THE

ESSENTIALS

OF

MANAGEMENT

A Personal View

EDIE FROST JOHNSON and JOHN J. O'NEILL

THE ESSENTIALS
OF MANAGEMENT

A Personal View

by

JOHN J. O'NEILL
Secretary for Planning

and

EDIE FROST JOHNSON
Planning Specialist

National Conference of Catholic Bishops
and
United States Catholic Conference

Acknowledgments

Grateful acknowledgment is made of permission to refer to and use quotations from

Like its companion publications, The Essentials of Planning *and* The Essentials of Organization, *this project was undertaken in response to an increasing number of suggestions and other indications that a publication of this nature might have considerable informational and operational value for individuals involved in various dimensions of management in Church institutions at both the national and diocesan levels. The content, however, has been designed for use in connection with a much wider range of organizations.*

The National Conference of Catholic Bishops (NCCB) is a canonical entity operating in accordance with the Conciliar Decree, *Christus Dominus*. Its purpose is to foster the Church's mission to mankind by providing the Bishops of this country with an opportunity to exchange views and insights of prudence and experience and to exercise in a joint manner their pastoral office. (cfr. *Christus Dominus*, #38)

———◆———

The United States Catholic Conference (USCC) is a civil entity of the American Catholic Bishops assisting them in their service to the Church in this country by uniting the People of God where voluntary, collective action on a broad diocesan level is needed. The USCC provides an organizational structure and the resources needed to insure coordination, cooperation, and assistance in the public, educational, and social concerns of the Church at the national, regional, state, interdiocesan and, as appropriate, diocesan levels.

For our Parents, Families, and Friends,
and especially for Marnie,
May and Agnes

Foreword

This study is being published in conjunction with the eighth anniversary of the appointment of the undersigned co-author as the first Secretary for Planning of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops and the United States Catholic Conference.

Those who are familiar with *The Essentials of Planning* and *The Essentials of Organization,* the earlier companion publications, will doubtless recognize marked similarities in approach, content, and style. The reasons for this are the favorable and generous response to the earlier studies, the essential interdependence of the disciplines treated, and the identical authorship.

The major purpose of this foreword is to note, with what I hope may be viewed as pardonable pride, the steadily increasing contribution of Mrs. Edie Frost Johnson.

In the first study, as has already been noted elsewhere, the extent of her contribution was not fully realized until it was, unfortunately, just too late to include a deserved designation as co-author. This error was corrected in the second study, which also included in its preface an explanation and an apology.

In this third study, there appears to be considerable justification for listing Mrs. Johnson as the sole author. The basic concept, the general arrangement, the selection of the specific areas to be covered, all of the basic research and much of the final writing are hers. However, she has graciously declined my offer to have myself listed as a consulting editor rather than as a co-author.

Finally, it is appropriate (and sadly necessary) to note once more, and once again over Mrs. Johnson's objections, that a significant amount of her work on this study was also accomplished at home and in the hospital during periods of intense pain and general physical discomfort.

April 15, 1978   John J. O'Neill

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

Preface

Among the more interesting and encouraging responses to
The Essentials of Planning (1975) and *The Essentials of Organization* (1977) is the large and increasing number of inquiries concerning the general discipline of management, of which both program and organizational planning are, of course, integral and indispensable elements.

The intent of the present study is to respond to these inquiries, and to others which have arisen during the past eight years, not by providing yet another complex, technical, and fully annotated textbook, but by presenting certain key concepts and illustrating them with examples which should be relatively familiar to most of those using the publication.

As in their previous studies, the authors make no claim to breaking new ground. Our hope, however, is that readers may discover a fresh approach to many of the matters treated.

Our reliance is upon our combined recollections of more than forty years of experience in the private sector and in government, together with material gathered from the works of acknowledged authorities in the field. (The significantly lower number of years recorded in the earlier studies was doubtless the subconscious product of a certain amount of wishful thinking on the part of the elder author.)

The choice of this approach was initially based upon our combined judgment that what is most needed at the present time is a series of concise, straightforward, and practical working documents, a judgment which appears to have been confirmed by the reception accorded to the two earlier studies.

In this connection, the authors have been extremely gratified with the observed and reported successful usage of the earlier works at the national, diocesan, and parish levels within the Church.

Although this publication is a Conference project, it should not be viewed as an official NCCB/USCC document. Full responsibility

for the content as well as for any errors or other deficiencies rests solely with the authors: thus the designation as a personal view.

At the same time, grateful acknowledgment is made of the contributions of many individual Bishops and many staff associates. The number of those involved precludes a complete listing.

It does seem appropriate, however, to include a special word of gratitude to those Bishops who have served as members of the Committee on Research, Plans and Programs during these eight years: Cardinals Carberry, Dearden, and Krol; Archbishops Bernardin, Donnellan, Maguire, and the late Leo Byrne; and Bishops Kelly and Rausch. Each of these individuals has contributed in an important way not only to what we may have been able to accomplish in these years, but also, and most deeply, to the joy which has been so closely identified in our own minds and hearts with the achievement.

It seems appropriate, too, to use this instrumentality to extend our best wishes to those new members who will soon be assuming an active role in the work of this key Conference Committee: Archbishops Quinn and Roach.

Finally, it seems particularly appropriate to express our appreciation to those involved in various dimensions of planning and organizational work at the diocesan level. Their inquiries and their interest have provided no small part of the incentive for undertaking and continuing this series, and have done much to determine the nature of its content.

April 15, 1978   Edie Frost Johnson
                                                      John J. O'Neill

Table of Contents

THE ESSENTIALS OF MANAGEMENT

A Personal View

Introduction

Like the two earlier publications in this series, *The Essentials of Planning* and *The Essentials of Organization,* this present study has been designated as a personal view.

The technical reason for this designation is set forth in the preface: the studies present the personal reflections of the authors and are not, therefore, to be read as official NCCB/USCC documents.

There is, however, a second and equally important sense in which the designation is appropriate: the emphasis—and insistence—upon the personal element.

As noted in *The Essentials of Organization,* the authors believe it is of critical importance never to lose sight of the personal dimension of an organization, its essentially human nature: not a cold bureaucratic structure, but a body of living members, an edifice of living stones.

This focus on the personal, and the interpersonal, should be even more apparent in the present study, since it deals primarily with people in action, in relationship, whereas the principal emphasis in the earlier studies was necessarily upon the structures and systems through which individuals act and relate.

In this highly complex age, the range of organizations borders on the infinite—in terms of what they do and the ways they go about doing it. Yet no matter how great the variety, there is this common trait: their essentially human nature. In the final analysis, ORGANIZATIONS ARE ESTABLISHED BY, MADE UP OF, AND STAND OR FALL WITH THE PERFORMANCE OF, INDIVIDUAL HUMAN BEINGS.

Accordingly, since the framework and context of the management function is the organization, IT IS ESSENTIAL TO VIEW

1

MANAGEMENT FIRST AND FOREMOST AS RELATIONSHIP, AS PERSONAL ENCOUNTER IN THE PURSUIT OF COMMON OBJECTIVES, THE CARRYING OUT OF COMMON TASKS.

From this perspective, it will be seen that management is more truly an art than a science—with the only scientific management worthy of the name being that which involves scientific data and techniques as aids to those practicing the art of management.

By the same token, impersonal management—in which so many seem to take so much pride—is a contradiction in terms. Incomplete at best, it is a modern-day relative of absentee ownership.

The manager who lacks certain specific management skills can function effectively if these skills are available on a continuing basis from others on the management team; but the manager who possesses all of the necessary basic skills except for an ability to relate to other individuals on a meaningful basis cannot be similarly shored up in the long run.

In summary, then, IT IS AT THE LEVEL OF THE PERSONAL AND THE INTERPERSONAL THAT MANAGEMENT WORTHY OF THE NAME BEGINS AND ENDS: AND IT IS AT THIS LEVEL THAT THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT IS ULTIMATELY DETERMINED.

In view of the critical importance of this personal dimension, it is a subject which will recur frequently in the course of the present study. Using an analogy from the world of music, it may be said that the personal and interpersonal dimension is the major theme upon which the individual sections form a series of variations.

*   *   *

One initial question which may arise among potential readers and users of this study is whether their own particular organizations may not be too small (or more rarely, too large) to permit meaningful application of the principles and conclusions here presented.

Although this factor of size is the subject of a separate section later in the work, it may be helpful to indicate at the outset that THE PRINCIPLES OF MANAGEMENT ARE LARGELY UNAFFECTED BY THE SIZE OF THE ORGANIZATION.

It is true, of course, that certain corollary aspects, such as the precise distribution of the various management tasks and the

number of management levels required, may well be affected. But the task in its totality remains essentially the same.

And, despite frequent assumptions to the contrary, it is not necessarily less difficult in a smaller organization.

<p style="text-align:center">*　　*　　*</p>

Finally, we would like to include a further word of explanation concerning the relationship between this present study and the two earlier ones.

The subject matter of the earlier studies made it necessary to focus primarily upon the structures and systems through which people act and relate in carrying out the mission of a given organization.

More specifically, those studies dealt in the main with two areas which are among the major responsibilities of management and also provide management with two of its most indispensable tools; program planning and organizational planning.

The present study deals more directly with management itself; its role and responsibility; its development and evaluation; its substance and style; its strengths and weaknesses, and their sources; its limits and excesses; in general, with what it must do and how best to do it.

Nevertheless, although management involves much more than systems and structures, it cannot be considered in isolation from them.

For this reason, and because the earlier studies did focus wherever possible on the personal dimension, the authors have felt free to quote directly or to paraphrase material from *The Essentials of Planning* and *The Essentials of Organization* in this present publication.

Despite this intentional interrelationship, each study has been designed to stand on its own—although it is hoped that they will frequently be used together.

The Nature of Management

Management, as the term is used throughout this study, refers to the actual running of an organization, overseeing the carrying out of its essential mission, directing the fulfillment of its reason

for being. It refers also to those individuals to whom this responsibility has been delegated by the owners of the organization.

Although the management function usually involves dealing with things as well as with people, the essential heart of the function is to be found in the latter, in motivating and directing people in pursuit of organizational and societal goals.

What Peter Drucker has said so well of organizations (in a passage quoted elsewhere in this study) can be applied also to management: the purpose of management is to enable common men to do uncommon things.

Genius is always in short supply, and even where it exists it cannot always be relied upon to be suited to the immediate task in hand. But strength is to be found almost everywhere.

It is the task, indeed a major purpose of management to identify individual strengths, to build upon them, to encourage their effective use, and to reward excellence when it appears.

The importance of this human dimension, this making it possible for common men to do uncommon things, should become even more evident in the remainder of this section, and in the five following sections, each of which discusses one particular aspect of the nature of management. (Readers are also encouraged to review the section on "The Human Dimension" in *The Essentials of Organization,* pages 7 and 8.)

As a frame of reference for this present discussion, the authors have chosen an approach which takes the form of answers to this question: What does the manager manage?

Among the many categories of answers which have been suggested in various management texts, our own preference is for a relatively common four-dimensional classification to which we have added a fifth category which appears to be seldom if ever specifically and separately included in discussions of this kind.

Using this classification, the manager is viewed as having responsibility for:

- managing the organization or enterprise;
- managing other managers;
- managing non-management personnel;

- managing the work; and

- self-management.

The rationale for the inclusion of this last category should be readily apparent from what has been said in the preface and introduction concerning the importance of the personal and inter-personal dimension of management. It should become even more apparent through the separate treatment given to it in a later section.

Managing the Organization

In terms of the five-fold classification set forth above (though not necessarily in terms of relative priority), the first task of the manager is that of managing the organization: running the enter-prise, directing it toward the achievement of its essential mission.

In most instances what is said here and elsewhere throughout this study about managing the organization as a whole applies as well to managing the individual operating units or staff entities within the total organization. The manager of each of these ele-ments may be said to have "a piece of the action" while the gen-eral manager has overall responsibility for the totality which they comprise.

The task of managing the organization, broadly interpreted, might be seen as encompassing the remaining four. The intent here is to discuss this dimension in the narrower sense, viewing the organization from an institutional rather than from a personal perspective: as a religious or civil entity, a corporate body, a struc-ture designed to facilitate the achievement of a particular purpose.

Within this narrower context, managing an organization means being responsible for:

- the definition, or continuing refinement, of the essen-tial mission, the organization's reason for being;

- the formulation of long-range goals designed to foster the achievement of the essential mission;

- the articulation of more specific short-range objec-tives designed to facilitate the achievement of, and aid in measuring progress toward, the long-range goals;

- the elaboration of a specific action agenda—and the establishment or maintenance of related systems and procedures—directed toward the accomplishment of the defined mission, goals, and objectives;

- the carrying out of the specific action agenda; and

- the measurement of the results achieved.

In sum, the responsibility of the manager runs from the earliest planning stage through implementation and follow-up, encompassing the entire spectrum of the internal functions of the organization.

In addition, since organizations cannot function apart from the societies within which they exist, the responsibility of the manager has an important social dimension. This responsibility has two major aspects:

- fulfillment of the social responsibilities of the organization; and

- management of its social impact.

This critical social dimension is frequently overlooked, or at least underemphasized, in definitions of the role of management. It is relatively easy to understand the significance of the day-to-day internal tasks with which management must be concerned. The importance of the social dimension, particularly from the standpoint of short-run or day-to-day perspectives, is not as readily apparent. Yet it is essential that it be given proper emphasis through continuing attention if the enterprise is to be successful in the longer run. The reason for this should be obvious: the essential mission of any organization arises from and must be carried out within the social context of which the organization is an integral part (whether or not it considers itself as such).

In the long run, an organization does not exist for itself. It has no existence independent of the society (community, individuals, and other institutions) of which it is a part. And since management has no existence independent of the organization, it too must be viewed in the final analysis as an organ of society.

Greater detail concerning what is involved in these internal and external dimensions of the responsibility of management will emerge in the following sections.

It seems appropriate here to point out a difficulty which can, and often does, arise when the meaning of management is taken in the sense of this one dimension: a tendency to approach the management function on an impersonal basis.

The source of this difficulty is not difficult to identify. This approach to a definition of the task of the manager, as is clearly to be seen in the foregoing paragraphs, involves focusing on things and how they work rather than on persons and how they relate: missions, goals, objectives, action agendas, structures, systems and procedures. The impression is of running something, or tending to something, or making sure that something works— with very little compensating focus on the broader and more personal dimension of engagement with others in the carrying out of a common task.

The remedy for this difficulty is to focus concurrently upon the more personal dimensions of the total task. The nature of these dimensions is treated in the following sections.

Managing Other Managers

We turn next to the question of managing other managers.

The primary reason for separate identification of this element is that it is not enough—as is sometimes assumed—for a manager at a given level simply to divide his own assignment into several segments, assign each of these in turn to individual managers at the next downward level, and then turn his own attention "upward and outward" except for occasional monitoring of his "downward" area of responsibility.

Another major reason for treating this dimension separately is that it represents, in relation to the immediately preceding section, a movement from the institutional to the personal perspective.

It is not overly difficult to delineate, in textual or graphic form, the flow of responsibility and authority, assignment and response, between the two management levels referred to above. Nor is it overly difficult to identify individual tasks and the appropriate tools and techniques for addressing them within this same context.

The real difficulty, the challenge, the test of management, is that of bringing all of these pieces—and all of these persons—

7

together, of fusing the fragmented elements into a common endeavor.

It is at this point that one encounters the real heart of the management function. It is here that what may truly be called the discipline of management begins.

As has already been emphasized, it is possible for the manager who lacks or is deficient in certain specific management skills to function effectively if these skills are available on a continuing basis from others on the management team. But the manager who possesses all of the necessary skills while lacking the ability to relate to other individuals on a meaningful basis cannot be similarly shored up in the long run.

The reason for this is that the essential role of the manager is not, as is too commonly supposed, to practice the techniques of management, to employ its tools. THE ESSENTIAL ROLE OF THE MANAGER IS TO PRACTICE THE DISCIPLINE OF MANAGEMENT. THOSE WHOSE ASSIGNMENT BEGINS AND ENDS WITH THEIR USE OF MANAGEMENT TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES MUST BE SEEN AS SPECIALISTS OR TECHNICIANS, AND NOT AS MANAGERS.

A useful approach to explaining what is involved in practicing the discipline of management, and one that the authors have found particularly effective, is to view the matter from the standpoint of a simple two-level model. In this situation, the first-level manager is responsible for bringing together the managers on the second level and becoming personally involved with them in the mutual carrying out of their common overall task.

In this context, "bringing together" is to be seen as encompassing at least the following.

- **convening,** to discuss issues and problems, particularly those which cut across organizational lines, individual functions, or areas of concern;

- **guiding,** by giving overall direction, and by sorting out priorities on the basis of considerations transcending the individual units;

- **unifying** and **reconciling,** in instances of disagreement or conflict, and seeking, insofar as possible, to anticipate and so prevent such instances;

8

- **coordinating,** or **"ordering"** the various responsibilities and concerns of the individual units in relation to those of the totality;

- **advocating,** in connection with the needs and concerns of those within the total entity and those above it in the general organizational structure;

- **encouraging** creative action and innovation, including appropriate recognition of accomplishments in this area;

- **exploring,** in order to discover new purposes to be served, new approaches to existing purposes, and other ways of fostering the continuing renewal which is essential to the life of the organization; and

- **motivating** the group as a whole and the individuals within it.

In sum, from the particular perspectives of the discipline of management, MANAGING OTHER MANAGERS MUST BE SEEN AS ONE OF THE PRINCIPAL MEANS FOR THE ACHIEVEMENT OF A CREATIVE, COHERENT, AND COHESIVE APPROACH TO THE COMMON TASK, WITH THE GREATEST POSSIBLE UNITY CONSISTENT WITH THE FUNDAMENTAL REQUIREMENTS OF EACH OF THE SEPARATE FUNCTIONAL AREAS INVOLVED.

Managing other managers must be seen, that is, as directed to the formation of a true management team.

Indeed, as organizational experience so conclusively demonstrates, it is only in this sense that the term management team can be said to have a true and lasting meaning. Without this solid and proven base it is little more than a catch phrase or a bit of jargon.

Unfortunately this is not always recognized, and there is a persistent tendency, particularly in poorly managed organizations, to use the phrase as a substitute for the reality—in the vain hope that calling an amorphous grouping a management team will somehow transform it into one. Readers who are familiar with various approaches to the building of community in the civil or religious context will doubtless recognize the analogy here.

If this particular section were to be published separately, it would conclude with a discussion of the personal and inter-

9

personal dimensions of the task of managing other managers, since success in managing other managers requires the development and the sustaining of meaningful interpersonal relationships between manager and managed.

The reason for not treating this subject on a more extended basis at this point is two-fold: (1) it is treated in more detail in the section dealing with the management of non-management personnel, and a similar treatment here would involve considerable duplication; and (2) it is the underlying theme of the entire study, and all that is said about it elsewhere should be considered also as applying here.

Accordingly, it should suffice to conclude this present section with the simple statement that what is true of management in general is true also of this particular dimension of management: it begins and ends at the level of the interpersonal, and, in the long run, it is at this level that its effectiveness is ultimately determined.

Managing Non-Management Personnel

The task of managing other managers does not fall to all management personnel in a given organization (although all managers should be prepared for such an eventuality). But every management position is virtually certain to involve managing non-management personnel.

It is important to emphasize that the fundamental responsibility of the manager in this regard remains the same whether the number of individuals involved be large or small.

If one individual is to be managed, it is of critical importance for that individual to be managed well. If several—or many—individuals are to be managed, it is of critical importance for each individual to be managed well.

"Individual" is the operative word. To repeat: IT IS ESSENTIAL TO VIEW MANAGEMENT FIRST AND FOREMOST AS RELATIONSHIP, AS PERSONAL ENCOUNTER IN THE COURSE OF CARRYING OUT A COMMON ENDEAVOR.

It seems appropriate at this juncture to direct attention to, and quote directly from, a particularly relevant section of *The Essentials of Organization,* that entitled "The Spirit of Performance."

As noted there, that section title is also the title of a key chapter in *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices,* by Peter F. Drucker, published by Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. (10 East 53rd Street, New York, New York 10022). As also noted in the earlier study, this book is regarded by the authors as one of the most valuable resources available to those for whom this series is primarily intended: individuals involved in various dimensions of management for Church institutions at both the national and diocesan levels. Our own indebtedness to the work extends far beyond the direct quotations used in this series of studies.

So important in the present context is one particular segment of the material quoted from that book in the section under discussion that the authors have requested and received permission to repeat it here:

- The purpose of an organization is to enable common men to do uncommon things.

- No organization can depend on genius: the supply is always scarce and unreliable. It is the test of an organization to make ordinary human beings perform better than they seem capable of, to bring out whatever strength there is in its members, and to use each man's strength to help all the other members perform. It is the task of the organization at the same time to neutralize the individual weaknesses of its members. The test of an organization is the spirit of performance.

- The spirit of performance requires that there be full scope for individual excellence. The focus must be on the strengths of a man—on what he can do rather than on what he cannot do.

The twin concepts of building upon the strengths of individuals and neutralizing their weaknesses, treated in a general way in the remainder of this section, are so central to the entire concept and discipline of management that they will also be treated more extensively in a separate section later in the study.

Here the operative phrase is "building upon strength." The advantages of such an approach are so clearly evident that it is difficult for the authors to understand why individual managers,

and even total organizations, persist in placing the primary emphasis upon identifying and "weeding out" specific weakness.

One common result of this contrary approach, which we have chosen to designate as "negative management" and about which we will have more to say later, is an unacceptably high rate of personnel turnover, together with a general lowering of productivity and morale among a work force which is understandably more preoccupied with a defensive covering up of weaknesses than with a creative application of strengths.

The effectiveness of management itself is also directly diminished, as energies are diverted to the pursuit of the impossible dream of a work force of individuals without weaknesses instead of being directed toward the attainable goal of neutralizing known weaknesses in otherwise strong employees.

Another not uncommon dimension of negative management involves using fear as leverage in the effort to improve performance. This approach—and again it is difficult to understand its persistence where effectiveness is the long-range goal—errs in assuming that the manager is a master. It is of course true that the manager may be seen as "over" those he manages from the standpoint of the organizational hierarchy, and as his position is reflected on the organizational chart. In the technical jargon of the organization, the manager may be referred to as the "superior" of those he manages. But in reality he is their fellow-employee.

In the final analysis, managing non-management personnel comes down to meeting them as individual persons, guiding (and, yes, even assisting) them in the performance of their share of the total task, helping them to use their strengths most effectively, and, in general, contributing to their well-being in terms of job satisfaction, career development, feelings of self-respect, and personal pursuit of happiness.

Managing the Work

What was said above about the term managing the organization is equally true of the phrase managing the work: both expressions are frequently used as shorthand for the total management task.

The intent in the present context is to consider work in a narrower sense: as the specific substance or content of the task

for which the managerial entity is responsible. The concern is with the totality of the work assignment and the individual segments into which it is divided.

Because this dimension of the total management task deals specifically with work assignments, with pieces of work, it should seldom be the exclusive preoccupation of the manager.

To say this is not to deny the fact that the work itself is a large part of the organization's reason for being. The intent is to stress the importance of considering the work and the worker together, as essential co-elements of an integral whole.

For example, a key function of the manager is to break the total task down into performable segments; and the basis for such action must, in the final analysis, be the capacities of individual persons rather than the dictates of impersonal logic.

Further, the determination of individual capacities must not be made on a purely statistical basis such as possible units of output. It must take into account the psychological and emotional as well as the physical.

Within the context of this personal perspective, managing the work involves:

- understanding the total task of the particular management area and its relationship to that of the organization as a whole;

- defining and explaining that task in a meaningful way to other managers and to non-management personnel assigned to the management area;

- dividing the task into individual components designed to maximize the prospects for effective performance of the work and for meaningful participation for all of those involved in it;

- integrating the results of individual performance into an effective whole; and

- taking advantage of the entire process to build an increasingly unified work force pursuing its common goals with increasing satisfaction and effectiveness.

The weight of management theory and experience indicates that an approach patterned along these lines will ensure adequate

focus on the work itself without the degree of preoccupation which leads so easily to another form of impersonal management.

It cannot be denied that individual instances can be cited in which dramatic success has been achieved through an exclusively work-oriented approach. The view here, a view based on many years of observation and experience, is that such success cannot be sustained in the longer run. Even in the shorter run it is seldom achieved without an unacceptable level of personal trauma and human cost, particularly at the lower non-management levels of the organization. In addition, such an approach almost invariably proves more costly in the longer run even in purely economic terms.

On the other hand, considering work and worker together has the added advantage inherent in the fact that the worker is likely to be the best source of all in adapting theoretically designed tasks so that they can be performed effectively in the real work-a-day world.

In sum, THE MANAGERIAL TASK IS INCOMPLETE IF THE WORK ITSELF IS NOT CAREFULLY CONSIDERED AND EFFECTIVELY MANAGED. BUT THE TASK AND ITS RESULTS ARE VIRTUALLY CERTAIN TO BE DISTORTED IF THE WORK IS CONSIDERED AND MANAGED IN ISOLATION FROM THE CAPACITIES AND CON-CERNS OF THOSE WHO MUST ACTUALLY PERFORM IT.

Self-Management

Following our summary review of the four categories cus-tomarily included in what managers manage, we turn to what we consider an equally important fifth category: self-management, the responsibility of the manager for managing himself.

In our view the task of management begins with self-manage-ment: A MANAGER WHO IS UNABLE TO MANAGE HIMSELF IS UNLIKELY TO BE ABLE TO MANAGE OTHERS EFFECTIVELY, par-ticularly over the longer term.

What is true of the organization is also true with regard to those who are called upon to manage it: THE ESSENTIAL MISSION MUST BE ACHIEVED INTERNALLY BEFORE IT CAN BE ACHIEVED EXTERNALLY.

It is our further view that a large number of management failures, including many attributed to other causes, can ultimately be traced to failures in the area of self-management.

Self-management relates to a whole spectrum of human and personal considerations: the ability of the manager to deal realistically with his own strengths and weaknesses; a willingness to recognize the strengths of others and to meet their weaknesses with compassion; all that is traditionally involved in self-control and self-possession; and a willingness on the part of the manager to demand at least as much from himself as from those he manages.

One highly visible measure of a manager's self-control is his ability to avoid, except in the most extreme circumstances, the public rebuke or reprimand, the putting down of an individual in the presence of his peers, or in the presence of other managers.

Clearly, then, what is said above concerning the negative aspects of management through fear also applies here. What is intended as a show of strength is all too plainly a sign of weakness. The manager who feels compelled to appeal to fear as a motivating force is as "out of control" as are those who exercise the "arrogance of power" in other spheres of activity.

The same is true of such related devices as playing upon the self-doubts of employees, undermining their self-confidence, pitting them against each other. It is equally true of all forms of resort to "naked force" or the exercise of raw managerial power as an absolute.

The manager is not in the final analysis a master but a fellow employee, a co-worker. There is nothing in the position of manager that confers a personal exemption from the ethical norms which govern relationships between free human beings.

From all of this, it follows that an essential dimension of management training and development must be training and development on the broad human level. The manager is a person before he is a manager. The basic management skills, as traditionally and too narrowly defined, are simply not enough.

"See how they love one another" is not generally thought of as applying in the organizational context, yet it is difficult to think of a better measure, particularly in the specific milieu with which the present study is most directly and immediately concerned.

It is true, of course, that management, broadly speaking, is a discipline, a field of study, a profession. But the exercise of management at the practical level, the only level with ultimate meaning, is an individual personal activity, a personal responsibility.

Each specific act of management, that is, begins with an individual: with an individual, and so within that individual. For this reason, self-management is as critical to the discipline of management as self-control is to the greater discipline of life.

WHERE SELF-MANAGEMENT IS LACKING THERE CAN BE NO MANAGEMENT WORTHY OF THE NAME, just as without self-control truly human life is but a shadow of what it might otherwise be.

Upward Relationships

Treatment of the nature of management in terms of what is managed involves dealing with what might be described as "downward relationships"—although wherever other individuals are involved the relationships must be seen as essentially mutual.

The manager must also be concerned with relationships going in the other direction, involving, in most instances, those immediately above him in the managerial hierarchy, and, at the top level, the owners, usually represented by the officers of the enterprise, or an executive committee, or a board of directors.

The nature of this upward relationship is largely the other side of the coin of the downward relationship described in the section on managing other managers. Once again the key is mutual respect, effective communication, and enthusiastic cooperation in the context of personal encounter in the course of carrying out a common endeavor.

The specific relationship with the ownership of the organization is somewhat more complex in certain respects.

Clearly, it is the owners who are ultimately in charge of the enterprise, who determine its overall direction and thrust, and who may be said, in the most general sense, to run the organization.

Paradoxically, however, one of the shortest routes to diminished management and organizational effectiveness is direct ownership intervention in ongoing day-to-day operations at levels below top management.

The same result can of course ensue even at that level if the intervention fails to take into account established formal relationships, and the systems and procedures designed to facilitate them. Top management is the appropriate point of ownership contact, in both directions, and provision is normally made for an orderly relationship at this level.

It is at lower management levels that the difficulty is more likely to occur. Even though a manager at these levels is completely aware of and understands the importance of working within established lines of staff responsibility and authority, it is not easy—and may not always even be possible—for such a manager to refuse to respond to the direct intervention of one of the corporate officers, or of a body such as the board of directors.

Such disruptive interventions are particularly likely to occur in organizations in which individual staff components interface with elements of a committee structure established by the owners and often including them in its membership.

This is not to say that the owners do not have the right to intervene in the affairs of their organization. They not only have the right, but, at certain critical times, the obligation.

It is to say rather that it is in the best interests of themselves as owners, and of the staff to which they have delegated responsibility for actual operation of the enterprise, to make such interventions at appropriate levels and according to established norms and procedures.

This approach should not be seen as in any way diminishing the authority of the owners, since the norms and procedures involved should, in the first place, have been established by them, or with their specific approval.

It is one of the critical roles of top management to keep the appropriate lines to and from ownership open at the top. The more successfully this is accomplished the less likelihood will there be of inappropriate interventions at lower levels.

One of the real keys to effectiveness in this area is a two-pronged approach involving periodic meetings with a designated executive body to which the owners have delegated the necessary authority to act on their behalf, and ongoing provision for an

effective flow of meaningful information from management to ownership.

Once again, the ultimate requirement is effective relationship at the personal level.

Building on Strength

Although the foregoing discussion of the nature of management has repeatedly emphasized the importance of building on strength, the subject appears to call for additional separate treatment, even at the risk of some repetition.

A major determinant of management and general organizational effectiveness is the effectiveness with which available resources are used in achieving the designated task or essential mission.

The key resource of most organizations, and of service organizations in particular, is to be found in its people. A truly meaningful, truly complete, inventory of organizational resources should begin and end with its human resources.

It follows that organizational effectiveness depends to a large extent upon the effectiveness with which human resources are employed.

And effective employment of human resources depends in turn upon the degree of success achieved in building upon individual strengths while neutralizing individual weaknesses.

This entire concept of building on strength is a major theme of an excellent book which the authors are pleased to recommend as an important resource for those who may wish to pursue further a number of the subjects being treated here: *The Effective Executive,* by Peter F. Drucker, published by Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc. (10 East 53rd Street, New York, New York 10022). Of particular relevance in the present context are the following observations from that work:

- Organization is, to a large extent, a means of overcoming the limitations mortality sets to what any one man can contribute.

- Organization is a means of multiplying the strength of an individual.

One of the more important ways in which organization makes possible the overcoming of individual limitations is, of course,

through building on individual strengths: through identifying such strengths, and through discovering ways in which they can be employed to maximize the contribution of the individual possessing them.

The multiplication of the strengths of an individual occurs when these strengths are applied in such a way as to reinforce and support parallel strengths of others, or to neutralize their weaknesses—so that in a very real sense the sum of the total effort is greater than the sum of its individual elements.

All of this is probably clear enough, and indeed virtually self-evident, when it is called to mind and reflected upon. The difficulty is that it is not always so remembered, largely because of the pervasive human tendency to be preoccupied with the weaknesses and limitations of others (and of ourselves), and to focus accordingly on potential frustrations rather than on possible future accomplishments.

This tendency accounts for a great deal of the negative management to which reference has already been made.

It also accounts for the distortion, and consequent weakness, of many management development programs and performance review (evaluation) systems.

As long as such programs and systems are directed—as so many seem to be—to the discovery of shortcomings, of limitations, of reasons for not promoting or developing, their full potential will never be realized. In fact, in terms of both future organizational effectiveness and present employee morale, they are virtually certain to be, on balance, counter-productive.

The task of the manager, in terms of these specific management tools and in more general terms as well, is to do everything possible to provide for the continuing upgrading of the human resources for which he is responsible. And, although it will doubtless be necessary from time to time to accomplish this upgrading through dismissal and replacement, the more effective route—and certainly the one to be tried first—is to help the employee who may not be contributing at the desired level to find within himself the strength required and the means to make it productive.

IN MANAGEMENT, AS IN LIFE ITSELF, THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL IS TO DO ALL THAT CAN BE DONE TO BRING

OUT THE BEST IN THOSE AROUND HIM, AND TO HELP THOSE
AROUND HIM TO ACCOMPLISH THE SAME FOR HIM.

We are all weak, but we are not all weak in the same places.
This is why the approach of eliminating all of those in whom
weakness is discovered and endeavoring to replace them with
others without weakness is doomed to failure in the long run.

The authors can think of no better way to conclude this critically
important section than by quoting further from an outstanding
book which has already (in *The Essentials of Organization*) been
highly recommended to those involved in all levels of organiza-
tional life: *The Human Nature of Organizations,* by J. Douglas
Brown, published in 1973 by AMACOM, a Division of American
Management Associations (130 West 50th Street, New York, New
York, 10020). It is hoped that the following brief excerpts will not
only serve to underscore the main theme of this section but also
serve as an invitation to readers to a full reading of the book from
which they are taken:

- Another fundamental art of leadership is to broaden
  the natural striving for self-respect, which lies deep in
  human personality, so that it encompasses respect
  for one's organization—its mission and its leader-
  ship—as well as for one's performance.

- There is no clearer evidence of the human nature of
  organization than the wide range of variation in the
  incentive of an organized group under conditions of
  strong self-respect and mutual respect compared
  with pro forma fulfillment of duties.

- Mutual respect should exist in both the vertical and
  the horizontal planes in organization in order to pro-
  duce its fullest effect in motivation.

- The essential purpose of the leader is to enhance
  motivation in the individual, not to weigh his faults
  in his presence.

- Criticism should emphasize the better way rather
  than the personal fault.

- The framing condition of the effective use of praise
  or criticism in leadership is sincere personal interest
  in the person to whom it is directed.

20

- One has to start with the individual, the essential particle out of which organizations are developed.

- A leader in human organization is seeking to motivate people as they are, not to recreate them in his own image.

As in *The Essentials of Organization,* it is also to be noted here that the influence of this book, *The Human Nature of Organizations,* extends well beyond these direct excerpts, and it is a pleasure to acknowledge such a debt.

The Functions of Management

Our focus up to now has been largely on what management is, on the nature of management, as we have sought to answer the question: What does the manager manage?

It is time now to shift our focus to what management does, to the functions of management, by seeking to answer a second question: What does the manager do?

Clearly the two are not completely separable, or mutually exclusive. It is however often helpful for discussion purposes to treat them as two separate subjects or categories, separate but essentially and continuously overlapping and interlocking.

Using this approach, the effort to define the nature of management results in a description of what the manager is supposed to be, while the effort to define the functions of management results in a description of what the manager is expected to do if he is to become fully what he is supposed to be.

The specific functions of the individual manager may vary widely from organization to organization, or from position to position or from level to level within a single organization. Nevertheless it is possible to identify a generally common job content— at least in terms of the major functional areas involved in carrying out the majority of managerial tasks and assignments.

This is what we have sought to do in the remainder of this section, although it is clearly essential in the light of what has just been said that the material presented be viewed as illustrative rather than exhaustive. Our own experience tells us that readers will find it relatively easy to make additions, relatively difficult to take anything away.

What, then, does the manager do? Or better: What should the manager do? Our own complete answer would include all of the following, and more in terms of both extent and detail were it not for the constraints of space in a study such as this. The effort here is to provide at least the essential minimum.

To begin with, the manager "does" the essential mission of the enterprise, or of that part of it which falls within the purview of his particular position.

One of the best available approaches to fleshing out the nature and scope of this overall task is to be found in another previously recommended major work: Peter F. Drucker's *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*. A particular advantage of this work in the present context is that it includes an extensive treatment of the management of public service institutions.

It is extremely difficult to choose one particular excerpt from among the many which could be used appropriately and effectively in the present context. Our own choice has fallen ultimately upon a passage which we feel not only meets the present need but also succeeds in representing the general tenor of this excellent work:

> There are five basic operations in the work of the manager. Together they result in the integration of resources into a viable growing organism.
>
> A manager, in the first place, sets objectives. He determines what the objectives should be. He decides what has to be done to reach these objectives. He makes the objectives effective by communicating them to the people whose performance is needed to attain them.
>
> Second, a manager organizes. He analyzes the activities, decisions, and relations needed. He classifies the work. He divides it into manageable activities and further divides the activities into manageable jobs. He groups these units and jobs into an organization structure. He selects people for the management of these units and for the jobs to be done.
>
> Next, a manager motivates and communicates. He makes a team out of the people that are responsible for various jobs. He does that through the practices with which he works. He does it in his own relations to

the men with whom he works. He does it through his "people decisions" on pay, placement, and promotion. And he does it through constant communication, to and from his subordinates, and to and from his superior, and to and from his colleagues.

The fourth basic element in the work of the manager is measurement. The manager establishes yardsticks— and few factors are as important to the performance of the organization and of every man in it. He sees to it that each man has measurements available to him which are focused on the performance of the whole organization and which, at the same time, focus on the work of the individual and help him do it. He analyzes, appraises, and interprets performance. As in all other areas of his work, he communicates the meaning of the measurements and their findings to his subordinates, to his superiors, and to colleagues.

Finally, a manager develops people, including himself.

While an extended commentary on each of the above paragraphs is clearly beyond the limitations of this work (and is also unnecessary since it is readily available in the book itself), it does seem appropriate to call particular attention to the emphasis placed upon the importance of communication in the role of the manager.

A second and somewhat more specific approach to setting forth the functions of management is to be found in the following excerpt from a model position description for the "chief executive officer" of our own organization, as currently being used by the authors in developing similar position descriptions at other management levels.

- Recommend consolidated annual and long-range objectives, plans and programs, including plans for supporting resources—such as organization and staffing, finances, and facilities.

- Monitor implementation of plans, programs and policies.

- Provide general direction, supervision, and coordination of all organizational units and activities.

- Ensure the provision of central financial and administrative support and services.

- Recommend appointments to principal executive positions, for approval by appropriate executive body of organization.

- Evaluate the performance of individuals in principal executive positions of organization.

- Supervise coordination of program activities within organization and with related programs of other organizations.

- Represent the organization to other organizations, to particular constituencies, and in the public forum.

- Perform such other duties as may be assigned by appropriate executive authorities of the organization.

It may be instructive to append, from the same document, the identification of the principal working relationships involved in carrying out these functions:

- With appropriate executive authorities of the organization (e.g., president, other officers, executive committees, and ownership).

- With other members of executive staff.

- With related organizations—to foster collaboration and cooperation toward common objectives.

- With total staff.

Finally, it is to be noted that what is said with regard to specific internal and social responsibilities in the section on managing the organization also has direct application here.

Management Tools

To assist the manager in carrying out this broad range of functions, a number of specific tools are in relatively common use. As pointed out in the introduction, two such tools which the authors consider indispensable are:

- program planning; and
- organizational planning.

These two types of planning are the primary subjects, respectively, of *The Essentials of Planning* and *The Essentials of Organization*.

Two other types of planning, closely related to these and in some instances structurally linked to them, are:

- financial planning; and
- budgetary planning.

Other particularly important and generally useful management tools include:

- organizational charts, policy and procedures manuals, and other similar instruments;
- management data systems and other similar reporting mechanisms;
- staff meetings and other types of regular and special meetings;
- performance review and evaluation programs; and
- the services of professional management consultants or management consulting firms.

Program and Organizational Planning

So pivotal are these two planning disciplines, so necessary to organizations in general, and so long largely unrecognized as such in the particular milieu to which this series of studies is primarily addressed, that the authors considered it mandatory to treat them extensively before undertaking this present study of management itself.

As structure must follow function, so *The Essentials of Organization* follows *The Essentials of Planning*. These twin disciplines are the primary basis for determining whether a particular enterprise should be created or continue to exist—and, if the answer is positive, for determining what form the organization should take. Thus, from the very beginning, they are vitally important to the (potential) founders and owners of the enterprise being considered. And, where the decision is positive, they immediately assume the same importance for the organization's management team. (This, among other considerations, is the basis for the order in which the three studies have appeared.)

Because of the extensive treatment already given these two key dimensions of planning, it should suffice here to reiterate the following observations from *The Essentials of Organization:*

- The most effective instrumentality available to management for ensuring the necessary control of an organization's program agenda is a fully functioning program planning system.

- The most effective instrumentality available to management for ensuring the necessary control over an organization's structure is a fully functioning organizational planning system, including a formal set of guidelines governing the establishment of new structural units.

Finally, it is important to note that program and organizational planning are much more than specific management tools. They hold an important position among the primary responsibilities of management; and they are invaluable instruments for measuring management effectiveness, since meaningful measurement necessarily presupposes the existence of established goals and objectives.

Financial and Budgetary Planning

An extensive treatment of financial and budgetary planning is clearly beyond the scope or intent of the present study.

It is important, however, to stress their importance in relation to the very existence of organizations and to the effectiveness with which such organizations are managed.

In this context, fiscal planning goes hand in hand with program and organizational planning in determining the size and scope of the enterprise, its potential for growth, and the limits within which management must carry out its assigned tasks and responsibilities.

Because general financial considerations and specific financial problems frequently thrust themselves into the foreground of organizational life, fiscal planning, at least in a rudimentary form, is likely to be found in most organizations.

Rarely, however, does it reach its full potential unless it is consciously employed on a continuing basis in conjunction with pro-

gram and organizational planning. One increasingly frequent demonstrations of this, particularly among nonprofit service organizations, is the fact that these other planning disciplines, which should have been introduced concurrently with or prior to fiscal planning, are introduced only (and then often reluctantly) in response to crisis situations which financial planning alone is unable to resolve. (The interrelationship among these three planning disciplines is treated more fully in *The Essentials of Planning,* particularly on pages 11 and 12, and page 21.)

Finally, it is to be noted that, like the other planning disciplines, fiscal planning is also more than a specific management tool. It too is a major responsibility of management and an indispensable instrument for measuring management effectiveness.

Organizational Charts

The organizational chart is a graphic expression of the decisions of the appropriate governing authorities of an organization with regard to hierarchical structures and related authority-responsibility relationships within that organization or individual segments thereof. What is set forth is the general norm, using conventional and generally understood symbols and techniques. The chart should be viewed as a context rather than as a constraint. The objective is to provide a comfortable rather than a confined situation.

The significance of the organizational chart in a treatment of various dimensions of management is fairly obvious. It can be viewed as a formal graphic definition of the management structure and relationships, and also as a statement of management philosophy by those developing and approving it.

Policy and Procedures Manuals

Policy and procedures manuals, like organizational charts, express the mind of appropriate governing authorities, using conventional and generally understood language and illustrations. As with organizational charts, the intent is to provide a context for flexible operation rather than to establish rigid limits. One test of management effectiveness is its ability to make appropriate and timely exceptions to established norms.

It is most important for those responsible for preparing such manuals to remember that those reading them are likely to regard

27

them not only as sources of specific information but as expressions of management philosophy and attitudes.

Thus even format and style are likely to take on dimensions not always envisioned by those preparing and approving such manuals.

The most graphic illustration of this problem is usually, and most unfortunately, to be found in the manual setting forth personnel policies.

The prevailing tendency is to convert such manuals (unconsciously or consciously) into a form of Magna Carta for the organization, setting forth the rights of the organization and its management, and defining these rights in terms of the negative limitations they impose upon the individual employee.

It is for this reason that such manuals so frequently prove to be sources of discontent and division rather than effective resources.

It is difficult for employees, particularly those in the lower echelons of an organization, to accept the fact that management regards them as co-workers, fellow employees, essentially unique individuals, engaged along with management in the pursuit of common goals, when faced with a manual which projects a largely contrary impression.

At times the difficulty is only a matter of style; its source is often to be found in the tendency to copy old and outdated manuals rather than to create new ones more in keeping with the spirit of the times. At other times the difficulty goes much deeper; in these instances its source is most often to be found in a failure to take appropriate account of the human nature of organizations, and the legitimate needs and aspirations of the individual persons who are their living heart.

Management Data Systems

Management data systems and other reporting and communicating mechanisms, properly designed to meet the particular needs of the individual organization, are among the best means available for providing, and exchanging, on a continuing basis the data necessary for informed decision-making and for generally effective management.

Such mechanisms can be invaluable in filling the informational gap which tends to exist in many organizations between regularly scheduled meetings, or in the interval between the individual steps of a formal management review process.

The range of possibilities in this regard is so wide, and so likely to vary significantly between organizations, that it does not seem feasible to attempt to provide even a general model for illustrative purposes. It might, however, be useful to record, from our own experience, one particularly striking pre-computer application: a pocket-sized "management data book" which, according to the individual using it, was the key to a day-to-day "knowledge-ableness" and effectiveness which played a large part in making him known, among both his associates and his competitors, as one of the most effective executives ever to function at the top level of the automotive industry.

Meetings

Staff meetings and other types of regular and special meetings, rightly employed, can also be a highly effective management tool.

The staff meeting is only one among a large number of vehicles for dialogue and the flow of information and ideas within an organization. It can be particularly effective when there is a desire or need for mutual involvement, dialogue, and the development of consensus at a given level. While it can also be used for short announcements and even simple and direct statements or re-affirmations of policy, the effort to use it for lengthy unilateral pronouncements is almost certain to undercut its effectiveness to a degree which will make it a counter-productive force. This is not to deny management the prerogative of making such pronouncements. It is simply to suggest that their effect may be seriously diminished, and a valuable management tool may be seriously undercut, if the staff meeting is used as a platform for such pronouncements. The staff meeting, if it is to be involved in such matters at all, can be used most effectively as a forum for discussion and dialogue both before and after the pronouncement.

These observations with regard to the staff meeting point up a major difficulty with meetings in general: their tendency to be a diversion from, or an interruption of, or even an escape from the more serious business of management.

This is not to say that meetings generally have no place on the agenda of the effective executive. But it is to say that meetings with no clearly defined purpose relevant to the needs of the organization, its management, or its people, do not have such a place.

Aside from organizational entities whose specific purpose directly includes or involves the convening of meetings, or the carrying out of functions through them (a board of directors is one example frequently given), performance is more likely to be adversely affected as a result of too many meetings than in consequence of too small a number.

Part of the reason for this is that unnecessary meetings take time away from the performance of more essential tasks. Another factor is that such meetings tend to generate additional work much of which is marginal at best in terms of its contribution to the achievement of the essential mission or even intermediate goals. Examples are agendas, documentation (frequently involving time-consuming recasting of material already in useable form for more directly work-related purposes), special reports, minutes, schedule realignment, and even facilities alterations to meet the increasing demand for conference areas.

One hears with increasing frequency variations of this specific complaint: "I just can't get my work done with so much of my time being taken up in attending meetings." There are of course instances in which the problem is very real and not readily resolved. But even the way the complaint is customarily phrased, with its conscious or unconscious separation of meetings and work, supports the contention that the difficulty is not in unmanageable jobs but in unnecessary meetings.

When attendance at meetings reaches the point where it represents the principal demand upon the time of the individual manager, or a group of managers, it is usually a symptom of an underlying functional or structural difficulty—and a relatively reliable signal that, if the meetings involved are truly essential, the entire situation needs to be restudied in relation to the norms of effective utilization of resources, human resources in general and management personnel in particular.

The first step in such a reexamination should be a hard look at the meetings themselves, in terms of:

- their "legitimacy" in relation to the broader task which they are, at best, designed to facilitate;

- their frequency in relation to demonstrated need;

- the number, and individual roles, of those invited or required to attend; and

- possible optional approaches to achieving even the "legitimate" results desired.

Despite the pervading tenor of this section, it remains true that the meeting is a significant and at times even an essential management tool. But, like the organization itself, and the individual managers within it, the meeting needs to have a clearly defined purpose, and needs to be directed toward the achievement of that purpose within a reasonable period of time.

Performance Review Programs

As noted specifically in the introduction and reiterated throughout this entire series of studies, the authors believe it is of critical importance never to lose sight of the personal dimension of an organization, its essentially human nature.

The studies, that is, have consciously and deliberately and repeatedly emphasized:

- the need for constant focus on the personal element, together with the concomitant obligation to do everything possible to ensure the meaningful participation of each individual; and

- the concurrent need to identify and build upon the strengths of each individual.

In this context, it is virtually impossible to overstate the potential contribution of an effective performance review program to the critical task of identifying the particular needs and strengths of each individual employee.

Unfortunately, however, the achievement of this potential is a rare occurrence.

By some strange reversal of values, it has become persistently "normal" to use as the basis for the individual performance review an instrument designed specifically to identify and focus on weakness.

Conceptually, of course, the idea of an evaluative instrument to measure individual performance is fundamentally sound. The core of the difficulty which is endemic in actual practice is that THE MAJORITY OF THE FORMS NOW IN USE ARE RELATIVELY DIRECT DESCENDANTS OF (AND BEAR A STRIKING FAMILY RESEMBLANCE TO) SIMILAR INSTRUMENTALITIES DEVELOPED BY CLINICAL AND ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGISTS TO AID IN DIAGNOSING THE WEAKNESSES AND ABNORMALITIES OF TROUBLED PATIENTS WHO SEEK THEIR HELP.

The almost inevitable result in the organizational context is that performance review programs whose goal should be the pursuit of excellence foster, instead, a counterproductive ferreting out of weaknesses which by and large have little or no relationship to the ability of the individual to contribute constructively and productively to the accomplishment of the total organizational task.

The fact remains that in the rare instances in which organizations or individuals within them have managed to break free of this unfortunate tradition, the performance review program has proven itself as one of the more useful management tools.

Beyond the basic flaw referred to above, other more specific areas are in need of additional attention and study:

- the validity of restricting the making of the evaluation to one individual, usually the immediate supervisor;

- the related possibilities of evaluation by more than one individual at a higher level than the individual being reviewed, or by peers, or, in the case of management personnel, by subordinates;

- the wisdom, or unwisdom, of combining into one event (as is so often done) the performance review and the notice of salary action;

- possible approaches to preventing the performance review from becoming (as it so often does in the hands of supervisors busily preoccupied with "more important things") another routine, and annoying, bureaucratic requirement, to be "gotten over with" as quickly and painlessly as possible; and

- possible approaches to the necessary separation of the performance review program from whatever legitimate "enforcement" systems the organization finds it necessary to maintain.

Certain aspects of the performance review program are necessarily given further consideration in the later discussion of employee relations programs.

Administrative Assistants

Although the administrative assistant is not usually considered as an integral element of management in the broader sense, the role normally assigned to the position makes it an important adjunct to, and facilitator of, the management function. It is in this sense that it is included in this discussion of management tools—the application of this term to persons in this section and the next being a grammatical device rather than an expression of a philosophical view.

The position is most effectively used as a vehicle for freeing the executive management of a given operation from day-to-day concern with administrative functions (and with certain details of the planning and budgetary functions) which support but are not a part of the primary management task. The functions involved are those commonly associated with "keeping the show on the road" rather than with determining its scope or content. They are, that is, those relatively routine, but nonetheless important, functions which are more or less common to all of an organization's operating units, however wide the differences in their specific functional and operational responsibility.

Although specific responsibility may vary from organization to organization, and even within separate elements of a single organization, the responsibility normally assigned to an administrative assistant is likely to include most, if not all, of the following areas:

- Planning: Basic planning is of course the responsibility of executive management. However, the administrative assistant is usually expected to coordinate the procedural aspects of the process, and to prepare the specific documents required.

- Budgeting: Basic budgeting decisions also belong to executive management. However, the administrative

assistant is usually expected to coordinate the procedural aspects of the process, and to prepare the specific documents required. In addition, it is normally the responsibility of the administrative assistant to monitor and report on budget performance.

- General Administration: Except in instances where new policy decisions are involved, the administrative assistant is expected:

    - to handle all of the procedural aspects of personnel recruiting and other ongoing dimensions of the total personnel program;

    - to work with the General Services element to ensure the adequacy of facilities, furnishings and equipment, and amenities;

    - to coordinate with appropriate internal and external agencies arrangements for all other materials and services which are essential to maintaining day-to-day operations;

    - to handle virtually all other routine aspects of the total operation.

Another way of looking at the specific responsibility of the position is in terms of delegating to it the non-policy aspects of all functions of executive management which might otherwise lessen the ability of such management to focus upon responsibilities deriving directly from its defined essential (functional) mission.

A third approach is through the concept of transferability of the skills involved. Since the position of administrative assistant involves responsibilities which are more or less common to all operations, individuals holding those positions are usually more transferable than their principals. In the USCC context, for example, the qualifications for the positions of Secretary for Education and Secretary for Social Development differ as a result of the differing disciplines involved, while administrative assistants in the same two areas would normally be interchangeable (with relatively minor adjustment).

It should be clear from the foregoing that the key element in selecting an administrative assistant is not familiarity with the

operation (though that might be useful) but knowledge and experience in the basic administrative skills.

Professional Consultants

Individual professional management consultants or management consulting firms represent an important resource available to management. Such consultants are likely to be particularly helpful in instances in which:

- internal management lacks the time, or the specific expertise, to conduct its own study in the degree of depth required;

- an independent objective point of view is required, usually because those members of internal management who would normally conduct the study are too deeply involved in the "problem area"; or

- recommendations from an outside source are more likely to be acceptable to the ownership of the organization, or more likely to provide the owners with the "leverage" required for effective implementation of actual recommendations.

This subject is treated more extensively in *The Essentials of Planning* (on pages 13 through 15) where considerable stress is placed upon the importance of a proper definition, by the using organization, of the specific matter to be studied by the consultants.

With particular reference to Church organizations at the diocesan level, the earlier study suggests the following as options which can usefully be explored prior to the retention of professional consultants on a formal fee basis:

- Use of information on the experience of other dioceses of comparable size and complexity, including unsuccessful experience, which is often equally instructive.

- Enlistment of the voluntary assistance of management professionals active in the Church or civil community, many of whom are likely to be more than willing to assist the Church in the particular area of their professional competence.

- Reference to standard management literature on a selected basis.

The Follow-up Function

Among the major responsibilities (it might also be listed among the tools) of the manager is that of effective and timely follow-up to ensure that individual projects are followed through to completion; that established cost and timing schedules—and quality standards—are met; and that both individual and overall performance within his area of responsibility are maintained at a level which ensures the achievement of predetermined objectives. This is the essence of "management by objectives" as the term seems to be most often used.

This follow-up function is a continuing one. It should not be attended to—as it often is—only when it happens to come to mind, or only in periods in which the manager finds himself with a certain amount of free time. It involves something more than the occasional use of the question "Whatever happened to this, or to that?" or the more general "How are things going?" or "What's happening?"

A continuing systematic approach can help to ensure that objectives are met on an orderly basis over the duration of the program or project rather than on a costly and disruptive crash basis as the target date approaches.

It can also serve to bring particular problems or problem areas to the attention of management in their incipient stages and thus decrease the need for crisis management.

Finally, it can serve as a valuable adjunct to the employee relations function by providing a tangible indication of continuing interest on the part of management. This will only be the case, however, when the follow-up system is employed with sufficient intelligence and compassion to prevent its becoming, or even seeming to be, an instrumentality for subtle or unsubtle harassment.

One important way of ensuring the acceptability and credibility of the follow-up effort is to include within it actions which are designed specifically for the benefit of those whose progress the system is actually measuring. Illustrations are actions relating

to working conditions, salaries, or the general employee benefits package.

Peter F. Drucker, in *The Effective Executive,* offers a striking example of the exercise of the follow-up functions by an individual who was quite unexpectedly called upon to assume the position of chief executive officer upon the sudden death of the considerably younger incumbent whose assistant he had been. Because of this age difference he had never expected to assume the top position.

> But when he suddenly found himself president, he asked himself: "What can I and no one else do which, if done really well, would make a real difference to this company." The one, truly significant contribution, he concluded, would be the development of tomorrow's managers. The company had prided itself for many years on its executive development policies. "But," the new chief executive argued, "a policy does nothing by itself. My contribution is to make sure that this actually gets done."

> From then on for the rest of his tenure, he walked through the personnel department three times a week on his way back from lunch and picked up at random eight or ten file folders of young men in the supervisory group. Back in his office, he opened the first man's folder, scanned it rapidly, and put through a telephone call to the man's superior. "Mr. Robertson, this is the president in New York. You have on your staff a young man, Joe Jones. Didn't you recommend six months ago that he be put in a job where he could acquire some merchandising experience? You did. Why haven't you done anything about it?" And down would go the receiver.

> The next folder opened, he would call another manager in another city: "Mr. Smith, this is the president in New York. I understand that you recommended a young man on your staff, Dick Roe, for a job in which he can learn something about store accounting. I just noticed that you have followed through with this recommendation, and I want to tell you how pleased I am to

see you working at the development of our young people."

After recounting this incident, an actual occurrence in a large nationwide retail chain, the author indicates that although this individual was only in this top position for a few years before his own retirement, "today, ten or fifteen years later, executives who never met him attribute to him, and with considerable justice, the tremendous growth and success of the company since his time."

Measuring the Effectiveness of Management

The most immediately apparent—and therefore the most common—method of measuring the effectiveness of individuals at both management and non-management levels is in terms of the product or service which is the organization's reason for being.

But this is only a partial measurement: the full measurement involves not only the impact of the individual upon the product or service—the work—but the impact of the work upon the individual.

Just as the cost of a product or service can be too high in terms of wear and tear on machinery and equipment, or other facilities and resources, so also can it be too high in human terms.

To the extent that an organization is truly human, it will place a high value on this inner dimension: the well-being of the "producer" will take its place alongside the quality of the product or service as a yardstick for measuring results.

Effectiveness in achieving the established goals and objectives of the organization, in accomplishing its essential mission, is the ultimate measure of management as well as program effectiveness.

"Goals and objectives" in this context should be taken to include internal financial and budgetary standards: effective performance is, by definition, performance within the limits of predetermined resource allocations (including "pre-approved" variations from such allocations).

Certain other broad measurements of program effectiveness can also be used in evaluating the effectiveness of management. Among these are the factors of consistency with the approved priorities of the total enterprise, internal consistency among related management areas, and comparative effectiveness in relation

to parallel or competing efforts in comparable organizations or organizations carrying out comparable individual programs.

More specific evaluative criteria can be expected to evolve out of the intrinsic nature or mission of each individual management area. For this reason it is not possible to provide an exhaustive listing: the range can be expected to extend across a broad spectrum, from precise and specific quantitative criteria to such qualitative measurements as professional judgment (preferably by consensus) or past experience.

The following are illustrative examples of commonly accepted evaluative criteria or techniques:

- units of product or volume of services;
- performance in relation to budget;
- adherence to predetermined time schedules or other similar quantitative targets;
- paid attendance (at seminars, workshops, and the like), or paid circulation (for publications or other similar materials);
- constituency response (quantitative and qualitative);
- external or independent internal audits; and
- cost-benefit studies.

The individual performance review, to the extent that it can be freed from the serious flaws discussed in an earlier section, can be an invaluable adjunct to these broader and more general criteria and techniques.

Once again, the approach to measurement must be positive. The objective is effective and meaningful performance, meaningful to both the organization and the individual. The intent, once again, is to make the good better, in pursuit of excellence.

One highly significant day-to-day measure of management effectiveness, somewhat more difficult to quantify or even to measure except by direct and continued observation, is the ability of the manager to make appropriate and timely exceptions to established procedures, policies, or other similar norms.

Where this talent for "management by exception" is limited or

entirely lacking the potential for effectiveness, particularly in the longer haul, is open to serious question.

Two of the books quoted elsewhere in this study should be particularly useful to those who wish to pursue this important subject at greater length: *The Effective Executive,* by Peter F. Drucker, in its entirety and *The Human Nature of Organizations,* by J. Douglas Brown, particularly the chapters dealing with the attributes of the effective leader and with the role and arts of leadership. These two works offer the particular advantage of a relatively intensive and extensive treatment of this and other related subjects in highly readable packages of manageable length.

Finally, because the various dimensions of planning, and the internal documents which planning elicits, provide many of the most realistic guidelines against which performance can be measured, readers are once again invited to refer to our own *The Essentials of Planning.*

The Employee Relations Function

In the light of all that has been said about the essentially human nature of organizations and the necessity for viewing management first and foremost as personal encounter, it should come as no surprise that THE AUTHORS CONSIDER THE OBSERVATIONS IN THIS SECTION AS CENTRAL TO THIS PRESENT STUDY, AND INDEED TO THE ENTIRE SERIES OF WHICH IT IS A PART.

Central, in turn, to this particular section are the following two observations:

- THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN IMAGINATIVE, MEAN-INGFUL, AND BROADLY BASED EMPLOYEE RELA-TIONS FUNCTION IS A MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY, AND OBLIGATION, OF MANAGEMENT.

- THE CONTINUED EXISTENCE OF AN IMAGINATIVE, MEANINGFUL, AND BROADLY BASED EMPLOYEE RELATIONS FUNCTION IS VITAL TO THE GENERAL WELL-BEING OF AN ORGANIZATION, AND IS AMONG THE MORE IMPORTANT KEYS TO, AND MEASURES OF, OVERALL MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS.

One of the central themes of *The Essentials of Organization* is stated as follows:

- THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AN ORGANIZATION IS ULTIMATELY DEPENDENT UPON THE ABILITY OF ITS INDIVIDUAL ELEMENTS TO WORK TOGETHER IN HARMONY AS PARTS OF A TOTAL SYSTEM OR ENTITY.

The primary "individual elements" of an organization are its people, management and non-management alike—and in this context there is clearly no hierarchy of values. Accordingly, it is appropriate for present purposes to rephrase the above statement in this manner:

- THE EFFECTIVENESS OF AN ORGANIZATION IS ULTIMATELY DEPENDENT UPON THE ABILITY OF ITS PEOPLE, MANAGEMENT AND NON-MANAGEMENT ALIKE, TO WORK TOGETHER IN HARMONY AS PARTS OF A TOTAL SYSTEM OR ENTITY.

The achievement and maintaining of this necessary harmony is "the essential mission" of the employee relations function.

Thus the term employee relations is virtually without real or enduring meaning if, as is so often the case, it means nothing more than occasional attention to the levels of employee morale. The mere absence of visible discontent is not a viable long-run measure of the effectiveness of formal or informal employee relations efforts.

The manner in which the various elements of the total personnel function are enumerated and categorized varies with the context of the particular discussion or study and with the mind sets of the individuals involved. However, it seems adequate in terms of the point to be made here to speak in relatively general terms and to deal with a list which is admittedly illustrative rather than exhaustive.

Thus: recruitment; placement; orientation and in-house training; personal and career counseling; personnel policies (as normally expressed in a manual); the employee benefit package (including assistance to the employee in dealing with the outside agencies by and through which such benefits are provided); grievance procedures; information and assistance in all areas; and as a separate and distinct category encompassing all of the others in one way or another but also far transcending them, EMPLOYEE RELATIONS.

An exhaustive treatment of the nature, scope, and content of the employee relations function is, unfortunately, not possible within the compass of a general study such as this. The following list, accordingly, should be read only as a compendium of some of the more fundamental elements which would furnish the basis for chapters or entire sections of a broader study:

- The separate employee relations function, as such, is normally regarded as an integral part of the total personnel function, and as a consequence is assigned to the personnel office, often, however, as a separate component.

- The scope of this function is determined in a general way by the executive management of the organization in question, but the actual content of day-to-day operations is normally determined in large part by the individual employees of the organization. "What's on your mind?" is the spoken or implicit opening of the person responsible for this function when approached by an individual employee.

- Definitions of the specific role of the "employee relations specialist" vary widely, as do listings of the specific services he is responsible for providing. But it is generally agreed that the employee has a right to expect, as a minimum, competence, compassion, and confidentiality.

- While the "employee relations specialist" normally operates within the context of an official policy manual, his function, if it is to have any real meaning, must go beyond a mere reading or quoting of the manual, and perhaps even beyond interpretation. "I'll see what I can do," is the most frequent and explicitly spoken conclusion of an encounter with an individual employee who has come to discuss a problem.

- The "employee relations specialist" must constantly remind himself—as must all members of management involved in this sensitive area—that what is being sought is an answer understandable and acceptable to the employee. This is not to say that such answers must always come down on the side of the

employee; but it is to say that the welfare of the organization is ill-served by an answer that is considered as reasonable and complete merely because it is objectively valid and in line with the manual, without regard to the way in which the employee receives the answer.

- The "employee relations specialist" must avoid solutions which are based entirely on a distinction between "real" and "imaginary" employee problems. The response, "No real problem," is unacceptable if it represents nothing more than a conclusion that the employee's troubles are "all in his head." Imaginary problems can destroy the effectiveness of an individual or an organization as quickly as real ones— and represent even more of a danger when management satisfies itself with this false distinction as an alternative to remedial action.

- The employee relations function will not simply take care of itself as long as everything else is going well; that is, good employee relations can never be taken for granted, and it can never safely be assumed that there is no need for continuing positive attention to the employee relations function.

- At its essential heart, the employee relations function is a service function rather than a monitoring or policing device.

- There is no mystery and no mystique involved in the effective carrying out of this function. In its most simple terms, it is the application of the basic principles of human relationships within a specific context.

The last point alone should be sufficient to make the case for ongoing separate attention to the employee relations function.

For the particular benefit of the audience for which these studies were first designed, it may be useful to say something further with regard to the above admonition against taking good employee relations for granted and assuming that there is no need for a positive formal approach. The tendency toward this approach is especially prevalent and persistent among service organizations in general and church-related organizations in par-

ticular. This is due to the assumption that the spirit of community in the broader spheres out of which such organizations ordinarily arise will automatically carry over to the work-a-day world of the organizations themselves. Unfortunately the assumption is rarely valid in this still less than perfect world.

It will doubtless be observed that this is by a considerable margin the longest section in the present study. This should not be regarded as an accident. It is an accurate measure of the importance attached to the employee relations function.

Indeed, it is the hope of the authors that readers will wish to pursue the subject even more extensively. Those who do should find it particularly useful to refer to appropriate sections of the books listed in the acknowledgments at the beginning of this study. In this connection, the section in *The Essentials of Organization* entitled "The Spirit of Performance" quotes extensively from an invaluable chapter bearing the same name in Peter Drucker's *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*.

In addition, it seems likely that a second reading of the earlier section on performance review programs in the light of what is said here will provide important new insights.

Finally, the authors offer this present section as the ultimate justification for their decision—in preparing the two earlier studies—to include compassion among the essential conditions for effective program and organizational planning. What was said there applies equally well to the entire discipline and to the entire spectrum of organizational life: COMPASSION IS NOT AN OPTION—IT SIMPLY BELONGS.

The Ongoing Management Cycle

Although overall space limitations do not permit an extensive discussion of each phase of the following schematic cycle, it is hoped that the basic information it provides, and the manner in which it is presented, will prove useful, if only as an invitation, and possible guide, to further inquiry:

- Management Development: Provision of formal and informal opportunities for professional and personal growth on the part of all employees.

- Management Selection: Selection of individuals for management positions, from the internal manage-

ment development program or, secondarily, through outside recruitment.

- Management Training: Provision for the continuing education (development) of managers already selected and functioning.

- Management Evaluation: Measurement of management performance against pre-established standards, and through appropriate performance review programs.

- Management Replacement: Provision for continuity through the development, selection, training, and evaluation processes.

The three books listed in the acknowledgments are also particularly excellent sources of further information on each of the major phases of this generally too little understood cycle. This fact—recommendation—is recorded because it is not possible to do more than scratch the surface of this complex area in an abbreviated study such as this.

The brief sections which follow may be useful in themselves. Our real hope, however, is that they will provide an additional impetus to further study.

Management Development

Management development should concern itself primarily with the knowledge and skills needed by individuals, with job content and structure, and with employee relations. The objective is to enable the employee to perform more effectively, not to remake him according to some preconceived organizational image.

Management development should not be seen as the mere training of replacements. This can be achieved more effectively through apprenticeship or understudy programs. It should rather be viewed as preparation for a future in which the organization itself and many of the management positions within it will almost inevitably be different.

Finally, management development should be concerned with professional growth in an environment which will give full opportunity for personal growth as well, without trying to shape the direction of the latter.

Management Selection

The selection of individuals to fill management positions is clearly among the major determinants of organizational effectiveness. It is much too important to be handled politically, routinely, or casually. It should not be left to chance. It should be planned for in advance to avoid the necessity of crisis selection or interim caretaker management.

Where a new position is involved, the selection should be on the basis of a carefully and thoroughly developed description of the position, not merely on a general idea of what is likely to be or is normally required for such positions.

Where a replacement is involved, the selection should be on the same basis. It should not be assumed that the existing position description (if there is one) remains valid, or that the way in which the incumbent has been handling the position is the only, or even the best, way.

The incumbent has a significant role to play in the selection of the replacement, and should not be excluded from the process. However, the ultimate choice should not be left to the incumbent alone. Experience demonstrates that such an approach has an extremely high potential for selection based on style rather than on substance—probably as a result of the natural preference for "my kind of person."

An important key to effective management is the achievement of an appropriate balance between the basic desire to promote from within and the obvious danger of becoming inbred to the point of narrowness, isolation, or even unreality. One of the more effective approaches is to restrict hiring from the outside, as a general rule, to new positions or to existing positions which require specific skills, educational background, or professional qualifications which are clearly not to be found among those presently in the employ of the organization. However, exceptions may occasionally be appropriate and even necessary to maintain the flow of new blood in the organizational veins—particularly when it is remembered that it does not take an overly long period of time for an outsider to become an insider.

Finally, experience demonstrates that there is much to be said, particularly at the upper levels of an organization, for involving the next two higher levels in the selection process. No member

of management is or should be always present and always available. As a consequence, it will frequently be necessary in the normal course of things for a given manager to deal with the immediate subordinates of those managers who report directly to him. Under the suggested approach to selection the compatibility factor can be largely determined in advance, with a resultant and clearly advantageous minimization of the potential for personal or professional conflict.

Management Training

Management training, as distinguished here from management development, refers to the continuing education of managers. The reference is to managers already selected and functioning, and to training or education which is directly related to the responsibilities of the positions they occupy. In times of rapid change such as the present and anticipated future it is no longer safe—if it ever was—to assume that the qualifications which led to the initial selection of an individual manager are the qualifications which will be required throughout his tenure in the same position.

It is in the best interest of the organization to work with the individual manager in determining the nature of additional qualifications which may be required with the passage of time and changes in the organization. It is also in the best interest of the organization to do everything that can reasonably be done to assist the manager in acquiring the necessary added qualifications, even to the extent of financing the acquisition. The manager has a corresponding obligation to expend the necessary effort. Once again the key is mutual approaches to mutual concerns.

Management Evaluation

Management evaluation involves the measurement of management performance on both the individual and general levels.

On an individual basis, all that has been said above concerning the employee relations function in general and performance review programs in particular has direct application here. In this regard it is essential to remember, and all too easy to forget, that the manager when all is said and done is an individual employee.

As such, the manager should of course be included in the organization's performance review program. The organization has

the right to include the manager and the manager has the right to be included. A personal recollection may be of interest in this regard. It involves an organization which not only included managers in its program, but also used, as an additional measure of individual performance, the effectiveness with which managers reviewed their own subordinates. An essential element in this approach, which has both advantages and disadvantages, was the review of each individual by a minimum of three others. Despite obvious difficulties, the program was at least as successful as most programs involving only a single reviewer.

Management evaluation at the general level is treated in a later section entitled "Measuring the Effectiveness of Management."

Management Replacement

The replacement of individual managers is a particular dimension of the more general subject of management selection, and has already been touched upon in the section dealing with that subject. The emphasis there was upon determining who should be involved in making the selection and upon defining the role in the selection process of the individual being replaced.

Mention has also been made of the risk involved in assuming without appropriate testing that the potential replacement will be required to do precisely what the incumbent has been doing.

And finally it has been stressed that the replacement process should provide for due consideration of the relative merits of selection from within or outside of the organization.

It remains only to stress the need for a planned, orderly, and open approach to this critical aspect of organizational life. Too many replacements seem accidental in terms of the individual selected, the time phasing, or the impact upon management area from which the replacement is taken when the choice is internal. There is much to be said, in replacement situations where a number of positions are affected, for an effectively coordinated approach.

Where this is not the case the resulting uncertainty can be significantly disruptive and counterproductive. Organizations, like the individuals who comprise them, find that uncertainty is among the most difficult of life's trials.

Management Limits and Excesses

Among the more generally accepted limits within which management is normally expected to function, the following appear to have the widest application:

- The mission of the total organization, or of individual components with defined missions.

- Internally established structural and functional boundaries:

    - Approved plans (program limits);

    - Approved budgets (expenditure limits);

    - Standard operating procedures (procedural limits);

    - Approved operating policies (policy limits);

    - Approved position descriptions (job limits).

Among the more common excesses which are generally recognized as significantly counterproductive are:

- Frequent or habitual exercise of "raw power"; or resort to other questionable approaches to motivation (e.g., appeals to fear, fostering self-doubt).

- The assumption of "omni-competence"; or other similarly unreal and thus disruptive postures.

- Invasion of individual privacy, usually by the conscious or unconscious extension of supervision or judgment to the private, personal dimension.

Before leaving the subject of management limits and excesses it may be instructive to "enter into the record" a number of the more common management stereotypes:

- The Autocrat

    - With respect to substance (arbitrary)

    - With respect to style (arrogant or domineering)

- The Busy Executive

    - Projecting "busy" (or "too busy to talk now") self-image

    - Demanding similar image projection by employees

    - Recalling, to the observer, Thoreau's observation that it is not enough to be busy, the true test being what we are "busy about"

- The Superficial Approach

    - Projecting the appearance of "managing" while studiously avoiding or over-simplifying problems

    - Smoothing over the surface manifestations of problems rather than dealing with their root causes

    - Practicing non-involvement: making sure that employees are doing "whatever it is they're supposed to do" without seeking to understand or assist

- The "Hoverer" (Omni-present)

- The "Recluse" (Omni-absent)

This listing is clearly incomplete and in need of further refinement. But even in this rudimentary form it should provide the reader with a fertile basis for reflection.

The actual intent is to highlight a number of "types of mismanagement"; or common management aberrations; or mistaken approaches to management; or "types of management an organization cannot afford"; or counterproductive deviations from generally accepted norms.

The effort is to amplify the definition of what management should be by delineating what it should not be; to show the inadequacy or superficiality of much that passes for management. In this connection, it may be interesting to observe the clear relationship between the listing of stereotypes and the preceding comments on generally accepted limits and common excesses.

Finally, it is to be noted that the omission of the customary "any resemblance to any individuals, living or dead, is purely coincidental" is purely coincidental.

The Factors of Size and Growth

The principles of organization as set forth in this study are largely unaffected by the size of the organization.

Also essentially unaffected by organizational size are the several elements of the management task discussed in the opening sections: managing the organization, managing other managers (the true "one-man show" being the exceedingly rare exception), managing non-management personnel, managing the work itself, and self-management.

Relative size does, however, have a direct impact upon the management structure. Other things being equal, the larger organization is likely to require a greater differentiation of function. This in turn is likely to result in a more complex structure, at least in terms of the number of management levels required, and possibly in terms of management approaches and practices. The underlying principles, however, remain the same.

Further, despite the advantage claimed on the basis of greater individual visibility, smaller organizations do not necessarily offer greater opportunities for advancement. The visibility factor, the opportunity to be "a big fish in a little pond," is likely to be offset in larger organizations by the wider range and variety of positions made possible and necessary by their greater size.

For the beginner this can provide a greater opportunity to start out in the specific type of work for which he considers himself most qualified in professional and personal terms. For the longer service employee it can increase the number of possibilities for advancement to a higher level. Ultimately the individual's choice of a larger or a smaller organization is likely to be a matter of personal preference rather than statistical analysis. And on the basis of individual experience a favorable case can be made for either choice.

It is clear that the factor of growth is also operative here. Growth permits and often necessitates an increasing degree of functional differentiation and task specialization at both management and non-management levels. The task of management be-

comes increasingly complex, but there is at the same time an opportunity to assign more and more of it to specialists in particular management areas. But once again the underlying principles remain unchanged.

There is, however, a limit to growth and a concomitant limit to size. This varies widely from organization to organization, depending upon such factors as the nature of the products or services offered and the complexity of the machines or processes required to produce them.

But whatever the size of an organization, and whatever its growth rate, it is essential for the size and structure of its management team to be related directly to these factors and responsive to changes in them.

Where there is more management than an organization needs, the cost in economic terms alone is likely to be more than the organization can bear except in the very short run, and the other costs are too evident to need elaboration here.

On the other hand, where there is more organization than management can effectively manage the best that can be hoped for is a faceless and impersonal bureaucracy.

In both instances the problems have to do with the size and structure of management rather than with basic management principles. Indeed the problems may be said to arise as a direct result of a failure to apply these principles in an effective way.

Concluding Thoughts

The observations in this final section are not in any sense mere afterthoughts, nor should they be seen as secondary to those in earlier sections of the study.

The intent in some instances is to amplify and augment the material already presented, and in others to introduce completely new subjects, in separate and relatively brief paragraphs—the order of which has no particular significance.

Except for space limitations these observations would have been treated more extensively either by expanding existing sections or by introducing new ones.

<p align="center">*   *   *</p>

It is not sufficient to measure the effectiveness of an organization or of its management by the effectiveness of its individual programs or structures, unless there has been a prior determination that the programs are right, and the structures relevant, in relation to the essential mission. The wrong program does not become right because it is effectively implemented. An irrelevant structure does not become relevant because it is effectively managed.

*   *   *

The provision of amenities such as heating and cooling, lighting, and clean and safe facilities is among the most neglected of all management responsibilities. It is clearly advantageous to the organization as a whole and to management itself to provide an environment conducive to effective performance and to general well-being. The provision of such an environment is also a moral obligation, and in a growing number of jurisdictions a legal one as well. It nevertheless remains true that the general track record of management in this regard leaves much to be desired. It is time and indeed past time for management to recognize that it is simply not enough to turn the matter over completely to "the maintenance people" or "general services" or "the night crew" or some equally anonymous entity on the theory that such things are somehow beyond the scope—or beneath the dignity—of professional management personnel. The work may indeed be turned over to others, but the responsibility for planning, organizing, and properly funding it, and for the effectiveness with which it is performed, cannot be similarly given away.

*   *   *

Two cardinal rules (no pun intended) to be observed in delegating authority are that matters should not be delegated merely because they are distasteful, and must not be delegated when the delegation makes possible the side-stepping or complete avoidance of a personal obligation to another individual or group of individuals within the organization.

*   *   *

An extended treatment of the decision-making process is not feasible within the limits set for the present study. It is our hope that what has been said will be of assistance in improving the general environment in which decisions are made. Beyond this, it seems particularly important in relation to the overall theme of

the study to include in this final section the following additional excerpt from *The Human Nature of Organizations,* by J. Douglas Brown:

> Although historical data may be helpful in itself as a guide to decision, any predictions concerning the *future* behavior of people remain subjective judgments quite distinct from the application of the highly predictive laws of physical science developed to deal with non-human substances.
>
> Despite the expanding use of computers and mathematical procedures, we are still unable to predict from past evidence the swings of political attitudes, business enterprise, consumer spending, birth rates, or fashions before change has already begun. We are but recording change, not predicting it. We can develop extensive analyses of past attitudes and behavior, but because of the diverse impacts of a multitude of influences upon a multitude of diverse people, wise prediction is far more the result of mature understanding, sensitive intuition, and considered judgment than of the scientific marshaling of historical, quantitative evidence.

<p style="text-align:center">*   *   *</p>

From shared Gethsemani years, and later correspondence, with Father M. Louis, O. C. S. O. (Thomas Merton):

- Father Louis liked to say that his obligation, his allegiance, and his love—they were all one to him— belonged to his brothers in religion (his "co-workers") rather than to the Abbey of Gethsemani, Incorporated (his "organization").

- And he used to offer with us this prayer for busy monks (and managers), "Lord, free us from the laziness that goes about disguised as activity when activity is not required of us."

- Finally, it was Father Louis who first told either of us that the best books are those which seem to "write themselves out of lived experience." It is here that we place our present hope. . . .

Reference Notes