

“Management and Leadership Performance in the Defense Department: Evidence from Surveys of Federal Employees.”

Web Appendix

Results of models with split samples—Table 4.

These models have the disadvantage of splitting the sample, reducing the number of cases, and decreasing the precision of the estimates. In the models of the questions asking about high levels of respect or regard for senior leaders, the results are very similar. The coefficient estimate for the Army is slightly smaller in 2002 (4.87) than in Table 1 and slightly larger in 2004 (7.29) than in Table 1. The estimate in 2004 is actually larger than that for the Air Force although the coefficients are not statistically distinguishable (7.29 vs. 6.78). In the models of the question asking whether or not leaders promoted communication, the differences were somewhat larger. The coefficient estimate for the Air Force is larger in 2002 (6.78) and smaller and not significant in 2004 (2.43). The coefficient estimate for the Army is larger in 2004 (3.60) and marginally significant. The coefficient estimate for the Navy is actually negative in 2004 (-1.52) but not significant.

Results of models with split samples—Table 5.

Specifically, in the 2002 models of respect for senior leaders, the coefficient estimate on rank got smaller and lost significance while the coefficient estimate on PHD level education increased and became significant at the 0.05 level. In 2004 the coefficient on rank was much larger and significant while the estimate on PHD education was smaller and lost significance. The coefficient estimate on political experience also got larger and significant at the 0.10 level. In the models of communication in 2002, the coefficient estimate on job tenure is larger but loses significance. The coefficient on political experience becomes larger and significant at the 0.10 level. The coefficient on private management becomes larger but is significant only at the 0.10 level. The coefficients on education are similarly sized but lose significance. In 2004 the key findings diminish such that coefficient estimates on tenure and private management are still positive but smaller and insignificant.

Appendix A. Change in Employee Evaluations of Leadership, Management, and Overall Work Climate by Change in Manager Background, 2002-2004

	Leadership			Management		Work Climate	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
<i>Manager Background</i>							
Δ Rank	1.88	0.42	-1.20	-1.52	-1.32	1.45	1.30
Δ Tenure as bureau chief (Months)	0.06	0.09**	0.12**	0.08*	0.01	0.13**	0.08
Δ Level of Education	5.42	9.39**	9.92**	4.70*	5.56	6.08	6.94
Δ Political Experience	-3.36	-5.06**	-5.78**	-1.95	-0.58	-0.98	-2.80
Δ Combat Experience	0.57	-0.88	0.32	-1.04	-0.90	-3.14	-1.80
Δ Academy	0.77	2.36	2.44	3.01	0.10	1.85	3.62
Δ ROTC	-0.86	-0.46	1.95	2.15	-0.96	2.23	4.13
<i>Controls and Constant</i>							
Δ Ln(Employment)	-8.59**	-9.87**	-5.96**	-3.34*	-7.69**	-6.11*	-7.51**
Δ Ratio of Managers to Employees	-4.05	-0.58	-3.43	-6.13**	-0.05	2.22	4.64
Constant	4.74**	-1.15	-13.10**	-0.33**	0.63	0.08	1.82
N	34	34	34	34	34	34	34
F	1.30	2.62**	1.89	1.37	1.47	0.80	1.11
R ²	0.33	0.50	0.42	0.34	0.36	0.23	0.29

Note: Dependent variable is Δ % Strongly agree or agree. *significant at the 0.10 level, **significant at the 0.05 level in two-tailed tests.

- (1) “I hold my organization’s leaders in high regard” or “I have a high level of respect for my organization’s senior leaders. (Strongly Agree, Agree)” for 2002, 2004, respectively.
- (2) “In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Strongly Agree, Agree)”
- (3) “Managers review and evaluate the organization’s progress toward meeting its goals and objectives (Strongly Agree, Agree).”
- (4) “The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals (Strongly Agree, Agree).”
- (5) “Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources)” or “Managers promote communication among different work units (Stongly Agree, Agree)” for 2002 or 2004, respectively.
- (6) “I recommend my organization as a good place to work (Strongly Agree, Agree).”
- (7) “How would you rate your organization as an organization to work for compared to other organizations? (One of the Best, Above Average).”

Appendix B. Employee Evaluations of Leadership, Management, and Overall Work Climate by Manager Background Including Details About Political Experience, 2002-2004

	Leadership			Management		Work Climate	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
<i>Manager Background</i>							
Rank (0-4)	1.89*	1.77*	-0.11	0.53	0.93	1.94*	1.72
Tenure as bureau chief (Months)	0.01	0.00	0.11**	0.06**	0.04**	0.03*	0.03*
Masters (0,1)	0.20	0.88	2.64	0.07	2.55	3.04	1.70
PhD (0,1)	7.77**	7.11**	2.73	3.09	4.67**	4.61*	4.00*
White House (0,1)	-5.38**	-7.49**	-6.26**	-1.13	-2.83*	-0.39	0.81
Congress (0,1)	5.28**	4.95**	0.85	4.14**	1.36	0.98	3.06*
DOD Political Appointee (0,1)	2.65*	2.19*	1.30	0.72	2.00	0.20	-0.38
Combat Experience (0,1)	0.07	-0.60	-1.51	2.72	-1.45	-0.04	-0.59
Academy (0,1)	-2.00	-3.27	-5.77**	-0.15	-3.85	-0.46	-0.29
ROTC (0,1)	-1.79	-2.18	-4.46*	-0.95	-2.28	-0.97	-1.49
OCS (0,1)	-4.23	-3.97	-2.49	-2.18	-1.38	-1.16	-1.63
Private Management Experience (0,1)	4.68	9.33**	7.43**	4.11	8.13*	7.93	7.66
<i>Controls and Constant</i>							
Agency headed by appointee (0,1)	0.18	-0.89	-2.80	0.74	-0.84	-0.40	-0.11
War fighting agency (0,1)	-2.34	-0.80	-1.34	-2.16	-1.37	-1.81	-2.34
Ln(Employment)	-2.43**	-1.76**	-0.07	-0.36	-0.94	0.39	-0.15
Ratio of Managers to Employees	1.02	6.22**	2.09	-2.34	6.03**	5.62**	3.66
2002 Survey	-8.17**	-3.58**	10.41**	-1.97**	-2.99**	-4.66**	-5.55**
Constant	71.01**	52.88**	56.49**	75.53**	58.04**	51.30**	51.75**
N	79	79	79	79	79	79	79
F	19.02**	14.02**	21.17**	18.95**	14.15**	2.42**	13.39**
R ²	0.69	0.62	0.76	0.45	0.44	0.32	0.34

Note: Standard errors clustered on agency. *significant at the 0.10 level, **significant at the 0.05 level in two-tailed tests.

(1) "I hold my organization's leaders in high regard" or "I have a high level of respect for my organization's senior leaders. (Strongly Agree, Agree)" for 2002, 2004, respectively.

(2) "In my organization, leaders generate high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Strongly Agree, Agree)"

(3) "Managers review and evaluate the organization's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives (Strongly Agree, Agree)."

(4) "The workforce has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals (Strongly Agree, Agree)."

(5) "Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, needed resources)" or "Managers promote communication among different work units (Stongly Agree, Agree)" for 2002 or 2004, respectively.

(6) "I recommend my organization as a good place to work (Strongly Agree, Agree)."

(7) "How would you rate your organization as an organization to work for compared to other organizations? (One of the Best, Above Average).