Chapter-1
1.0 Introduction

This chapter comprises of two sections. The first section deals with trust, its dimensions and related aspects. The second section deals with the dimensions of managerial performance and managerial roles.

1.1 Trust and its Development

Trust is feeling wherein one can expect that the word or promise of another individual, whether verbal or written, can be relied upon (Rotter, 1971). It is a “Behavior that conveys appropriate information, permits mutuality of influence, encourages self-control, and avoids abuse of the vulnerability of others” (Zand, 1972). Yet, another conceptualization explains trust as, “an expectation or belief that one can rely upon another person’s actions and words and/or that the person has good intentions toward oneself” (Mc Allister, 1995). It determines the extent to which one is willing to rely upon and make oneself vulnerable to another (Bigley & Pearce, 1998). “Trust is one’s willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the other is beneficent, honest, open, reliable, and competent” (Tschannen-Moran, 2004).

Convergence of goals set jointly create trust and commitment (Das and Teng, 1998). Speeding up trust building depends on individual and organizational communications as well as on interpersonal and partnership competencies.

Three fundamental types of trust enumerated by Joni (2004) are:

- **Personal Trust**, based on faith in person’s integrity, is a trust at its most fundamental level and widely understood. It is the trust of confidences.
shared without thought of betrayal, ideas revealed without fear that they will be pirated, and tasks assigned to teammates with the assurance that they will try hard not to let you down?

High personal trust exists when we answer yes to the following questions: Is this person honest and ethical? Will he make good on his word? Is he basically well intentioned? Will he handle confidential information with care and discretion? Will he be straight forward about what he doesn’t know?

- **Expertise trust** is reliance on an adviser’s ability in a specific subject area. In our daily lives we show expertise trust every time we board a plane or schedule surgery. In organizations, leaders develop expertise trust by working closely with people who consistently demonstrate their mastery of particular subjects or processes. Or, lacking personal experience with qualified people, we seek out those with the strongest reputations. Unlike personal trust, the parameters of expertise trust tend to be limited to a particular content area. Even though one would have worked with colleague enough to know that he/she has world-class mind when it comes to thinking strategically about markets and segmentation, yet one would hesitate-correctly-to consult him/her on any subject outside that realm.

High expertise trust exists when we answer is yes to the following questions: Is this person expert in his/her field? Is his/her knowledge up-to-date? Does he/she present credible information to support her positions? Is he/she able to apply the expertise to the specific situation? Can he/she offer sage advice on risks, options, and trade-offs.

- **Structural trust** reflects how roles and ambition affect advice and spin information. High structural trust provides leaders with a channel for pure insight and information. People with high structural trust are individuals whose advice is sought by people in power e.g. President Johnson sought the advice of Mr. Clark Clifford, who held no official position. It was Mr. Clark Clifford expertise as well as the fact that he had no stake in the government that gave him a position of high structural trust.
High structural trust exists when we answer yes to the following questions. Given this person’s role and responsibilities, can he offer judgment untainted by his goals or interest? Is he in a position to be fully loyal? Is he unlikely to spin or filter information? Is it reasonable to assume he will not move into a role that places structural constraints on our level of trust (for example, will we someday compete for the same position or for the same client)?

Trust takes a long time to build, is fragile and gets obliterated on a slight doubt and then becomes difficult to regain it again (Sonnenberg 1993). Since trust begets trust and distrust begets distrust, maintaining trust requires delicate handling and careful attention. Natural trust develops slowly (Barney & Hansen, 1994), though incremental investments and experiences increase the possibility to develop trust.

Conditional trust may be enough for an exchange relationship to function at a certain level (Zucker, 1986), but the need to monitor and control remains. Trust is always fragile and the early, conditional trust is on a testing period. Even minor signals of distrust may freeze the interest and attempt to develop the relationship may be viewed with suspicion. If there is deterioration in trust, parties can no longer take the role of the other with dependability and the process of distrust starts. If the parties are able to reach level of unconditional trust, they may concentrate fully on the task to be accomplished.

1.1.1 Dimensions of trust

Trust is the basis of human relationships and it supports the ethical norms of human behavior. Chartier (1991) held that generation of trust calls for a collage of characteristics and attitudes. Table 1-1 presents various personal characteristics, attitudes, and behaviors that contribute to a climate of trust. The level of trust depends on the degree to which some or all are present.
Table 1-1: TRUST ORIENTATION PROFILE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Willing to Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accepting and Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Accountable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Genuine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mutual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Problem Centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dependable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Chartier, 1991)

Tschannen-Moran (2004) also suggested the key ingredients as depicted in table 1-2, that make for trustworthy relationship.
### Table 1-2: FACETS OF TRUST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACETS OF TRUST</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Caring, extending good will, having positive intentions, supporting staff, expressing appreciation for staff efforts, being fair, guarding confidential information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>Having integrity, telling the truth, keeping promises, honoring agreements, having authenticity, accepting responsibility, avoiding manipulation, being real, being true to oneself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>Engaging in open communication, sharing important information, delegating, sharing decision making, sharing power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Having consistency, being dependable, demonstrating commitment, having dedication, being diligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Setting an example, engaging in problem solving, fostering conflict resolution (rather than avoidance), working hard, pressing for results, setting standards, buffering staff, handling difficult situations, being flexible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Tschannen-Moran, 2004)

**1.1.2 Trust and Communication**

The 'Johari Window' model proposes that mutual trust improves perceptual accuracy and communication
In addition to information based on facts (Sydow, 1998), information on feelings, intentions, and opinions should also be communicated. In successful communication, there exists complexity of network relations, wherein organizational functionaries transact with one another for a variety of reasons and exchange different contents, i.e., information and emotions. If a communicator is able to be clear and precise on the issue and simultaneously add and develop the dialogue, she/he is bound to develop a trusting relationship.

If trust is shown honestly in the form of proactive information, advice, and social support, it serves as a strong building block for trust.

1.1.3 Trust and Team Work

Trust is an important element of effective work groups (Golembieske & McConkie, 1975, and Larson & La Fasto, 1989). Theory Z also suggests that large complex organizations are human systems and their effectiveness depends on the quality of humanism used. Mutual trust between members of an organization reduces conflict and leads to team work (Gupta, 1990). Work teams are the building blocks of organizations and responsible for organizational development (French and Bell, 1995).
This model argues for more open communication on the assumption that people understand each other better when the amount of information in the open area increases. The trust leads to more accurate and complete information. The level of confidence and influence is higher in a trusting environment (Zand, 1972). The constituents are depicted in the Figure 1-2.

Figure 1-2: RELATIONSHIP OF TRUST TO INFORMATION, INFLUENCE AND CONTROL

**TRUST**
Increase one's vulnerability to others whose behavior one cannot control

**CONTROL**
Accept more interdependence with others. Impose less procedure to control others. Greater confidence that others will do what they agree to. Greater commitment to do what one agreed to

**INFORMATION**
Disclose more accurate, relevant, and complete data about the problem, one's thoughts and one's feelings

**INFLUENCE**
Accept more influence from others in selection of goals, Choice of methods, evaluation of progress

(Source: Zand, 1972)

Leaders can build trust in teams members by role modeling (Rich, 1997). High-performance teams are characterized by high mutual trust among its members. That is, members believe in the integrity, character and ability of each other. (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1996; Shamir, Zakay, Breinen & Popper, 1998).
Trust is even more important in cross-functional, geographically distributed dyads because of the different disciplinary perspectives and the lack of face-to-face interaction while working at a distance. Trust improves the work process and performance of both members of the dyad, i.e., the trustor and the trustee, leading to a greater work output, marked by larger output in less time, less cost and of better quality (Zolin Fruchter and Hinds 2003). Trusting behavior leads to optimization of organizational processes, such as, decision-making, communication, leadership, motivation, control, and coordination giving rise to synergistic outcomes in terms of quality outputs at lower costs. Trust helps in integrating individual, group, and organizational goals.

1.1.4 Trust and Relationships

In an ongoing relationship, there is a sense of care, not just care about the immediate outcome but also care about the relationship. People make emotional investments in trust relationships and believe that these sentiments are reciprocated (McAllister, 1995). When trust in the benevolence of others is missing, there is likely to be a cost in overall productivity as energy is invested in making mental provisions or alternative plans or in assessing the available recourse in case of lack of trust.

One of the important requirements for managerial success is to gain and sustain people’s attention (Davenport & Beck, 2000), which may be better achieved if it is sent by trustworthy managers having credible relationships. People do not want their time, or their attention, wasted. The scarcest resource for today’s business managers is no longer just land, capital, human labor, or information. Attention is what is in short supply.

Investing in relationships is important not only with the frontline employees but also with the unions and supervisors for the success of the enterprise (Gittell, 2001). Respect as a culture ripples through the entire business if one goes after people’s hearts. Encouraging and providing help to young employees for their growth rather than just the operational focus develops trust and makes the relationship bonds stronger, which results in short and
long term organizational success. Understanding people and the relationship between them is at the core of group-formation to decide ‘What group will work together best to get a specific job done?’

1.1.5 Trust and Performance

The productivity of departments with high group loyalty, one of the components of trust, exceed the productivity of departments with low group loyalty. Supportive leaders are more productive through effective work teams and are accepted as leaders in unstructured situations as well. This highlights the significance of trust generating leader behavior. Positive qualities tend to be inferred from high team performance and negative qualities tend to be inferred from poor team performance (Staw, 1975).

Trusting culture results in effective performance (Dwivedi, 1980), which is reflected in accomplishment of higher levels of outputs, reduction in restraining behavior, such as, employee-turnover, absenteeism, indiscipline, grievances, and unrest to the lowest possible levels and enhancement of participants' morale.

Trust is a core basis of effective leadership (Bennis & Nanus, 1984). Lack of trust in an organization can lead to a culture of control and the likely response is the institution of rules in the organization to serve as a substitute of trust (Zucker, 1986) and is likely to affect performance. Trustworthiness is an important trait of leaders (Bass, 1990). Argyris (1964), McGregor (1967), and Likert (1967) highlighted the significance of trust in leadership for effective organizations.

Trust in leadership is important in that it allows the team to be willing to accept the leader’s activities, goals, and decisions and work hard to achieve them (Dirks, 2000). When the team feels that they cannot rely upon the leader and/or that the leader does not have their interests at heart, they are unlikely to carry out the roles specified by the leader, and work towards the performance-related objectives and strategies set by the leader. This will make it difficult for the team to work together effectively and perform at a high level.
1.2 Facets of Managerial Performance

Managerial performance is a subset of organizational performance. The performance measures for the organization have always been a matter of discussion and concern. The early approaches concentrated mainly on tangible financial parameters such as, Profitability Ratios - return on investment (ROI), operating expense ratio, earnings per share (EPS), Liquidity Ratios - current ratio, quick ratio, Leverage Ratios - total debt ratio, debt equity ratio, capital equity ratio, Activity Ratios - assets turnover, inventory turnover, debtors turnover. These measures focus on the quantitative aspect of managerial performance. As the perspectives on managerial performance changed, organizations also started to focus on the qualitative aspects of performance like job satisfaction, employee turnover, customer satisfaction among others.

We shall discuss ahead how the two perspectives of managerial performance (quantitative and qualitative) evolved.

The three perspectives on managerial effectiveness (Page, Wilson and Mayer, 1999) are:

- A traditional/conventional perspective
- A strategic management/organizational level competency approach
- An individual level competency-based approach to managerial effectiveness

Traditional/conventional approach. The perspective on management was developed in the era of business stability and drew heavily on the work of Mintzberg (1973) and Katz (1974).

Traditionally management was established as a process of planning, organizing, leading and controlling. Mintzberg added interpersonal, informational and decisional managerial roles. Katz provided a typology of managerial skills, termed 'Technical', 'Human' and 'Conceptual'.

Strategic Management/Organization competency approach. In the strategic perspective, the emphasis is on identifying a set of core competences.
(strengths) of the organization in order to achieve and sustain a competitive advantage

Competency-based approach at individual level Managerial performance is evaluated by measuring transferable management skills that are applicable across different circumstances. This management model focuses solely on the human input provided by managers.

This perspective on managerial effectiveness has its share of detractors. Critics opine that it doesn't consider the impact of circumstances which can have a major role in deciding managerial effectiveness. Further, it focuses on assessable technical skills and ignores the importance of more abstract personal characteristics like sensitivity, emotional stability, and credibility.

In spite of these problems, this approach has been adopted at national, industry, and organizational levels.

The organizational performance is affected by a number of factors such as commitment, decision-making, communication, control, motivation, organizational structure, conflict management, and leadership style. It is also presumed that within the parameters of available resources and external environment, the degree of variation for organizational performance does not have a definite relationship with any single factor.

This evolutionary perspective has been crisply crystallized by (Quinn, Faerman, Thompson, and McGrath, 1990). Key context and process of emergence of these models are presented, in brief, below.

The models and definitions of management keep evolving (Quinn, 1990). As societal values change, existing viewpoints alter and new models of management emerge. The four major management models evolved from the conditions in each of the first three quarters of the twentieth century are enumerated here below. The emergence of each new model indicates that some additional dimensions to conceptualizations of managerial job were
added. It complemented the earlier view and enriched the perspective of managerial roles and responsibilities.

**1900-1925: The Rational Goal Model and the Internal Process Models**

The first 25 years of this century witnessed exciting growth and progress. It contributed to the high prosperity of the twenties. The economy was characterized by rich resources, cheap labor and laissez-faire policies. This was a period of ‘survival of the fittest’. Taylor introduced a variety of techniques for rationalizing work. Efficiency was the key concern. Henry Ford was principle and most visible exponent of this model.

In this historical context the first two models of management began to emerge. The first being *rational goal model*. Key decisions were driven by considerations of the bottom line. Ultimate criteria of effectiveness were productivity and profit. The manager, in this context, played the role of the *director and producer*.

The second model, the *internal process model* also emerged simultaneously. In this model the emphasis was on stability and continuity. Earlier Fayol and later Max Weber helped codify this approach. The core belief was that routinisation leads to stability. Key processes focused on definition of responsibilities, measurements, documentation and record keeping. The ultimate value was efficient work flow and the manager’s job was to be a structured *monitor and coordinator*.

**1926-1950: The Human Relations Model**

During this period, some fundamental changes began to appear in the fabric of society during the second quarter of the century. Unions, now a significant force, adhered to an economic agenda. Worker’s earning increased. There was a sense of prosperity and a concern with recreation as well as survival. Factory workers were not as eager as their parents had been to accept the opportunity to work overtime. Neither were they as likely to give unquestioning obedience to authority. Hence, managers were
finding that the rational goal and internal process models were no longer as effective as they once were.

The emerging orientation was thus the *human relations model* in this model, the key values were commitment, cohesion, and morale. The central processes were participation, conflict resolution, and consensus building. The organization took a clanlike, team-oriented climate in which decision-making was characterized by deep involvement. Here, if an employee's efficiency declined, managers took a developmental perspective and looked at a complex set of motivational factors. They altered the person's degree of participation through application of social psychological variables. The manager's job became sensitive *mentor and facilitator*.

**1951-1975: The Open Systems Model**

In this period, there was a marked shift from a clear product economy to the beginnings of a service economy. Technological advances began to occur at an ever-increasing rate. Societal values also shifted dramatically. A more individualistic and conservative orientation began to take root. Spurred by considerable prosperity and higher levels of education, workers were now concerned not only with money and recreation but also with self-fulfillment. Women began to move into professions. The agenda of labor expanded to include social and political issues. Organizations became knowledge intense, and it was no longer possible to expect the boss to know more than every person he or she supervised.

In the mid-sixties, spurred by the ever-increasing rate of change and the need to understand how to manage in a fast-changing, knowledge-intense world, a variety of academics began to crystallize open systems model of organization. This model was more dynamic than others. The manager was no longer seen as a rational decision maker controlling a machinelike organization. Mintzberg (1973), for example, showed that in contrast to the highly systematic pictures portrayed in the principles of administration, managers live in highly unpredictable environments and have little time to
organize and plan. There are, instead, bombarded by constant stimuli and forced to take rapid decisions. Such observations were consistent with the movement to develop contingency theories. These theories recognized the over-simplicity of earlier approaches.

In the *open systems model*, the organization is faced with a need to compete in an ambiguous as well as competitive environment. The key criteria of organizational effectiveness were adaptability and external support. Because of the emphasis on organizational flexibility and responsiveness, key processes were political adaptation, creative problem solving, innovation, and the management of change. The organization had to have innovative climate and was more of an adhocracy rather than a bureaucracy. In this situation, common vision and shared values were very important. The manager was expected to play the role of *innovator/change catalyst and broker/ambassador*.

**1976 ONWARDS: Variety of different perspectives or models**

Subsequently, it became apparent that organizations were in deep trouble. US economy faced severe competition from Japanese products. In the labor force, knowledge work became commonplace and physical labor rare. Labor unions experienced major setbacks as organizations struggled to downsize their staffs and increase quality at the same time. The issue of job security became increasingly important in labor negotiations. Organizations faced new issues, such as takeover and downsizing. One middle manager struggled to do the job previously done by two or three. Burnout and stress became hot topics. Revitalize a stagnant organization became a key concern.

In a world of intense competition and change, the new buzzwords were excellence, quality, customer driven, urgency, continuous improvement culture, transformational leadership, and integrity. These reflected the challenge of revitalizing the still bureaucratic orientations of the 1951 to 1975 period to an orientation of continuous responsiveness in a highly ambiguous and fast-changing environment.
In such a situation, simple solutions became suspect. None of the four models summarized in Table 1-3 offered a sufficient answer. Even the more complex open systems approach was not sufficient. Sometimes structure was required, sometimes change. But, more and more, we needed both at the same time. Today, for example, many organizations find themselves both downsizing and expanding simultaneously. Managing such a process was inherently difficult.

Table 1-3: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FOUR MANAGEMENT MODELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of effectiveness</th>
<th>Rational Goal Model</th>
<th>Internal Process Model</th>
<th>Human Relations Model</th>
<th>Open Systems Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Productivity, profit</td>
<td>Stability, continuity</td>
<td>Commitment, cohesion morale</td>
<td>Adaptable, external support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear direction leads to productive outcomes</td>
<td>Belief that routinization leads to stability</td>
<td>Belief that involvement results in commitment</td>
<td>Continual adaptation and innovation lead to acquiring and maintaining external resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal clarification, rational analysis, and action taking</td>
<td>Defining responsibility, measurement, documentation</td>
<td>Participation conflict resolution, and consensus building</td>
<td>Political adaptation, creative problem solving, innovation change management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational economic * the bottom line</td>
<td>Hierarchical</td>
<td>Team oriented</td>
<td>Innovative, flexible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director and producer</td>
<td>Monitor and coordinator</td>
<td>Mentor and facilitator</td>
<td>Innovator and Broker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Quinn Faerman, Thompson and McGrath 1990)
Most of the times, one thinks of the concept of organization in a very static and purposeful way. One reason we have this perception is because of our experience. At the lowest levels organizations are encountered as relatively stable, predictable patterns of action. They appear to be, or at least we expect them to be, the ultimate product of rational-deductive thinking. We think of them as static mechanisms designed to accomplish some single purpose.

Organizations are dynamic. Particularly as one moves up, things become less tangible and less predictable. A primary characteristic of managing, particularly at higher organizational leaders spend much of their time living in fields of perceived tensions. They are often no right answers.

The people who come to be masters of management do not see their work environment only in structured, analytic ways. Instead, they also have the capacity to see it as a complex, dynamic system that is constantly evolving. In order to interact effectively with it, they employ a variety of different perspectives or models. As one set of conditions arises, they focus on certain cues that lead them to apply a very analytic and structured approach. As these cues fade, they were being very intuitive and flexible. At another time they may emphasize the overall task, and at still another they may focus on the welfare of a single individual.

Quinn (1988) highlighted that the four models need not be seen independently, but rather as competing or complementary elements in a larger model of management. These models can be viewed as closely related and interwoven. Taken alone, no one of the models offers the range of perspectives and the increased choice and potential effectiveness provided by considering them all as part of a larger framework known as competing values framework, where the inputs are competing or also complementary.

The managerial performance must, therefore, focus on all the areas of the competing values framework. This study makes use of this conceptualization of managerial job and evaluates managerial performance.
in terms of these complimentary roles i.e. of a director, producer, monitor, coordinator, facilitator, mentor, innovator/change catalyst and broker/ambassador.

Figure 1-3: COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK FOR MANAGERIAL PERFORMANCE

The relationships among the models can be seen in terms of two axes. The vertical axis ranges from flexibility at the top to control at the bottom. The horizontal axis ranges from an internal organization focus at the left to an external organization focus at the right. Each model fits in one of the four quadrants.
The human relations model, for example, stresses the criteria shown in the upper left quadrant: participation, openness, commitment, and morale. The open systems model stresses the criteria shown in the upper right quadrant: innovation, adaptation, growth, and resource acquisition.

The rational goal model stresses the criteria shown in the lower right quadrant: direction and goal clarity, and productivity and accomplishment. The internal process model, in the lower left quadrant, stresses documentation, information management, stability, and control.

Each model has a perceptual opposite. The human relations model, defined by flexibility and internal focus, stands in contrast to the rational goal model, which is defined by control and external focus. In the first, for example, people are inherently valued. In the second, people are of value only if they contribute greatly to goal attainment.

The open systems model, defined by flexibility and external focus, runs counter to the internal process model, which is defined by control and internal focus. While the open systems model is concerned with adapting to the continuous change in the environment, the internal process model is concerned with maintaining stability and continuity inside the system.

Parallels among the models are also important. The human relations and open systems models share an emphasis on flexibility. The open systems and rational goal models share an emphasis on external focus. The rational goal and internal process models emphasize control. And, the internal process and human relations models share an emphasis on internal focus.

The general values reflected in the competing values framework are given below:

The framework reflects the complexity confronted by people in real organizations. It therefore provides a tool to broaden thinking and to increase choice and effectiveness. This, however, can only happen as three challenges are met.
Figure 1-4: EIGHT GENERAL ORIENTATIONS IN COMPETING VALUES FRAMEWORK

(Source Quinn, 1988)
Challenge 1 - To appreciate both the values and the weaknesses of each of the four models

Challenge 2 - To acquire and use the competencies associated with each model

Challenge 3 - To dynamically integrate the competencies from each of the models with the managerial situations encountered

The competing values framework encompasses four models. The managerial performance thus depends on eight roles the manager is required to perform. These roles and the key competencies needed are enumerated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Managerial Role</th>
<th>Key Competencies needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director Role</td>
<td>1 Taking initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Delegating effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer Role</td>
<td>1 Personal productivity and motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Motivating others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Time and stress management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Role</td>
<td>1 Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Organizing and designing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Controlling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Role</td>
<td>1 Reducing information overload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Analyzing information with critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Presenting information, writing effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Role</td>
<td>1 Understanding yourself and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Interpersonal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Developing subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator Role</td>
<td>1 Team building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Participative decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Conflict management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contd
Innovator Role  
1 Living with change  
2 Creative thinking  
3 Managing change  

Broker Role  
1 Building and maintaining a power base  
2 Negotiating agreement and commitment  
3 Presenting ideas  

(Source Quinn Faerman Thompson and McGrath 1990)

As a **director**, a manager is expected to clarify expectations through processes, such as planning and goal setting to be a decisive initiator who defines problems, selects alternatives, establishes objectives, defines roles and tasks, generates rules and policies and gives instructions.

As a **producer**, a manager is expected to be task oriented and work focused and to have high interest, motivation, energy, and personal drive. They are supposed to accept responsibility, complete assignments, and maintain high personal productivity. This usually involves motivating members to increase production and to accomplish stated goals.

As a **monitor**, a manager is expected to know what is going on in the unit to see if people are complying with the rules, and to see if the unit is meeting its quotas.

As a **coordinator**, a manager is expected to maintain the structure and flow of the system. The person in this role is expected to be dependable and reliable.

As a **facilitator**, a manager is expected to foster collective effort, build cohesion and teamwork, and manage interpersonal conflict.

As a **mentor**, a manager is expected to be engaged in the development of people through a caring empathetic orientation.

As an **innovator/change catalyst**, a manager is expected to facilitate adaptation and change. The innovator pays attention to the changing environment, identifies important trends, conceptualizes and projects needed changes and tolerates uncertainty and risk.
As a broker/ambassador, a manager is expected to maintain external legitimacy and obtain external resources. The person in this role is concerned for image, appearance, and reputation.

Thus the competing values framework helps in getting a holistic picture of managerial performance, we are able to evaluate managerial performance in both the qualitative (using open and human relations models) and quantitative (using rational and internal process) aspects. This study has, therefore, used this framework to assess managerial performance.