

مهارات الإدارة والقيادة الإدارية وأثرها على القوي العاملة الفدرالية في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية

د. ابوالقاسم سالم عبدالله دوة - كلية الاقتصاد - العجيلات - جامعة الزاوية

s_dowa@yahoo.com

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was to reveal whether, the leadership and management

skills within the U.S. federal workforce directly affect employee perception, which, in turn, is reflected in the political agenda of the presidential of the United States. Given the political structure of the organization, a shift in political office initiates change in the leadership of the organization. The significance of this study was to determine if the inclusive and participative approaches of the government seniors created a significant increase in the perception of organizational and management effectiveness based on the indicators in the leadership/climate assessment at the Department of Labor. The literature review examined the practices of organizational and management effectiveness and how it affected federal employees based on presidential influence. It also showed that the government adopts management trends from the private sector without understanding, at first, if they are adaptable to the federal government.

Keywords: Leadership, Federal workforce, Federal executives, Organizational management, Management effectiveness.

المخلص

الغاية من هذه الدراسة هو إيضاح ما إذا كانت للمهارات الإدارية والقيادة الإدارية تأثيراً مباشراً على إدراك العاملين في نطاق القوي العاملة الفدرالية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. والذي بدوره ينعكس على الأجندة السياسية للرئاسة الأمريكية، بالأخذ

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

بتركيبية السياسية للمنظمة كقناة في مبادرة المكتب السياسي للتغيير في القيادة الإدارية للمنظمة.

أهمية هذه الدراسة هو في تحديد ما إن كانت الأساليب الشاملة أو المشاركة للقيادات الحكومية قد أحدثت زيادة مهمة في الإدراك التنظيمي والفاعلية الإدارية وفقاً للمؤشرات القيادة الإدارية) تقييم بيئة العمل في قطاع العمل. الدراسات السابقة اختبرت الممارسات التنظيمية والفاعلية الإدارية، وكيف أثرت في الموظفين الفدراليين تبعاً للتأثير الرئاسي. كذلك بينت أن الحكومة تتبنى اتجاهات القطاع الخاص دون إدراك ما إذا كانت هذه التوجهات قابلة للتبني بالحكومة الفدرالية.

Introduction

No complex organization can transform itself without great leaders, leaders who can conduct business while guiding the organization through ongoing turbulence and uncertainty (Ringo & MacDoanld, 2008). The federal government is a multifaceted bureaucracy and is the single largest employer in the United States (Ledford, 2007). Working in today's federal labor force is challenging, and at times, overwhelming. In their service to the American public, federal executives and managers must cope with numerous, varied problems: large deficits; demands for discretionary dollars to fund the global war on terror; a possible flu pandemic; rebuilding communities, such as those stricken by Hurricane Katrina; and sending astronauts to space (Brokaw & Mullins, 2006).

Federal executives and managers are tasked with leading and managing this growing federal workforce. According to Lee (2006), in 2005, federal employees numbered 1.9 million (with an additional 9 million contractors and grantees that were part of the workforce), excluding military and postal personnel. The transient nature of the federal government senior leadership adds another layer of complexity to this structure. The 2008 administration transition changed the government landscape in many ways: a potential shift in the Presidential / Congressional balance of power, and a potential change in policy direction (Peterson, 2008). According to Peterson, this will cause the Department of Labor to lose 11.4% of its management and policy executives. With the transition of management and policy executives in the United States Department of Labor, the Labor Department will set new

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

mission and vision statements based on political influence. In a study by The Partnership for Public Service done in 2007, the Department of Labor ranked 15th of out of 30 for employee satisfaction and engagement among large agencies.

Statement of the Problem

The Federal Human Capital Survey conducted by the U.S. Office of Personnel Management measures federal employees' perceptions of workforce management in their agencies. Results since the baseline in 2002 show federal employees at the U.S. Department of Labor perceive their agency as having leadership, morale, and job satisfaction issues. According to OMB (2008) FHCS results, 10.1% of Labor employees reported being very satisfied with senior leaderships practices and policies; 9.9% of Labor employees reported being very satisfied with the level of morale that senior leadership generates, and 23% reported being very satisfied with their job. Less than half of employees surveyed would recommend that organization as a good place to work.

Significance of the Problem

As leadership being aligned with the newly elected President of the United States is appointed to lead each agency within Department of Labor, each new Assistant Secretary selects political appointees to serve the agenda of the President. Political appointees can change the mission and vision and set new goals and objectives for an agency. Career conditional senior executive leadership staff (SES) are career federal employees who do not change with political shifts, yet SES can be transferred to other positions within an agency at the Secretary of Labor's discretion.

During the Bush administration, federal employees at the Department of Labor did not historically score the agency high in the Office of Personnel Management's Federal Human Capital Survey. Employees at the Department of Labor average 17.1 years of tenure and 47 years of age. Due to the fact that the (official) federal employee retirement age is 55 years with 30 year of service, these employees will most likely not retire within the next 10 years. Understanding how leadership from the President affects perception of employees is vital to understanding the federal workforce.

Theoretical and Conceptual Foundations

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

Working in today's federal government is challenging, and at times, overwhelming. Given the responsibilities of federal executives and managers, it is important to note how organizational and management effectiveness affects federal employees.

Follet (1868–1933), who wrote on the topic of organizational and management effectiveness in the early 20th century, defined management as "the art of getting things done through people" (Barrett, 2003). Original contributors to this field include (but are not limited to): Taylor (1856-1915), who has been called the father of scientific management; Gantt (1861-1919), who emphasized the need for scientific administration and developed the Gantt chart; Barnard (1886-1961), who authored *the Functions of the Executive* in 1938; and Fayol (1841-1925), who developed universal management functions, which include planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling, which are issues today. The science of management has evolved from the 19th to the 21st century, and the one constant that remains is the relationship between management and employees. Managerial actions have long been recognized as important determinants of employee perception and behavior (Philippe & Koehler, 2005). In his study, Bohn (2002) states, "Leaders influence perceptions of organizational efficacy." Three elements that leaders and management need to contend with are: morale, productivity, and job satisfaction of employees.

Organizational effectiveness is the degree to which an organization realizes its goals (Daft, 1995). One of leadership's primary functions is to motivate the team toward this realization. Highly motivated teams are considered key contributors to the effectiveness and efficiency of any organization (Panchak, 2003). Oftentimes, the little things can matter as much as big issues when it comes to keeping employees motivated and satisfied. According to Messmer (2006), most managers intuitively know this and do their best to regularly show their appreciation to staff members and perhaps offer tangible rewards for jobs well done. Despite their best intentions, however, managers can sometimes inadvertently lower morale in small, subtle ways (Messmer, 2006). Clearly, management should be able to identify and eliminate processes and organizational features that serve to de-

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

motivate employees; leadership and management need to be cognitive of motivational techniques.

For as long as organizational dynamics have been studied, at least in the past century, researchers have been struggling to understand how the many aspects of human relations in the workplace affect bottom-line performance. Organizations should consider the nature of employee engagement, because this one variable is likely to predict an organization's ability to achieve high results with productivity, profitability, customer service, staff retention, and workplace safety (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). Within the federal government, productivity is not measured by the bottom-line of a balance sheet, rather, productivity is measured in outputs from the various agencies. The Department of Labor's output, for instance, can be judged by the number of cases completed.

Organizational scholars have long been interested in why some people report being highly satisfied with their jobs, while others express low levels of satisfaction (Locke, 1979). Both in academia and in practice, it is known that a link exists between job satisfaction, the inclination to quit a job, and labor productivity (Igarria and Guimaraes, 1999). Understanding the factors that affect employee satisfaction is a key for leadership and managers in sustaining their employees' satisfaction. The Office of Personnel Management conducts a Federal Human Capital Survey every two years. Comparing the trend from 2002, 2004, 2006 and 2008, there is no significant statistical change in federal employee job satisfaction from year to year (OPM, 2009). Some scholars have speculated that the paucity of job satisfaction research regarding government employees stems from the belief that the work motivations and attitudes of those employed in the public sector are essentially the same as those of their private sector counterparts (Perry & Wise, 1990). Understanding how job satisfaction is impacted by organizational and management effectiveness is key to successful leadership.

Organizational and Management Effectiveness

Follet (1868–1933), who wrote on the topic of organization in the early 20th century, defined management as "the art of getting things done through people" (Barrett, 2003). Original contributors to the field include, but are not limited to: Taylor (1856-1915), who has been called the father of

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

scientific management; Gantt (1861-1919), who emphasized the need for scientific administration - and who developed the Gantt chart; Herzberg (1923 - 2000), who proposed the Motivation-Hygiene Theory; Maslow (1908 - 1970), who is noted for his conceptualization of a "hierarchy of human needs" and is considered the father of humanistic psychology; McClelland (1917-1998), who is known for his work on achievement motivation and the consciousness; Vroom (1932-Present), who performed research on the expectancy theory of motivation; Barnard (1886-1961), who authored *the Functions of the Executive* in 1938; and Fayol (1841-1925), who developed universal management functions that include those discussed today: planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling.

Scientific Management was the dominant approach to management from the late 1800s to the early 1930s, and the Human Relations approach is generally credited as beginning in the 1920s (Greenwood, 2004).

It was not that many decades ago when businesses viewed people as machines. During the Industrial Age, the little attention that employees received was focused on speeding production, mechanizing human movement, and ensuring a consistent product; business leaders wanted employees to follow orders and strived to suppress individuality (Frazee, 2004). During the 1920s, a study conducted by Elton Mayo (a professor at Harvard Business School) and Fritz J. Roethlisberger focused on the relationship between job satisfaction and productivity. The term "Hawthorne Effect" (the phenomenon in which subjects in behavioral studies change their performance in response to being observed) was derived from those series of experiments carried out in the Hawthorne Works of the Western Electric Company, Chicago, between 1927 and 1933 (Chiesa & Hobbs, 2008). Essentially, the Human Relations Movement stressed a concern for positive relationships among workers and movement away from the early scientific management concept of outputs.

Organizations emerged as a recognized field of social scientific study during the 1950s. The field was interdisciplinary from the outset. The two academic centers most critical in shaping this nascent discipline were the Carnegie Institute of Technology (now Carnegie-Mellon University) and Columbia University (Scott, 2004).

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

According to McCann (2004), the organizational effectiveness theory began a dramatic evolution nearly 50 years ago with the merging of general systems theory concepts and then-prevailing management theory (Ackoff, 1970; Churchman, 1971; Emery & Trist, 1965; Herbst, 1974). This combination signaled the start of a paradigm shift--a new way of viewing the world and of relating to one another--comparable to a shift from "machine age to organic thinking" (McCann, 1991). "Machine age" thinking was literally a product of the Industrial Revolution from the late 1800s and a world view that held the organization as an independent and nearly free agent, able to act on its larger environment and insulated from regulation and control (Chandler, 1962; Morgan, 1986).

Systems theory views the individual, group, organization, and the organization's larger set of interdependent organizations as a dynamic, interrelated whole (McCann, 2004). Changes in one or more parts of this complex system imply changes for the others. All system parts are in a state of more or less constant and active adaptation, and how well adaptation occurs becomes the critical question from an effectiveness perspective (McCann, 2004).

Systems thinking affected other management fields, even leadership theory where the analog became situational leadership--the idea that the most effective leadership style depended upon the situation or context (Blake & Mouton, 1964; Fiedler, 1967). The continuous quality improvement movement, with its TQM, business process reengineering, and six sigma manifestations, profoundly improved the performance of organizations and entire industries (Deming, 1982; Drucker, 1991; Juran, 1964).

Nonetheless, researchers and practitioners found solid operational traction by focusing on the interaction of individual and group practices with organizational processes, systems, and technologies for acquiring, sharing, retaining, and applying knowledge--all within the broadly identified "knowledge management" field (Davenport & Prusak, 1998; McCann & Buckner, 2004). It is smart knowledge management strategy, for example, for an organization to cultivate functionally diverse and geographically dispersed "communities of practice" around important technical challenges. Such "communities" are grounded in basic human needs to problem-solve and

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

share, and by enabling sharing behaviors through sophisticated global information systems and communications technologies, individual and group learning is leveraged to an organization and industry level (Davenport & Prusak, 1998). From a knowledge management perspective, effective organizations are those that promote individual and group learning through management practices that amplify and move information through organization-level systems, processes, and technologies (McCann & Buckner, 2004).

Organizational and Management Effectiveness in the Federal Government

The management improvement program within the federal government dates back to Executive Order 10072, issued July 29, 1949, which established an Advisory Committee on Management Improvement and required systematic appraisals of operations (Yamada, 1972). According to Divine (1951), this order directs agency heads to give special attention to the effectiveness of programs and the economy of operations for which they are responsible and to make systematic reviews of programs and operations in order to identify improvement opportunities. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 created the General Accounting Office, which housed the Bureau of Budget. Beginning in 1938 and 1939, the Bureau of Budget greatly expanded its staff and responsibilities to comprehend organizational and management, planning, policy development and negotiation, fiscal policy, statistical coordination, and other activities (Mosher & Stephenson, 1982). Previously, this agency did not have a role in administrative management function within the federal government. Expansion of duties resulted from the 1939 transfer to the Executive Office of the President. The 1939 transfer included a new division of Administrative Management, which was entrusted to conduct research in the development of improvement plans of administrative management, and to advise the executive departments and agencies of the government with respect to improved administrative organization and practice (Benda & Levine, 1986). From 1952 to 1959, continuing attention to management improvement was maintained by the Bureau of Budget through the normal process of budgetary review and contacts with agencies by budget examiners (Yamada, 1972).

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

In 1960, a “Management Service Branch” was established to launch specific programs to meet the needs expressed by top administrative personnel of the agencies for central leadership and assistance (Yamada, 1972). The first major effort for this new branch was launched in September 1960 when the Bureau invited 25 agencies to join with it in conducting a review to identify the most significant steps taken during recent years to strengthen agency management and to identify opportunities for future improvement that the Bureau and agencies should pursue. In 1962, the federal government selected five agencies to participate in an experiment to determine if productivity within the federal government could be measured (Morris, Corbett, Usilaner, 1972). The original study, conducted by the Bureau of Budget, concluded that valid productivity indices could be developed for many government activities. According to Morris, et al. (1972), the study fell into limbo as higher priority concerns caused staff to be reassigned to other projects; in 1970, the General Accounting Office reopened the project at the instigation of Senator Proxmire, Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

On July 1, 1971, Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970 went into effect, with Bureau of Budget reconstituted at the Office of Management and Budget (Benda & Levine, 1986). According to Yamada, (1972) better government meant not only more efficient government, but also more responsive and effective government. President Nixon wanted to reestablish effective management apart from the budget aspect, thus the Office of Management and Budget was created. Management by objectives was formally introduced in 1973 as an uncomplicated, results-oriented approach to federal program coordination and effectiveness, somewhat in the sense of planning-programming-budgeting, and to program implementation (Newland, 1976). The immediate purpose of the Management by Objective initiative was to stimulate the agencies to develop specific management improvement “objectives” as part of the annual budget process (Benda & Levine, 1986). Newland (1976), Rose (1977), and Benda & Levine, (1986), concluded that the Management by Objectives initiative failed to improve government efficiency in the 1970s.

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

By the mid to late 1980s, total quality management, or TQM, was all the rage; billions of dollars were invested in training, consulting, and management education efforts in an all-out effort to close the quality gap between the United States and Japan and to remake the basic management precepts of American industry (Hyde, 1997a). The Federal Quality Institute, part of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, was formed in 1988 to help implement TQM throughout the government (Warner, 1993). According to an October 1992 General Accounting Office (GAO) report, 68% of more than 2,200 federal civilian and Department of Defense installations responding to a GAO survey had some kind of TQM program. A survey in late 1992 of about 1900 installations found that 68% were in the process of implementing programs; of these, 82% had quality councils, and 72% had quality improvement teams. Only 13% of all employees were involved in its initial phases (Larkin, 1992). The federal government encourages TQM and various derivatives, but it wisely did not specify application goals or quotas. Agencies were expected to explore possibilities and use the approaches in line with their unique situational realities (Balk, 1995).

According to Swiss (1992), TQM in its unmodified form is strictly ill suited to the government environment because:

It was originally aimed at routine tasks, while government provides complex services. Consequently, in process, quality measures and improvements are much more problematical.

Government customers' enclaves are not only difficult to define, different groups have different, if not contrary, needs. Sometimes government clients, as well as those in the public, are "totally inattentive". This assesses customer satisfaction as highly problematical.

In the public service, it is often necessary to focus upon inputs (e.g., budgets), procedures (e.g., legal requirements), and results-oriented performance controls rather than outputs.

Government agency cultures work against continuous involvement on the part of the hierarchy in improving management.

Total quality management may have potential to improve productivity; however, in principle, endorsing the concept is not an

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

unqualified recommendation to introduce it indiscriminately to every government agency (Halachmi, 1995). According to Halachmi (1995), many public managers' inclination to embrace TQM without asking too many questions was reinforced by President Bush's Executive Order 12637, which espoused to introduce TQM to the federal government across the board and without any qualifications. Early success of TQM were demonstrated in the public and private sector by Ross (1993), Carr and Littman (1990), and Barzelay (1992), while Swiss (1992), Radin & Coffee (1993), and Durant & Wilson (1993) were skeptical of TQM in the federal government without major modifications to fit public sector unique characteristics. At this point, the executive branch was introducing management concepts extracted from the private sector to improve federal management in the government.

Gradually, TQM, the consulting program and label, gave way to a more patient, fundamental approach termed simply, quality management (Hyde, 1997b). According to Hyde, (1997b) in the Clinton administration, responsibility for management change was quickly delegated to Vice President Al Gore in the form of a sweeping internal executive review called the National Performance Review (NPR). In September 1993, the report of the NPR was issued, and TQM was not a primary reference point, but the report's second chapter "Putting Customers First" was quality management 101 (Hyde, 1997b). The NPR, led by Vice President Gore, is the Clinton administration's effort to "reinvent government" by making government "entrepreneurial, competitive, customer driven, and results oriented." It sought to "strengthen executive control of federal administration and drastically reduce congressional involvement in it" (Rosenbloom, 1995, p. 4). The executive branch under President Clinton was looking to reinvent government; the National Performance Review used philosophies and techniques of the excellence and quality movements found in private sector attempts to improve productivity (Kautz, Netting, Huber, Borders, & Davis, 1997). In 1993, Congress passed the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). Simplistically put, GPRA requires federal agencies to define what they intend to accomplish, measure performance, report on the results, and use the performance information for decision making and strengthening accountability (Caudle, 2001).

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

The GPRA affirms the power of Congress to set national priorities; National Performance Review, on the other hand, applies the authority of the executive branch to structure, direct, and control itself. Fundamental conflict exists between the two (Kautz et al. 1997). GPRA itself was a last-moment compromise between congressional democratic leaders who wanted their own government reorganization commission and a newly elected president who wanted his own internal review process, the National Performance Review. President Clinton received his National Performance Review, and OMB accepted passage of GPRA with a five-year pilot effort to phase it in (Hyde, 2005). By the end 1990s, the National Performance Review was no longer relevant to government agencies as a performance management tool; GPRA was ending a five-year pilot period. Despite its congressional origin, GPRA is aimed strongly at the managers of government, from the agency head down (Bingman, 2006). According to a Government Accounting Office (GAO) report in 2002, although a foundation has been established, numerous significant challenges to GPRA implementation still exist. Inconsistent top leadership commitment to achieving results within agencies and OMB can hinder the development of results-oriented cultures in agencies.

According to Bingham (2006), the GPRA statute has clearly served the valuable purpose of forcing or encouraging agencies to think through more intensively and realistically what the major strategic goals of the agency are. Although GPRA lingers within the federal government as a management tool, President Bush's administration reestablished the executive branch through the Office of Management and Budget as the management branch of the government.

From the beginning of his administration, President George W. Bush called for better management and performance of the federal government (Breul, 2007). President Bush introduced three initiatives to meet the management and performance goals of his administration: the President's Management Agenda (PMA), the Executive Branch Management Scorecard, and the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART). According to Breul (2007), public management includes leadership and oversight of how agencies devise, obtain enactment, implement, manage, evaluate, and then, if

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

necessary, modify the statutory programs and policies for which they are responsible, consistent with the policies of the incumbent administration.

Walker (2005) concluded that the administration's implementation of the PMA has been a positive initiative. It had served to raise the visibility of key management challenges, increased attention to achieving outcome-based results, and reinforced the need for agencies to focus on making sustained improvements in addressing long-standing management problems, including items on GAO's high-risk list. OMB uses the PMA scorecard to illustrate agencies' quarterly progress in realizing results in financial performance, human capital, e-government, performance improvement, and commercial services management (Mosquera, 2009).

The scorecard uses a color system to signify how an agency scored: red, yellow, and green, with green being the highest rating. In June 2005, the Department of Labor (DOL) became the first to achieve all green on the government-wide PMA initiatives (Pizzella, 2008). Even as the DOL was the first to score all green, the DOL did not score in the top 10 in the OPM FHCS in the 2006s Human Capital Assessment and Accountability Framework index.

The HCAAF index is calculated by:

***Leadership & Knowledge Management Index** indicates the extent employees hold their leadership in high regard, both overall and on specific facets of leadership*

***Results-Oriented Performance Culture Index** indicates the extent employees believe their organizational culture promotes improvement in processes, products and services, and organizational outcomes.*

***Talent Management Index** indicates the extent employees think the organization has the talent necessary to achieve its organizational goals.*

***Job Satisfaction Index** indicates the extent employees are satisfied with their jobs and various aspects thereof. (OMP, 2007)*

Based on the difference in the PMA scorecard and the Federal Human Capital Survey results, it could be argued that the PMA is a leadership checklist which does not factor in organizational climate. Current literature does not support the theory, but it should be noted, since human capital is a

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

component of the PMA. The GAO (2001) indicated high performing organizations in the private and public sectors have long understood the relationship between effective “people management” and organizational success. An organization’s people—its human capital—are its most critical asset in managing for results. However, the federal government has often acted as if people were costs to be cut rather than assets to be valued.

According to Lomax (2005), PART consists of a series of diagnostic questions that fall under four broad topics: program purpose and design, strategic planning, program management, and program results/accountability. The Office of Management and Budget indicates PART was developed to assess and improve program performance so the federal government can achieve better results. A PART review helps identify a program’s strengths and weaknesses to inform funding and management decisions aimed at making the program more effective. Ponser (2007) indicated the more important role of PART was not its use in making resource decisions, but in its support for recommendations to improve program design, assessment, and management.

After the election of President Obama, former President Bush’s three initiatives to meet the management and performance goals of his administration (the President’s Management Agenda (PMA), the Executive Branch Management Scorecard, and the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)) were taken down from their respective websites. The change in administration occurred well before Barack Obama took office.

Senator Barack Obama of Illinois, standing before the Old State Capitol where Abraham Lincoln began his political career, announced his candidacy for the White House by presenting himself as an agent of generational change who could transform a government hobbled by cynicism, petty corruption, and “a smallness of our politics” (Nagourney & Zeleny, 2007). Senator Obama was facing the challenge of Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, who had brought into the arena years of experience in presidential politics, a command of policy and political history, and an extraordinarily battle-tested network of fund-raisers and advisers, and former Senator John Edwards, the Democratic nominee (Nagourney & Zeleny, 2007).

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

Prior to Obama's announcement, *The Economist* (2006) ran a story entitled "Obamamania," which created a political stir and energized the Democratic Party with the statement that Obama had "thought about" running for president in 2008. Numerous other articles used similar language and one even included the term "rock star" to describe the then Senator from Illinois.

Senator Obama took his campaign to the Internet. Web 2.0 technology was capitalized on with the use of blogs, RSS feeds, YouTube video, and discussion boards and allowed for the people to share and voice their concerns. The site: "barackobama.com" evolved into "change.com" than transitioned into "whitehouse.gov."

The following appeared on his website:

The Obama Administration will look to the challenges we face as a nation with the same spirit of determination and optimism that characterized President-elect Obama's campaign. From the beginning, the campaign was about a nation tired of the same old politics, a nation eager to stand up and lead the world in a new direction. It was a campaign calling for change – to restore prosperity, create jobs, and cut taxes for the middle-class; to make health care and college more affordable; to invest in new energy sources, set a timetable to end the war in Iraq responsibly, and restore our standing in the world (change.gov, 2008).

President Obama was able to cast himself as the "change" and "hope" candidate during the 2008 election. The key now is whether the two years of campaigning has changed the perception of the federal workforce to include these valiant characterizations.

The unspoken truth at the heart of all efforts to improve government management and efficiency is that government wasn't designed to be efficient. It was mostly designed to be accountable; to advance social goals; and to avoid fraud, waste, and abuse (Treverton, 2004). Improving the management and performance of the federal government is a complex issue. Agency goals and directions are set based on the political administration and change based on the outcomes of an election. Given that with each presidential election cycle the federal government management and performance direction will most likely change and new initiatives will be

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

launched as a new administration will take office, it is important to know how each program affects the federal workforce. Through the different administrations, the government has been trying to create a way to assess management effectiveness. Previous methods, such as Management by Objective, Total Quality Management, and Program Assessment Rating Tool, do not ensure that a scientific study is being conducted in a timely manner that identifies real issues within a specific organization that management can directly influence and change. The one constant will be the federal workforce anticipating the new administrations' political objectives and transition to another method of measuring effectiveness.

Federal Workforce Overview

The federal government is facing new and more complex challenges in the 21st century because of long-term fiscal constraints, changing demographics, evolving governance models, and other factors (Mihm, 2007). Federal agencies do not always have the right people in the right jobs at the right time to meet the challenges they face. Today, and in the near term, the federal government faces a retirement wave, and with it, the loss of leadership and institutional knowledge at all levels (Mihm, 2007). Sixty percent of the federal workforce is eligible to retire over the next 10 years. Some predict employee commitment and retention will become a larger and more complex problem as so many young people – who tend to switch jobs more often – enter civil service to replace large numbers of federal retirees (Springer, 2007). The state of federal management has improved and is improving, as data on outputs, if not social outcomes, get better and managers are impelled to pay more attention to them (Treverton, 2004).

For as long as organizational dynamics have been studied, at least over the past century, researchers have been struggling to understand how the many aspects of human relations in the workplace affect bottom-line performance. Organizations should consider the nature of employee engagement, because this one variable is likely to predict an organization's ability to achieve high results with productivity, profitability, customer service, staff retention, and workplace safety (Buckingham & Coffman, 1999). Within the federal government, productivity is not measured in a

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

bottom-line of a balance sheet; productivity can be measured in outputs from the various agencies; for instance, in the Department of Labor, output can be construed as number of cases completed.

Organizational scholars have long been interested in why some people report being very satisfied with their jobs, while others express much lower levels of satisfaction (Locke, 1979). Both in academia and in practice, it is known that a link exists between job satisfaction, the inclination to quit a job, and labor productivity (Igbaria and Guimaraes, 1999). Understanding the factors that affect employee satisfaction is a key for leadership and managers in sustaining employee's satisfaction. The Office of Personnel Management, a federal government agency, conducts a Federal Human Capital Survey every two years. The FHCS measures employees' perceptions of whether, and to what extent, conditions characterizing successful organizations are present in their agencies. Comparing the trend from 2002, 2004, and 2006, there is no significant statistical change in federal employee job satisfaction from year to year (OMP, 2007). Some scholars have speculated that the paucity of job satisfaction research regarding government employees stems from the belief that the work motivations and attitudes of those employed in the public sector are essentially the same as their private sector counterparts (Perry & Wise, 1990). Understanding how job satisfaction is impacted by organizational and management effectiveness is an important aspect for leadership.

Career vs. Political Appointee Effectiveness

Questions about whether appointees or careerists are best for U.S. Government performance go back at least to the late 1800s with the passage of the Pendleton Act (Lewis, 2007). One of the primary motivations for the 1883 passage of the Pendleton Act was to ensure competent administration of federal programs by creating a merit-based civil service system (Skowronek 1982; Theriault 2003; Van Riper 1958).

Political appointments are generally made by the administration in office to support and advocate the president's political goals and policies. They are non-career appointments—that is, they are noncompetitive and are therefore made without regard to the rules for competition that govern career appointments. Political appointees fill positions in the executive branch under various types of appointments and generally resign at the end of

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

presidential administration. Career employees are federal government staff members that retain positions through a presidential administration.

Ironically, current literature uses the Office of Management and Budget's Performance Assessment Rating Tool of President Bush's administration to measure political appointee performance of their respected federal programs. This rating tool was implemented by political appointees in 2001. Political appointees often do not have the management skills and agency experience needed to successfully run federal programs, according to John Gilmour of the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va. and David Lewis of Princeton University (Ballard, 2003). According to Ballard (2003), the two scholars studied the Bush administration's quarterly management grades and found that federal programs run by political appointees received lower grades than those run by career employees. In an article published by the FederalTimes.com (2005), Robert Shea, who oversees the PART program at Office of Management and Budget, rejected the study findings and explained that the research methodology was faulty.

President Bush named 12% more political appointees and 33% more Schedule C appointees than President Clinton (Schedule C appointees have noncompetitive positions with policy-determining responsibilities and work directly with agency heads (Brodsky, 2008)). Regardless of the debate surrounding the performance and effectiveness of career vs. political appointees in senior leadership positions within the federal government, political appointments will be appointed and carry out the goals and objectives of the administration.

Leadership Transition

The leadership transition that occurred in 2009 was the first since 1952 to take place without an incumbent president or vice president on the ballot. The new president needed a two-track plan: forge ahead with positive reforms from the Clinton and Bush administrations and look to lessons from the past to determine what government ought to do differently (Kettl, 2008). This posed an interesting situation with federal government performance and efficiency measures. A new president will have different policy priorities, management objectives, and political appointees governing performance and efficiency measures.

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

There are roughly 4,000 political appointees in the government, and more than 1,100 of those require Senate confirmation. On average, it takes up to one year to assemble a new administration (Lunney, 2008). During the transition, operations of the federal government programs proceed as directed by the rules and regulations of the programs. Numerous literature searches did not yield sufficient results detailing the effect that transition has on federal government employees. Studies indicate how leadership handles the transition or how leadership can prepare, yet the individuals who are the front line of the government are mostly ignored. Understanding how federal employees react to the transition will help make the transition a smoother occurrence.

Ageing Workforce

The early baby boomers turned 18 years of age in and around 1964; many started working for the federal government in the 1960s and early 1970s. These long-time federal employees are now entering their 6th decade in civil service, and many are in leadership positions in federal agencies (Smith, 2008). According to an issue brief published by the Partnership for Public Service (2008a), by 2012, federal agencies will lose nearly 530,000 employees, many of whom hold leadership and critical skills positions. This challenge is intensified for the federal government because downsizing in the 1990s reduced the size of the federal workforce by nearly 400,000 positions and left agencies with critical skills gaps. The Department of Labor is projected to have 21% of its workforce retire by 2012. On the other hand, according to the Office of Personnel Management report in (2008), retirement projection statistics, calculated using past retirement and other demographic information, imply the percentage of employees that will actually retire is smaller than the predicted number of employees deemed eligible to retire.

According to the Partnership for Public Service (2008b), research suggests that government has a golden opportunity to attract talented, experienced workers to federal service, but that agencies must take action to more effectively appeal to this cohort. The ageing workforce within the federal government is eligible to retire. The right time for when the workforce retires is still open for debate. Regardless of the demographic of the workforce, managements still control the outcome of the workers.

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

Management Control of Organizational Factors

The issue of leadership has been an ongoing discussion for several decades (Kotter, 1990; Truske, 1999; Ponser & Kouzes, 1987; Bennis, 1989; Bennis & Nanus, 1985) and has roots as far back as 1921 (Hughes, Ginnett & Curphy, 1999, P.8). Theorists have been asking for over a hundred years, a good manager or a good leader (Turk, 2007). The literature details the differences between managers and leaders (Buhler, 1995; Dobbs & Field, 1993; Turk, 2007, Zaleznik, 2004); beyond the theoretical difference, it remains that management and leadership both control organizational factors influencing employees. Managerial actions have long been recognized as important determinants of employee perception and behavior (Philippe & Koehler, 2005). In his study, Bohn (2002) states, “Leaders influence perceptions of organizational efficacy.” Three elements that leaders and management need to be cognitive of are seen in areas where their behavior directly affects employee morale, productivity, and job satisfaction.

Organizational effectiveness is the degree to which an organization realizes its goals (Daft, 1995, p.53). Achieving a high level of organizational effectiveness is the ultimate goal of organizations. However, it is hard to measure organizational effectiveness because organizations have diverse and fragmented activities that purpose multiple goals (Draft, 1995). Previous studies have used financial objectives as an indicator for achieving organizational effectiveness. Within the federal government, this is not prudent, since financial health or stock price is not a measure of effectiveness of government agencies.

One of leadership’s primary functions is to motivate the team towards achieving its goals. Highly motivated teams are considered key contributors to the effectiveness and efficiency of any organization (Panchak, 2003). Sometimes, little things can matter as much as the larger issues when it comes to keeping employees motivated and satisfied. According to Messmer (2006), most managers intuitively know this and do their best to regularly show their appreciation to staff members and perhaps offer tangible rewards for jobs well done. Despite their best intentions, however, managers sometimes inadvertently lower morale in small, subtle ways (Messmer, 2006). Management should identify and eliminate processes and organizational

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

features that serve to de-motivate employees. Current research indicates that significant proportions of the population, from factory workers to surgeons, have advanced stages of burnout (Golembiewski, Boudreau, Sun & Luc 1998).

The concept of management control is quite simple. Management control encompasses all activities designed to ensure that an organization accomplishes its objectives effectively and efficiently within the planned timeframe, within approved cost limitations, and with the planned quality and quantity of output (Riso & Kendig, 1986). Studies have shown that there is often a positive relationship between integrated bundles of human resource management practices and different measures of organizational performance (Arthur, 1994; Delery & Doty, 1996; Guthrie, 2001; Huselid, 1995; MacDuffie, 1995). Organizational performance is affected by management and leadership's ability to manage and lead. Organizational and management effectiveness are factors that can be studied and influenced.

Factors Influencing Organizational and Management Effectiveness

According to Cameron (1986), the most important factors associated with both static and dynamic assessments of effectiveness are environmental factors and management strategies. The purpose of Cameron's study was to identify the major factors associated with high levels of effectiveness in colleges and universities that differed from previous studies. Cameron explained that the actual strategic actions of managers were not assessed in this study, only their strategic orientations. Much more fine-grained analyses should be performed regarding which specific actions managers can take to preserve or enhance the effectiveness of their institutions.

Steers (1975) and Zammuto (1982) describe the measurement of effectiveness as one of the most problematic issues in the field of organizational theory. Despite its elusive nature, organizational effectiveness has been considered a critical concept in organizational theory (Goodman and Pennings, 1980). Researchers have offered a variety of models for examining effectiveness, yet there is little consensus as to what constitutes a valid set of effectiveness criteria (Cameron & Whetten, 1983; Lewin & Minton, 1986). Some of the earliest models developed were goal-based (Etzioni, 1960;

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

Steers, 1977) but later deemed unsatisfactory because the selection of inadequate goals cannot lead to an effective organization (Miles, 1980; Mohr, 1983). Essentially, the models were goal-centered or system-resource models. According to Das (1990), the definition and, consequently, the criteria and approaches employed in evaluating effectiveness are various, and in some instances, paradoxical, as shown by the variability of definitions. To have a comprehensive understanding of organizational effectiveness, the key variables in the domain of effectiveness must be identified, and then the relationship of these variables to effectiveness must be determined (Handa & Adas, 1996).

In his research, Brodeur (2003) refined the following factors: environment, teamwork, management effectiveness, involvement, reward and recognition, competency, and commitment that affect organizational and management effectiveness. The factors are inter-related and can be used to predict morale, job satisfaction, and productivity levels based on employee perception of the organization. Brodeur's assessment measures organizational elements that management can directly influence - and as a result can improve morale, productivity, and job satisfaction. Within the federal government, the President appoints political appointees to be in charge of large government agencies. The President has a direct impact on the organizational and management effectiveness of an agency.

According to Brodeur (2003), the objective of performing an employee climate assessment is to identify the key areas which are hindering production and reducing effectiveness and which might generate unexpected costs in the near future. Leadership and management effectiveness is achieved by research-driven and scientifically based management decision making by conducting periodic valid and reliable studies of organizational factors that most influence morale, productivity, and job satisfaction within the specific organization being studied. Brodeur found that organizations have unique cultures, and thus all results may not apply outside of that organization and should be repeated in other organizations. However, based on the organizational dynamics of all government agencies, results of this study could realistically be generalized to the government as a whole. The idea and approach is for the organization not to simply perform an academic

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

exercise simply because they ‘do it at this time every year,’ but to critically examine themselves to see where the company and its employees might be finely tuned to generate higher levels of performance. Once identified, opportunities to strengthen existing approaches that are working well, as well as select appropriate interventions for addressing the weakest areas, should be aggressively pursued for the maximum benefit of everyone. One cannot underestimate the importance of having good data. Making changes in approach, policy, or procedure may be difficult or expensive, and efforts in doing so should be entered into lightly. It is leadership’s failure to act upon data that result in organizational stasis. (Brodeur, 2004).

Conclusion

Leadership and management are important to the success of any organization, and understanding how organizational and management effectiveness affect the workforce is essential for increasing employee morale, productivity, and job satisfaction. The federal government as the single largest employer within the United States has a dynamic leadership and management situation that changes based on political office. With each transition in political office, new leaders are appointed to head each government agency and subsequently appoint assistance secretaries under them, and change occurs. Based on party affiliation, the change can be regarded as positive or negative, yet a major disadvantage occurs when career staff must except change without a voice.

This descriptive study determined if the inclusive and participative approaches of the government seniors created a statistically significant increase in the perception of organizational and management effectiveness based on the indicators in the leadership/climate assessment at the Department of Labor. The literature review provided an overall aspect of the federal government by providing a brief review of studies and history of civil servants and how they are affected by changes in leadership and how leadership caused the effect. The career federal workforce is constant, and individual federal agencies should understand their own workforce’s strengths and weaknesses. Current literature shows that government adopts management trends from the private sector without understanding, at first, if

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

they are adaptable to the federal government. Conducting organizational assessments is not a trend, yet could be a powerful tool to gauge the current workforce. By understanding if the president created a perception of change in the federal workforce, the federal government could better understand how to continue the momentum.

References

- Ackoff, R., (1970). *A Concept of Corporate Planning*. New York: Wiley.
- Arthur, J.B. (1994). Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 670–687.
- Brokaw, G. S., & Mullins, J. M. (2006) In pursuit of higher performance--part I: Federal executives and managers are using proven change tools to strategically improve and advance their organizations. In *The Public Manager*, 35, p28(6). Retrieved May 25, 2007, from *Academic OneFile* via Thomson
Gale: http://find.galegroup.com/itx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC- Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&docId=A158908997&source=gale&userGroupName=limr_main&version=1.0
- Balk, W. L. (1995). Is there life beyond TQM? *Public Productivity Through Quality & Strategic Management*; 1995, Vol. 1, p245-255, 11p
- Ballard, T. N. (2003). Study says career executives make better managers than appointees. Government Executive On-line. Retrieved September 25, 2008, from http://www.govexec.com/story_page.cfm?filepath=/dailyfed/1003/103103t1.htm
- Barrett, R. (2003). Vocational Business: Training, Developing and Motivating People. *Business & Economics*, Page 51.
- Barzelay, M. (1992). *Breaking through bureaucracy*. Berkley, University of California Press
- Benda, P. M. & Levine, C. H. (1986). OMB and the central management problem: is another reorganization the answer? *Public Administration Review*; Sep/Oct86, Vol. 46 Issue 5, p379-391, 13p
- Bingham, C. F. (2006) Proposals for improving GPRA annual performance plans. *Public Budgeting & Finance*; Summer2006, Vol. 26 Issue 2, p143-154, 12p
- Blake, R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1964). *The Managerial Grid*. Houston: Gulf.
- Bohn, J. G. (2002). The relationship of perceived leadership behaviors to organizational efficacy. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies* 9.2 (Fall 2002): 65(15). Retrieved May 25, 2007, from Academic

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

OneFile via Thomson Gale

[http://find.galegroup.com/itx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC-
Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&docId=A96072
088&source=gale&srcprod=AONE&userGroupName=lirn_main&version
=1.0](http://find.galegroup.com/itx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC-
Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&docId=A96072
088&source=gale&srcprod=AONE&userGroupName=lirn_main&version
=1.0)

- Breul, J. D. (2007) Three Bush administration management reform initiatives: the president's management agenda, freedom to manage legislative proposals, and the program assessment rating tool. *Public Administration Review*; Jan2007, Vol. 67 Issue 1, p21-26, 6p
- Brodeur, K. J. (2003). Organizational climate assessment. QV Research On-line. Retrieved May 25, 2007, from <http://www.qvresearch.com/>
- Brodeur, K. J. (2004). Quality values, market dominance through customer satisfaction.
- Buckingham, M. and Coffman, C. (1999) First, break all the rules: What the world's greatest managers do differently. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Buhler, P. (1995, May). Leaders vs. managers. *Supervision*, 56(5), 24. Retrieved September 3, 2008, from Business Source Premier database.
- C. Camman (eds.), Organizational Assessment. New York: Wiley,
- Cameron, K. (1986, January). A study of organizational effectiveness and its predictors. *Management Science*, 32(1), 87-112. Retrieved October 18, 2008, from Business Source Premier database.
- Cameron, K. S. and Whetton, D. A. (1983). Organizational effectiveness. Academic Press, New York capturing mindshare in the new administration. Input Consulting, Special Report Published April, 2008.
- Carr, D. K. & Ian, D. L. (1990) Excellence in government; total quality management in the 1900's. N.Y., Cooper and Lybrand
- Chandler, A.D. (1962). Strategy and Structure. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chiesa, M. & Hobbs, S. (2008). Making sense of social research: how useful is the hawthorne effect? *European Journal of Social Psychology*; Jan/Feb2008, Vol. 38 Issue 1, p67-74, 8p, 2 charts
- Churchman, C.W. (1971). The Design of Inquiring Systems. New York: Basic Books.
- Daft, R. L. (1995) Organization theory & design. (5th ed.) MN: West Publishing Company.
- Das, H. (1990). Organizational theory with Canadian application. Gage Educational Publishing Co., Toronto
- Davenport, T.H. & Prusak. L. (1998). Working Knowledge: How Organizations Manage What They Know. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Deming, W.E. (1982). Out of the Crisis. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

- Divine, W. R. (1951). Strengthening the management of Federal programs. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (Spring, 1951), pp. 109-115
- Durant R. F. & Wilson L. (1993) Public management, TQM and quality improvement: towards a contingency strategy. *American Review of Public Administration* 22(3) pp. 215-245
- Etzioni, A. (1960) "Two approaches to organizational analysis: a critique and a suggestion." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1960, 5,257–258.
- Federal Times (2005) Careerists make best managers study: They get better results than political appointees. *Federal Times On-line*, October 10, 2005. Retrieved September 15, 2008 from [Federaltimes.com](http://www.Federaltimes.com):
<http://www.Federaltimes.com/index2.php?S=1160661>
- Foresman, 1980.
- Golembiewski, R., Boudreau, R., Sun, B., & Luo, H. (1998). Estimates of burnout in public agencies: worldwide, how many employees have which degrees of burnout, and with what consequences? *Public Administration Review*, 58, 59–65.
- Goodman, P. S., & Pennings, J. M. (1980) "Critical issues in assessing greatest managers do differently. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Greenwood, R. (2004). Employee privacy issues of the early 20th century: 1900 through Hawthorne Studies. *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, Jan 2004. Retrieved September 15, 2008 from [Findarticles.com](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa5383/is_200401/ai_n21342870?tag=content;coll):
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa5383/is_200401/ai_n21342870?tag=content;coll
- Halachmi, A. (1995). Is TQM ready for the public sector? *Public Productivity Through Quality and Strategic Management*. ISO Press, 1995
- Handa, V., & Adas, A. (1996, July). Predicting the level of organizational effectiveness: a methodology for the construction firm. *Construction Management & Economics*, 14(4), 341-352. Retrieved September 18, 2008, doi:10.1080/014461996373412
- Huselid, M.A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 635–672.
- Hyde, A. (1997a) From quality circles to TQM. *Government Executive* July 1, 1997. Retrieved September 15, 2008 from <http://www.govexec.com/reinvent/articles/0797fqg2.htm>
- Hyde, A. (1997b) End of the Road for TQM. *Government Executive* July 1, 1997. Retrieved September 15, 2008 from <http://www.govexec.com/reinvent/articles/0797fqg3.htm>
- Hyde, A. C. (2005) The end of performance? *The Public Manager*, Spring, 2005

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

- Igbaria, M. and Guimaraes, T. (1999). Exploring Differences in Employee Turnover Intentions and its Determinants Among Telecommuters and Non-telecommuters. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 16(1), 147-164.
- Kautz, J. R., Netting, F. E., Huber, R., Borders, K. & Davis, T. S. (1997) The government performance and results Act of 1993: implications for social work practice. *Social Work*; Jul97, Vol. 42 Issue 4, p364-373, 10p
- Kettl, D. F. (2008) Advice + dissent: viewpoint fixing the future. *Government Executive* January 1, 2008. Retrieved August 25, 2008 from: Govexec.com <http://www.govexec.com/features/0108-01/0108-01advp.htm>
- Kotter, J. (1990). A force for change: how leadership differs from management. New York: McMillian
- Larkin, J. (1992). Public Administration Time (American Society for Public Administration) Vol. 15, No 11. December 1992. P1
- Ledford, T. (2007). Flip sides of the Federal coin: the nation's largest employer is the Federal government. The nation's largest purchaser of services is the Federal government. Which is the better career path for you, civil service or Federal contractor? *The Officer*, September 1, 2007
- Lee, C. (2006). Big government gets bigger: study counts more employees, cites increase in contractors. *Washington Post*. Friday, October 6, 2006; Page A21. Retrieved May 25, 2007 from: Washington Post.com: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/10/05/AR2006100501782.html>
- Lewin, Y. A. and Minton, W. J. (1986). Determining organizational effectiveness: another look and agenda for research. *Management Science*, 32(5), 517 – 37
- Locke, E. (1976) The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally, Chapter 30, pp. 1297-1349.
- Lomax, A. (2005, December). What Has Been the Impact of the Program Assessment Rating Tool?. *PA Times*, 28(12), 12-12. Retrieved April 11, 2009, from MasterFILE Premier database.
- Lunney, K. (2008) Presidential campaigns and Senate urged to expedite appointments process. *Government Executive* September 25, 2008. Retrieved October 1, 2008 from: Govexec.com http://www.govexec.com/story_page.cfm?articleid=41055&dcn=specialreports_transition
- McCann, J. E. (2004) Organizational effectiveness: changing concepts for changing environments. *Human Resource Planning* 27.1 (March 2004): p42(9).

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

- McCann, J.E. (1991). "Design Principles for an Innovating Company." *Academy of Management Executive*, May.
- Messmer, M. (2006). How small slights can cause big damage to Morale.
- Mihm, J. C. (2007). Human Capital: Federal Workforce Challenges in the 21st Century: GAO-07-556T. GAO Reports; 3/6/2007, p1, 15p
- Miles, R. H. (1980) Macro-organizational behavior. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Models. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press, 1983.
- Mohr, L. B. (1983) "The implications of effectiveness theory for managerial practice in the public sector." In K. Cameron and D. Whetton (eds.), *Organizational Effectiveness: A Comparison of Multiple Models*. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press, 1983.
- Morgan, G. (1996). *Images of Organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Morris, T. D., Corbett, W. H. and Usilaner, B. L. (1972) Productivity measures in the Federal government. *Public Administration Review*; Nov/Dec72, Vol. 32 Issue 6, p753, 11p, 4 Charts, 4 Graphs
- Mosher, F. C. and Stephenson Jr., M. O. (1982) The office of management and budget in a changing scene. *Public Budgeting & Finance*; Winter82, Vol. 2 Issue 4,
- Mosquera, M. (2009). More agencies get high marks on latest PMA scorecard. *Federal Computer Weekly*. Jan 08, 2009. Retrieved January 25, 2009: <http://fcw.com/articles/2009/01/08/more-agencies-get-high-marks-on-latest-pma-scorecard.aspx>
- Nagourney, A. & Zeleny, J. (2007). Obama Formally Enters Presidential Race. *The New York Times On-line*. Retrieved April 5, 2009, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/11/us/politics/11obama.htm>
- Newland, C. A. (1976) Policy/program objectives and Federal management: the search for government effectiveness. *Public Administration Review*; Jan/Feb76, Vol. 36 Issue 1, p20, 8p
- OMB, (2009). Federal human capital survey, 2008. Office of Personnel Management. Retrieved March 25, 2009, from <http://www.fhcs.opm.gov/2008/>
- OPM, (2007). Federal human capital survey, 2006. Office of Personnel Management. Retrieved May 25, 2007, from <http://www.fhcs2006.opm.gov/>.
- OPM, (2008). An analysis of Federal employee retirement data, predicting future retirements and examining factors relevant to retiring from the Federal service. Office of Personnel Management. Retrieved March, 2008, from http://www.opm.gov/feddata/RetirementPaperFinal_v4.pdf

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

- organizational effectiveness.” In E. E. Lawler III, D. A. Nadler, and Panchak, P. (2003) Nurturing the motivated workforce. *Industry Week*, 252 (3) p11.
- Perry, J., and L. Wise. 1990. The motivational bases of public service. *Public Administration Review* 50, 367-373.
- Peterson, D. (2008). Industry leaders’ guide to the 2008 administration transition capturing mindshare in the new administration. Input Consulting, Special Report Published April, 2008.
- Philippe, T. and Koehler, J. W. (2005, June). *Managerial actions that significantly affect employees' perceptions*. *Journal of the Academy of Business and Economics*, January, 2005. Retrieved May 25, 2007 from Findarticles.com: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0OGT/is_1_5/ai_n16619652
- Pizzella, P. (2008, December). Good Management, Good Policy. *PA Times*, 31(12), 5-5. Retrieved April 11, 2009, from MasterFILE Premier database.
- Ponser, J. & Kouzes, B. (1987). The leadership challenge: how to get extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- practice in the public sector.” In K. Cameron and D. Whetton Quality Values Research. San Diego, California Copyright 2004
- Radin, B. A. & Coffee, J. N. (1993) A critique of TQM: problems of implementation in the public sector. *PAQ* 17(1) Spring pp. 42-45 Retrieved September 15, 2008 from: http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0HTO/is_1_34/ai_n25112772?tag=content:col1
- Ringo, T. and MacDonald, R. (2008) Unlocking the DNA of the adaptable workforce; the global human capital study 2008. IBM Global Services. Retrieved September 08, 2008 from <http://www-931.ibm.com/tela/servlet/Asset/172343/The%20Global%20Human%20Capital%20Study%202008.pdf>
- Riso, G., & Kendig, W. (1986, September). Strengthening Federal Management Controls With Less Effort. *Public Administration Review*, 46(5), 438-446. Retrieved September 4, 2008, from Education Research Complete database.
- Rose. R. (1977) Implementation and evaporation: the record of MBO. *Public Administration Review*; Jan/Feb77, Vol. 37 Issue 1, p64-71, 8p
- Rosenbloom, D. (1995). The context of management reform. *Public Manager*, 29, pp.3-6.
- Ross, J. E. (1993) Total quality management. Delray Beach, F.L. St. Lucie Press
- Scott, W. (2004) Reflections on a half-century of organizational sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*; 2004, Vol. 30 Issue 1, p1-21, 21p

Leadership and Management Skills and Its Influences on the U.S. Federal Workforce

- Skowronek, S. (1982). Building a new american state: the expansion of national administrative capacities, 1877-1920. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press
- Smith, R. (2008) The aging and retiring - Federal workforce. FedSmith.com, May 7, 2008. Retrieved September 08, 2008 from:
<http://www.fedsmith.com/article/1600/>
- Spring, M. L. (2007). Results from the 2006 Federal Human Capital Survey. Federal Human Capital Survey 2006. Retrieved September 08, 2008 from
http://www.fhcs2006.opm.gov/Published/FHCS_2006_Report.pdf
- Steers, R. N. (1975). Problems in the measurement of organizational effectiveness. *Administrative Science*, 20, 546-58
Strategic Finance (Dec 2006): 15(2). Retrieved May 25, 2007, from *Academic OneFile* via Thomson Gale:
http://find.galegroup.com/itx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC- Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&docId=A155873033&source=gale&srcprod=AONE&userGroupName=lirn_main&version=1.0
- Strategic Finance* (Dec 2006): 15(2). Retrieved May 25, 2007, from *Academic OneFile* via Thomson Gale:
http://find.galegroup.com/itx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC- Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=AONE&docId=A155873033&source=gale&srcprod=AONE&userGroupName=lirn_main&version=1.0
- Swiss, J. (1992). Adapting total quality management (TQM) to government. *Public Administration Review*. July/August 1992, Vol. 52, No. 4, pp. 351-361
- Treverton, G. F. (2004). The state of Federal management. *Government Executive*; 1/1/2004, Vol. 36 Issue 1, p23-34, 7p, 4 charts
- Turk, W. (2007, July). Manager or Leader?. *Defense & AT-L*, 36(4), 20-22. Retrieved September 3, 2008, from Business Source Premier database.
- Walker, D. (2005, April 21). Management Reform: Assessing the President's Management Agenda: GAO-05-574T. *GAO Reports*, Retrieved April 11, 2009, from MasterFILE Premier database.
- Warner, D. (1993). Bureaucracy, heal thyself - Federal government personnel management. *Nation's Business*, October, 1993. Retrieved September 08, 2008 from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1154/is_ai_14215979
- Yamada, G. T. (1972). Improving management effectiveness in the Federal government. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 32, No. 6 (Nov. – Dec., 1972), pp. 764-770