from experience. These are the things that might realistically be developed on the job. Arranged in order of frequency (beginning with the most frequently mentioned lesson, Direct and Motivate), the graphs show what experiences executives said taught each kind of lesson.

Lesson 1, for example, is the category containing all the things executives learned about directing and motivating subordinates (157 individual statements). The graphic display shows that 34.3% of all Fix-It assignments resulted in at least one significant lesson about directing and motivating subordinates. Likewise, almost a third of Starting from Scratch, Change in Scope, and First Supervision events also taught the same kinds of lessons. The probability of learning how to direct and motivate decreases as one moves down the table, and one might reasonably conclude that Purely Personal events, Early Work experiences, and Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs are unlikely sources of learning about directing and motivating people.

A Theoretical Look at the Lessons

Each of the 34 lessons is important in and of itself, but obviously there are connections among them. It seems unlikely that executive development is a scorecard on which the lessons of experience are checked off randomly. And having a long list of independent skills is not a guarantee
that they could be used in concert to accomplish a particular objective. It might be useful, then, to have some rationale for sticking these lessons together, especially in the context of the executive's work.

Drawing from both our own innumerable attempts to cluster the 34 lessons and from research now available on executives, we eventually came up with five general areas that seemed to make theoretical sense of the lessons—setting agendas, handling relationships, basic values, executive temperament, and personal awareness. These "qualities of executive leadership" and the lessons that compose them are listed in Figure 1.

The first cluster reflects what John Kotter has called agenda setting, as distinguished from formal planning. As he described them, general managers' agendas contained "loosely connected goals and plans" addressing a range of time frames, covering a broad range of business issues, and including both "vague and specific goals and plans." These agendas were not usually written and were only loosely related to formal plans (Kotter, 1982, p. 66). Executives need to know in general where they are going, both short and long term, and the basic lessons that enable them to form an agenda rest on a foundation of business and technical knowledge, organizational design skills, thinking broadly and accepting responsibility for direction, and finding alternative ways to accomplish one's ends.

A second cluster of lessons, important to implementing agendas but also critical to almost every managerial activity, involves handling relationships. As the figure shows, the kinds of relationships are quite diverse. What the figure doesn't show is how different the underlying skills are for dealing with different groups. Working with a high-level executive is a totally different exercise than negotiating with a union, for example. While all of these lessons rest on a fundamental base of being able to understand the other person's point of view, there is no such thing as a man for all interpersonal seasons. The ability to work effectively with one group does not guarantee that a manager is equally adept with other constituencies. While some skills do overlap somewhat (e.g., negotiation skills are helpful in persuading those over whom you have no authority), each relationship is distinctive.

Basic values, the third constellation of lessons, represent guiding principles with pervasive behavioral implications. People enter an organization with a set of values which are then constantly tested and shaped by the situations they face. Relative to other kinds of lessons, values seem more susceptible to the blinding flash phenomenon—where a single
Figure 1

The Lessons of Experience Are About...

Setting and Implementing Agendas

- Technical/Professional Knowledge
- All About the Business One is In
- Shouldering Full Responsibility
- Strategic Thinking
- Innovative Problem-Solving Methods
- Doing It Beats Hypothesizing

Handling Relationships

- Directing and Motivating Subordinates
- Understanding Other People's Perspectives
- Handling Political Situations
- Dealing with People Over Whom You Have No Authority
- How to Work with Executives
- Strategies of Negotiation
- Confronting Subordinate Performance Problems
- What Executives are Like
- Getting People to Implement Solutions
- Developing Other People
- Managing Former Bosses and Peers
- Dealing with Conflict

Basic Values

- Basic Management Values
- Sensitivity to the Human Side of Management
- You Can't Manage Everything All Alone

Executive Temperament

- Self-Confidence
- Coping with Ambiguous Situations
- Persevering Through Adversity
- Being Tough When Necessary
- Coping With Situations Beyond Your Control
- Use (and Abuse) of Power

Personal Awareness

- Personal Limits and Blind Spots
- Knowing What Really Excites You About Work
- Taking Charge of Your Career
- The Balance Between Work and Personal Life
- Recognizing and Seizing Opportunities
dramatic display can have long-lasting impact. Perhaps because values are rooted in such hard-earned intangibles as integrity and trust, they appear to be easy to lose and difficult to rebuild.

A fourth constellation of lessons reflect "what you are made of." Perhaps more than the other themes, they capture the fundamental ambiguities of managerial life. Their essence lies in accurately assessing situations which, by their nature, are hard to distinguish. Is this situation truly beyond your control, or are you giving up too soon? Is this situation inherently ambiguous or can you gain control over it if you just keep at it long enough? Is it really necessary to be tough or is that just the easy way out? And, of course, accurate diagnosis still leaves the hard part: coping or acting appropriately, "playing mind games with yourself to stay sane."

Finally, five lessons cluster around the personal insight theme. It begins with discovering what excites you about work, then taking charge of your own development. Naturally, only awareness of blind spots and weaknesses allows people to direct their own development and realistically assess their aspirations.

Viewed in this way, lessons are not independent, but interrelated and cumulative. The ability to set and implement agendas, for example, is not a single lesson. Rather, it is a constellation of lessons including specific knowledge, cognitive abilities, and relevant skills which must be used in concert. As one looks at the various events that reportedly teach this constellation of lessons, it is apparent that learning to set agendas is predominantly learned through assignments of various kinds.

The tables beginning on page 301 list the lessons in each of the five constellations and their most probable sources. Broadly speaking (and with some notable exceptions), the lessons contained in setting and implementing agendas, handling relationships, and executive temperament are taught by assignments; the lessons in basic values by other people; and personal awareness by hardships. This suggests the critical importance of balance across experiences and in the lessons learned. The effective leadership honed from tough assignments may run amuck if untempered by basic values and a realistic sense of self.

Using Part II

In summary, Part II, the lessons of experience, consists of two major sections. The first provides detailed information on all 34 lessons, ranked by how frequently they were
mentioned, including their definitions, subtypes, and sources. A reader looking for ideas on where a specific lesson might be learned will find some guidance in this section.

The second major section organizes the 34 lessons according to five theoretical constellations. It suggests how particular lessons relate to one another and to the executive job, and might prove useful in diagnosing managerial deficiencies and doing something about them.
The Lessons
THE LESSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON CATEGORY</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Direct and Motivate</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basic Management Values</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-Confidence</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Specific Technical Knowledge</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How the Business Works</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dealing with People</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Comfort with Ambiguity, Stress and Uncertainty</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Politics is Part of Organizational Life</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Getting Lateral Cooperation</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Standing Alone</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Human Values: Sensitivity to Human Needs</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Persevering Under Adverse Conditions: Singleness of Purpose</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How to Work with Executives</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Recognition of Personal Limits and Weaknesses</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Seeing Organization as Systems</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Learning to be Tough: Biting the Bullet, Do What Has to be Done Despite Consequence—to another person</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Finding Alternatives in Solving and Framing Problems</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Strategy and Tactics of Negotiation with External Parties</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Needing to Act on or Confront a Subordinate Performance Problem</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Strategies for Coping with Situations Beyond Your Control</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. You Have to Take Control of Your Own Career ....... 277
23. What Executives are Like ................................. 279
24. Management is Different From Technical; People are Important and Problematic .............. 281
25. How to Build and/or Use Structure and Control Systems .............................................. 283
26. Develop Your People ........................................ 285
27. How to Manage People Who Have More Experience Than You or Who Used to be Your Peer or Boss ...... 287
28. Perspective on Life and Work .............................. 289
29. Dealing with Conflict ....................................... 291
30. Can't Manage it All by Yourself ......................... 293
31. Be Ready to Take Opportunities (Be Prepared) ....... 295
32. Use and Abuse of Power, Comfort with Power ........ 297
33. Management Models ........................................ 299
34. Doing It is More Important Than Thinking About It--Practice Over Theory. Use What You Know ...... 300
35. Miscellaneous ............................................... 300
LESSON 1: Direct and Motivate

Events

- Fix-It* 34.3%
- Scratch 32.4%
- Scope* 31.7%
- First Sup 30%
- Trauma 27.3%
- Role Model 26.1%
- VPO 20%
- Break a Rut 16.7%
- BF&M 16.7%
- Coursework 15.8%
- Line Staff 15.4%
- Sub Perf Pr 14.3%
- Proj Task Fc 13.2%
- Personal 6.3%
- Early Work 5%
- Lousy Job 3.7%

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
DIRECT AND MOTIVATE: DEFINITION

Direct and motivate encompasses the staffing, managing, and directing required in building a working organization. Delegation, sharing responsibility, building competence, team building, and leadership roles are predominant topics.

Staffing focuses on learning the importance of hiring good people (e.g., "don't replace a 2 of clubs with a 4 of clubs").

Managing describes ways to encourage and motivate subordinates describing the following:

Clear the way for them; help others set goals, tell them where they stand and when they do a good job, spend time with people, delegate, keep them informed, explain, challenge, lead by example, pitch in, protect them, give them strong support, let them have some say. Help them learn the basics, learn from their mistakes, understand goals, gain people's confidence, have fun.

Directing strategies are what the name implies: ways to enjoin subordinates. The theme of these lessons is that instrumental behaviors are sometimes needed to accomplish a task through others.

DIRECT AND MOTIVATE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

157 (10.2%) of all reported lessons were lessons in how to staff, manage, or direct employees. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 157 lessons were: Change in Scope (26%), Fix-It (17%), and Starting from Scratch (10%).

136 (22%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in how to direct and motivate. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach how to direct and motivate are: Fix-It, Starting from Scratch, and Change in Scope.
LESSON 2: Basic Management Values

- VPO*: 30.8%
- Role Model: 26.1%
- Personal: 25%
- Scratch: 20.6%
- Early Work: 20%
- Lousy Job: 18.5%
- Proj Task Fc: 17.1%
- Line Staff: 15.4%
- BF&M: 12.5%
- Fix-It: 10.4%
- Sub Perf Pr: 9.5%
- Scope: 8.7%
- Break a Rut: 8.3%
- First Sup: 3.3%
- Coursework: 2.6%

*p < .05
BASIC MANAGEMENT VALUES: DEFINITION

Basic management values includes statements of ideal values and practices and undesirable practices of management values or principles that guide appropriate, ethical behavior as a manager. Most of the lessons in this category are examples of the integrity, trust, and credibility a manager must exemplify.

Ideal values and practices describe specific examples of value-laden standards to imitate:

Treat people with respect: keep integrity, be above board, give credit, don't make people feel at risk for asking questions or disagreeing, explain what you're doing, don't make promises you can't keep.

Undesirable practices are statements of exactly that. Most often they come from watching negative values playing out in the organization.

BASIC MANAGEMENT VALUES: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

107 (7%) of all reported lessons were lessons in ideal values and practices and undesirable practices. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 107 lessons were: Values Playing Out (22%), Change in Scope (16%), and Project/Task Force (13%).

92 (15%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in basic management values. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach basic management values are: Values Playing Out, Role Models, and Purely Personal.
LESSON 3: Self-Confidence

Coursework* 29
Proj Task Fc* 26.3
Personal 25
Scratch 23.5
Fix-It 19.4
Line Staff 15.4
Scope 13.5
BF&M 12.3
VPO 12.3
First Sup 10
Early Work 10
Trauma 9.1
Break a Rut 8.3
Lousy Job 7.4
Sub Perf Pr 4.8
Role Model 4.4

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
SELF-CONFIDENCE: DEFINITION

Self-confidence lessons are statements of self-trust, knowing oneself, and arrogance. They span trust in one's own competence (e.g., in one's skills, ability, judgment, intuition). Faith in one's ability to take risks, handle tough situations, and be successful.

Self-trust contains lessons of self-competence, such as:

Trust in self, follow own road, take a risk, a "can do" attitude, confidence in intelligence, ability to trust one's abilities compared to others, willingness to test conventional wisdom, etc.

Knowing oneself is just what the name implies—learning to assess oneself, to sort strengths from weaknesses.

Arrogance surfaces in some of the statements when self-confidence approaches self-deception (e.g., "I found out that my skills generalize across situations." "Nobody does it better.")

SELF-CONFIDENCE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

106 (7%) of all reported lessons were lessons in self-trust, knowing oneself and arrogance. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 106 lessons were: Project/Task Force, Change in Scope, and Fix-It.

96 (16%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in self-confidence. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach self-confidence are: Project/Task Force, Coursework, and Purely Personal.
LESSON 4: Specific Technical Knowledge

- Line Staff*: 53.9
- Coursework*: 26.3
- Break a Rut: 20.8
- Scope: 16.3
- Early Work: 15
- Fix-It: 13.4
- Proj Task Fc: 13.2
- Scratch: 8.8
- Role Model: 8.7
- BF&M: 8.3
- First Sup: 6.7
- Personal: 6.3
- Lousy Job: 3.7
- VPO: 3.1

* p < .05
SPECIFIC TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE: DEFINITION

Specific technical knowledge lessons are statements of new content in a well-defined technical area. This category includes learning technical or business content areas such as finance, strategic planning, computers, budgeting, law.

SPECIFIC TECHNICAL KNOWLEDGE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

87 (6%) of all reported lessons were lessons in finance, strategic planning, computers, budgeting, and law. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 87 lessons were: Change in Scope (22%), Project/Task Force (15%), Fix-It (12%), and Coursework (12%).

76 (12%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in specific technical knowledge. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach specific technical knowledge are: Line to Staff, Coursework, and Breaking a Rut.
LESSON 5: How the Business Works

Line Staff* 38.5
Fix-It* 20.9
Scratch* 20.6
Break a Rut 18.7
Scope 13.5
Proj Task Fc 11.8
First Sup 6.7
Early Work 5
VPO 4.6
Coursework 2.6

* p < .05
HOW THE BUSINESS WORKS: DEFINITION

How the business works is exactly that: learning about one's area (division, function) or organization. Included in this category are subjects (e.g., the organization's products, structure, financial or commercial practices, markets) and functions (e.g., marketing, operations, research, manufacturing).

HOW THE BUSINESS WORKS: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

68 (4%) of all reported lessons were lessons in learning about one's area. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 68 lessons were: Change in Scope (24%), Fix-It (21%), Project/Task Force (13%), and Starting from Scratch (13%).

60 (10%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in how the business works. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach how the business works are: Line to Staff, Fix-It, and Starting from Scratch.
LESSON 6: Dealing with People

- BF&M: 20.8%
- Personal: 18.8%
- Scratch: 17.6%
- Proj Task Fc: 15.8%
- Early Work: 15%
- Coursework: 13.2%
- Scope: 12.5%
- Fix-It: 10.4%
- Line Staff: 7.7%
- First Sup: 6.7%
- Role Model: 6.5%
- VPO: 3.1%

Percent of Co-Occurrence
DEALING WITH PEOPLE: DEFINITION

Dealing with people other than one's peers, bosses, and subordinates requires understanding their perspectives, speaking their language. These lessons emphasize the notion that people are different and that to be successful in dealing or communicating with them, one must be sensitive to these differences and act in accordance. Strategies suggested include the following:

Get inside people's knickers, help others look good; one must be low key; keep a finger on the group's pulse, know what turns people on and off and put oneself in others' place before acting.

DEALING WITH PEOPLE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

66 (4%) of all reported lessons were lessons in learning how to deal with people other than one's peers, bosses, and subordinates, understanding their perspectives, and speaking their language. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 66 lessons were: Project/Task Force (20%), Change in Scope (20%), and Starting from Scratch (12%).

62 (10%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in dealing with people. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach dealing with people are: Business Failures and Mistakes, Purely Personal, and Starting from Scratch.
LESSON 7: Comfort with Ambiguity

- Line Staff*: 30.8%
- Early Work: 20%
- Proj Task Fc: 15.8%
- Fix-It: 13.4%
- Scope: 12.5%
- Scratch: 11.8%
- Lousy Job: 11.1%
- Coursework: 7.9%
- Personal: 6.3%
- VPO: 6.2%
- Break a Rut: 4.2%
- First Sup: 3.3%
- Role Model: 2.2%

*p < .05
COMFORT WITH AMBIGUITY, STRESS OR UNCERTAINTY: DEFINITION

Comfort with ambiguity, stress, or uncertainty is discovering that one has the capacity to manage in an ambiguous situation. This category includes two major kinds of learnings: that even with incomplete knowledge one has the ability to act in a turbulent context, putting out brushfires while learning the job, and that learning on the run is one way to learn new skills while using old ones.

Putting out brushfires focuses on the ability to sense which of several brushfires may become forest fires and extinguishing them. Learning that one can roll with the punches, learn from mistakes, and be flexible are examples of this lesson.

Learning on the run essentially describes how to apply previously used skills or knowledge to a new, unfamiliar situation and move ahead despite a lack of skills or knowledge.

COMFORT WITH AMBIGUITY, STRESS OR UNCERTAINTY: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

63 (4%) of all reported lessons were lessons in putting out brushfires and learning on the run. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 63 lessons were: Change in Scope (24%), Project/Task Force (19%), and Fix-It (16%).

60 (10%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in comfort with ambiguity, stress or uncertainty. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach comfort with ambiguity, stress or uncertainty are: Line to Staff, Early Work, and Project/Task Force.
LESSON 8: Politics is Part of Organizational Life

Events

- Lousy Job*: 33.3%
- BF&M: 20.8%
- VPO*: 18.5%
- Line Staff: 15.4%
- Proj Task Fc: 13.2%
- Fix-It: 9%
- Scratch: 8.8%
- Personal: 6.3%
- Early Work: 5%
- Role Model: 4.4%
- First Sup: 3.3%
- Coursework: 2.6%
- Scope: 1.9%

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
POLITICS IS PART OF ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE: DEFINITION

Politics encompasses both realization that organizations are, in part, political systems and recommendations for dealing within them. For example, a recognition of the political component in decision making may result in the discovery that one needs to make a personal choice regarding the use of politics to achieve a goal—to sell a point, idea, or project. Political insights fall into three broad categories: naive, cynical, and pragmatic.

**Naive** statements sound like first glimpses into the existence of politics in organizations.

**Cynical** statements resemble retaliatory actions like: don't be candid, bypass bosses, flash wins, mask creativity and intelligence because it intimidates others.

**Pragmatic** statements deal with realizations of how to use the system: the importance of learning the ropes, selling up, working within to get things done; having no hidden agendas; fighting with facts.

POLITICS IS PART OF ORGANIZATIONAL LIFE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

60 (4%) of all reported lessons were lessons in naive political statements, cynical political statements, and pragmatic political statements. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 60 lessons were: Values Playing Out (23%), Project/Task Force (17%), and Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs (17%).

55 (9%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in politics is part of organizational life. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach politics is part of organizational life are: Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs, Business Failures and Mistakes, and Values Playing Out.
LESSON 9: Getting Lateral Cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fix It*</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch*</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Task Fc</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Work</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break a Rut</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousy Job</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Sup</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
GETTING LATERAL COOPERATION: DEFINITION

Getting lateral cooperation is getting cooperation in non-authority relations, both lateral relationships and others. Overall, this category states that to get things done one must be able to involve many others over whom one has no direct authority or control. Several elements are present in this category: how to do it, the importance of doing it, and the diplomacy involved. Within the "how to" arena are skills in persuasion, selling, participation, bridge-building, cajoling, and learning that without authority over someone "you can catch more flies with honey."

GETTING LATERAL COOPERATION: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

58 (4%) of all reported lessons were lessons in how to get cooperation in non-authority relations. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 58 lessons were: Fix-It (28%), Change in Scope (21%), and Project/Task Force (19%).

56 (9%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in getting lateral cooperation. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach getting lateral cooperation are: Fix-It, Starting from Scratch, and Line to Staff.
LESSON 10: Standing Alone

- Scratch*: 29.4%
- Fix-It*: 19.4%
- First Sup: 13.3%
- Break a Rut: 12.5%
- Scope: 11.5%
- Trauma: 9.1%
- Personal: 6.3%
- VPO: 6.2%
- Proj Task Fc: 5.3%
- Early Work: 5%
- Lousy Job: 3.7%
- Role Model: 2.2%

* p < .05
STANDING ALONE: DEFINITION

Standing alone, taking full responsibility, assuming the risk for the group is the essence of this category. Examples span the following:

How to handle a situation in which one is completely responsible and accountable. Learning how to make decisions and take the actions required. Note: Standing alone does not mean doing it all by oneself: part of the task is building a working organization. The key is Leadership.

STANDING ALONE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

57 (4%) of all reported lessons were lessons in standing alone; taking full responsibility, assuming the risk. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 57 lessons were: Fix-It (23%), Change in Scope (21%), and Starting from Scratch (19%).

55 (9%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in standing alone. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach standing alone are: Starting from Scratch, Fix-It, and First Supervision.
LESSON 11: Human Values

First Sup* 23.3
Personal 18.8
Trauma 18.2
Sub Perf Pr* 14.3
Role Model* 13
VPO* 12.3
Coursework 7.9
Fix-It 7.5
Early Work 5
BF&M 4.2
Proj Task Fc 3.9
Lousy Job 3.7
Scope 2.9

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
HUMAN VALUES: SENSITIVITY TO HUMAN NEEDS: DEFINITION

Human values are fundamental assumptions of one's values about human beings. This category contains statements of warmth and caring and of insights of human nature. The fact that people are the business and have needs and lives which go beyond the day-to-day functions they perform lends awareness to the importance of sensitivity to others. In this category fall insights into how people should be treated and why.

Warmth and caring statements are empathic in nature while human nature statements tend to be lessons in basic human nature.

HUMAN VALUES: SENSITIVITY TO HUMAN NEEDS: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

50 (3%) of all reported lessons were lessons in warmth and caring, and "it's human nature." The events supplying the highest proportions of these 50 lessons were: Values Playing Out (18%), First Supervision (14%), and Role Models (12%).

46 (7%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in human values: sensitivity to human needs. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach human values: sensitivity to human needs are: First Supervision, Purely Personal, Personal Trauma, Subordinate Performance Problems, Role Models, and Values Playing Out.
LESSON 12: Persevering Under Adverse Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trauma*</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousy job*</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Work</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Task Fc</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break a Rut</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
PERSEVERING UNDER ADVERSE CONDITIONS: SINGLENESS OF PURPOSE: DEFINITION

Persevering under adverse conditions means developing ways to accomplish one's goals in the face of obstacles, recognizing that difficult situations are often not out of one's control, and action on them. Three types of perseverance were described: Standing Up For Beliefs, Moving Ahead, and Surviving Tough Times.

Standing up for beliefs: even when personal risk is involved, knowing the importance of standing up for one's beliefs despite opposition.

Moving ahead: accomplishing the goals of one's assignment despite obstacles and detours; hanging in and moving ahead.

Surviving tough times: fighting for survival by waiting to come back up after a lost battle or mistake.

PERSEVERING UNDER ADVERSE CONDITIONS: SINGLENESS OF PURPOSE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

48 (3%) of all reported lessons were lessons in neck on the line, getting the job done, and the perseverance required for surviving very tough situations. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 48 lessons were: Fix-It (19%), Values Playing Out (15%), Project/Task Force (13%), and Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs (13%).

46 (7%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in persevering under adverse conditions: singleness of purpose. The graph on the opposite page shows some of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach persevering under adverse conditions: singleness of purpose are: Personal Trauma, Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs, and Fix-It.
LESSON 13: How to Work with Executives

- Line Staff*: 30.8
- BF&M: 16.7
- Proj Task Fc: 13.2
- Fix-It: 9
- Lousy Job: 7.4
- Scope: 6.7
- First Sup: 6.7
- VPO: 6.2
- Scratch: 5.9
- Coursework: 5.3
- Break a Rut: 4.2
- Role Model: 2.2

* p < .05
HOW TO WORK WITH EXECUTIVES: DEFINITION

How to work with executives in various contexts, from how to present ideas to them to the importance of impressing and not antagonizing them. This category contains critical deportment and skills and the art of cajoling.

Deportment and skills focuses on proper demeanor, presentation style that are critical in dealing with executives.

Cajoling contains the subtle tweaking and nudging received to lead bosses in one's own direction.

HOW TO WORK WITH EXECUTIVES: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

45 (3%) of all reported lessons were lessons in deportment and skills. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 45 lessons were: Project/Task Force (22%), Change in Scope (16%), and Fix-It (13%).

45 (7%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in how to work with executives. The graph on the opposite page shows a proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach how to work with executives are: Line to Staff, Business Failures and Mistakes, and Project/Task Force.
LESSON 14: Recognition of Personal Limits

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
RECOGNITION OF PERSONAL LIMITS AND WEAKNESSES: DEFINITION

Recognition of personal limits and weaknesses in managing often stemmed from lack of time and/or expertise to accomplish alone the variety of tasks necessary to be successful. Sometimes, managers seemed to know their limits:

Before the fact, and were able to seek advice early, to follow the principle that "there is always someone smarter or with a better idea than me" and get help first. Other times, managers realized:

After the fact that they should have recognized their limits earlier. These are statements of what the manager should have or should not have done.

RECOGNITION OF PERSONAL LIMITS AND WEAKNESSES: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

45 (3%) of all reported lessons were lessons in recognizing personal limits and weaknesses before the fact and after the fact. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 45 lessons were: Change in Scope (20%), Business Failures and Mistakes (16%), and Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs (11%).

43 (7%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in recognition of personal limits and weaknesses. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach recognition of personal limits and weaknesses are: Business Failures and Mistakes, Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs, and Personal Trauma.
LESSON 15: Seeing Organization as Systems

Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff*</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Work</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Sup</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Task Fc</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousy Job</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
SEEING ORGANIZATION AS SYSTEMS: DEFINITION

Seeing organization as systems comprises the ability to learn to rise above day-to-day operations, to take a corporate view, and gain a broader perspective. This represents the transition from a short-term, smaller-scope view of the organization to being able to look at the "big picture," seeing both a longer time frame and a broader organizational scope. Developing a strategic perspective involves looking at the corporation as a whole, thinking about its mission and direction. Seeing a broader organizational scope also involves looking at the organization with respect to its environment, legislation, international issues.

SEEING ORGANIZATION AS SYSTEMS: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

43 (3\%) of all reported lessons were lessons in seeing organization as systems, taking a broad organizational view. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 43 lessons were: Change in Scope (21\%), Project/Task Force (16\%), and Fix-It (14\%).

40 (6\%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in seeing organization as systems. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach seeing organization as systems are: Line to Staff, Early Work, and First Supervision.
### LESSON 16: Learning to be Tough

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Work</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It*</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lousy Job</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Sup</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Perf Pr</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Task Fc</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
LEARNING TO BE TOUGH: BITING THE BULLET, DOING WHAT HAS TO BE DONE DESPITE CONSEQUENCE--TO ANOTHER PERSON: DEFINITION

Learning to be tough is developing the strength to do what must be done in the service of the organization, even though it may involve a human cost. Being tough requires the ability to stand fast (resist pressure to back off) and to move ahead (grit one's teeth although the action to be taken has the potential of hurting others). This lesson involves learning that, even when an action may hurt someone, to procrastinate is harmful.

Stand firm and don't back down; take initiative, say no; how to be nasty without being personal; explaining to others, setting an atmosphere.

LEARNING TO BE TOUGH: BITING THE BULLET, DOING WHAT HAS TO BE DONE DESPITE CONSEQUENCE--TO ANOTHER PERSON: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

43 (3%) of all reported lessons were lessons in learning to be tough. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 43 lessons were: Fix-It (23%), Project/Task Force (12%), and Role Models (12%).

43 (7%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in learning to be tough. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach learning to be tough are: Early Work, Fix-It, and Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs.
LESSON 17: Solving and Framing Problems

- Early Work: 15%
- Coursework: 10.5%
- Fix-It: 9.1%
- Scratch: 8.8%
- Proj Task Fc: 7.9%
- Line Staff: 7.7%
- First Sup: 6.7%
- Role Model: 6.5%
- VPO: 6.2%
- Scope: 4.8%
- BF&M: 4.2%

Percent of Co-Occurrence
FINDING ALTERNATIVES IN SOLVING AND FRAMING PROBLEMS: DEFINITION

Finding alternatives are lessons in the art of problem solving, in transcending habitual ways of thinking about problems. Lessons span the following:

Ask next question, be rational, there is more than one way to "skin a cat," don't take everything at face value, blend together complexity, define problems within a common frame with very different people, look for new approaches, and develop model approaches to problems for later use.

FINDING ALTERNATIVES IN SOLVING AND FRAMING PROBLEMS: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

41 (3%) of all reported lessons were lessons in the art of problem solving. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 41 lessons were: Project/Task Force (20%), Fix-It (15%), and Change in Scope (15%).

38 (6%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in finding alternatives in solving and framing problems. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach finding alternatives in solving and framing problems are: Early Work, Coursework, and Fix-It.
LESSON 18: Negotiation with External Parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proj Task Fc*</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Work</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break a Rut</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Sup</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
Strategy and tactics of negotiation encompasses learning to deal with various types of external groups (i.e., clients, governments, competitors, or partners) in situations involving formal negotiation. These include adversarial, collaborative and customer/client relationships. Examples:

Put self in other's shoes, get to know personally, be aggressive and concise without flaunting ego, there is a time for consensus and a time to be directive; document facts.

39 (3%) of all reported lessons were lessons in dealing with various types of external groups. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 39 lessons were: Project/Task Force (44%), Fix-It (23%), and Values Playing Out (8%).

36 (6%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in strategy and tactics of negotiation with external parties. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach strategy and tactics of negotiation with external parties are: Project/Task Force, Fix-It, and Early Work.
LESSON 19: Confront Subordinate Performance

- Sub Perf Pr*: 85.7
- Fix-It*: 11.9
- Early Work: 5
- VPO: 3.1
- Scope: 1

* p < .05
NEEDING TO ACT ON OR CONFRONT A SUBORDINATE PERFORMANCE PROBLEM: DEFINITION

Acting on a subordinate performance problem is one of the more difficult tasks for the manager. The underlying learning is that it's more important to make the move quickly, and at the same time make sure one has adequate staffing to pick up the slack if the decision is made to terminate. Examples are:

Don't procrastinate, fire if necessary, it is not kind to keep the wrong people in a job, do it, have clear expectations; you inherit trouble sometimes but it's yours anyway.

NEEDING TO ACT ON OR CONFRONT A SUBORDINATE PERFORMANCE PROBLEM: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

37 (2%) of all reported lessons were lessons in acting quickly and humanely in confronting a problem subordinate. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 37 lessons were: Subordinate Performance Problems (65%), Fix-It (22%), and Values Playing Out (8%).

30 (5%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in needing to act on or confront a subordinate performance problem. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach needing to act on or confront a subordinate performance problem are: Subordinate Performance Problems, Fix-It, and Early Work.
LESSON 20: Coping with Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lousy Job</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF&amp;M</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break a Rut</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Task Fc</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Sup</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
STRATEGIES FOR COPING WITH SITUATIONS BEYOND YOUR CONTROL:
DEFINITION

Strategies for coping with situations beyond your control contains both pragmatic and cynical statements. Both come from the recognition that there are times when one faces a situation that one can do nothing to change that; some situations are influenced by factors outside of the manager's control such as luck, others' performance, and unrealistic expectations. Coping with such situations requires ways of dealing with or making the best of the uncontrollable situations by changing goals, being patient or optimistic, distancing oneself, or redefining the situations.

Pragmatic statements focus on accepting that life has good and bad times to offer and that keeping a stiff upper lip in hard times is important.

Cynical statements project blame for circumstances onto others, including the bureaucracy.

STRATEGIES FOR COPING WITH SITUATIONS BEYOND YOUR CONTROL:
FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

36 (2%) of all reported lessons were lessons in how to cope with situations beyond one's control; tactics for surviving tough times. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 36 lessons were: Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs (36%), Change in Scope (11%), Project/Task Force (8%), Personal Trauma (8%), and Business Failures and Mistakes (8%).

35 (6%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in strategies for coping with situations beyond your control. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach strategies for coping with the situations beyond your control are: Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs, Personal Trauma, and Business Failures and Mistakes.
LESSON 21: What You Really Want To Do

Break a Rut* 20.8
Line Staff 15.4
Scratch 11.8
Early Work 10
First Sup 6.7
Personal 6.3
Scope 5.8
Coursework 5.3
Sub Perf Pr 4.8
Fix-It 4.5
Role Model 4.4
Lousy Job 3.7
Proj Task Fc 2.6

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
DISCOVERING WHAT YOU REALLY WANT TO DO, WHAT REALLY EXCITES YOU: DEFINITION

The realization that one has found something one *likes*, which is exciting and worth doing on its own merit, or something one *dislikes* and will seek to avoid. This something can be a subject area, working with others, a lifestyle, or a contribution to something larger than one's self.

DISCOVERING WHAT YOU REALLY WANT TO DO, WHAT REALLY EXCITES YOU: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

35 (2%) of all reported lessons were lessons in likes and dislikes. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 35 lessons were: Change in Scope (17%), Breaking a Rut (17%), and Starting from Scratch (11%).

33 (5%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in discovering what you really want to do, what really excites you. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach discovering what you really want to do, what really excites you are: Breaking a Rut, Line to Staff, and Starting from Scratch.
LESSON 22: Take Control of Your Own Career

Break a Rut* 41.7
Lousy Job* 18.5
Line Staff 7.7
VPO 6.2
Coursework 5.3
Role Model 4.4
First Sup 3.3
Scratch 2.9
Scope 2.9
Fix-It 1.5

* p < .05
YOU HAVE TO TAKE CONTROL OF YOUR OWN CAREER: DEFINITION

You have to take control of your own career contains variations on the theme of how to take charge of the situation one is currently in. Examples include:

Realizing that you are the only one who can manage your career, set own pace, broaden if it gets too easy, get out of the box, find your high gear, use contacts, mentors, set goals and go.

YOU HAVE TO TAKE CONTROL OF YOUR OWN CAREER: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

34 (2%) of all reported lessons were lessons in how to take charge and steer one's own career. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 34 lessons were: Breaking a Rut (38%), Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs (15%), Change in Scope (12%), and Values Playing Out (12%).

30 (5%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in you have to take control of your own career. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach you have to take control of your own career are: Breaking a Rut, Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs, and Line to Staff.
LESSON 23: What Executives Are Like

- Line Staff
- Role Model
- BF&M
- Fix-It
- Coursework
- Early Work
- Scope
- VPO
- Break a Rut
- Proj Task Fc
- Scratch

Percent of Co-Occurrence

*p < .05
WHAT EXECUTIVES ARE LIKE: DEFINITION

Learning what executives are like, both the positives and the negatives, demystifies the executive aura. This category describes executives as human beings as well as what executives value, how they operate, and how they see things.

The positives include learning that executives are just people and watching and picking up their values.

The negatives include learning that executives are human and some of the less desirable habits of executives.

WHAT EXECUTIVES ARE LIKE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

31 (2%) of all reported lessons were lessons in learning what executives are like. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 31 lessons were: Change in Scope (16%), Line to Staff (16%), Role Models (13%), and Fix-It (13%).

30 (5%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in learning what executives are like. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportions of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach learning what executives are like are: Line to Staff, Role Models, and Business Failures and Mistakes.
LESSON 24: Management is Different From Technical

### Events

- First Sup*: 26.7
- Early Work: 10
- Scope: 7.7
- Proj Task Fc: 5.3
- Role Model: 4.4
- BF&M: 4.2
- Scratch: 2.9
- Fix-It: 1.5

* p < .05
MANAGEMENT IS DIFFERENT FROM TECHNICAL; PEOPLE ARE IMPORTANT AND PROBLEMATIC: DEFINITION

Learning that management is different from technical in terms of both requirements and challenges entails a shift in focus from individual task performance to managing people in order to accomplish a task. This category contains the recognition that people are key, that they can contribute either to accomplishments or to roadblocks, and the realizations that management is a separate skill, that one must leave the nitty gritty of technical work behind, that technical competence is no longer enough, and that management requires reliance on and working through others.

MANAGEMENT IS DIFFERENT FROM TECHNICAL; PEOPLE ARE IMPORTANT AND PROBLEMATIC: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

28 (2%) of all reported lessons were lessons in learning that management is different from technical. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 28 lessons were: First Supervision (32%), Change in Scope (29%), and Project/Task Force (14%).

27 (4%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in management is different from technical; people are important and problematic. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach management is different from technical; people are important and problematic are: First Supervision, Early Work, and Change in Scope.
LESSON 25: How to Build or Use Structure

- Fix-It*: 14.9
- Scope: 6.7
- Break a Rut: 4.2
- BF&M: 4.2
- Lousy Job: 3.7
- Scratch: 2.9
- Proj Task Fc: 2.6
- Role Model: 2.2

* p < .05
HOW TO BUILD AND/OR USE STRUCTURE AND CONTROL SYSTEMS: DEFINITION

How to build and/or use structure and control systems is filled with examples of learning to manage without being involved in every phase of day-to-day operations by setting up structures and systems which control work processes. Building and controlling systems so they can run without the manager, changing structure rather than people allows managing by remote control.

HOW TO BUILD AND/OR USE STRUCTURE AND CONTROL SYSTEMS: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

25 (2%) of all reported lessons were lessons in learning how to build and/or use structure and control systems. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 25 lessons were: Fix-It (44%), Change in Scope (28%), and Project/Task Force (8%).

24 (4%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in how to build and/or use structure and control systems. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach how to build and/or use structure and control systems are: Fix-It, Change in Scope, and Breaking a Rut.
LESSON 26: Develop Your People

- Trauma: 9.1%
- BF&M: 8.3%
- Scope*: 7.7%
- Role Model: 6.5%
- Sub Perf Pr: 4.8%
- Break a Rut: 4.2%
- VPO: 3.1%
- Fix-It: 3.0%
- Scratch: 2.9%
- Coursework: 2.6%
- Proj Task Fc: 1.3%

* p < .05
DEVELOP YOUR PEOPLE: DEFINITION

Develop your people describes learning that part of dealing with subordinates is developing them. This includes understanding that people can be helped to change and learn if the "right" environment (challenges, opportunity) is provided, and that individual growth benefits the organization. This category is about the importance of developing others and suggests ways of doing it:

Spend time, pitch in, subordinates will take charge if the right things happen, ask the right questions--challenge subordinates, cross-fertilize, expose them to training programs, put them with more experienced managers.

DEVELOP YOUR PEOPLE: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

23 (1%) of all reported lessons were lessons in learning how to develop your people. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 23 lessons were: Change in Scope (35%), Role Models (13%), Fix-It (9%), Business Failures and Mistakes (9%), and Values Playing Out (9%).

23 (4%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in how to develop your people. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach how to develop your people are: Personal Trauma, Business Failures and Mistakes, and Change in Scope.
LESSON 27: Manage People With More Experience

Events

- First Sup*: 13.3%
- Scope*: 7.7%
- Fix-It: 4.5%
- Scratch: 2.9%
- VPO: 1.5%
- Proj Task Fc: 1.3%

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
MANAGING FORMER PEERS OR BOSSES (HOW TO MANAGE PEOPLE WHO HAVE MORE EXPERIENCE THAN YOU OR WHO USED TO BE YOUR PEER OR BOSS): DEFINITION

Managing former peers or bosses contains lessons that managers learn as they begin to be promoted over their peers and bosses and must deal with them in a different role. Stressed are the importance of light-handedness and knowing that one can neither make everyone happy nor always win.

MANAGING FORMER PEERS OR BOSSES: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

21 (1%) of all reported lessons were lessons in managing former peers or bosses. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 21 lessons were: Change in Scope (52%), First Supervision (19%), and Fix-It (14%).

18 (3%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in how to manage former peers or bosses. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach managing former peers or bosses are: First Supervision, Change in Scope, and Fix-It.
LESSON 28: Perspective on Life and Work

- Trauma*: 45.5%
- Coursework*: 10.5%
- BF&M: 8.3%
- Lousy Job: 7.4%
- Personal: 6.3%
- Fix-It: 4.5%
- Role Model: 2.2%

* p < .05
PERSPECTIVE ON LIFE AND WORK: DEFINITION

Perspective on life and work encompasses the kinds of examining, re-evaluating and prioritizing that managers experience in balancing their work and personal life. Key within this category are recognizing the value of life outside work and discovering the importance of slowing down and relaxing in one's work life.

PERSPECTIVE ON LIFE AND WORK: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

20 (1%) of all reported lessons were lessons in setting personal priorities for life and work. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 20 lessons were: Personal Trauma (30%), Coursework (20%), and Fix-It (15%).

18 (3%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in perspective on life and work. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach perspective on life and work are: Personal Trauma, Coursework, and Business Failures and Mistakes.
LESSON 29: Dealing With Conflict

Trauma: 9.1%
Proj Task Fc: 6.6%
Early Work: 5%
VPO: 4.6%
Fix-It: 4.5%
BF&M: 4.2%
Lousy Job: 3.7%
First Sup: 3.3%
Scope: 1.9%

Percent of Co-Occurrence
DEALING WITH CONFLICT: DEFINITION

Dealing with conflict is recognizing and learning that conflict is endemic, that one can deal with conflict or learn to deal with it by reducing, resolving, or avoiding it.

DEALING WITH CONFLICT: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

18 (1%) of all reported lessons were lessons in how to reduce, resolve, or avoid conflict on the job. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 18 lessons were: Project/Task Force (28%), Fix-It (7%), and Values Playing Out (17%).

18 (3%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in dealing with conflict. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach dealing with conflict are: Personal Trauma, Project/Task Force, and Early Work.
LESSON 30: Can't Manage It All By Yourself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope*</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Staff</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fix-It</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Model</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
CAN'T MANAGE IT ALL BY YOURSELF: DEFINITION

Can't manage it all by yourself is exactly that: the
discovery that, by its very nature, the managerial job cannot
be done alone; that delegation and reliance on others are
crucial components of the job. Realizing that the scope is
too large to handle alone and that one's managerial success
requires building teams and relationships and reliance on
others exemplified this category.

CAN'T MANAGE IT ALL BY YOURSELF: FREQUENCY AND
PROBABILITY

17 (1%) of all reported lessons were lessons in learning
that you can't manage it all by yourself. The events
supplying the highest proportions of these 17 lessons were:
Change in Scope (71%) and Fix-It (12%).

17 (3%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in
can't manage it all by yourself. The graph on the
opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that
had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a
probability statement, the sources most likely to teach can't
manage it all by yourself are: Change in Scope, Line to
Staff, and Fix-It.
LESSON 31: Be Prepared

Break a Rut* 8.3
Personal 6.3
Early Work 5.0
Lousy Job 3.7
Coursework 2.6
Role Model 2.2
Scope 1.9
VPO 1.5

* p < .05
BE READY TO TAKE OPPORTUNITIES (BE PREPARED): DEFINITION

Be prepared espouses the notion that much of what happens is serendipitous; that one must be prepared to take advantage of opportunities as they arise. Examples include:

- Seize opportunities, prepare for the unexpected, don't assume time/opportunities are unlimited, plan ahead, develop a second skill.

BE READY TO TAKE OPPORTUNITIES (BE PREPARED): FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

10 (.65%) of all reported lessons were lessons in being prepared to take advantage of unfolding opportunities. The events supplying the highest proportions of these 10 lessons were: Change in Scope (20%), Breaking a Rut (20%), and Early Work (10%).

10 (2%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in how to be ready to take opportunities. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach how to be ready to take opportunities are: Breaking a Rut, Purely Personal, and Early Work.
LESSON 32: Use and Abuse of Power

- Trauma*: 9.1
- Personal: 6.3
- Fix-It*: 4.5
- Lousy Job: 3.7
- Role Model: 2.2
- Scope: 1

* p < .05
USE AND ABUSE OF POWER, COMFORT WITH POWER: DEFINITION

Use and abuse of power contains examples of dealing with the double-edged sword of power. Inherent within this category is recognition of the dilemma that use of power may either help or hinder the attainment of desired ends.

USE AND ABUSE OF POWER, COMFORT WITH POWER: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

8 (.52%) of all reported lessons were lessons in how to use, and not abuse, power. The events supplying the highest proportions of these eight lessons were: Fix-It (38%), Purely Personal (13%), and Personal Trauma (13%).

8 (1%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in use and abuse of power, comfort with power. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach use and abuse of power, comfort with power are: Personal Trauma, Purely Personal, and Fix-It.
LESSON 33: Management Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coursework</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPO</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proj Task Fc</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
MANAGEMENT MODELS: DEFINITION

Management models contains formal management theories or processes learned during the course of a career.

MANAGEMENT MODELS: FREQUENCY AND PROBABILITY

8 (.52%) of all reported lessons were lessons in formal management theories or processes. The events supplying the highest proportions of these eight lessons were: Coursework (63%), Values Playing Out (13%), and Project/Task Force (13%).

8 (1%) of all events supplied at least one lesson in management models. The graph on the opposite page shows the proportion of the event types that had at least one of these lessons. Using the graph as a probability statement, the sources most likely to teach management models are: Coursework, Values Playing Out, and Project/Task Force.
DOING IT IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN THINKING ABOUT IT--PRACTICE OVER THEORY. USE WHAT YOU KNOW: DEFINITION

Action vs. Hypothesis
(only one corporation reported these three lessons)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
N = 3 & \% \text{ of all lessons} = .19\% \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

MISCELLANEOUS
(segments of lessons, fragmented lesson statements)

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
N = 10 & \% \text{ of all lessons} = .65\% \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]
A Theoretical Look at the Lessons

LESSON CLUSTERS

Setting and Implementing Agendas ................................ 303

- Specific technical knowledge
- Specific business knowledge
- Stand alone and act
- Seeing organization as systems
- Alternatives in problem solving
- Building structure and control systems
- Doing it beats hypothesizing

Handling Relationships ............................................. 304

- Directing and motivating subordinates
- Dealing with people and perspectives
- Politics exist in organizations
- How to get lateral cooperation
- How to work with executives
- Strategies and tactics of negotiation
- Confronting performance problems
- What executives are like
- Management is different than engineering
- How to develop people
- Managing former peers or bosses
- Dealing with conflict
- Management models

Basic Values ............................................................. 305

- Management values
- Human values
- Can't manage it all alone

Executive Temperament .............................................. 306

- Self-confidence
- Dealing with ambiguity, stress, uncertainty
- Persevering through adversity
- How to carry out tough decisions
- Coping strategies
- Use/abuse of power
Personal Awareness

Recognizing limits
Discovering likes and sorting dislikes
You have to control your own career
Perspective on life and work
Be prepared
Lesson Clusters

Setting and Implementing Agendas

**Specific technical knowledge,**
new technical content; such as
finance, strategic planning,
computers, budgeting, law, etc.
(e.g., when faced with a new job
assignment, learns the technical
side of it quickly).

**Specific business knowledge,**
new things about how his/her part
of the business works; such as an
organization's products, markets,
financial, or commercial
practices, etc.

**Stand alone and act,** that being
in charge means taking full
responsibility for the
consequences of your actions, even
when the risks are great (e.g.,
take charge when trouble comes;
bias for action and quick decisions).

**Seeing organization as systems,**
that effectively managing day-to-
day operations is not enough—you
have to think at least one level
up (e.g., links personal
responsibilities with the overall
mission of the organization).

**Alternatives in problem solving,**
that there is more than one way to
skin a cat—problems can be
attacked from angles other than
the one you usually use (e.g., can
find the one or two core elements
of the problem; looks at the
problem from many angles).

**Building structure and control systems,** since everything can't
be managed personally—learning
to be able to build and use
organizational structure and
control systems as managerial
tools (e.g., build a system so
it can run without you).

**Most Probable Sources**

Line to Staff
Coursework
Breaking a Rut
Fix-It
Starting from
Scratch
Starting from
Scratch
Fix-It
First Supervision
Line to Staff
Early Work
First Supervision
Early Work
Coursework
Fix-It
Fix-It
Scope
Breaking a Rut
Doing it beats hypothesizing, N/A*
that it's one thing to concoct a
plan or a strategy but quite another
to carry it out.

Handling Relationships

Directing and motivating Fix-It
subordinates, the art of directing
and motivating employees, of
building a team with the skills and
motivation to get things done.

Dealing with people and Business Failures
perspectives, that people are quite
and Mistakes
different in their backgrounds and
Purely Personal
frames of reference; dealing with
Starting from
them requires you to see things from
Scratch
their point of view.

Politics exist in organizations, Demotions/Missed
that politics are very much a part Promotions
of organizational life and must be
Business Failures
taken into account if you are to get
and Mistakes
things done (e.g., sell up well,
Values Playing Out
fight with facts, know whom to
involve).

How to get lateral cooperation, Fix-It
that achieving cooperation among
Starting from
people over whom you have no formal
Scratch
authority requires subtle skills and
Line to Staff
a great deal of practice.

How to work with executives, Line to Staff
that working with executives
Business Failures
requires some special skills in
and Mistakes
presentation and persuasion (e.g.,
Project/Task Force
works effectively with them).

Strategies and tactics of Project/Task Force
negotiation, that formal
Fix-It
negotiation with external parties
Early Work
(such as unions, clients,
governments, partners) is an art
with its own strategy and tactics.

*Only three lesson statements, and all three from executives at one corporation, comprise this category. Two occurred with a Project/Task Force assignment; one with a Change in Scope assignment.
Confronting performance problems, that neither the subordinate nor the organization benefits if you procrastinate in directly confronting a problem subordinate.

What executives are like, that executives are human, too, with all the foibles and preferences and personality quirks that other people have (e.g., understanding executives as people—what they value, how they operate).

Management is different than engineering, that being technically correct is a minor part of managing—the difficult and major part is getting people to accept and/or implement solutions (e.g., manage others to accomplish the work).

How to develop people, that people can develop and grow if you, as a manager, create the "right" challenges and opportunities.

Managing former peers or bosses, that managing people with more experience or who were your peers or former boss is a difficult proposition.

Dealing with conflict, that conflict among people is a fact of life, but that it can be dealt with in several different ways.

Management models, formal management theories or processes.

Basic Values

Management values, that a manager loses everything if he/she compromises his/her integrity, loses the trust of his/her people, or takes actions that damage his/her credibility.
Human values, that people are the business and have needs and lives that go beyond work; a manager must be sensitive to the human side.

Can't manage it all alone, that in his/her job you can't manage everything all by yourself; even if you are brilliant and work 18 hours a day you can't keep your arms around all the important pieces; you have no choice but to depend on others.

Executive Temperament

Self-confidence, enough self-confidence to trust his/her own instincts when handling tough, complex, or new situations.

Dealing with ambiguity, stress, uncertainty, that most important management situations are characterized by ambiguity, uncertainty, and stress--you have to learn to be comfortable with it and act in spite of it.

Persevering through adversity, that many difficult situations are not totally out of your control if you persevere, showing singleness of purpose in the face of resistance or obstacles.

How to carry out tough decisions, that decisions must be made for the sake of the business, even if they involve human cost and hurt you personally; you have to grit your teeth and do what must be done (e.g., fire a friend if necessary).

Coping strategies, that in a situation over which you genuinely have no control the best strategy is to accept what is, roll with the punches, and avoid tearing yourself apart over it.
Use/abuse of power, that the power you have as a manager is a two-edged sword that must be used with great care.

Trauma
Purely Personal
Fix-It

Personal Awareness

Recognizing limits, that he/she has personal limits and blind spots.

Business Failures
and Mistakes
Demotions/Missed Promotions
Trauma

Discovering likes and sorting dislikes, what he/she really wants to do—what it is about management and business that is really exciting.

Breaking a Rut
Line to Staff
Starting from Scratch

You have to control your own career, that only one person is ultimately responsible for your career—you.

Breaking a Rut
Demotions/Missed Promotions
Line to Staff

Perspective on life and work, that there must be a reasonable balance between work life and personal life.

Trauma
Coursework
Business Failures
and Mistakes

Be prepared, that opportunities can pop up at any time and you have to be prepared to seize them when they come.

Breaking a Rut
Purely Personal
Early Work
APPENDICES
The following graphs show the distribution of lesson categories within each event category. Proportions represent the events within the category that had at least one of a particular lesson category.
KEY EVENT: Starting From Scratch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mtvte</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standg Alone*</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confdnc</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Values</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Bus Wks</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Coop</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal W/Peopl</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambig Stress</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persevering</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Like Do</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Knowldg</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org as Systm</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altrnt Sltns</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Wk Execs</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prsnl Limits</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extnl Negotn</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cntrl Career</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execs Like</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KEY EVENT: Starting From Scratch
(continued)

Lessons

1. Mgmt Dif Tec 2.9
2. Bldg Systems 2.9
3. Devlop Peopl 2.9
4. MgmtPrs&Boss 2.9
5. Can't Manage 2.9

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Fix-It/Turn It Around

Lessons

- Direct Mtvte
- Lateral Coop*
- How Bus Wks
- Self-Confdnc
- Standg Alone
- Toughness
- Bldg Systems*
- Tech Knowldg
- Ambig Stress
- Persevering
- SubPerfProbm
- Mgmt Values
- Deal W/Peopl
- Extntl Negotn
- Altrnt Sltns
- Politics
- How Wk Execs
- Org as Systm
- Human Values
- Execs Like

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Fix-It/Turn It Around
(continued)

- Prsnl Limits 4.5
- What Like Do 4.5
- MgmtPrs&Boss 4.5
- Persp Lif Wk 4.5
- Deal Conflicts 4.5
- Use/Abus Pwr 4.5
- Coping 3
- Devlop Peopl 3
- Can't Manage 3
- Cntrl Career 1.5
- Mgmt Dif Tec 1.5

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Project/Task Force

- Self-Confldnc*: 26.3
- Extntl Negotn*: 21.1
- Mgmt Values: 17.1
- Deal W/Peopl: 15.8
- Ambig Stress: 15.8
- Direct Mtvte: 13.2
- Tech Knowldg: 13.2
- Politics: 13.2
- Lateral Coop: 13.2
- How Wk Execs: 13.2
- How Bus Wks: 11.8
- Org as Systm: 9.2
- Persevering: 7.9
- Altrnt Sltns: 7.9
- Toughness: 6.6
- Deal Conflict: 6.6
- Standg Alone: 5.3
- Mgmt Diff Tec: 5.3
- Human Values: 3.9
- Prsnl Limits: 3.9

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Project/Task Force
(continued)

- Coping: 3.9
- Execs Like: 3.9
- What Like Do: 2.6
- Bldg Systems: 2.6
- Do vs Think: 2.6
- Devlop Peopl: 1.3
- MgmtPrs&Boss: 1.3
- Mgmt Models: 1.3

Lessons vs Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Change in Scope

- Direct Mtyte: 31.7%
- Tech Knowldg: 18.3%
- Self-Confndnc: 13.5%
- How Bus Wks: 13.5%
- Deal W/Peopl: 12.5%
- Ambig Stress: 12.5%
- Standg Alone: 11.5%
- Can't Manage*: 11.5%
- Lateral Coop: 10.6%
- Mgmt Values: 8.7%
- Prsnl Limits: 8.7%
- Mgmt Dif Tec: 7.7%
- Devlop Peopl*: 7.7%
- MgmtPrs&Boss*: 7.7%
- How Wk Execs: 6.7%
- Org as Systm: 6.7%
- Bldg Systems: 6.7%
- What Like Do: 5.8%
- Altrnt Slns: 4.8%
- Execs Like: 4.8%

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Change in Scope
(continued)

- Persevering: 3.8
- Toughness: 3.8
- Coping: 3.8
- Human Values: 2.9
- Cntrl Career: 2.9
- Politics: 1.9
- Deal Conflict: 1.9
- Be Prepared: 1.9
- Extnl Negotn: 1
- SubPerfProbm: 1
- Use/Abus Pwr: 1
- Mgmt Models: 1
- Do vs Think: 1

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Line to Staff Switch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Percent of Co-Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tech Knowldg*</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Bus Wks*</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambig Stress</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Wk Execs*</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org as Systm*</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execs Like*</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mtvte</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Values</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confdnc</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Coop</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Like Do</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal W/Peopl</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altrnt Sltns</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cntrl Career</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Manage</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Business Failures & Mistakes

- Prsnl Limits* (25)
- Deal W/Peopl (20.8)
- Politics* (20.8)
- Direct Mtvte (16.7)
- How Wk Execs (16.7)
- Mgmt Values (12.5)
- Coping (12.5)
- Self-Confndnc (12.3)
- Tech Knowldg (8.3)
- Persevering (8.3)
- Extnl Negotn (8.3)
- Execs Like (8.3)
- Devlop Peopl (8.3)
- Persp Lif Wk (8.3)
- Human Values (4.2)
- Org as Systm (4.2)
- Toughness (4.2)
- Altrnt Slns (4.2)
- Mgmt Dif Tec (4.2)
- Bldg Systems (4.2)
- Deal Conflict (4.2)

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs

- Coping*: 44.4
- Politics*: 33.3
- Mgmt Values: 18.5
- Persevering*: 18.5
- Prsnl Limits*: 18.5
- Cntrl Career*: 18.5
- Ambig Stress: 11.1
- Toughness: 11.1
- Self-Confdnc: 7.4
- How Wk Execs: 7.4
- Persp Lif Wk: 7.4
- Direct Mtvte: 3.7
- Tech Knowldg: 3.7
- Lateral Coop: 3.7
- Standg Alone: 3.7
- Human Values: 3.7
- Org as Systm: 3.7
- What Like Do: 3.7
- Bldg Systems: 3.7
- Deal Conflict: 3.7

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Demotions/Missed Promotions/Lousy Jobs (continued)

- Use/Abus Pwr 3.7
- Be Prepared 3.7

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Breaking a Rut

- Cntrl Career*
- Tech Knowldg
- What Like Do*
- Direct Mtvte
- How Bus Wks
- Standg Alone
- Mgmt Values
- Self-Confdnc
- Extnl Negotn
- Be Prepared*
- Ambig Stress
- Lateral Coop
- Persevering
- How Wk Execs
- Coping
- Execs Like
- Bldg Systms
- Devlop Peopl

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Subordinate Performance Problems

- SubPerfProbm*: 85.7%
- Direct Mtvte: 14.3%
- Human Values*: 14.3%
- Mgmt Values: 9.5%
- Toughness: 9.5%
- Self-Confldnc: 4.8%
- Prsln Limits: 4.8%
- What Like Do: 4.8%
- Devlop Peopl: 4.8%

Percent of Co-Occurrence

*p < .05
KEY EVENT: Personal Trauma

- Persp Lif Wk*: 45.5%
- Direct Mtvte: 27.3%
- Persevering*: 27.3%
- Coping*: 27.3%
- Human Values: 18.2%
- Prsln Limits: 18.2%
- Self-Confndnc: 9.1%
- Standg Alone: 9.1%
- Toughness: 9.1%
- Devlop Peopl: 9.1%
- Deal Conflict: 9.1%
- Use/Abus Pwr*: 9.1%

Lessons

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Role Models (the Good, the Bad, & the Ugly)

- Direct Mtvte: 26.1%
- Mgmt Values*: 26.1%
- Human Values*: 13%
- Toughness: 10.9%
- Tech Knowldg: 8.7%
- Execs Like: 8.7%
- Deal W/Peopl: 6.5%
- Altrnt Sltns: 6.5%
- Devlop Pepl: 6.5%
- Self-Confdnc: 4.4%
- Politics: 4.4%
- Prsnl Limits: 4.4%
- What Like Do: 4.4%
- Cntrl Career: 4.4%
- Mgmt Dif Tec: 4.4%
- Ambig Stress: 2.2%
- Lateral Coop: 2.2%
- Standg Alone: 2.2%
- Persevering: 2.2%
- How Wk Execs: 2.2%

* Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Role Models (the Good, the Bad, & the Ugly) (continued)

Org as Systm 2.2
Coping 2.2
Bldg Systems 2.2
Persp Lif Wk 2.2
Can't Manage 2.2
Be Prepared 2.2
Use/Abus Pwr 2.2

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Values Playing Out

- Mgmt Values*: 30.8
- Direct Mtvte: 20
- Politics*: 18.5
- Self-Confndc: 12.3
- Human Values*: 12.3
- Persevering: 10.8
- Ambig Stress: 6.2
- Standg Alone: 6.2
- How Wk Execs: 6.2
- Toughness: 6.2
- Altrnt Sltns: 6.2
- Cntrl Career: 6.2
- How Bus Wks: 4.6
- Prsnl Limits: 4.6
- Extnd Negtn: 4.6
- Execs Like: 4.6
- Deal Conflict: 4.6
- Tech Knowldg: 3.1
- Deal W/Peopl: 3.1
- Lateral Coop: 3.1

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Values Playing Out
(continued)

Org as Systm  3.1
SubPerfProbm  3.1
Coping        3.1
Devlop Peopl  3.1
MgmtPrs&Boss  1.5
Be Prepared   1.5
Mgmt Models   1.5

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Coursework

- Self-Confdnc: 29%
- Tech Knowldg*: 26.3%
- Direct Mtvte: 15.8%
- Deal W/Peopl: 13.2%
- Mgmt Models*: 13.2%
- Altrnt Sltns: 10.5%
- Persp Lif Wk*: 10.5%
- Ambig Stress: 7.9%
- Human Values: 7.9%
- Prsnl Limits: 7.9%
- Lateral Coop: 5.3%
- How Wk Execs: 5.3%
- What Like Do: 5.3%
- Cntrl Career: 5.3%
- Execs Like: 5.3%
- Mgmt Values: 2.6%
- How Bus Wks: 2.6%
- Politics: 2.6%
- Org as Systm: 2.6%
- Devlop Peopl: 2.6%
- Be Prepared: 2.6%

Percent of Co-Occurrence

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Early Work

- Mgmt Values: 20
- Ambig Stress: 20
- Tech Knowldg: 15
- Deal W/Peopl: 15
- Org as Systm: 15
- Toughness: 15
- Altrnt Sltns: 15
- Self-Confldnc: 10
- Persevering: 10
- Extlnl Negotn: 10
- What Like Do: 10
- Mgmt Dif Tec: 10
- Direct Mtvte: 5
- How Bus Wks: 5
- Politics: 5
- Lateral Coop: 5
- Standg Alone: 5
- Human Values: 5
- Prslnl Limits: 5
- SubPerfProbm: 5

Percent of Co-Occurrence
KEY EVENT: Early Work (continued)

- Execs Like: 5
- Deal Conflict: 5
- Be Prepared: 5

Lessons

Percent of Co-Occurrence
KEY EVENT: First Supervision

- Direct Mtve: 30%
- Mgmt Dif Tec*: 26.7%
- Human Values*: 23.3%
- Standg Alone: 13.3%
- MgmtPrs&Boss*: 13.3%
- Self-Confndnc: 10%
- Org as Systm: 10%
- Toughness: 10%
- Tech Knowldg: 6.7%
- How Bus Wks: 6.7%
- Deal W/Peopl: 6.7%
- How Wk Execs: 6.7%
- Prsnl Limits: 6.7%
- Altrnt Sitns: 6.7%
- Extntl Negotn: 6.7%
- What Like Do: 6.7%
- Mgmt Values: 3.3%
- Ambig Stress: 3.3%
- Politics: 3.3%
- Lateral Coop: 3.3%

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: First Supervision
(continued)

- Coping: 3.3
- Cntrl Career: 3.3
- Deal Conflict: 3.3

* p < .05
KEY EVENT: Purely Personal

- Mgmt Values: 25%
- Self-Confidence: 25%
- Deal W/People: 18.8%
- Human Values: 18.8%
- Persevering: 12.5%
- Prsln Limits: 12.5%
- Coping: 12.5%
- Direct Mvte: 6.3%
- Tech Knowldg: 6.3%
- Ambig Stress: 6.3%
- Politics: 6.3%
- Lateral Coop: 6.3%
- Standg Alone: 6.3%
- Org as Systm: 6.3%
- What Like Do: 6.3%
- Persp Lif Wk: 6.3%
- Be Prepared: 6.3%
- Use/Abus Pwr: 6.3%

Percent of Co-Occurrence
### Event Categories and Associated Lesson Categories

**Co-occurrence Proportions and Lesson Distribution Patterns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Cat.</th>
<th>Bus/Fail*</th>
<th>LM***</th>
<th>L3***</th>
<th>SPP***</th>
<th>RUT***</th>
<th>Trauma***</th>
<th>OP Tech*</th>
<th>VPD***</th>
<th>CW***</th>
<th>EW</th>
<th>FS***</th>
<th>PERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASA**</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCATCH</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIX-IT**</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/TF***</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE***</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN/STF***</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3***</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP***</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUT***</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trauma***</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM**</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPD***</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW***</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EW</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS***</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion (rounded percentages) of each event category from which managers reported having learned one of the lessons within a lesson category and the lessons that occurred more than would have been predicted by chance (denoted by numbers that are either underlined once or twice (Appendix, p. 347).

* p<.10  The levels at which the thirty-four lesson categories were significantly differently distributed within this event.
** p<.05  The levels at which an individual lesson category contributed more than would have been predicted by chance to the overall lesson distribution pattern.
*** p<.01  The levels at which an individual lesson category contributed more than would have been predicted by chance to the overall lesson distribution pattern.
Events as Lesson Sources

The following tables show the event categories that were sources of individual lesson categories. It is from these tables that major sources of lessons were derived. The percentages show the proportion of events within the listed event category that had a lesson from the listed lesson category. The footnotes denote whether this lesson occurred more than expected by chance with a given event (Appendix, p. 347).

The lesson source tables include the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total N of 1 to 1 occurrences across all events</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution: Events as major sources of this lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The following table is a guide to which events had significantly different lesson distribution patterns, and at what significance level (Appendix, p. 347).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS</th>
<th>HARDSHIPS</th>
<th>OTHER PEOPLE</th>
<th>OTHER EVENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCRTCH</td>
<td>FIX-IT</td>
<td>TSK FC</td>
<td>SCOPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LINE</td>
<td>STAFF</td>
<td>BF &amp; M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LOUSY</td>
<td>JOB</td>
<td>SUB PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROBLM</td>
<td>A RUT</td>
<td>TRAUMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>MODELS</td>
<td>VALUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLYOUT</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Events as Lesson Sources

1. Direct and motivate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>BREAK</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>SUB PR</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>PURELY</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>LOUSY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Basic management values: integrity, trust, credibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.8²</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Self-confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>29²</td>
<td>26.3¹</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Specific technical knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>53.9²</td>
<td>26.3²</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How the business works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>38.5¹</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Dealing with people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Comfort with ambiguity, stress or uncertainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIX-IT SCOPE</th>
<th>SCRATCH JOB</th>
<th>LOUSY WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>FIRST SUPERV</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Politics is part of organizational life

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPERV</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.3⁵</td>
<td>20.8¹</td>
<td>18.5²</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Getting lateral cooperation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>FIRST SUPERV</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.9¹</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Standing alone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>FIRST SUPERV</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>29.4²</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Human values: sensitivity to human needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIRST SUPERV</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.3²</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.3¹</td>
<td>13¹</td>
<td>12.3¹</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Persevering under adverse conditions: singleness of purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCRCH</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PROJCT TSK FC</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.3¹</td>
<td>18.5¹</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How to work with executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PROJCT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>SCRCH</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.8¹</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Recognition of personal limits and weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>PROJCT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCRCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>25²</td>
<td>18.5¹</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Seeing organization as systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>PROJCT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>30.8¹</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Learning to be tough: biting the bullet, doing what has to be done despite consequence--to another person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>PROJCT TSK FC</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>SCRCH</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Finding alternatives in solving and framing problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Strategy and tactics of negotiation with external parties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.12</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Needing to act on or confront a subordinate performance problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBL</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>85.72</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Strategies for coping with situations beyond your control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>BF &amp; M PERSNL</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.42</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Discovering what you really want to do, what really excites you

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBL</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. You have to take control of your own career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.7¹</td>
<td>18.5²</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What executives are like

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>SCOPE PLYOUT</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.8²</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Management is different from technical; people are important and problematic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.7²</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How to build and/or use structure and control systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.9²</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Develop your people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.7¹</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. How to manage people who have more experience than you or who used to be your peer or boss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.3²</td>
<td>7.7²</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Perspective on life and work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>BF &amp; M JOB</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.5²</td>
<td>10.5²</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Dealing with conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>BF &amp; M JOB</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Can't manage it all by yourself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.5²</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Be ready to take opportunities (be prepared)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3²</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 32. Use and abuse of power, comfort with power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 33. Management models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>TSK FC</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Significance Levels and Footnotes: Individual Event Categories and their Lesson Distribution Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS</th>
<th>HARSHIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCRATCH</td>
<td>BF &amp; M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIX-IT</td>
<td>LOUSY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td>SUB PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSK FC</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE **</td>
<td>A RUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINE STAFF</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER PEOPLE</th>
<th>OTHER EVENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROLE MODELS</td>
<td>COURSE WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUES PLYOUT</td>
<td>FIRST SUPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***</td>
<td>EARLY WORK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURELY PERSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<.10
*** p<.05
* p<.01

The levels at which the 34 lesson categories were significantly differently distributed within a given event.

(A chi square test was done to see if the overall distribution pattern of event/lesson combinations within individual event categories was different for any of those event categories. Please note that the entries in the chi square table were not quite independent. Although whenever an event had more than one lesson statement in the same lesson category it was counted as only one observation of a one event/one lesson combination, it is conceivable that more than one of a particular lesson, although occurring with different events, came from the same manager.) In principle, this violates the assumption of independence necessary for the chi square. The requirement that the average cell size should be 5 is also being violated. However, because of the experimental nature of this research, we are using the chi square values as index numbers for the purpose of uncovering potential relationships of events and lessons.)

1p<.05
2p<.01

The levels at which an individual lesson category contributed to the overall lesson distribution pattern difference for a given event. (Having looked at the overall chi square, it was decided that individual contributions from each lesson category to that chi square might show which lessons were differently associated with each event. For the purposes of understanding these associations, these contributions were considered chi square...
values with 1 df. Thus, in the table, footnote 1 indicates that this chi square index number was significant at .05; footnote 2, at .01, implying that this lesson was associated with this event more than would be predicted by chance. Please note that these 34 individual tests are slightly dependent upon one another since they sum to a statistic with only 33 df. However, as in the overall chi square analysis, the use of these numbers was exploratory in nature and helped in our understanding of the data.)
CHI SQUARE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE: INDIVIDUAL EVENT CATEGORIES AND THEIR LESSON DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS

Critical values for $X^2$ (df=33)
* = p<.10 (cut off = 43.6393)
** = p<.05 (cut off = 47.063)
*** = p<.01 (cut off = 53.999)

Asterisks below individual cells correspond with footnotes 1 or 2 (Appendix, p. 347) which indicate the lesson categories that contributed most to the lesson distribution differences within the event category.

### Courrnrork

|         | Direct | Mgmt | Self | Cofdnc | Tech | Knowlg | Busin | Works | Dealw | People | Conf | Ambig | Politi | Laterl | Coop | Stand | Alone | Human | Value | Persever | Workw | Execs | Persm | Limits | Orgns | Sysmns | Tough | Altnr | procla |
|---------|--------|------|------|--------|------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|--------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| D       | 6      | 1    | 11   | 10     | 1    | 2.94   | 5     | 3     | 1     | 2     | 3    | 0     | 2.24   | 2.24   | 3    | 0     | 1     | 0     | 4     | 0.06   | + 2.77 | + 8.16 | + 10.28 | **    |
| E       | 6.72   | 4.55 | 4.76 | 3.78   | 2.94 | 3.08   | 2.94  | 2.73  | 2.73  | 2.80  | 2.24 | 2.24  | 2.24   | 2.10   | 1.96 | 2.10  | 1.89  |       |        |
| Dif     | -0.72  | -3.55| 6.24 | 6.22   | -1.94| 1.92   | 0.06  | -1.73 | -0.80 | -2.73 | -0.76 | -2.24 | -0.24  | -0.90  | -0.96 | -2.10 | 2.11  |       |        |

.06 + 2.77 + 8.16 + 10.28 = 12.83

### Extmnl

|         | SPP    | Coping | What | Wnt | Do | Contrl | Career | Execs | Like | Mgmt | Diffcl | Build | Systms | Devlop | People | Manage | Persp | Of Wkr | Dealw | Confcl | Can't | Manage | Be Pre |ared | Ug/Rs | Power | Mgmt | Models | Do vs. | Think |
|---------|--------|--------|------|-----|----|--------|--------|-------|------|------|--------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| D       | 0      | 0      | 0    | 2   | 2  | 0      | 0      | 0     | 1    | 0    | 4     | 0     | 0      | 1      | 0      | 5     | 0     | 0      | 5     | 0      | 0      | 5     | 0      | 0      | 5     | 0      | 0      | 0      | 70    |
| E       | 1.75   | 1.47   | 1.75 | 1.61| 1.47| 1.47   | 1.33   | 1.19  | 1.12 | .91  | .91   | .91   | .84    | .49    | .42    | .42   | .14   | .42    | 4.58  | .51    | .42    | .42   | .42    | .42    | .42   |
| Dif     | -1.75  | -1.47  | -1.75| .39 | .53 | .53    | -1.33  | -1.19 | -1.12| -.91 | -.91  | -.91  | -.84   | .51    | -.42   | 4.58  | -.14  | .51    | -.42  | -.42  | -.42  | -.42  | -.42  | -.42  | -.42  | .14    | 107.81***|

1.75 + 1.47 + 1.75 + .09 + .19 + .19 + 1.33 + 1.19 + .01 + .91 + 10.42 + .91 + .84 + .53 + .42 + 4.58 + .14 = 107.81***
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Motiv</th>
<th>Mgmt Values</th>
<th>Self Cnfnd</th>
<th>Tech Knowlg</th>
<th>Busns Works</th>
<th>Deal w People</th>
<th>Comfb Ambig</th>
<th>Poltics</th>
<th>Laterl Coop</th>
<th>Stndgd Alone</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Persevering</th>
<th>Work w Execs</th>
<th>Persml Limits</th>
<th>Org vs Sysms</th>
<th>Togacth</th>
<th>Altrn Probm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>1.33 + 2.40</td>
<td>.42 + .62</td>
<td>.18 + .24</td>
<td>1.06 + .90</td>
<td>.95 + .90</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>2.05 + .00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00 + .00</td>
<td>.02 + .61</td>
<td>.04 + .04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrnl Negots</td>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>What Wnt Do</td>
<td>Ctrlr Career</td>
<td>Execs Like</td>
<td>Mgmt DiffC</td>
<td>Build Systs</td>
<td>Develop People</td>
<td>Manage PrfBns</td>
<td>Perspv LF Wkr</td>
<td>Deal w Cnflct</td>
<td>Can't Manage</td>
<td>Be Prepared</td>
<td>Us/Abn Power</td>
<td>Mgmt Models</td>
<td>Do vs. Think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>.10 + 1.34</td>
<td>.23 + .19</td>
<td>.09 + 1.34</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>+1.09 + 1.02</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03 + .77</td>
<td>.45 + .38</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>02.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Work Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-3.22</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>-3.32</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>2.46 + .45</td>
<td>.33 + .16</td>
<td>.39 + .58</td>
<td>2.50 + .30</td>
<td>.33 + .33</td>
<td>.12 + .25</td>
<td>1.41 + .08</td>
<td>2.55 + 2.14</td>
<td>2.75 +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrnl Negots</td>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>What Wnt Do</td>
<td>Ctrlr Career</td>
<td>Execs Like</td>
<td>Mgmt DiffC</td>
<td>Build Systs</td>
<td>Develop People</td>
<td>Manage PrfBns</td>
<td>Perspv LF Wkr</td>
<td>Deal w Cnflct</td>
<td>Can't Manage</td>
<td>Be Prepared</td>
<td>Us/Abn Power</td>
<td>Mgmt Models</td>
<td>Do vs. Think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>.74 + .01 + 1.10 + .97 + .92 + .01 + 1.60 + .75 + .70 + .57 + .57 + .32 + .53 + 1.54 + .26 + .26 + .09 + 28.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Purely Personal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Motiv Mgmt Values</th>
<th>Self Confidc</th>
<th>Tech Knowl</th>
<th>Busines Works</th>
<th>Deal w People</th>
<th>Comft Ambig</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Laterl Coop</th>
<th>Stang Alone</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Perverse</th>
<th>Work w Execs</th>
<th>Permail Limits</th>
<th>Org as Sysyms</th>
<th>Toughness</th>
<th>Alttr Probm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.98</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>- .67</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>- .30</td>
<td>- .21</td>
<td>- .24</td>
<td>- .21</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>- .99</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>- .93</td>
<td>- .84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1.32 + 1.94 + 1.69 + .27 + 1.30 + 1.98 + .07 + .04 + .05 + .04 + .00 + 1.03 + .99 + 1.23 + .02 + .93 + .84 + = 31\]

| External Negot SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Controll Career | Exec Like | Mgmt Diffch | Build Systems | Devlop People | Manage PrbBos | Perspv Lf Wrk | Deal w Conflict | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Us/Ab Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs Think |
|---------------------|--------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 0                   | - .78  | - .65       | 2.78            | 1.71      | 0           | 0             | 0            | 0              | 0              | 1              | 0           | 1           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| E                   | 0      | 0.65        | 2.78            | 1.71      | 0           | 0             | 0            | 0              | 0              | 1              | 0           | 1           | 0           | 0           | 0           |
| Dif                 | - .78  | - .65       | 1.22            | .29       | - .65       | - .65         | - .59        | - .59          | - .59          | - .59         | .60         | - .40        | - .37        | .78          | - .19       | - .06       |

\[.78 + .65 + 1.91 + .12 + .65 + .65 + .59 + .53 + .50 + .40 + .90 + .40 + .37 + 2.77 + 3.45 + .19 + .06 = 32.74\]

### Fix-It**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Motiv Mgmt Values</th>
<th>Self Confidc</th>
<th>Tech Knowl</th>
<th>Busines Works</th>
<th>Deal w People</th>
<th>Comft Ambig</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Laterl Coop</th>
<th>Stang Alone</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Perverse</th>
<th>Work w Execs</th>
<th>Permail Limits</th>
<th>Org as Sysyms</th>
<th>Toughness</th>
<th>Alttr Probm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>-6.91</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>-1.85</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>- .85</td>
<td>-3.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[.30 + 3.43 + .17 + .57 + 2.79 + .62 + .00 + .66 + .47 + 2.59 + .50 + .68 + .11 + 1.82 + .00 + 2.00 + .01 + = 214\]

| External Negot SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Controll Career | Exec Like | Mgmt Diffch | Build Systems | Devlop People | Manage PrbBos | Perspv Lf Wrk | Deal w Conflict | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Us/Ab Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs Think |
|---------------------|--------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 7                   | 8      | 2           | 3               | 1           | 4           | 10           | 2            | 3              | 3              | 2              | 0            | 1           | 1.50        | 1.28        | 1.28       | .43         |
| E                   | 5.35   | 4.49        | 5.35            | 4.92        | 4.49        | 4.07         | 3.64         | 3.42          | 2.78          | 2.78          | 2.78        | 2.57        | 1.50        | 1.28        | 1.28       | .43         |
| Dif                 | 1.65   | 3.51        | -3.35           | -1.92       | -3.49       | -4.9         | -3.07        | 6.36          | -1.42         | 2.22          | 2.22        | - .57       | -1.50       | 1.72        | -1.28      | - .43       |

\[.51 + 2.74 + 2.10 + .75 + 2.71 + .05 + 2.32 + 1.11 + .59 + .02 + .02 + .02 + .13 + 1.50 + 2.31 + 1.28 + .43 = 51.31**\]
### Project/Task Force**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Motlv</th>
<th>Mgmt Values</th>
<th>Self CNFDCN</th>
<th>Tech Knowlg</th>
<th>Busins Works</th>
<th>Deal w People</th>
<th>Confl Ambig</th>
<th>Polities</th>
<th>Laterl Coop</th>
<th>Stand Alone</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Persevering</th>
<th>Work w Exce</th>
<th>Feral Limits</th>
<th>Org as Sysmts</th>
<th>Toughness</th>
<th>Altrn Prob</th>
<th>Externl Negot</th>
<th>SPP</th>
<th>Coping</th>
<th>What Wnt Do</th>
<th>Contrl Career</th>
<th>Exec Like</th>
<th>Mgmt Diffh</th>
<th>Build Systems</th>
<th>Devlop People</th>
<th>Manage Prfessns</th>
<th>Peresv LF Wrk</th>
<th>Deal w CNFDCN</th>
<th>Can't Manage</th>
<th>Be Prepared</th>
<th>Wa/Ab Power</th>
<th>Mgmt Models</th>
<th>Do vs. Think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>12.92</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff</td>
<td>-8.24</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>-2.26</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>-3.41</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>-7.00</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.72 + .03 + 3.88 + .01 + .13 + 1.59 + 2.03 + .91 + .76 + 1.57 + 1.56 + .00 + 2.53 + 1.28 + .53 + .09 + .15 + .87

| Externl Negot | SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Contrl Career | Exec Like | Mgmt Diffh | Build Systems | Devlop People | Manage Prfessns | Peresv LF Wrk | Deal w CNFDCN | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Wa/Ab Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs. Think |
|---------------|-----|--------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| 0             | 16  | 0      | 3           | 2             | 0          | 3           | 4             | 2             | 1              | 0             | 5             | 0            | 0            | 1            | 14            | .38          |

26.65 + 3.99 + .65 + 1.29 + 3.99 + .25 + .04 + .47 + 1.37 + .68 + 2.47 + 2.59 + 2.28 + 1.33 + 1.14 + .02 + 6.91 = 77.09**

** Starting From Scratch

| Direct Motlv | Mgmt Values | Self CNFDCN | Tech Knowlg | Busins Works | Deal w People | Confl Ambig | Polities | Laterl Coop | Stand Alone | Human Values | Persevering | Work w Exce | Feral Limits | Org as Sysmts | Toughness | Altrn Prob | Externl Negot | SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Contrl Career | Exec Like | Mgmt Diffh | Build Systems | Devlop People | Manage Prfessns | Peresv LF Wrk | Deal w CNFDCN | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Wa/Ab Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs. Think |
|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----|-------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 0            | 11          | 7          | 8           | 6            | 6.05         | 6.05        | 6.32      | 5.02       | 3.91         | 4.09         | 3.91        | 3.63        | 3.72         | 3.63         | 2.98      | 2.98      | 2.79        | 2.79   | 2.51    |
| E            | 8.93        | 6.05       | 6.32        | 5.02         | 3.91         | 4.09        | 3.91      | 3.63       | 3.72         | 3.63         | 2.98        | 2.98        | 2.79         | 2.79         | 2.60      | 2.79      | 2.79        | 2.51   |
| Diff         | 2.07        | .95        | 1.68        | -2.02        | 3.09         | 1.91        | .09       | -.63       | 3.28         | 6.37         | -2.98       | 1.02        | -.98         | -1.79        | .40        | -.79      | .49         |       |

.48 + .15 + .45 + .81 + 2.44 + .89 + .00 + .11 + 2.89 + 11.18 + 2.98 + .35 + .32 + 1.15 + .06 + .22 + .10 + .49

| Externl Negot | SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Contrl Career | Exec Like | Mgmt Diffh | Build Systems | Devlop People | Manage Prfessns | Peresv LF Wrk | Deal w CNFDCN | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Wa/Ab Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs. Think |
|---------------|-----|--------|-------------|---------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 0             | 1   | 0      | 4           | 1             | 1          | 1           | 1             | 1             | 1              | 0             | 0             | 1            | 0            | 0             | 0            | 0            | 0            | = 93 |
| E             | 2.33| 1.95   | 2.33        | 2.14          | 1.95        | 1.95        | 1.77         | 1.58         | 1.49           | 1.21          | 1.21          | 1.21         | 1.12         | .65          | .56          | .56          | .56          | .19          |
| Diff         | -1.33| -1.95 | -2.33       | -1.86         | -0.95       | -0.95       | -0.77        | -0.58        | -0.49          | -0.21         | -1.21        | -1.21        | -1.21        | -1.21        | -1.21        | -1.21        | -1.21        | -1.21        |

.76 + 1.95 + 2.33 + 1.62 + .46 + .46 + .34 + .21 + .16 + .04 + 1.21 + 1.21 + .01 + .65 + .56 + .56 + .56 + .19 = 37.30
### Line to Staff***

| Direct Motiv | Mgmt Values | Self Confidence | Tech Knowledge | Business Works | Deal w People | Contf Ambig | Politics | Laterl Coop | Standg Alone | Human Values | Persevering | Work w Execs | Perani Limits | Org as System | Toughness | Altrn Probld | Externl Negot| SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Control Career | Execs Like | Mgmt DiffThc | Build Systems | Develop People | Manage PrOd | PERSVP LF Wk | Deal w Conflict | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Us/Abs Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs. Think |
|--------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------|------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------|-------------|--------------|---------|----------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| O E          |             |                 |                |                |               |             |          |            |              |              |             |             |              |              |              |           |             |              |        |        |            |                |            |            |              |              |         |         |              |              |          |            |              |              |         |         |
|              | 2           | 2               | 2              | 5              | 1             | 1           | 4         | 2          | 2            | 0            | 0           | 1           | 4            | 0             | 4            | 4           | 1          | 1           | 2.32       | 2.93    | 3.08    | 7          | 2.43       | 1.89     | 1.89     | 1.76        | 1.80        | 1.76    | .90     | 2.11        | .24        | .20     | 1.76        | .44        | .44    | 1.35     | .26        | .33    | -1.22  |
| Dif          | -2.32       | -.93            | -1.06          | 4.57           | -3.11        | -2.98       | 2.11      | .24        | .20          | -1.76        | -1.44       | -1.44       | 2.56         | -1.35        | 2.74        | -1.35      | -1.22       | .123       | .37     | 8.60    | 5.12        | .49        | 2.36     | .03        | .02        | 1.76    | 1.44     | 1.44        | .35        | .59    | .96        | 1.35        | .04    | .97     | .09        | .09    |

### Scope***

| Direct Motiv | Mgmt Values | Self Confidence | Tech Knowledge | Business Works | Deal w People | Contf Ambig | Politics | Laterl Coop | Standg Alone | Human Values | Persevering | Work w Execs | Perani Limits | Org as System | Toughness | Altrn Probld | Externl Negot | SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Control Career | Execs Like | Mgmt DiffThc | Build Systems | Develop People | Manage PrOd | PERSVP LF Wk | Deal w Conflict | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Us/Abs Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs. Think |
|--------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|----------|------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|--------|--------|------------|----------------|-------------|------------|-------------|--------------|---------|---------|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------|---------|
| O E          |             |                 |                |                |               |             |          |            |              |              |             |             |              |              |              |           |             |              |        |        |            |                |            |            |              |              |         |         |              |              |          |            |              |              |         |         |
|              | 33          | 9               | 14             | 17             | 14            | 13          | 2         | 11         | 6.63        | 9.63        | 7.90        | 7.90        | 7.41        | 6.92        | 7.41        | 6.67      | 1.59        | -3.41      | 1.67   | .67    | 1.00        | 1.27     | .42      | .67        | 6.05       | .13      | .58      | 3.04        | 1.93       | .10      | .34      | .00        | 1.57       | .42     | .97    |
| Dif          | 9.29        | -7.06           | -2.80          | 3.66           | 3.63          | 2.13        | 2.63      | -7.63      | 1.12         | 2.37        | -4.90       | -3.90       | -90          | 1.59        | .08         | -3.41      | -1.67     | .97     | .67    | 1.00        | 1.27     | .42      | .67        | 6.05       | .13      | .58      | 3.04        | 1.93       | .10      | .34      | .00        | 1.57       | .42     | .97    |

### Externl Negot| SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Control Career | Execs Like | Mgmt DiffThc | Build Systems | Develop People | Manage PrOd | PERSVP LF Wk | Deal w Conflict | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Us/Abs Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs. Think |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-5.18</td>
<td>-4.19</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>-3.32</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>-1.89</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>-3.21</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.
***Significant at the .001 level.
### Business Failures and Mistakes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Motiv</th>
<th>Mgmt Values</th>
<th>Self-Conf</th>
<th>Tech Knowl</th>
<th>Business Works</th>
<th>Deal w/ People</th>
<th>Compt Ambig</th>
<th>Policie</th>
<th>Laterl Coop</th>
<th>Standg Alone</th>
<th>Humen Valur</th>
<th>Persevering</th>
<th>Work w/ Execs</th>
<th>Perem Limits</th>
<th>Org aa Systems</th>
<th>Toughness</th>
<th>Altrn Probl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ 0.20 + 0.04 + 0.08 + 0.23 + 2.16 + 3.21 + 2.18 + \frac{0.35}{2} + 2.08 + 2.03 + 0.29 + 0.67 + 0.07 + 3.30 + 2.46 + 0.15 + 0.20 + 0.11 + \]

### Externl Negts SPP Coping What Wnt Do Control Career Execs Like Mgmt DiffCh Build Systems Develop People Manage Perspy LF Wrk Deal w/ Confict Can't Manage Be Pre pared Us/Rs Power Morgt Models Do vs. Think

| D            | 2           | 0         | 3          | 0              | 0              | 2           | 1       | 1         | 2           | 0             | 2           | 1               | 0           | 0             | 0         | 0          |
| E            | 1.30        | 1.09      | 1.30       | 1.20          | 1.09          | 0.99        | 0.83    | 0.68      | 0.68        | 0.66          | 0.62        | 0.36           | 0.31        | 0.31         | 0.10      |
| Dif          | 0.70        | -1.09     | 1.70       | -1.20         | -1.09         | 0.91        | 0.01    | 0.12      | 1.17        | -0.68         | 1.32        | -0.32          | -0.62       | -0.36        | -0.31      | -0.10      |

\[ 0.38 + 1.09 + 2.22 + 1.20 + 1.09 + 0.76 + 0.00 + 0.02 + 1.65 + 0.68 + 2.56 + 0.15 + 0.62 + 0.36 + 0.31 + 0.31 + 0.10 = 46.81**

### Louey Job***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Motiv</th>
<th>Mgmt Values</th>
<th>Self-Conf</th>
<th>Tech Knowl</th>
<th>Business Works</th>
<th>Deal w/ People</th>
<th>Compt Ambig</th>
<th>Policie</th>
<th>Laterl Coop</th>
<th>Standg Alone</th>
<th>Humen Valur</th>
<th>Persevering</th>
<th>Work w/ Execs</th>
<th>Perem Limits</th>
<th>Org aa Systems</th>
<th>Toughness</th>
<th>Altrn Probl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dif          | -5.05       | -2.90     | -2.28      | -2.40         | -2.65         | -2.77       | -3.35   | 6.54      | -1.52       | -1.46       | -1.02       | 2.98         | -0.02        | 3.11          | -0.76     | -1.70      | -4.22 + 0.20 + 1.21 + 1.69 + 2.65 + 2.77 + 0.05 + 0.72 + 0.92 + 0.87 + 0.52 + 6.10 = 66.40 + 0.09 + 5.12 + 0.33 + 0.65 + 1.70 +

### Externl Negts SPP Coping What Wnt Do Control Career Execs Like Mgmt DiffCh Build Systems Develop People Manage Perspy LF Wrk Deal w/ Confict Can't Manage Be Pre pared Us/Rs Power Morgt Models Do vs. Think

| D            | 0           | 0         | 0          | 0              | 0              | 0           | 0       | 1.07      | 1.01        | 0.82         | 0.82        | 0.76          | 0.44        | 0.38          | 0.38      |
| E            | 1.58        | 1.32      | 1.58       | 1.45          | 1.32          | 1.32        | 1.20    | 1.07      | 1.01        | 0.82         | 0.82        | 0.76          | 0.44        | 0.38          | 0.38      |
| Dif          | -1.58       | -1.32     | 10.42      | -0.45         | 3.68          | -1.32       | -1.20   | -0.07     | -1.01       | -0.82        | 1.18        | -0.18         | -0.76       | -0.56        | -0.38      | -1.33      | 133.80***

\[ 1.58 + 1.32 + 0.72 + 0.14 + 10.26 + 1.32 + 1.20 + 0.01 + 1.01 + 0.82 + 1.70 + 0.04 + 0.76 + 0.71 + 1.01 + 0.38 + 0.13 = 135.80***

---

**Note:** *Data represents various factors affecting business failures and mistakes, including direct motiv, mgmt values, self-confidence, technical knowledge, business work, contract agreements, political behavior, lateral cooperation, standing alone, human values, perseverance, work with executives, performance limits, organization systems, toughness, and alternative problems.*
### Subordinate Performance Problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.141</td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.00 + .00 + .64 + 1.73 + 1.34 + 1.34 + 1.25 + 1.28 + 1.25 + 1.98 = 1.02 + 1.02 + .00 + .90 + 1.13 + .86 +

### External Neg. SPP Coping What Mnt Do Control Career Exec Like Mgmt Difficult Build Systems Develop People Manage Problems Persp LF Wrk Deal w Conflicts Can't Manage Be Prepared Us/Ab Power Mgmt Models Do va. Think

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>17.33</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.80 + 65.25 = .80 + .09 + .67 + .67 + .61 + .54 + .47 + .42 + .42 + .42 + .38 + .22 + .19 + .19 + .06 = 474.21***

### Breaking a Rut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>-2.07</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.06 + .37 + .45 + 2.38 + 2.09 + 2.07 + .48 + 1.85 + .41 + .75 + 1.50 + .17 + .17 + 1.41 + 1.32 + 1.41 + 1.27 +

### External Neg. SPP Coping What Mnt Do Control Career Exec Like Mgmt Difficult Build Systems Develop People Manage Problems Persp LF Wrk Deal w Conflicts Can't Manage Be Prepared Us/Ab Power Mgmt Models Do va. Think

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.57 + .09 + .03 = .57 + 82.00 = 82.57 + .00 + .89 + .03 + .08 + .61 + .61 + .61 + .56 + .56 + .28 + .28 + .28 + .09 = 128.47***
## Personal Trauma***

|          | Direct Motiv | Mgmt Values | Self Confnd | Tech Knowlg | Busins Works | Deal w People | Confst Ambig | Politics | Laterl Coop | Standg Alone | Human Values | Perservering | Work w Execs | Persnl Limits | Org as Sysnt | Toughness | Altrn Probl |
|----------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------|-------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|------------|
| D        | 2.30         | 1.56        | 1.63        | 1.30        | 1.01         | 1.06          | 0.94          | 0.96     | 0.77        | 0.77         | 0.72         | 0.67          | 0.72         | 0.65         |              |           | 0          |
| E        | 3.00         | 1.63        | 1.69        | 1.01        | 1.06         | 0.94          | 0.77          | 0.77     | 0.72        | 0.67          | 0.72         | 0.65          | 0.65         |              |           |            |
| Dif      | .70          | -1.56       | -1.63       | -1.30       | -1.01        | -1.06         | -0.94         | -1.01    | -0.96       | 1.23          | 1.28         | -1.28         | 1.28         | -1.28        | 0.65        |

0.21 + 1.56 + 0.24 + 1.30 + 1.01 + 1.06 + 1.01 + 0.94 + 0.96 + 0.00 + 1.97 + 6.46 + 2.26 + 0.67 + 0.11 + 0.65 + 0.21 + 1.56 + 0.24 + 1.30 + 1.01 + 1.06 + 1.01 + 0.94 + 0.96 + 0.00 + 1.97 + 6.46 + 2.26 + 0.67 + 0.11 + 0.65 = 35.66

## Externl Negots

|          | SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Contrl Career | Execs Like | Mgmt BifTch | Build Sysnt | Develop People | Manage PrsBos | Perspv Lf Wrk | Deal w Conflt | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Us/Ab Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs. Think |
|----------|-----|--------|-------------|---------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| D        | 0.60| 0.50   | 3.00        | 0.50          | 0.50       | 0.46         | 0.41        | 0.38            | 0.31          | 0.31         | 0.29          | 0.17         | 0.14        | 0.14        | 0.05         |
| E        | 0.60| 0.50   | 3.00        | 0.50          | 0.50       | 0.46         | 0.41        | 0.38            | 0.31          | 0.31         | 0.29          | 0.17         | 0.14        | 0.14        | 0.05         |
| Dif      | -0.60| -0.50 | 2.40        | -0.55         | -0.50      | -0.50        | -0.46       | -0.41           | -0.31         | 4.69         | 0.69          | 0.29         | 0.17        | 0.14        | 0.05         |

0.60 + 0.50 + 2.40 + 0.55 + 0.50 + 0.50 + 0.46 + 0.41 + 0.31 + 4.69 + 0.69 + 0.29 + 0.17 + 0.14 + 0.14 + 0.05 = 114.47***

## Role Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Motiv</th>
<th>Mgmt Values</th>
<th>Self Confnd</th>
<th>Tech Knowlg</th>
<th>Busins Works</th>
<th>Deal w People</th>
<th>Confst Ambig</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Laterl Coop</th>
<th>Standg Alone</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Perservering</th>
<th>Work w Execs</th>
<th>Persnl Limits</th>
<th>Org as Sysnt</th>
<th>Toughness</th>
<th>Altrn Probl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>-3.17</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>-1.96</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.03 + 10.02 + 1.94 + 0.00 + 3.19 + 0.04 + 1.50 + 0.31 + 1.37 + 1.30 + 5.25 + 0.84 + 0.84 + 0.03 + 0.60 + 3.25 + 0.44 + 0.84 + 1.50 + 0.31 + 1.37 + 1.30 + 5.25 + 0.84 + 0.84 + 0.03 + 0.60 + 3.25 + 0.44 = 76

## Externl Negots

|          | SPP | Coping | What Wnt Do | Contrl Career | Execs Like | Mgmt BifTch | Build Sysnt | Develop People | Manage PrsBos | Perspv Lf Wrk | Deal w Conflt | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Us/Ab Power | Mgmt Models | Do vs. Think |
|----------|-----|--------|-------------|---------------|------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| D        | 1.90| 1.60   | 1.75        | 1.60          | 2.00       | 1.44         | 1.29         | 1.22            | 1.00          | 0.77         | 0.77          | 0.77         | 0.77         | 0.77        | 0.77        | 0.00        |
| E        | 1.90| 1.60   | 1.75        | 1.60          | 2.00       | 1.44         | 1.29         | 1.22            | 1.00          | 0.77         | 0.77          | 0.77         | 0.77         | 0.77        | 0.77        | 0.00        |
| Dif      | -1.90| -1.60 | -0.25       | 0.40          | -0.29      | 0.56         | -0.29        | 1.78            | -0.99         | -0.99        | -0.99         | -0.99        | -0.99        | -0.99       | -0.99       | -0.99       |

-1.90 + 1.60 + 0.43 + 0.04 + 0.10 + 3.6 + 0.22 + 0.07 + 2.60 + 0.99 + 0.00 + 0.99 + 0.01 + 0.42 + 0.63 + 0.46 + 0.15 = 48.23**
### Values Playing Out***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Motiv</th>
<th>Mgmt Values</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Tech Know</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Busins</th>
<th>Deal w</th>
<th>Comf Ambig</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Laterl</th>
<th>Stancg</th>
<th>Human Values</th>
<th>Persevering</th>
<th>Work w</th>
<th>Persnl Limits</th>
<th>Org as Sys</th>
<th>Toughness</th>
<th>Altn Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>8.06</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-4.70</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>-3.46</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>-2.96</td>
<td>-.84</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>-.72</td>
<td>-.47</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.10 + 17.69 + .02 + 3.30 + .94 + 2.19 + .28 + 10.52 + 1.77 + .15 + 5.09 + 2.31 + .00 + .14 + .62 + .02 + .13 +

### Externl Negota | SPP        | Coping | What | Wnt Do | Contrl | Career | Execs | Like | Mgmt | DiffTch | Build | Systems | Develop | People | Manage | Perspv | LF Wrk | Deal w | Cnflct | Can't Manage | Be Prepared | Us/Ab | Power | Models | Do vs. | Think |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>- .10</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>-2.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.63***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.00 + .14 + .39 + 2.85 + .75 + .06 + 2.36 + 2.11 + .00 + .23 + 1.61 + 1.20 + 1.49 + .02 + .74 + .09 + .25 = 58.63***
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### Executive Leadership Qualities and Their Major Sources
#### Proportions and Probabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Qualities</th>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Hardships</th>
<th>Other People</th>
<th>Other Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tech Knowldge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How BUS Work</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand Alone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org as Sysm</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alltrt Sitsn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blng Systms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do vs Think</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Mvste</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal w/ Pepl</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral Coop</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Wk Execs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extln Negot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SubPerfProbm</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execs Like</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Dif Tec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devlop Pepl</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Prf&amp;Boss</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal Conflict</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Models</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mgmt Values</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Values</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't Manage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Confnc</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambig Stress</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persevering</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toughness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use/Bus Pwr</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prsnl Limit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Like Do</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ctrl Career</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percep Lf Wrk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be Prepared</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proportion (rounded percentages) of each lesson category that was reported once in conjunction with one event within an event category (Appendix, p. 367).

- p<.05
- p<.01
LESSONS: DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS ACROSS THE SIXTEEN EVENTS

The following tables show:

1. Whether and at what significance level each lesson was significantly differently distributed across the 16 events (Appendix, p. 367).
2. How each lesson was distributed across the 16 events (based on the proportion of events in the listed event category with which one of the lessons in each lesson category occurred).
3. The levels at which an individual event contributed to the overall distribution difference for each lesson [denoted by footnotes 1 and 2 (Appendix, p. 367)].

1. Direct and motivate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>VALUES PLAYOUT</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>34.3\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>31.7\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Basic management values: integrity, trust, credibility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>VALUES PLAYOUT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>30.8\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Self-confidence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>VALUES PLAYOUT</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>29\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>26.3\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Specific technical knowledge***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How the business works***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Dealing with people*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Comfort with ambiguity, stress or uncertainty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Politics is part of organizational life***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Getting lateral cooperation***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>PROJ TSK FC</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.9²</td>
<td>20.6¹</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Standing alone***

| TOTAL N (1 to 1) | SCRATCH | FIX-IT | FIRST SUPV | BREAK A RUT | SCOPE | TRAUMA | PURELY PERSNL | VALUES PLYOUT | PROJ TSK FC | EARLY WORK | LOUSY JOB | ROLE MODELS |
|------------------|---------|--------|------------|-------------|-------|--------|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| 55               | 29.4²   | 19.4²  | 13.3       | 12.5        | 11.5  | 9.1    | 6.3           | 6.2           | 5.3        | 5          | 3.7       | 2.2        |

11. Human values: sensitivity to human needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PROJ TSK FC</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.3²</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>14.3¹</td>
<td>13¹</td>
<td>12.3¹</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Persevering under adverse conditions: singleness of purpose**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PROJ TSK FC</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>27.3¹</td>
<td>18.5¹</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How to work with executives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PROJ TSK FC</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>30.8²</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Recognition of personal limits and weaknesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>BF &amp; M LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Seeing organization as systems

| TOTAL N (1 to 1) | LINE STAFF EARLY WORK FIRST SUPV PROJECT TSK FC FIX-IT SCRATCH SCOPE PURELY PERSNL BF & M LOUSY JOB VALUES PLYOUT COURSE WORK ROLE MODELS |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------|--------|------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 40               | 30.8        | 15          | 10           | 9.2    | 9           | 8.8        | 6.7        | 6.3           | 4.2    | 3.7    | 3.1        | 2.6           | 2.2    |

16. Learning to be tough: biting the bullet, doing what has to be done despite consequence--to another person

| TOTAL N (1 to 1) | EARLY WORK FIX-IT LOUSY JOB ROLE MODELS FIRST SUPV SUB PR PROBLM TRAUMA PROJECT TSK FC VALUES PLYOUT SCRATCH BF & M SCOPE |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------|--------|------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 43               | 15          | 14.9        | 11.1          | 10.9   | 10          | 9.5        | 9.1        | 6.6           | 6.2    | 5.9    | 4.2        | 3.8           |        |

17. Finding alternatives in solving and framing problems

| TOTAL N (1 to 1) | EARLY WORK COURSE WORK FIX-IT SCRATCH PROJECT TSK FC LINE STAFF FIRST SUPV ROLE MODELS VALUES PLYOUT SCOPE BF & M |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------|--------|------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 38               | 15          | 10.5        | 9.1          | 8.8    | 7.9         | 7.7        | 6.7        | 6.5           | 6.2    | 4.8    | 4.2        |               |        |

18. Strategy and tactics of negotiation with external parties

| TOTAL N (1 to 1) | PROJECT TSK FC FIX-IT EARLY WORK BREAK A RUT BF & M FIRST SUPV VALUES PLYOUT SCRATCH SCOPE |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 36               | 21.1        | 10.4        | 10           | 8.3    | 6.7         | 4.6        | 2.9        | 1             |        |          |
19. Needing to act on or confront a subordinate performance problem***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>85.7²</td>
<td>11.9²</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Strategies for coping with situations beyond your control***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>44.4²</td>
<td>27.3²</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Discovering what you really want to do, what really excites you*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.8²</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. You have to take control of your own career***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.7²</td>
<td>18.5²</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. What executives are like**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30.8²</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Management is different from technical; people are important and problematic***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How to build and/or use structure control systems***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Develop your people

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>SUB PRB PROBLM</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. How to manage people who have more experience than you or who used to be your peer or boss**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.32</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Perspective on life and work***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL N (1 to 1)</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29. Dealing with conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYOUT</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>BF &amp; M LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Can't manage it all by yourself***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Be ready to take opportunities (be prepared)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Use and abuse of power, comfort with power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Management models***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL N</th>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYOUT</th>
<th>PROJECT TSK FC</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Doing it beats hypothesizing
only 3 lessons comprise this category.
Significance Levels and Footnotes: Individual Lesson Category Distribution Patterns Across the Sixteen Event Categories

* p<.10 The levels at which event/lesson combinations were significantly differently distributed across the 16 events for each listed lesson.

** p<.05 (A chi square test was done to see if the overall distribution of event/lesson combinations was different for any of the 34 lessons across the 16 events. Please note that the entries in the chi square table were not quite independent. [Although whenever an event had more than one lesson statement in the same lesson category it was counted as only one observation of a one event/one lesson combination, it is conceivable that more than one of a particular lesson, although occurring with different events, came from the same manager.] In principle, this violates the assumption of independence necessary for the chi square. The requirement that the average cell size should be 5 is also being violated. However, because of the experimental nature of this research, we are using the chi square values as index numbers for the purpose of uncovering potential relationships of events and lessons.)

*** p<.01

1p<.05 The levels at which an individual event contributed to the overall distribution difference for the listed lesson.

2p<.01 (Having looked at the overall chi square, it was decided that individual contributions from each event to that chi square might show which events were differently associated with each lesson. For the purposes of understanding these associations, these contributions were considered chi square values with 1df. Thus, in the table, footnote 1 indicates that this chi square index number was significant at .05; footnote 2, at .01, implying that this event was associated with this lesson more than would be predicted by chance. Please note that these 16 individual tests are slightly dependent upon one another since they sum to a statistic with only 15df. However, as in the overall chi square analysis, the use of these numbers was exploratory in nature and helped in our understanding of the data.)
CHI SQUARE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE: INDIVIDUAL LESSON CATEGORY DISTRIBUTION PATTERNS ACROSS THE SIXTEEN EVENT CATEGORIES

Critical values for $X^2$ (df=15)

* = p<.10 (cut off = 22.307)
** = p<.05 (cut off = 24.996)
*** = p<.01 (cut off = 30.578)

[Asterisks below individual cells correspond with footnotes 1 and 2 (Appendix, p. 367) which indicate the event categories that contributed most to lesson category distribution difference across all the events.]

**Direct and motivate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PR</th>
<th>PROJEC</th>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK</th>
<th>A RUT</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>PLOYUT</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>PURELY</th>
<th>PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY</th>
<th>JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-2.432</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.336</td>
<td>8.176</td>
<td>-1.624</td>
<td>-6.728</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>10.016</td>
<td>-1.304</td>
<td>-0.856</td>
<td>1.552</td>
<td>-1.416</td>
<td>-3.352</td>
<td>2.536</td>
<td>-4.984</td>
<td>-1.305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Basic management values: integrity, trust, credibility**

| D           | 12          | 1     | 7     | 13    | 2     | 9     | 2    | 2     | 0     | 20    | 4     | 4     | 5     | 3     |       | 92     |


**Self-confidence**

| D           | 12          | 1     | 3     | 13    | 2     | 8     | 14    | 2     | 2     | 1     | 8     | 2     | 4     | 2     |       | 96     |
| Dif         | 5.048       | -5.200| -1.704| 2.536 | -2.264| 8.192 | 2.720 | -2.224| -1.744| -.016 | -1.728| -2.176 | -1.072 | 1.504  | -2.224 | -.744 |

### Technical Knowledge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PROB</th>
<th>PROJ TSK</th>
<th>TSC¢</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES PL CAT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>5.288</td>
<td>-1.700</td>
<td>-1.724</td>
<td>0.716</td>
<td>-2.584</td>
<td>0.662</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>4.156</td>
<td>2.036</td>
<td>5.404</td>
<td>-1.368</td>
<td>-6.036</td>
<td>-0.568</td>
<td>-0.976</td>
<td>-2.344</td>
<td>-0.964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{5.288}{2.964} & = 5.0766 \\
0.597 & + 0.798 & + 0.062 & + 2.584 & + 0.046 & + 0.333 & + 1.345 & + 1.399 & + 18.298 & + 1.368 & + 4.553 & + 0.133 & + 0.482 & + 1.643 & + 0.314 \\
& = 39.799^{***}
\end{align*}

### How the Business Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PROB</th>
<th>PROJ TSK</th>
<th>TSC¢</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES PL CAT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{1.989}{2.340} & = 4.500 \times 0.305 + 8.509 \times 2.040 + 0.356 \times 4.148 \times 1.468 \times 1.178 \times 1.101 \times 1.080 \times 1.775 \times 0.133 \times 0.482 \times 1.643 \times 0.314 \times 39.799^{***}
\end{align*}

### Dealing with People

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PROB</th>
<th>PROJ TSK</th>
<th>TSC¢</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES PL CAT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>1.156</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>-1.038</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>-2.108</td>
<td>4.374</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.522</td>
<td>-2.418</td>
<td>-0.302</td>
<td>-1.116</td>
<td>-4.572</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>-2.728</td>
<td>2.582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
0.348 & + 0.586 & + 0.355 & + 0.009 & + 2.108 & + 2.509 & + 1.967 & + 0.607 & + 2.418 & + 0.070 & + 1.116 & + 3.181 & + 0.520 & + 1.195 & + 2.728 & + 2.757 = 22.473^{*}
\end{align*}

### Comfort with Ambiguity, Stress, or Uncertainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PROB</th>
<th>PROJ TSK</th>
<th>TSC¢</th>
<th>SCRTCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES PL CAT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-0.720</td>
<td>-3.500</td>
<td>-1.940</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>-2.040</td>
<td>4.620</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>2.860</td>
<td>-1.340</td>
<td>2.740</td>
<td>-1.080</td>
<td>-2.360</td>
<td>2.080</td>
<td>-0.560</td>
<td>-2.340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
0.139 & + 2.722 & + 1.280 & + 0.925 & + 2.040 & + 2.892 & + 0.148 & + 0.807 & + 0.767 & + 5.958 & + 1.080 & + 0.876 & + 2.253 & + 0.201 & + 0.049 & + 2.340 = 24.479^{*}
\end{align*}

369
Politics is part of organizational life**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PR PROBLM</th>
<th>TSK FC</th>
<th>SCRCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.703+ 1.095+ 1.066+ .000+ 1.870+ 1.547+ .000+ 5.725+ 2.145+ .618+ .990+ 6.530+ .328+ .129+ 17.891+ .3.800 = 45.438**

Lateral cooperation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>= 56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Standing alone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>= 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-3.41</td>
<td>-3.125</td>
<td>1.305</td>
<td>7.005</td>
<td>-1.870</td>
<td>-2.765</td>
<td>6.975</td>
<td>2.705</td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>-1.155</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-1.83</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>-2.145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Human values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>= 46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.052</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>5.014</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>5.658</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>7.774</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>4.876</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>1.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4.746</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>-2.658</td>
<td>-2.53</td>
<td>-4.774</td>
<td>-1.794</td>
<td>-.966</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>3.124</td>
<td>-4.72</td>
<td>1.804</td>
<td>-1.024</td>
<td>-.794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.008+ 1.885+ 2.933+ .000+ 1.319+ 1.249+ 2.53+ 2.932+ 1.794+ .966+ 1.659+ 2.002+ .152+ 2.721+ .518+ .351 = 30.077**
### Persevering under adverse conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PR</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES PLOYUT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSONL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>3.450</td>
<td>2.254</td>
<td>5.014</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>5.658</td>
<td>2.530</td>
<td>7.774</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>4.876</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>1.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>5.535</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>7.605</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-2.06</td>
<td>-1.175</td>
<td>-.450</td>
<td>-1.056</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>-2.365</td>
<td>-1.177</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>-.376</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### How to work with executives*

| O            | 2.79 | 3.375 | 2.205  | 4.905  | 1.53    | 5.535   | 2.475 | 7.605       | .945      | .81    | 4.77         | 1.44       | 1.17          | 1.98      | 1.755  |
| E            | 2.79 | 3.375 | 2.205  | 4.905  | 1.53    | 5.535   | 2.475 | 7.605       | .945      | .81    | 4.77         | 1.44       | 1.17          | 1.98      | 1.755  |
| Dif          | .79  | -2.375| -.205  | 1.095  | -1.53   | 4.465   | -1.475 | -1.605      | -1.755    | 3.055  | -.376        | -.159      | -.71          | .02      | .245   |

.224+.1671+.019+.024+.153+.360+.091+.048+.325+.876+.91+.124+1.44+1.17+.0002+2.872 = 24.047*

### Recognition of personal limits and weaknesses**

| Dif          | .334 | -1.225 | -.107  | -1.687 | -.462   | -2.289  | -1.365 | 1.733      | -1.677    | -.903  | 1.226-1.558  | -.376      | .882          | 3.108     | 4.323  |

.042+.065+.009+.607+.146+.991+.789+.413+1.677+.903+1.942+.533+.103+.696+5.106+11.144 = 25.561**

### Seeing organization as systems*

| Dif          | -1.480-2.000 | 1.040 | 1.640-1.360 | 2.080 | .800 | .240-1.560 | 3.160 | -.720-2.240 | 1.720- -.040 | -.760- -.560 | **

### Toughness

| COURSE WORK | ROLE MODELS | FIRST SUPY | FIX-IT | SUB PR | PROJ TSK FC | SCRTCH | SCOPE | BREAK | LINE | STAFF | TRAUMA | VALUES | EARLY | PURELY | LOUSY | BIF & M |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------|--------|-------------|--------|-------|--------|------|-------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|---------|
| 0           | 0           | 5           | 3      | 10     | 2           | 5      | 2     | 4      | 0    | 1     | 4      | 3      | 0      | 3     | 1      | 43    |

\[
2.666 + .977 + .379 + 6.023 = 18.454
\]

### Finding alternatives in solving and framing problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>1.644</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>-1.292</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>-1.422</td>
<td>-1.482</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>-684</td>
<td>-6028</td>
<td>1.784</td>
<td>-988</td>
<td>-1.672</td>
<td>-482</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
1.147 + .008 + .010 + .833 + 1.292 + .376 + .396 + .315 + 1.482 + .051 + .684 + .000 + 2.617 + .988 + 1.672 + .157 = 12.028
\]

### External negotiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.232</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.764</td>
<td>3.924</td>
<td>1.224</td>
<td>4.428</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>6.084</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>3.816</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td>1.584</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-2.232</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>3.076</td>
<td>-1.224</td>
<td>11.572</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>-5.084</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>-.756</td>
<td>-.648</td>
<td>-.816</td>
<td>-.848</td>
<td>-.936</td>
<td>-.1584</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\]

### Needing to act on or confront a subordinate performance problem

| 0           | 0           | 0           | 18          | 0           | 0           | 1           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 2           | 1           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 0           | 30    |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------|
| Dif         | 1.860       | -2.250      | -1.470      | 4.73        | 16.980      | -3.690      | -1.650      | -4.070      | -1.170      | -.630       | -.540       | -1.180      | -.840       | -.780       | -1.320      | -1.170      |

\[
\]
Strategies for coping with situations beyond your control***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE WORK</th>
<th>ROLE MODELS</th>
<th>FIRST SUPV</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUB PR</th>
<th>PROJ TSK</th>
<th>SCRATCH</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES PLYOUT</th>
<th>EARLY WORK</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY JOB</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.170</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>1.715</td>
<td>3.815</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>4.305</td>
<td>1.925</td>
<td>5.915</td>
<td>1.365</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>3.710</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>1.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>-2.170</td>
<td>-1.625</td>
<td>-1.715</td>
<td>-1.815</td>
<td>-1.190</td>
<td>-1.305</td>
<td>-1.925</td>
<td>-1.915</td>
<td>-3.65</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>-1.710</td>
<td>-1.120</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>1.460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.170+ 1.006+ .298+ .863+ 1.190+ .396+ 1.925+ .620+ .098+ .096+ .816+ .788+ 1.120+ 1.306+ .710+ 1.950 = 93.796***

What want to do*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.046</td>
<td>2.475</td>
<td>1.617</td>
<td>3.597</td>
<td>1.122</td>
<td>4.059</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>5.577</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>3.498</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>1.452</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>- .046</td>
<td>-.475</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>-.597</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>-2.059</td>
<td>2.185</td>
<td>.423</td>
<td>3.713</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>-.594</td>
<td>-3.498</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.001+ .091+ .091+ .099+ .013+.104+ 2.630+ .032+10.712+ 2.465+ .594+ 3.498+ .844+ .024+ .141+ 1.287 = 23.566*

You have to take control of your own career***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-1.020</td>
<td>3.690</td>
<td>- .650</td>
<td>-2.070</td>
<td>8.830</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>-.540</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>-.960</td>
<td>-.780</td>
<td>.3680</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


What executives are like**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>-1.470</td>
<td>.730</td>
<td>-1.020</td>
<td>- .690</td>
<td>- .650</td>
<td>- .070</td>
<td>-1.170</td>
<td>3.370</td>
<td>-.540</td>
<td>-1.180</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.780</td>
<td>-.320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.011+ 1.361+ 1.470+ .163+ 1.020+ .129+ .256+ .001+ .025+18.027+ .940+ .010+ .002+ .780+ 1.320+ .589 = 25.703**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ROLE</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUBPRI</th>
<th>PROBTL</th>
<th>TSK FC</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>LERVE</th>
<th>CREAT</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>A RUT</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODELS SUPV</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>4.025</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF &amp; M</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURELY LOUSY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL JOB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>2.943</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>2.862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management is different from technical

How to build and/or use structure and control systems

Developing your people

How to manage people who have more experience than you or who used to be your peer or boss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ROLE</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUBPRI</th>
<th>PROBTL</th>
<th>TSK FC</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>LERVE</th>
<th>CREAT</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>A RUT</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODELS SUPV</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>2.616</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.055</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>5.004</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>2.544</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF &amp; M</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>2.616</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.055</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>5.004</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>2.544</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURELY LOUSY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL JOB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>2.616</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.055</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>1.976</td>
<td>5.004</td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>2.544</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management is different from technical

How to build and/or use structure and control systems

Developing your people

How to manage people who have more experience than you or who used to be your peer or boss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ROLE</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUBPRI</th>
<th>PROBTL</th>
<th>TSK FC</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>LERVE</th>
<th>CREAT</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>A RUT</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODELS SUPV</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF &amp; M</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURELY LOUSY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL JOB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25+</td>
<td>0.98+</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management is different from technical

How to build and/or use structure and control systems

Developing your people

How to manage people who have more experience than you or who used to be your peer or boss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE ROLE</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>SUBPRI</th>
<th>PROBTL</th>
<th>TSK FC</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>CARE</th>
<th>LERVE</th>
<th>CREAT</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>A RUT</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURELY LOUSY</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL JOB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Perspective on life and work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>SUPY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>SCRITCH</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dif</strong></td>
<td>2.884</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.1038</td>
<td>-.612</td>
<td>-.2214</td>
<td>-.990</td>
<td>-.3042</td>
<td>-.702</td>
<td>-.378</td>
<td>4.676</td>
<td>-.908</td>
<td>-.576</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>1.298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conflict

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>SUPY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>SCRITCH</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dif</strong></td>
<td>-1.116</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.1038</td>
<td>-.612</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>-1.042</td>
<td>-.702</td>
<td>-.378</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.1092</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>-.468</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Can't manage it all by yourself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>SUPY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>SCRITCH</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.275</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>1.853</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>2.091</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>2.873</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.357</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>1.802</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dif</strong></td>
<td>-1.054</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.578</td>
<td>-.2091</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>9.127</td>
<td>-.663</td>
<td>-.643</td>
<td>-.306</td>
<td>-.802</td>
<td>-.544</td>
<td>-.442</td>
<td>-.748</td>
<td>-.663</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.054</strong></td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>2.091</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.28995</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>1.802</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.442</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.953 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Being ready to take opportunities (be prepared)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>FIX-IT</th>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>SUPY</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SCOPE</th>
<th>SCRITCH</th>
<th>BREAK A RUT</th>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>TRAUMA</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>EARLY</th>
<th>PURELY PERSNL</th>
<th>LOUSY</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dif</strong></td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>-.490</td>
<td>-1.090</td>
<td>-.340</td>
<td>-1.230</td>
<td>-.550</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.180</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.233</strong></td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>1.090</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>1.230</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td><strong>2.106</strong></td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>15.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Power use/abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Work</th>
<th>Role Models</th>
<th>First Superv</th>
<th>Fix-It</th>
<th>Sub Plan Problem</th>
<th>Project Task FC</th>
<th>Scratch</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Break A Rut</th>
<th>Line Staff</th>
<th>Trauma</th>
<th>Values Ployout</th>
<th>Early Work</th>
<th>Purely Pernl</th>
<th>Louisy Job</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dif</td>
<td>- .496</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>- .392</td>
<td>2.128</td>
<td>- .272</td>
<td>- .934</td>
<td>- .94</td>
<td>- .352</td>
<td>- .312</td>
<td>- .168</td>
<td>- .856</td>
<td>- .848</td>
<td>- .256</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[.496 + .267 + .392 + 5.193 + .272 + .934 + .94 + .092 + .312 + .168 + 5.088 + .848 + .256 + 3.016 + 1.193 + .312 = 19.329\]

### Management models***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Work</th>
<th>Role Models</th>
<th>First Superv</th>
<th>Fix-It</th>
<th>Sub Plan Problem</th>
<th>Project Task FC</th>
<th>Scratch</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Break A Rut</th>
<th>Line Staff</th>
<th>Trauma</th>
<th>Values Ployout</th>
<th>Early Work</th>
<th>Purely Pernl</th>
<th>Louisy Job</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td>1.352</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[40.899 + .600 + .392 + .872 + .272 + .000 + .440 + .092 + .312 + .168 + .144 + .027 + .256 + .208 + .352 + .312 = 45.346***\]

### Doing beats thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Work</th>
<th>Role Models</th>
<th>First Superv</th>
<th>Fix-It</th>
<th>Sub Plan Problem</th>
<th>Project Task FC</th>
<th>Scratch</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Break A Rut</th>
<th>Line Staff</th>
<th>Trauma</th>
<th>Values Ployout</th>
<th>Early Work</th>
<th>Purely Pernl</th>
<th>Louisy Job</th>
<th>BF &amp; M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[.186 + .225 + .147 + .327 + .102 + 2.209 + .165 + .479 + .117 + .063 + .054 + .318 + .096 + .078 + .132 + .117 = 9.815\]
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Other Articles From This Research


Deals with the issues involved in trying to balance the demands of the executive job with those of a fulfilling personal life. Based in part on the interviews with successful executives done for the study of learning, growth, and change.


Written prior to analysis of the data from this research on successful executives, this article reports the results of a review of research done on executive development and selection.


This article summarizes executives' descriptions of five kinds of assignments they thought had developed them: Fix-It, Starting from Scratch, Change in Scope, Line to Staff Switches, and Project/Task Force.


"Values Playing Out" is one of the sixteen kinds of events executives described for this study, but the short duration and high impact of these value-laden incidents makes them unusual. This technical report explores these vignettes in depth, suggesting that the culture of a corporation emerges from accumulations of such displays.


Job rotation, mentors, executives as tough guys, and perfection all get slammed in this article based on the interviews with 79 executives.

intolerable boss. Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership.

Most executives (75% of those we interviewed) admit that at some point in their career they had a boss they considered intolerable. This paper documents what these successful executives saw as intolerable in a boss, and more importantly, how they coped with the situation.


Sometimes extremely successful executives who have reached very high levels and are expected to go even higher don't. This study compares those who derailed with those who didn't, and reports the qualities that propelled the derailers as high as they went, the flaws that did them in, the situations that surfaced those flaws, and how the derailers differed from those who made it.


Written for a general audience, this book is a summary of this study of key events and the lessons they taught.


This short research report provides information on efforts to develop a questionnaire (the Job Challenge Profile) for measuring the developmental potential of jobs. The instrument, based on a content analysis of the descriptions of key events in executives' lives, captured six dimensions of challenge in jobs.


As the title indicates, this paper reviews the research we could find dealing with learning on the job.

This unpublished report describes in detail the methods used to collect and analyze the data from the 79 interviews with executives. These were the activities that resulted in the initial framework of events and lessons.
The Center for Creative Leadership is a nonprofit educational institution founded in 1970 in Greensboro, North Carolina. Our mission is to encourage and develop creative leadership and effective management for the good of society overall. We accomplish our mission through research, training, and publication—with emphasis on the widespread, innovative application of the behavioral sciences to the challenges facing the leaders of today and tomorrow.

Through our research, we are developing models of managerial practice; through our training programs, we are applying these models as guides for assessment and development. This combined approach makes our research accessible and our training practical.