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Abstract:
Both in the financial world and in the entrepreneurial world, high-performance leaders have been constantly sought to cope with current economic and social times. The issue of leadership has been debated for many years and thus models have been found to meet economic needs. There are many impact leaders who have different strategies from each other. Often the style in which leaders lead organizations efficiently must be shaped by the circumstances that arise in the world of continuous development.
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1. Introduction

Every organization has a leader. We can agree that we individually need someone to run our business and institutions. The leader of any organization is expected to fulfill his role, which is given by communicating the values of the organization he represents. Leadership skills are required by a manager to function effectively at the strategic level, and a successful manager will be able to identify personal skills to achieve strategic ambitions, as well as manage personal leadership development to support the achievement of the strategic ambitions. Where it will be able, a leader will evaluate the effectiveness of the management plan and will promote a healthy and safe environment that supports a culture of quality.

2. The leader in times of crisis

The leader in times of crisis is the one who makes decisions and tells people what to do. This model of leadership must be seen as the one who runs the company during crises. When there are challenging circumstances in an organization, you want a person who can step in and take responsibility and make tough decisions to put things back on a path of healing and growth. The analogy we can use is that of a fire. If there is a fire and the room is filled with smoke, people will panic. Most people will want someone to take the first step and tell them what to do to ensure their survival. This would not be the time for a committee to be formed, to debate what to do, to reach some kind of agreement and then to take action unless the group of people already has experience in solving problems quickly.

In figure no. 1 we present a progression of models of leadership in which a leader oscillates permanently. We emphasize that a strong leader will not stop practicing a single leadership model but will be during his exercise in the model that shows the circumstances of the organization he leads, constantly evolving to collaborate with employees.
Among the character traits of a strong leader we find the ability to quickly assess a situation, match previous knowledge and understanding of the company, make a decisive decision and have enough charisma, confidence and authority for everyone to follow. If all this is not part of the character of the crisis leader, then a disaster could happen. In each of these examples, the end result would be disastrous. The same can be said about the organizational situation. An impact crisis leader would know the organization well, be able to quickly analyze any situation, make a final decision and have the trust and respect of employees to quickly implement the plan. This would increase the chances of a successful outcome that would get them out of the crisis. [1].

Even the leadership of the crisis leader, who is on the side of the dictator in the progress of the leadership, is far from the typical manager. One of the most obvious differences is demonstrated when a problem arises. An old-fashioned manager will want to take control of the situation and then establish a path that will have the least negative impact and bring things back to the way they were before the crisis. Common statements, such as "This is how we will get out of this hole" or "Let's get into damage control and contain the situation" indicate a desire to answer the problem and control the narrative as much as possible. Managers tend to want to put the best possible light in a bad situation and, if all else fails, to figure out who is to blame for the crisis. Once the problem is contained, then the manager will want to move quickly to the next problem (and blame all these unfortunate problems).

The crisis leader, on the other hand, has a broader vision of a particular situation. They will also want to address the current crisis with some measures to fill the gaps with appropriate measures, but they will also want to find a way to avoid a recurrence of the problem by changing and improving the process. They will want to use this opportunity to help the organization learn how to work as a team to address the crisis in order to move towards the collaborative part of the leadership diagram. Crisis leaders will ask questions such as "What can we learn from this problem?", "What did we do well as a team when we faced a difficult situation and what could we
have done better?” And “What do we have to do? Changing the process or system to prevent this from happening again? ”The goal of a crisis leader is to get out of the other side of an issue with a stronger set of processes and a more skilled team, who are better prepared to deal with the next situation. A crisis leader will even praise the group for discovering the problem, bringing it to the leader's attention and assisting the solution. When this is the approach a leader takes when a crisis arises, the fear of sharing bad information and the fear of failure begin to evaporate throughout the organization.

Another way to see the difference between a crisis leader and a leader is to look at how the data is handled. Managers tend to want to do whatever it takes to keep the data from looking bad or moving in the wrong direction. Some might see bad data as a sign of weakness that could prevent a manager from getting the next promotion or pay rise. A crisis leader, on the other hand, will want the data to be as accurate and visible as possible, even if this paints a bad picture of the situation. Then they will dig into the data and use the information to help discover the root of the problem to permanently resolve the situation. [2].

The crisis leader knows that the only way to stimulate improvement is to get the whole organization to recognize that it needs to change. One way to make this a reality is by exposing uninterrupted data to the entire organization. A crisis leader called this data "ugly" and often spoke of the need to expose both good and bad data in order to determine what needs to be repaired and to set a starting point so that progress can be made. improvement can be measured accurately.

As a way to demonstrate the difference between managers and leaders when it comes to data usage, the following model could help bring more perspectives. As an example, in a fairly large global corporation, the two dozen business units will report monthly performance. It is clear that in many cases, what is being reported is not exactly what is actually happening in these business units. The Director-General has established that there will be a "day of amnesty" when it comes to reporting safety, quality and customer satisfaction data. This would allow these companies to clean up their data and start reporting what is actually happening without any form of redemption. About half of the business units decided to present the same numbers they had always reported, refusing to admit that they did not do as well with the recorded data (after a bit of investigation, it was quite easy to establish that the data painted much more good. The image of the company than what is actually happening). The managers of these companies tried to control the narrative and turn the data around to make things look better than they really were. The other half of the business units had the opportunity to re-evaluate their data and established that the numbers do not reflect what is actually happening. In the end, they reported much worse results than previously thought (but were closer to reality). The CEO, in his opinion, did not unleash his anger on these businesses, but praised them for their honor and hired financial resources to help them with their improvement efforts. These organizations had crisis-style leaders who were willing to admit that they had problems and had to go into crisis. It didn't take long for these businesses to start making significant improvements.

3. The leader who gathers ideas for decision making

The leader makes decisions after receiving a significant contribution from employees and asks for ideas to improve the solution: once the crisis is in the rearview mirror, the leader can begin the process of moving the organization to collaboration and teamwork. As pointed out, many people, especially in middle management, will resist this change in leadership style. When people have worked for a dictator for a long time (especially if the leader remains in Leadership mode in times of crisis, far from the end of the crisis), they feel full of conviction and are afraid to take responsibility for making decisions. For example, in an organization, the leader used the dictator's style for several years. When he left, the new boss began asking people to make their own decisions. More than half of the staff resigned in the first month. One of the employees, the director of human resources, said in her exit interview that she accepted the position in the hope that she
would never need to make meaningful decisions or take any responsibility. He had hoped to work for someone to tell him what to do and how to do it throughout his career.

How can a leader easily break the organization out of the habit of relying on the boss to make all the decisions? As the crisis draws to a close, the leader will need to begin the transition from the crisis model of the leader to the idea-gathering leader model. This style of leadership depends on asking people for their input and ideas before making a final decision. The person in charge will ask questions, listen carefully to the inputs from several sources and then decide on a course of action.

One of the concerns of the leadership that gathers ideas is that this is quite easy to falsify. In other words, the leader may have already thought about what to do and go only through the movements of asking for input.[3] If the boss and employees lack trust, there may be a perception that the leader is not honest when asking for ideas.

Why is the leader model that gathers ideas to help the organization move toward collaboration essential? By soliciting people's input and ideas, it will initiate the development of critical thinking skills in the workforce. They will begin to see their work in a different light. "How can my process be better?" or "How would I do things differently?" it will become part of a daily habit of looking for a better way of doing things. When an employee, at any level, raises an idea or contributes to solving a problem, it is important that leaders respond in a positive way. If it makes sense, has the potential to have a constructive impact by bringing the organization closer to its vision and there are resources available, the leader will begin to build his goodwill by finding a way to implement the employee's idea. If any (or all) of these criteria are not met, it will be important to thank the person and explain why this particular idea will not work at present. Then this leadership model will ask for more ideas.

One way to facilitate this is to put a flip chart in the area where the leader would like to start asking for contributions for improvements and explain that because employees are thinking of better ways to do their job, they should write the idea (or tell their supervisor) and they can do the writing along with their date and name. Once an idea has been written, the only way it can be removed from the list is if the idea has been implemented or if the employee has received a good explanation of what cannot be done at present. One of the rules of this process is that the only person who can remove an item from the list is the employee who came up with the idea. It becomes an excellent visual tool to see how many ideas are gathered and how many have been addressed. It will be important to periodically celebrate, with the entire department, the ideas that are being implemented and to connect the improvements to the overall performance of the organization. This will start the process of building a sense of pride and achievement among the workers.

Asking for ideas is considered a step towards collaboration, but it is not a huge leap, because the leader still takes responsibility for making the final decision. This allows the development of critical thinking skills without forcing people to be held accountable. The fear of failure can be difficult to overcome. However, when they see that the leader is making a decision to implement an idea, especially one that does not work, they will begin to overcome this fear. When failure occurs, it is important to realize why it went wrong and immediately start asking for new ideas to continue progress. This is the idea behind the plan, to perform, to verify (or study), the act of improvement.

First of all, we are introduced to the aspect of a leader following the model of the leader who gathers ideas. On the surface, it seems that it would be quite easy to ask employees for their ideas on how to improve their processes. However, if there is a lack of trust, which is usually where they try to change the culture, employees may resist because they may think there are adverse reasons as to why they are included. Second, it is realized that without vision, it is difficult to sort out ideas on how to improve. It introduces the concepts of mission, vision, strategy and values.
4. The leader who forms teams

The model for teams formed to work on specific issues with restrictions and supervision by the leader of this model, begins when the first real problem-solving team is formed. Not only are employees in this group sharing their ideas, but they are now being asked to make a recommendation for action. This will extend the critical thinking phase to now include taking on a certain responsibility for making a decision. The team's recommendation will still be verified and approved by the leader, so the team is not 100% responsible. However, the team leader will want to ensure that the team has the knowledge (data), tools, and methodology to make a recommendation that is highly likely to be accepted and ultimately work. There is a great thrill achieved within the team for the first time when it participates in the implementation of one of its ideas and then it witnesses the positive impact on the process. This continues to create a sense of pride and ownership, which will continue to connect employees with the success of the company.

This is also an easily falsified leadership model. I was part of several teams that were asked to work on a specific problem or make an improvement and then find out later that it was a facade and that the leaders did not intend to follow any of the suggestions. If this happens, leaders may return to an old-fashioned leadership model.

The team leader is a leader who can more easily implement this model. This is starting to separate those executives who really want their organization to achieve excellence and those who are trying to do the minimum amount of work to perpetuate a facade. This step requires great concentration, determination and support from every leader in the organization. There is a misconception that all it takes to form a team is to throw a group of people into a room, give them a task, and they will naturally start acting as a team. This is rarely the case. To achieve true teamwork, several key ingredients are needed, and if they are not present, the team will eventually fail. If this happens, skeptics will argue that improvement efforts have not been successful and this will become an excuse to move the organization to an old management model, a comfort zone for many in the organization.

What are the key ingredients needed to promote successful teams?

A common understanding of the organization's mission, vision and strategy. Each team formed will have a much better chance of getting the time, resources and support they need, if it is clear why the success of this team is essential for achieving the strategy that supports the vision.[4] Too often, we notice that teams intertwine and then are given a task that has little or no impact on the future success of the organization. This is usually done for the manager to check a box that meets a personal goal, without the intention of allowing the team to have any real impact. We can give the example of a team that was created to decide what type of plants would work best in the employees 'canteen and another team that was assigned the task of coordinating the employees' birthdays. We see that the actions of such teams would not help the organization to achieve its strategy, but would allow management to say that they use teams.

Another reason why it is extremely important for the team to understand where it fits into the overall strategy is that participants want to know if team time is appreciated or lost. One of the main causes of disruptive behavior in a team meeting is the lack of a valid answer to the question "Why are they here?" Team participants are usually under significant pressure to complete their day-to-day work, and if there is a belief that the team they were asked to do is not so important, then they will become disruptive. These disruptions take many forms, such as late display (if any), making phone calls in the middle of the meeting, trying to leave on a tangent to perform the actual work, and not working on any of the tasks assigned. These are seen as low priorities. These interruptions, especially without a facilitator, will usually lead to a team being transformed and eventually to break up.

In the early 1990s, General Electric launched a team initiative called "Out Out." This was a company-wide initiative that was implemented to start gathering teams of employees to solve problems. In many parts of the company it was necessary for each of these teams to have a trained, neutral facilitator. In most cases, even the most difficult teams managed to get positive results due...
to the presence of a facilitator. What exactly is the role of a facilitator? A facilitator is there to help the team succeed. They do not go into the content, but instead focus on the meeting process. This means that before the meeting, the facilitator will make sure that there is an agenda, that there is a clear definition of the aspect of success and that the scope of the problem is well defined and the right people have been invited. During the meeting, they will follow a plan that will help improve the chances of participants meeting in teams (icebreakers and team building exercises), provide tools to help the team analyze data and reach conclusions, and to help and with the help of the team reach consensus. Consensus is reached when all team members reach an agreement that may not have been the first choice, but it is acceptable for them to go ahead with a recommendation. To help teams achieve positive results, it is extremely important that the facilitator be neutral. If there is a perception that the facilitator is trying to direct the group to a specific outcome, the team will believe that the meeting is false and that management has placed a spy in the room to ensure the team reaches the conclusion the managers want. So, the best facilitator is the one who is outside the department, division or even outside the entire organization. Only teams that have been brought together to make meaningful decisions need a facilitator. Also, as the team gains experience working together and making decisions, the need for a facilitator will diminish. The use of truly neutral facilitators is the strongest indicator that the organization has a team leader who is willing to make the necessary investments to move the organization to collaboration. All team members were trained on tools and methodologies to improve development. Often an organization will throw a group of employees together, with little or no training, and wait to come together as a team and solve a difficult problem. If managers do not want to invest the time and resources to help their employees gain the skills they need to work together for improvement, then their goal of achieving excellence will ultimately fail.

The training also provides teams with the tools and methodologies they will need to work on complex issues. A common saying is: "If the problems had been easy to solve, they would have been solved a long time ago." There are many tools available to help a team better understand their process (process maps, charts), display data to better understand what is happening (Histograms, Run Charts, Scatter Charts) and analyze the data to make a recommendation for a solution. There are also several methodologies that will provide a roadmap for teams to better understand the steps needed to have the best chance of success. The most common methodology is known as Planning, Initiation, Verification, Action or Planning, Initiation, Study, Action. This is a simple, four-step approach that ensures that teams follow a prescribed formula when making changes. Most organizations understand the importance of making a plan before they change anything. However, with everyone's busy schedules, there is a temptation to implement the plan and then offer no monitoring to see if the desired result has been achieved. Failure to follow this cycle, improvement efforts have a higher chance of failure, which will destroy teams. Proper training and dedication to using the right tools and methodologies will reduce the chances of this happening.

Avoiding the use of the wrong tools and techniques when making decisions is essential for effective leadership. There are many ways in which a team can implode and get poor or even negative results. Training will help teams better understand the pitfalls of avoiding and providing assistance when problems arise. Teams can also avoid using techniques that will ensure their destruction if they are aware of these dangers. For example, there is only one decision technique that will guarantee that the team will break up, fall apart, and then fail completely and completely. This decision technique is voting. When a vote takes place, the team now consists of "winners" and "losers". Nobody wants to be a loser. The losers will do everything in their power to ensure that the decision does not work and will tell the majority who won the vote that they were wrong and should have voted. This causes a great friction within the team, which leads to a subsequent failure. If the leaders of the organization really want their teams to be successful, then they will provide training and a neutral facilitator to ensure that participants avoid these types of mistakes.

Teams have all the data and resources they need to make the best decisions possible, and "Knowledge is power" is a well-known statement. Some managers are reluctant to give up team data because it is a step towards giving up their power. This is why the step towards leadership that
forms teams in the progression model is a real test of the organization's desire to achieve the necessary collaboration to achieve its vision of excellence. Often the data the team is looking for is owned or the company cannot afford to pass the data on to a competitor or customers. In many of these cases, the data proved to be common knowledge in the industry and it became clear that the manager did not want to diminish his power, allowing others access to this knowledge.

Another way managers can limit the ability of employee teams to do much more is to starve them of the resources they need to do anything. There are many examples of teams coming up with ideas that will actually save the company's significant money with low investment, but managers do not seem to find the funds or release the resources to make the necessary changes. If this is the case, it would have been better not to start forming teams in the first place. Not being able to implement their ideas will cause frustration and will eventually lead team members to believe that using teams is a façade. [5]

There are several key resources that could benefit the team if they were part of the improvement process. One resource that every team needs is a good accountant who is connected to the organization's finance department. Calculating the savings associated with the improvement can be difficult and if someone who has a financial fund can give credibility to these calculations. Each team also needs a sponsor, someone who is in the lead, who can ensure that the team is directly connected to the strategy and vision of the organization. The sponsor can help ensure that team members have enough time to meet, that a facilitator is provided, and that the understanding the team is working with is well understood. The sponsor can also ensure that any bottlenecks are addressed and that resources and funding are provided to implement the team's recommendations. In many cases, the leader who forms the teams or the team will be the actual sponsor, especially at the beginning of the improvement process.

The ultimate ingredient for successful teams is that they don't do stupid things. This final ingredient is the most important, so we'll repeat it: The team doesn't have to do stupid things! One surefire way to stop all team work and destroy any hope of excellence is to lay off employees through an improvement project. Unfortunately, this happens too often. Why is the dismissal of employees due to improvements (or even the perception that the dismissals were due to improvements) so destructive? If a team recommends a change that results in a colleague, friend, or even being let go of the organization, no one will volunteer to be part of another training team. This will hinder the team's efforts for years, maybe even decades, and the trust between employees and management will drop to zero.

The leaders of the organization will have to make a sincere commitment not to fire anyone because of an implemented improvement. However, employees may be fired due to a downturn in the economy (this must be explained in detail in the workforce or confidence will continue to evaporate) or because of it. If an improvement reduces or eliminates the need for workers in that part of the process, then leaders will have to work hard to find a new home and slowly allow the workforce to be reduced to appropriate levels. If there are currently no open positions, it may be necessary to create temporary jobs, possibly full-time jobs.

Leaders will also need to consider the cause and effect of all the improvement team's recommendations. [6]. In a factory, a team's improvement plan can almost trigger a riot. A real example is a team working on something that should have been a positive thing for everyone: improving the quality of the product they produced. However, the highest pay in the factory turned out to be the repairmen who fixed the defective product. They naturally assumed that if the quality improved, fewer repairs would be needed, and repair workers would be left without a job. When it was discovered how upset the workers were, the leaders finally made a commitment that everyone would have a job and that no one's wage rate would be reduced. When quality improved and fewer repairs were needed, leaders kept their word and found homes for all repair workers and did not change their payment methods. This has created trust between leaders and employees and they have finally been able to make big improvements.

The team leader model understands that in order to achieve true collaboration, it is very important for the entire organization to trust each other, work well together, not blame others for
failures driven by faulty processes, and create a culture based on teamwork. If the leader of this model is truly committed to making this significant change in culture, then they will go through all the training, similar to their employees (not the executive assembly, but the entire classes), will serve on a training team, as a regular participant, and completing the role of sponsor for other improvement or development teams. Many organizations that have gone this route now require every employee, including the manager and every other leader, to serve at least one week a year on a training team. When an organization is able to achieve this level of commitment to teamwork, the path to excellence begins to materialize.

5. The empowerment leader who works with the team

Teams made up entirely of employees who work with the leader to achieve excellence. Employee empowerment is quite debated in organizations trying to change their culture. A leader who empowers his delegates knows that this is one of the most difficult models to implement successfully. The leader is primarily responsible for the overall success of the organization. Empowerment does not mean anarchy. To achieve this level of performance, employees will need to master the three previous models and be ready to take on this new level of responsibility. This can easily take several years of preparation, practice and research to accomplish. The types of decisions the team should make are also limited (they can extend over time). The first area of empowerment usually deals with day-to-day decisions, which will ensure that the client's needs are met. Next, it would be to quickly fix the problems on the spot to put out any fire that might occur (this should then trigger the use of a troubleshooting team to try to figure out how to avoid the problem again). Some organizations have gone so far as to allow their teams to participate in the hiring process, contribute to awards and recognition reviews, and decide how to launch new products or services in their business. An organization that has achieved the leadership of this model throughout the enterprise will be close to (or even surpassing) achieving what the Japanese have implemented decades ago.

This pattern of leadership model progression is meant to be fluid. In other words, a good leader may need to move back and forth, using different leadership styles depending on the current situation. For example, if a leader got the whole organization to model 3 or 4 and a new crisis arises, then it may be necessary to return to model 1 to deal with the current situation. This will need to be explained to the organization so that employees do not become frustrated (different people express the fact that once they experience what it is like to work in a team, they do not want to go back to the old ways). The second point is that various parts of the organization can move along this evolution at different speeds. There may be a leader who understands this new way of thinking and quickly moves his group to model 3, while everyone else tries to figure out how to make model 2 work. In an organization, the CEO actually uses this leadership chart to keep track of the style that each of their leaders currently uses at all levels of the company. They then use the leadership progression model as a way to have discussions about what would be needed to move that part of the organization to the next model.

The empowerment leader model in the workplace is the most difficult radical change needed to fully achieve excellence. [7]. In each case where the driving of the Model 4 has taken root, the performance values have been improved by an order of magnitude, including safety, quality, delivery and customer satisfaction.

If the use of fully skilled teams has such a profound impact, why doesn't every organization pursue this approach? There are a multitude of reasons, including: the fear of leadership giving up too much power, the fear of managers being looked at for promotion opportunities if teams get a job bonus, the fear that a team of employees will make a mistake, the fear of employees not coming together as a team and doing what is right for the organization, fear of sharing knowledge, fear of not following standardized processes and fear of changing 100 years of old and deep-rooted management practices. Unfortunately, there are several examples of companies that have gone out
of business or have been badly hurt by not overcoming these fears and have established themselves for mediocrity, while their competitors have focused on achieving excellence. [8]

First, most organizations need to go through leadership models 1 through 3 to build a solid foundation before trying to move to model 4. Without a solid foundation of experience that responds quickly to a crisis (model 1), developing critical thinking skills (model 2) and team-based problem solving (model 3) and standardized, well-documented training and processes that go hand in hand with these efforts, empowered teams will tear apart, make mistakes and, in the end, after all, they will fall apart (which would have been the result desired by managers who did not really want to change and only create a facade). It will usually take a year or two to build this foundation before the organization is ready to try to use skilled teams.

Next, the top executives of the organization must understand and understand what it takes to be successful in using qualified teams. This may require a complete change in the way people are measured and rewarded, allowing leaders to move from total control to becoming more of a coach, mentor, and enabling teams to fail and learn. A newly created, empowered team must be cultivated and allowed to grow just like a newly hired employee. It is quite rare, when a new employee is brought in, to throw them directly into a difficult decision-making process on their first day. The same boarding process must be used when launching a qualified team.

Finally, employee teams need to have guidelines on what they can decide for themselves and when to involve the leaders of the organization. Teams have the task of coping with day-to-day activities, helping to solve problems and providing ideas on how to improve and then helping to implement ideas. Leaders are still responsible for the overall functioning of the organization. However, using skilled teams, leaders will have more time to focus on interacting with customers, researching trends in their industry, setting vision and strategy for mission accomplishment, coaching and guiding their teams, and developing the celebration of when they achieve certain goals.

6. Conclusions

The sustainable development of any organization takes place once or after the development of the leader's ability to adapt to each situation. The leader pushes the organization to grow. The crisis leader must present data permanently to the organization. The data presented will be both positive and negative. By observing the points that can be improved, the organization can evolve for a more smooth operation. Measuring progress is essential to make a synthesis of sustainable development.

Gaining the trust of employees is necessary for the leader in times of crisis to grow to gather ideas from employees to help him grow the organization. Employees will need to be included in the organization's activities so that they feel that real progress is in place and that this progress also depends on them. Equally important is the vision that the leader projects over the whole. Without this vision, the ideas that come from employees will be difficult to sort out to ensure improvements. Thus, the mission, strategy and vision will be elements that will not be neglected by a successful leadership in this journey of improvement.

The leader who forms teams will induce the spirit of collaboration, mutual trust of the teams and between their members. Teams will be pushed to work well together, not to blame each other for the failures created by the system. A culture based on teamwork will be created. The leader will engage in all stages of development together with the team to create a culture of development. The leader will participate in the training teams and will constantly monitor the work and the results obtained.

The teams formed must have clear lines regarding what they can decide for themselves and when the involvement should come from the leader of the organization. Teams have the task of coping with day-to-day activities, helping to solve problems and providing ideas on how to improve and then helping to implement ideas.
Leaders are primarily responsible for the smooth running of the organization. By forming successful teams, leaders will focus on other aspects such as interacting with customers, observing key elements of their industry, setting organizational strategies, coaching and guiding teams toward performance, and last but not least, rewarding in a constructive way the teams that bring the results regarding the achievement of the organization’s objectives.
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