1. What is Managerial Effectiveness?

The Manager has the task of creating a true whole that is larger than the sum of its parts, a productive entity that turns out more than the sum of the resources put into it.

Peter F. Ducker

Life is not long, and too much of it must not pass in idle deliberation how it shall be spent.

Samuel Johnson

The great end of life is not knowledge but action.

Thomas Huxley

There is only one realistic and unambiguous definition of Managerial Effectiveness.

Effectiveness is the extent to which a Manager achieves the output requirements of the position. This concept of Managerial Effectiveness is the central issue in management. It is the Managers’ job to be effective – it is their only job. Managerial Effectiveness has to be defined in terms of output rather than input, by what Managers achieve rather than what they do.

1.1 RESULTS, NOT PERSONALITY

Effectiveness is best seen as something a Manager produces from a situation by managing it appropriately. It represents output not input. The Manager must think in terms of performance not personality. It is not so much what Managers do but what they achieve.

1.2 EFFECTIVENESS AREAS AND OBJECTIVES

Every managerial job has effectiveness areas associated with it. They may not be written down or even known, but they are always there. These are the areas by which the performance of the Manager in a job may be judged.
Preparing and using such written effectiveness areas has cured numerous management ills simply because the true reason for each Manager’s existence is investigated, discussed, and ultimately agreed on by that manager and the Superior. Effectiveness areas are easily prepared. A typical key opening heading is, “This Manager is performing effectively when this happens...” Initially the answers sometimes are:

“My Superior likes my work”.

“There is no conflict”.

“I get raises”.

“I put in a good day’s work”.

“Letters and requests are handled promptly”.

All five of these answers may or may not lead to, or result from, Managerial Effectiveness, and none reflect output. Managers need to rewrite the answer to the basic question several times before they are satisfied with it.

1.3 OBJECTIVES
Effectiveness areas carried to their logical conclusion lead to “Management by Objectives”. This is nothing more than designing an organisation around the outputs of Managers’ jobs rather than the inputs. There should be quantification in terms of percentages, dollars, time or units. Time bounds should be set, and when this is done the effectiveness areas are transformed into objectives.

1.4 JOB DESCRIPTIONS INHIBIT EFFECTIVENESS
Unfortunately many Managers are held back from focusing on objectiveness because of the way their positions are defined. Job descriptions and position descriptions do not usually help in increasing effectiveness, this is because of the way the job descriptions are written. Lengthy job descriptions usually indicate very little. Many, if not most, managerial jobs are defined in terms of their input and behaviour requirements by such phrases as; the Manager administers..., the Manager maintains..., the Manager organises..., the Manager plans.... Naturally Managers never refer to job descriptions like these.
Once made, they are not too useful as an operating guide. They are often proposed initially by those who want to use a seemingly scientific technique to justify the widespread change in salary differentials or change in the organisation structure. They are often a negative influence as they focus on input and behaviour, the less important end of the Manager’s job.

Some Managers focus on job input by saying, “I manage two hundred people” rather than in terms of output, “I’m responsible for expanding products A and B at 6-10% a year, using my existing resources”.

1.5 EFFICIENCY
Job descriptions often lead to an emphasis on what could be called Managerial Efficiency: the ratio of output to input. The problem with this is that even if both input and output are low, efficiency could still be 100%. In fact, a Manager or department could be 100% efficient and 0% effective. The efficient Manager is easily identified, in referring to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFICIENCY VERSUS EFFECTIVENESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do things right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solves problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguards resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowers costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do right things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce creative alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimise resource utilisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase profit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job descriptions lead to the kind of thinking on the left-hand side: effectiveness areas lead to that shown on the right.

1.6 POSITION DESCRIPTIONS ALSO INHIBIT EFFECTIVENESS
Some organisations have a predominance of descriptions that focus on a Manager’s position in the organisation such as:

The Manager reports to…
The Manager authorises…
The Manager co-ordinates…
The Manager approves…

This kind of description can be important to the military in war time, when changes in command can take place in seconds. Position descriptions, focusing as they do on structure, spring from and reinforce the bureaucratic style.
Many senior military officers who participate in managerial training are surprised to see evidence mount up that they are bureaucrats, that they work essentially for a position-description framework with little attention to output. Position descriptions without objective areas of output associated with them can lead to the maintenance of Managers who are not contributing to their organisations in any useful way.

1.7 THREE KINDS OF EFFECTIVENESS
Managerial Effectiveness is not always clearly understood, and in order to be most effective themselves, Managers should learn to distinguish sharply between:

- Managerial Effectiveness
- Apparent Effectiveness
- Personal Effectiveness

APPARENT EFFECTIVENESS
It is difficult if not impossible to judge managerial effectiveness by observation of behaviour alone. The behaviour must be evaluated in terms of whether or not it is appropriate to the output requirements of the job. For example the following qualities, while important in some positions, may, in others, be irrelevant to effectiveness:

- Usually on time
- Answers promptly
- Has tidy desk
- Make quick decisions
- Good at public relations

These characteristics usually give an air of apparent effectiveness in no matter what context they are used. Unfortunately apparent effectiveness may or may not lead to managerial effectiveness.

PERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS
Poorly defined job outputs can also lead to what might be called “Personal Effectiveness” that is, satisfying personal objectives rather than the objectives of the organisation. This is particularly likely to occur with ambitious people in an organisation that has only a few clearly defined management-output measures. Meetings with these people are riddled with hidden agendas that operate below the surface and lead to poor decision making.
1.8 EFFECTIVENESS IS REWARDED
A well-designed organisation usually ensures that Managerial Effectiveness (and only Managerial Effectiveness) leads to personal rewards. While organisations do vary in the extent, speed, and accuracy of rewards for effectiveness, there can be little doubt that, in the long run, the effective Manager is the rewarded one. The rewards are usually concrete in terms of salary, level of position, and advancement rate. Other rewards more important to some are fulfilled ambitions, assured security, self-actualisation, personal satisfaction or happiness, or simply survival.

2. An Outline of the 3-D Theory

By learning to apply the 3-D theory, any Manager can learn to be more effective. It was designed with that single specific purpose in mind.

At the heart of the 3-D theory there is a very simple idea. It was discovered in a long series of research studies conducted by psychologists in the United States. They discovered that the two main elements in managerial behaviour concerned the task to be done and relationships with other people. They also found that Managers sometimes emphasised one and sometimes emphasised the other, and that these two elements of behaviour could be used in small or large amounts.

For instance, a Manager could be very much task orientated or only a small amount. Also, both behaviours could be used together (the 3-D term is integrated style), task could be used alone (dedicated style), relationships could be used alone (related style) or each could be used to only a small degree (separated style). The four basic styles arranged as shown in the exhibit 2.1. The TO and RO, along the sides stand for Task Orientation (TO) and Relationships Orientation (RO) respectively. These four basic styles represent four types of behaviour.

Not all types of managerial behaviour will fit neatly into these four types, but they are very useful as a general framework. A clear set of indicators and characteristics for each type has been developed which enables each style to be fully understood.
Exhibit 2.1. Four basic styles. There are four basic styles to managerial behaviour.

As an example some indicators of a more effective Separated style are:

- Cautious – careful – conservative – orderly
- Prefers paper work – procedures – facts
- Looks for established principles
- Accurate – precise – correct – perfectionist
- Steady – deliberate – patient
- Calm – modest – discreet

2.1 NO ONE STYLE IS ALWAYS EFFECTIVE

Further researches conducted at several universities clearly established that any of these four basic styles of behaviour could be effective in certain situations and not effective in others. None are more or less effective in themselves. Their effectiveness depends on the situation in which they are used. This means that each one of the four basic styles has a less effective equivalent and a more effective equivalent, resulting in eight managerial styles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASIC STYLE</th>
<th>LESS EFFECTIVE MANAGERIAL STYLE</th>
<th>MORE EFFECTIVE MANAGERIAL STYLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>Compromiser</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedicated</td>
<td>Autocrat</td>
<td>Benevolent Autocrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related</td>
<td>Missionary</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>Deserter</td>
<td>Bureaucrat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For instance, when the high Task Orientation of the dedicated basic style is used inappropriately, the popular as well as the 3-D name given to it is ‘Autocrat’. When used appropriately, the name used instead is ‘Benevolent Autocrat’.

These eight managerial styles then are not eight additional kinds of behaviour. They are simply the names given to the four basic styles when used appropriately or inappropriately. By the use of both the basic and managerial styles, 3-D distinguishes sharply between behaviour and the effectiveness of behaviour.

Exhibit 2.2 Adding the third dimension. Any of the four basic styles may be more or less effective.

These eight managerial styles can be arranged round the four basic styles by using a third dimension of effectiveness as shown in exhibit 2.2. The four basic styles are in the centre, the four less effective equivalents at the front and the four more effective equivalents at the rear. The third dimension is effectiveness. One of the contributions of 3-D is that it gives this term a clear, usable definition. Managerial effectiveness is measured by the extent to which a Manager achieves the output requirements of the position. Clearly Managers must understand, and then work to achieve, the outputs, not the inputs, of their jobs.
2.2 STYLE FLEX

If any one of the four styles may lead to higher outputs, then ‘Style Flexibility’ is clearly a skill most Managers would want to acquire. It is the skill to use a variety of styles to match a variety of situations. Style flexibility needs to be distinguished sharply from ‘Style Drift’, that is, changing one’s own style to keep the peace or to lower pressure on oneself; this is clearly not effective behaviour. ‘Style Resilience’ though is a positive quality. It is maintaining an appropriate style under stress; it is sharply distinguished from ‘Style Rigidity’, which is maintaining an inappropriate style.

The dividing line along some of these is obviously thin. The 3-D theory makes the distinction clearer by teaching how to recognise all four types of behaviour and how to use two of them.

2.3 THREE MANAGERIAL SKILLS

Well, if effectiveness depends on using the appropriate behaviour to match the situation, what skills besides Style Flexibility will effective Managers have? They must know how to read situations (Situational Sensitivity), and they must have the skill to change the situations if they need to be changed (Situational Management Skill). An effective manager, then, needs not simply an ability to use high or low Task or Relationships Orientation or any particular style but these three: Situational Sensitivity Skill, Style Flexibility Skill, Situational Management Skill.

The acquisition of these three skills is usually called experience. Some very young Managers have them to a high degree while much older Managers have hardly acquired them even in minimal amounts.

2.4 THE SITUATION

Clearly the ‘situation’ is very important for Managers to consider. Up to now this term has been used without too much explanation. Just what is it? How can it be broken down into manageable units in order to observe or change it? The 3-D theory breaks the situation into five elements which contain all aspects of it: Organisation, Technology, Superior, Coworkers, Subordinates.

Organisation, short for Organisation Philosophy, is all those influences on behaviour that come from outside the Manager’s work itself and from outside the department or division. Organisational Philosophy is usually reflected in systems design, in operating procedures, and who does and who does not get promoted. It is an expression of ‘How we do things around here’. Managers in a firm staffed heavily by engineers may have quite different demands on their behaviour than in a firm staffed by accountants.
In the same way, the Organisation Philosophy behind a government department is often quite different from the military. These differences are real and understanding how they operate is important to managerial effectiveness. The second element, Technology, is how work can be done. Some technologies need a dedicated style of management, some separated, and so on. For instance, if the work some are doing have these elements, they should use the dedicated, highly Task Oriented style:

- Subordinates have to put physical effort into their work.
- The Manager knows more about the job than the subordinates.
- Unscheduled events are likely to occur.
- Directions must be given.
- The subordinates’ performance is easily measurable.

Analysis of work along these lines can help Managers to decide which style to use. It is particularly helpful for Managers when they are moving into a new position or when they are re-designing the technology of their department.

One of the helpful analytical tools provided by 3-D is the effectiveness map. This map enables Managers to get an actual picture of the situation they are in or might soon encounter.

From this picture they can more easily decide what action they should take. It is also useful for counselling. The heart of the effectiveness map is the ‘Basic Styles Diagram’. On this may be drawn the Managers’ range of style and one or up to all five of the situational elements.

### 2.5 3-D TRAINING

What kind of training must the 3-D theory lead towards? First, Managers must be taught the theory. Then they must be taught to read situations, and to answer the question, ‘What does it take to be effective here?’ They must be taught to increase their range of style behaviour and their skills in changing situations.

In management team training, the central question is still, ‘How can we increase effectiveness?’ The team equivalent to managerial style flexibility is, ‘Flexible job trading’ – re-arranging the technology and decision structure of the department to improve effectiveness. This kind of incisive thinking and willingness to take action can be developed among any group of Managers.