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Authoritarianism and Partnership

This paper presents the psychological and socio–cultural conditions of two contrasting organizational systems—authoritarianism and partnership. The starting point for differentiating them is the difference in sense of location of control over one’s actions amidst members of the organization. An external or internal sense of location of control as a psychological quality determines the relationship to the hierarchy of authority, its stability, and the objective or subjective treatment of subordinates by the superior as well as related cultural models. Although this article makes no attempt to formulate unequivocal valuations, its contents clearly points to a need to develop partnership organizations and eliminate authoritarian systems. This tendency should not only be the result of technical reasons and economic conditions under which today’s organizations function, but also, or perhaps primarily, for moral reasons.
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Wherever the manager and his subordinates agree that the control of their activities is always conducted by an external entity—a “power”—exercising a hierarchical system, then this is considered to be natural and desirable. However, if it is a conviction that people control their activities themselves and that it is their decision as to what sort of target they set and to what extent they achieve such a target that is predominant, then the power hierarchy is treated as the action–impeding, unfair, and frustrating. The relation to social hierarchy resulting from the power system is not actually influenced by the fact that a part of the relationships between people in the organization always adopts the nature of superiority and subordination. More important, however, are the differences in the sense of one’s own influence over those functioning as subordinates and the degree of stability of such relationships—in other words, whether or not the ascribed
roles change in the long run and whether or not people often exchange these roles with each other.

A positive relation to social hierarchy results from the conviction of a natural and desirable division of people into those who have power and those who are subordinated to them. This opens the door to the creation of authoritarian organizations, where the possibility of goal achievement is sought in the knowledge, skills, and personal traits of managers in the hierarchical management system.

On the other hand, questioning the social hierarchy and demanding a smoother division of power is the starting point for the creation of partnerships. In such organizations attention is focused on the use of the potential of all employees, as prerequisite for efficient functioning. Such an attitude constitutes the basis for the foundation and functioning of partnerships.

**The Authoritarian Organization**

**Effects of an External Sense of Control**

An external sense of control—i.e. the conviction that nothing or almost nothing depends on us—leads to fatalism. If we cannot influence anything, the only thing we are left with is to surrender to the rule of those who are stronger and cleverer than us. This is an attitude of passivity and resignation from ambitious objectives. Once such a cultural assumption is adopted, one has to seek someone to rely on, someone who will be a guardian and leader in operations. That this attitude is close to many Poles, or at least was close in mid–1990s, was demonstrated by the results of the “Polish General Survey of the Quality of Life” of 1996. Results indicated that only 10% of the respondents were of the opinion that the level of their life was dependent on themselves, whereas as many as 59% were convinced that it was dependent on some “power” [Isakiewicz, 2007]. Due to such an external sense of control, the “power”—i.e. those who are higher in the hierarchy—becomes responsible for the fate of those who are subordinate. The culture of hierarchy flourishes in an authoritarian organization. The gist of this is that “people see themselves as dependent on some external forces. They perceive such forces as omnipotent in the angelic or devilish sense, or both. They appeal to them in the face of danger, simultaneously blaming them for their misfortunes” [Bolesta–Kukułka, 1992: 187].

In a hierarchical culture the conviction prevails that in various life situations people should seek an external authority and be guided by its indications. An extreme outlook in this matter was that of Plato who, in his work on the state, wrote that the most important thing is that no one, whether a man or a woman, should ever be without management, so as not to get accustomed, in serious matters or while playing, to act in one’s own way and
on one’s own. Everybody should, both in war and in peacetime, have his eyes directed to the superior and succumb to his orders, even in the most trivial matters, such as standing if he so orders, marching, exercising, washing, and eating [Popper, 1993: 27].

In hierarchical cultures, the trust shown in the manager by his subordinates clashes with the lack of trust shown in them by their manager. The results of studies indicate that Chinese managers do not show trust in their employees because they are convinced that this would diminish their authority among people of lower social status [Wang and Clegg, 2002]. In a culture of this type, the reason for the lack of trust in one’s subordinates is surely also the manager’s envy and fear of losing his own position. It is not without reason that K. R. Popper considers the promotion of the mediocre and the elimination of the most well thought-of people to be a typical phenomenon under conditions of authoritarian power. After all, the chance of rising through the ranks and being promoted falls to those who do not dispute authority, not to those who protest, doubt, and dare to resist the authority’s influence [Popper, 1993: 158].

In an authoritarian organization, relationships based on partnership between the superior and his subordinates are excluded. Maintaining a social distance between people holding different positions in the power hierarchy is thought to be important for retaining the manager’s authority. The superior must be somewhat unknown and mysterious. Familiarity with subordinates may make them consider him to be similar to themselves. As noted by A. Kępiński, television, by bringing the images of sovereigns closer to millions of viewers, appeared to be much more dangerous with respect to their authority than all attempts to democratize power, because such authority subsides in undue approximation [Kępiński, 1978: 48].

In a hierarchical culture, it is the distance of power that is a typical phenomenon, i.e. the fundamental inequality in the positions of the manager and his subordinates. It is this distance that should persuade the subordinates into obedience to their superior and convince them as to the justness of expecting that he ensure confidence and security. G. Hofstede defines the distance of power as the “scope of expectations and acceptance for the unequal distribution of power, expressed by less influential (subordinate) members of the institution or organization” [Hofstede, 2000: 67]. Tools used to create and maintain the social distance between the superior and his subordinates include various insignia of power. C. Barnard calls them the “organizational apparatus of position (status).” Among them he numbers ceremonies for the appointment of an official, public badges of rank, titles and names of offices, salaries and fringe benefits, and limitations in admission of visitors [Barnard, 1946: 50]. T. Peters says that ironically, the promotion to which we are still accustomed consists of a progressing isolation from subordinates that is the result of a shifting of the promoted employees to less and less accessible manage-

HRM(ZZL)_6-2011eng_Sikorski-C_99-112
cial offices that are more and more effectively protected by an army of secretaries and security guards [Peters, 1993: 450].

In this culture, the great distance from authority reflects the status of inequality between people, not only between their positions in the hierarchy. A praise of the great distance of power means an elitist attitude that may be an element of national culture. The results of international comparative studies carried out by G. Hofstede indicate that the greatest distance of power was found in Malaysia, the Philippines, Mexico, Venezuela, India and Singapore [Hofstede, 1984: 77]. Studies, carried out applying the same method, on the level of the distance of power in Poland indicate that this level is also high—a score of 86 on the Hofstede scale, where the maximum reaches 104 (Malaysia) and minimum eleven (Austria) [Mikuła and Nasierowski, 1995].

The development of elitist national traditions is largely affected by religion. Hofstede accounts for the great distance of power by the impact of Hinduism and Confucianism. The same author also emphasizes the role of characteristics of the socio-political system, especially the elitist social theories that support them. These theories express a conservative conviction that everybody has his or her permanent and appropriate place in the social system, and emphasize the importance of obedience [Hofstede, 1984: 74–76].

In hierarchical cultures the differences in the hierarchical power position are not infrequently substantiated by factors independent of people. This is served by “blood tie” concepts demanding a special place for ancestral aristocracy in the society, nationalistic and racist concepts seeking the right to dominate others in nationality or race affiliation, and finally various ideologies usurping the privilege of imposing their truths on others and deriving from there the right to place their representatives in exceptionally important positions. The commonness of the phenomenon of inequality of positions and social roles inclined Hobbes to differentiate between two types of people: those who value prestige above security and those who value security above the risk connected with pursuing prestige, i.e. masters and slaves [Manent, 1994: 67]. In old literature, the characteristic pairing of the master and slave appeared ad nauseam. The former tried to conquer the world, the latter considered faithful service to his master to be the greatest fortune.

The belief in the helplessness of common people that can be overcome somehow only by a few great leaders has been clearing the way for authoritarian organizations since time immemorial. However, an authoritarian organization would have never been founded if the hierarchical culture had characterized exclusively the leaders or candidates for this function. A hierarchical culture, and consequently the authoritarian organization, is formed by common people—subordinates who wish to have a leader and protector. Referring to the absolute power exercised by the authoritarian entity, Hobbes rejects its religious interpretation. The sovereign does not represent the divine force,
but the weakness of his subjects. It is his subjects that granted him absolute power in
order to overcome their weakness [Manent, 1994: 51–52]. A similar phenomenon was
indicated by T. E. Rowell in the animal world in his study on baboons. He states that
hierarchy results from the behavior of submissive individuals, so it is imposed by animals
at the lowest level of the hierarchy, not at its highest level [Fromm, 2002: 132]. That
democracy’s progress does not change much in this respect may be evidenced by the
responses in telephone polls with a sample of a thousand people that was conducted in
Poland in May 2007\(^1\). It appears that almost 60% of the respondents in that poll were of
the opinion that Poland needs a strong–arm government [Isakiewicz 2007].

**Value of Hierarchy**

In an authoritarian organization the main value, and at the same time the rule that
regulates social relationships, is hierarchy. Owing to hierarchy, relationships are clearly
specified, uniform, and predictable. We should concur with B. R. Kuc that the primary
objective behind the development of organizational hierarchies was that members of
organizations constructed it in such a way so they could feel safe [Kuc, 2004: 443]. After
all, hierarchy is the “holy power” (Greek: *hieros* – holy, *arche* – power). “Holy,” because
the relatively permanent relationships of superiority and subordination give the feeling
of confidence connected with the knowledge of one’s own place in the structure and its
related organizational role.

Ascribing a special importance to hierarchical relationships stems from the convic-
tion that hierarchy is a natural law that is universally in force. Everything has a hierarchi-
cal structure. Everything is based on the relationship of superiority and subordination.
For many people, the concept of God as the Almighty Lord who rewards the righteous
and punishes the wicked, who is at the top of the universe’s hierarchy, is a vision much
better understood than perceiving Him in terms of one’s conscience, which constantly
reminds of moral duties towards other people. We should not, however, forget that it
is a human vision. It is not the belief in God that imposes the hierarchical order. It is
the human attachment to hierarchy that imposes such a concept of the human being’s
relationship to God. This attachment results from a desperate searching for confidence
and security, which arise from the willingness to subject oneself to someone’s disposi-
tions and commandments as well as avoiding the situation in which top–down guidelines
might be missing.

In a hierarchical culture, power is acknowledged as a synonym of prestige and social
importance, which is responsible for a tendency to climb upwards and treat those efforts

\(^1\) Study conducted by SMG/KRC Poland Media in May of 2007 as ordered by *Newsweek*. 
as the only and natural way of promotion. The reward is satisfaction from the consumption of knowledge, felt by both the corporal drilling his soldiers and the marshal shifting figures on a scale model of the battlefield, a janitor opening the gate for a belated stranger and the president signing a bill into law. Everybody is subordinate to somebody and has control over somebody. The nuisance caused by someone who has a higher position in the hierarchy may be compensated by making those who hold lower hierarchical positions than ours realize our superiority.

The hierarchy may only provide a sense of confidence and security when the relationships of power are stable. Only then do the emotional bonds between the leader and his subordinates have a chance to develop and consolidate. Followers of the hierarchy have no sympathy for the temporariness and variability of managerial functions. They prefer rigorous, outdistanced, and durable power. In their opinion, only such power assures a proper order and sense of security.

This view on the need for stable social hierarchy may be encountered in articles by former politicians and conservative moralists. The basic rule promoted for social relationships, including those between the superior and subordinates, was the saying: “Know your place.” Benjamin Franklin instructed vividly: “The pauper who apes a wealthy man is verily as mad as a frog which puffs up to equal the ox in volume,” and also: “Huge ships may venture far into the sea, but small ships should keep close to the shore” [Franklin, 1861].

The mediocrity cult resulting from these views is intended to serve the stabilization of the power relation and, as such, is timeless. Restraint of ambition is inseparably connected with a high value ascribed to hierarchy. The needs for recognition and self-fulfillment always offend those who are convinced that they cannot influence their own fate.

The manager who decides the fate of his subordinates, instilling in them a sense of confidence and security, should not have any doubts and especially should not share them with his subordinates. Therefore, in an authoritarian organization, the manager should not tell his subordinates everything. He should not reveal to them any risks and controversies. Most importantly, he must not admit that he made a mistake or is unable to find a solution. Thus, in a hierarchical culture, the manager drifts more and more apart from his subordinates. He has more and more control over them, but at the same time he can less and less count on the use of their potential. The stronger the leader, the lonelier he is.

In an authoritarian organization there is vertical coordination that is connected with the tendency to centralize decisive rights. Focusing these rights on the highest levels of power may support the accomplishment of organizational goals only in the case of small organizations acting in stable environments and performing simple tasks. If any of these conditions is not met, centralization of power leads to an overburdening of managers by
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decision as well as excessive concentration on the management of current activities at the expense of long-term matters. To prevent this, the management span is decreased, forming new managerial posts and management levels, thereby extending the organizational hierarchy. This in turn prolongs the taking of decisions and conveying them for implementation. In a hierarchical system, the strongly dismembered organizational structure also brings about the dominance of vertical communication orientated towards the needs of power, simultaneously weakening horizontal communication orientated towards the accomplishment of tasks.

The basic weaknesses of hierarchical organizations, herewith referred to as authoritarian organizations, are sought by A. Jay in elites’ self-consolidation by investing in the features that assured success in the past. This leads to an inability to cope with the requirements of completely new situations [Jay, 1996: 79–80].

Role of Obedience

Obedience is the basic social norm in a hierarchical culture. Those who are lower in the hierarchy should be obedient to those who have a higher position in it. The subordinates’ submissiveness, eagerness with which they wish to fulfill their superior’s directives, cements and consolidates the hierarchy. After all, it signifies the strength of the leader’s authority.

Subject to such conditions, the manager quite easily broadens the scope of his knowledge, sometimes extending it to the sphere of his subordinates’ personal lives. In an authoritarian organization’s culture the employees themselves expect interest in their personal matters from their superior. They confide in him and ask for advice. This allows them to reproduce a family home atmosphere at the workplace with its accompanying sense of security.

The tendency to extend the scope of power by the entity exercising it is considered a natural phenomenon. After all, Montesquieu’s famous rule relating to constraining one authority by another arose from the following statement: “(…) eternal experience teaches that anybody who has power is prone to overuse it” [Montesquieu, 1957]. M. Mulder notes that managers feeling the need for dominance try to increase the scope of their authority [Mulder, 1977: 92]. This particularly refers to charismatic leaders whom the authoritarian organization develops and who feel especially well in it. D. Kipnis presents the psychological mechanism of this phenomenon as follows: If someone has power, the temptation to increase his influence over the behavior of subordinates grows. Once such influence is increased, the conviction emerges that subordinates do not control their behavior, only their superior does that. As a result of this conviction there appears a tendency to create psychological distance with respect to subordinates, along with perceiving them exclusively as objects of manipulation [Kipnis, 1972].
Stanislaw Ossowski noted that instilling obedience is most effective when it consists of appealing to human passivity and inertia. This is because complete obedience, while excusing somebody from the duty of deciding, also relieves them of related fears and conflicts [Ossowski, 1983: 85].

Extension of the scope of power and extortion of obedience also occurs in an authoritarian organization as result of the managers’ lack of resistance to criticism and the creation of a climate of a single correct rightness that they represent. However, the most characteristic element of the authoritarian style of management is ensuring oneself subordinates’ obedience through the ability to induce fear. Followers of hierarchy are keen on glorifying those leaders who have such inclinations.

R. O’Brien describes the behavior of J. W. Marriott at the time when he was still the owner of a small restaurant in Washington as typical for this style: “His managers never knew exactly at what time, by day or night, he would run into the kitchen or restaurant and start checking the cleanliness in the refrigerator and pantry, the freshness of the waiters’ shirts, dust on pictures and chandeliers or under the table, or the sheen on beer mugs. They were aware that if he did not find everything glowing, shining, or clean and just perfect, they would have hell on earth” [Stachowicz–Stanusch, 2004: 116].

One can really hardly trust people if they admire such a style of management, confusing hysteria and rudeness with professionalism, and petty-mindedness with perfectionism.

Obedience based on anxiety and a conviction of the omnipotence of power gives rise to an attitude of humbleness and conformism. But first of all, it means that in power relationships the subordinate party becomes completely passive, devoid of any initiative and willingness to exert an impact on the course of events in the organization.

**Partnership**

**Consequences of the Internal Sense of Control**

The basic principle behind partnerships is an organizational culture in which the main assumption is an internal sense of control. The conviction that everyone is the architect of his own fortune and is basically dependent on himself as to whether or not he achieves his planned goals diverts attention away from seeking external points of support in the form of strong protectors and directs it to the development of own potential. Adoption of such a cultural assumption points to an egalitarian attitude expressed in the tendency to minimize social differences and carefully legitimize all powers. A natural effect of such attitudes is the insignificant distance of power. G. Hofstede’s observation indicates that in countries of insignificant distance of power, subordinates find it easy to contact their
superiors and express an objection to directives whose rightness seems dubious to them. These countries include Austria, Israel, New Zealand, Ireland, and the Scandinavian countries [Hofstede, 1984: 80]. It is the educational ideals instilled in the children at home and at school that are decisive in this case. Truth is not conveyed to the children by their parents and to the pupils by their teachers, but it is reached jointly through discussion and mutual learning.

When the distance of power is insignificant, position in the hierarchy is not so important. Differences between places in the hierarchy result from playing different organizational roles that are adopted exclusively for pragmatic reasons. Apart from that they do not diversify people as having higher or lower positions in the hierarchy. Characteristic of partnerships is employee reluctance to reduce the degree of their freedom and independence to the advantage of increasing the scope of the superior’s power. Predominant is the conviction that the subject of a manager’s contacts with his subordinates should be exclusively professional matters, where the managerial function is treated as an exclusively official function that should not regulate relationships between people outside the workplace and work time. P. Senge’s comment on the fundamental change in skills that are decisive in success in managerial work refer to partnerships in full. These are no longer the skills of decision–making and problem solving, but moralizing and training capabilities as well as helping others to learn [Senge, 1998: 335]. Requirements posed before partnership managers radically decrease the importance of power insignia. Demonstration of rights connected to the position held is not an element of prestige. This is because the need to strengthen communication requires the provision of easy contacts between the manager and his subordinates.

According to H. P. Sims and C. C. Manz, an inherent part of the partnership concept is the idea of self–leadership. In line with this theory, we deal with self–leadership when the manager loses his central position because the relationships between him and his subordinates change from imperious to ones based on partnership. All employees are pillars of the organization, not just the leader who has a vision and establishes a direction for activities. All employees are able to effectively steer their own conduct. The self–leadership concept assumes the strong internal motivation of the employees oriented towards ambitious objectives. Sims and Manz point to definitions synonymous with self–leadership and connected with the impact of people on themselves—self–regulation, self–rule, and self–control. Simultaneously, the same authors do not call for depriving the organization or team of the managerial post. However, such a person should be a special manager who is called a “super–leader.” It is a person who gradually makes his employees independent, expecting them to take up the leading roles on the stage of the organization’s activity. The super–leader’s trainees become operational leaders capable
of interchangeable management of the work done by task teams, as the demand for their skills appears in this field [Sims and Manz, 1996].

Sims and Manz substantiate this by saying that in the fast changing world of the information civilization, it is the complete participation of all employees in the organization management that is needed, not just that of a small group of heroic leaders overburdened with work. All employees must be such heroes. There is a reason why they entitled their book *Company of Heroes*. So, the point is how to stimulate and use the talent, energy, enthusiasm, and professionalism of all members of the organization. What is decisive in the development of partnerships is the impact of the changeable and unpredictable environment, which imposes the obligation to cope with the uncertainty generated by this environment on all its members.

There is one more reason for pressure on the development of partnerships that is seldom mentioned, at least in management science. It is a particularly important reason because it is connected with the most praiseworthy institution of Western civilization—the liberal democracy.

A liberal democracy is based on several basic principles. The first is the primacy of human rights—the individual’s rights over the rights of social groups. This indicates the impossibility of depriving anybody of a fundamental scope of rights for the sake of a collective interest. The second is pluralism—admitting the possibility that many truths occur in public life and recognizing that they have equal rights. This is tantamount to protection of the freedom of speech, association, and assembly. The third is the tripartite principle of power, which leads to an inter–restraining of the legislative, executive, and judiciary powers. The related independence of specific state institutions absolutely must be complied with. Unacceptable to this rule are exceptions made in the sake of some higher purposes. Finally, the fourth principle is that of subsidiarity, which means assistance and support from the state power institutions and bodies for the sake of civic initiatives. This leads to power decentralization and the development of local autonomy. In a liberal democracy the state’s goal is to create developmental conditions for its citizens.

The ideals of liberal democracy gradually cleared the way for application in organizational systems. There seem to be no reasons whatsoever why members of any organization should be deprived of their human rights, even if only in part. Today, R. A. Dahl would have had far fewer reasons to complain about the ideological inconsistencies of the American democracy model, which in the 1960s consisted of the fundamental difference between power relationships in the state and enterprise [Dahl, 1970: 117]. Thus, we are not surprised today by the stand of Carol Pateman who in the 1970s made it clear, writing that the aim of participatory management is democracy and related justice, equality, and protection of civic rights, and not an increase in the efficiency or improve-
ment of the relationships between representatives of labor and capital [Pateman, 1975]. It is no accident that B. Barber writes about the replacement of “hard” power, the source of which is managerial hierarchy, with “soft” power, which derives its strength from the universalist culture that could create a system of principles and institutions [Barber, 2007: 79].

**Development and Use of Employee Potential**

A partnership culture’s values are connected with the development and use of the potential of all members of the organization. The models for this culture constitute a basis for participatory management and the creation of temporary task teams. Connected with the first issue is the democratization of visions and decisions in the organization. Subordinates cooperate closely with the manager in the vision-creating and decision-making processes. Connected with the latter issue is the temporariness and variability of managerial functions. A person who exhibits the knowledge and skills adequate for the type of the task and the conditions of its accomplishment in addition to the experience and personality traits that may appear particularly useful in accomplishment of a specific task here and now is appointed as the temporary manager in the task team. At the same time, this means that management is shared among almost all employees whose unique traits and skills may be used at different times in task teams management.

In partnerships, as a result of the dispersion of decisive rights, all members have, or at least theoretically may have, a share, even though uneven, in exercising power. The organizational system’s features in this case are the decentralization of decisions and temporariness of the division of power, leading to a heterarchy. This is tantamount to a special role of horizontal bonds and cooperation value. According to T. Peters, the manager in horizontal organizational structures has real control only when he can trust thousands of people, unknown to him, who undertake an initiative without taking into account the formal scopes of activities, better serve their clients, improve their own work, and work faster and flawlessly [Peters, 1993: 466].

In a decentralized organization, the manager is primarily an informer for his subordinate employees. He may not retain any information for himself because he is unable to evaluate which information is necessary and to what extent for the employee in unassisted problem solving. In such a case the selection of information rests not with the manager, but with his subordinates. Decentralization of power is connected with intensive communication and spurring the subordinates into learning and innovation. Decentralization of decisive rights motivates achievement and professional development, increases people’s creativity and susceptibility to changes, and supports learning and proper response to environmental situations. We can count on all such positive effects when the organization is big, has a complex profile and diversified activity areas, is
functioning in complex and variable surroundings and, last but not least, employs people exhibiting appropriate qualifications and skills, who are guided by the need to develop professionally. It is due to decentralization that the effect of combining the great scale of activities with flexibility was reached in divisional structures at one time, which initially seemed impossible. However, A. Jay notes that this way of thinking is not a discovery of the 1960s, but it appeared much earlier, as exemplified by the organizational structure worked out by Saint Dominic when he was founding the Dominican Order [Jay, 1996: 83]. A practical confirmation of the efficacy of decentralization under conditions of environmental pressure may be the example of Shell’s atypical reaction to the oil crisis in the 1970s. What was indisputable then was the conviction that the crisis conditions required an increased degree of the decision centralization. Surprisingly, Shell acted the other way round: It increased its local entities’ decision–making freedom and so outdistanced its competitors.

Activity based on a horizontal flow of information, where resources are deployed and task teams are formed, leads to the heterarchy phenomenon, which points to parallelism and variability of power centers. The manager of a given team may simultaneously be a subordinate of his employee, who performs the management of another team or another activity area where the mentioned manager participates as one of the contractors. Heterarchy deprives hierarchy of its basic features, i.e. stability and uniformity of the power system. Hierarchy is based on binary relations of the dependence and transitivity of the command–giving chain, expressed in the notion of the management pile up: If manager A has power over B, and B over C, then A has power over C. Instead, heterarchy means parallelism and variability of power centers: Manager A may have power over B, and B over C, but C may also have power over A [Hedlund, 1986].

Requirement of Self–Reliance

A partnership culture involves several basic norms. The self–reliance requirement, which is a simple consequence of weakened hierarchical correlations, results from most of them. In partnerships the horizontal relationships of cooperation predominate. Ordinary workers entangled in such relationships must immediately react to arising problems connected with the acquisition of new information or a change of client expectations. They simply have no time to consult their superiors. Besides, due to a considerable flattening of the structure, the manager holding a higher rank must deal with quite a different category of matters and does not have sufficient knowledge about direct executive matters. Therefore, the decision–making obligation rests with the executive level.

By the very nature of things, ordinary workers have the fastest access to significant source information. To be able to take decisions based on such information, they need to have the most comprehensive knowledge about the decision–related situation. In au-
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Authoritarian organizations, the managers in higher managerial positions have such knowledge as their employees obtained and convey to them. Partnerships attempt to equip ordinary workers with knowledge that allows them to take decisions independently. This should be knowledge going far beyond their professional specialty. It should relate to the whole organization’s functioning conditions and priorities, and find expression in a knowledge of various aspects of the problem that is the subject of the decision, while providing an appropriately broad outlook and a capacity for synthesis. The more ingenious and the better educated the employee, the less top–down management he needs and the more freedom and responsibility he should have in order to develop his whole potential.

The requirement of self–reliance and related personal responsibility for undertaken activities and decisions may be met only under conditions of strong motivation. Such conditions are created by internal motivation resulting from the employee’s personal incentives, not from external motivation resulting from the repertoire of stimuli used by the superior. The need for self–reliance arises from professional ambitions and interest in the content of the performed work. Of significant importance in this case is the level of professional knowledge developing such ambitions and interests. In work in outstanding teams—centers of excellence—diversity of contacts both inside and outside the organization and the possibility of implementing one’s own concepts are factors that strengthen internal motivation. Due to a poorly developed hierarchy and hence few permanent managerial positions, a particularly motivating form of promotion under these conditions becomes the horizontal promotion consisting of the employee’s participation in the accomplishment of more and more difficult and ambitious tasks in more and more elite teams. Obviously, apart from satisfaction, horizontal promotion contributes to an increase in the employee’s “market value” on the labor market and related financial bonuses.
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