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AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEIVED SKILLS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this research was to establish whether different perspectives on managerial effectiveness could be integrated to derive a common core of skills and characteristics. The different perspectives include management theory, strategic management and international business perspectives, and the competency-based approach to management effectiveness in the United Kingdom, the United States, and in New Zealand. The research programme used a blend of quantitative and qualitative techniques. Each phase of research is supported by a review of the international literature and empirical field work conducted in New Zealand. A research tool relatively new to management research, Concept Mapping (Trochim, 1989a, 1989b), was to allow qualitative verbal statements to be described in terms of both quantitative and spatial relationships. A singular advantage of Concept Mapping is that collection and analysis of data is conducted without imposing research constructs at any stage, and a distillation of a core set of skills and characteristics can be derived through the reiterative process of Concept Mapping. In addition to Concept Mapping sessions with practicing managers and management educators and developers, two national surveys were conducted. In essence, the research builds a framework of the factors influencing managerial effectiveness through literature reviews and empirical work to generate a predictor variable list, then tests that list for predictive strength. The primary outcomes of the research were: 1) the identification of a set of skills and characteristics that discriminate classes of effectiveness and ineffectiveness; and 2) the provision of a conceptual framework for analysing the similarities and differences between models of managerial effectiveness.
1. INTRODUCTION

The objective of this introductory section is to establish the context of the research programme, state the assumptions made, provide definitions of terms, and set parameters for study in an area of research that is ill-defined. Section one therefore explains the research construct developed for studying managerial effectiveness, defines the purpose of the research, and the process undertaken to address the purpose of the research. As such, the discussion is intended as an overview, with each premise and argument presented in the introduction to be expanded upon through the literature reviews contained in Sections two, three and four of the thesis.

1.1 Background Context on the Concept of Managerial Effectiveness

When reading the contemporary management literature it is clear that throughout the history of management as a discipline, there has never been such a sense of uncertainty and instability in the global business environment. Never before has there been such a need for finely tuned management and leadership of organisations, in order to gain a competitive advantage in an international arena (Sachs, 1993). At the same time, managers are claimed to be under-educated and lacking in skill worldwide (Karpin, 1995; Porter, 1985; Thorpe, 1990), while management education and development programmes are criticised for their inadequacies (Brosow & Kleiner, 1990; Osbaldeston & Barham, 1992; Osterweil, 1992; Syrett, 1993). Managers in the 1990s are, therefore, in a difficult and pressured position. The onus is on managers as individuals to contribute to national competitive advantage (Baker, 1991; Hornby & Thomas, 1989; Saul, 1993), while being accused of lacking in critical skills, with little opportunity to learn the “right” skills.
When changes in the business environment revealed the flaws in the traditional management style, a multitude of models emerged to prescribe the new skills and characteristics now required (Nohria & Berkley, 1994). These new models came from different perspectives, with a broad and diverse range of opinion on what it is that managers need to do, and be, to achieve a competitive advantage for the organisation and, ultimately, the nation (Baker, 1991; Hornby & Thomas, 1989; Karpin, 1995; Porter, 1985; Saul, 1993).

Different perspectives on what constitutes managerial effectiveness can usefully be categorised as being either traditional or contemporary, where traditional perspectives relate to a pre-1970s era of business stability and complacency (Frater, Stuart, Rose & Andrews, 1995), and where contemporary perspectives are to be found in current research. An examination of the changes that have taken place reveals the challenges to the traditional management style, and the responses that have been made to change, as discussed below.

For over a century management theorists have attempted to define and explain the aspects of human input that predict effectiveness in a management position. The existing models of managerial effectiveness have evolved from the traditional models developed by Fayol (1916) and Mintzberg (1973). Fayol established a model of management as a process of planning, organising, commanding, co-ordinating, and controlling functions that are universally applicable, and to this, Mintzberg (1973) added generic Interpersonal, Informational, and Decisional managerial roles, each with their subroles. In these traditional models (Luthans, Hodgetts, & Rosenkrantz, 1988; Worledge, 1996) strategic, tactical, and operational perspectives and time frames, different needs at different management levels, and the differences between general and functional roles are also recognised as universal aspects of management.

This traditional perspective that management is a universal set of functions and roles underpinned by personal skills and characteristics remains the cornerstone of many
contemporary management texts, where managerial input is defined as “technical” “human”, and “conceptual” skills according to Katz’s (1974) typology.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>TECHNICAL SKILLS</th>
<th>HUMAN SKILLS</th>
<th>CONCEPTUAL SKILLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartol &amp; Martin (1991, p. 18)</td>
<td>Skills that reflect both an understanding of and a proficiency in a specialised field</td>
<td>Skills associated with a manager’s ability to work well with others both as a member of a group and as a leader who gets things done through others. Examples: communicating, motivating others to develop themselves and perform well</td>
<td>Skills related to the ability to visualise the organisation as a whole, discern interrelationships among organisational parts, and understand how the organisation fits into the wider context of the industry, community, and world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daft (1997, pp15-17)</td>
<td>The understanding of and proficiency in the performance of specific tasks</td>
<td>The ability to work with and through other people and to work effectively as a group member. Examples: motivate, facilitate, co-ordinate, lead, communicate, resolve conflicts</td>
<td>The cognitive ability to see the organisation as a whole and the relationship amongst its parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert et al. (1995, p.18)</td>
<td>Acquired through training for or doing a particular kind of work</td>
<td>The abilities that the manager uses to work with and through other people. Examples: communicate, empathise, work as member of a group</td>
<td>Enable a manager to take a broad view of the organisation &amp; its environment &amp; to visualise possible future courses of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inkson &amp; Kolb (1995, pp 30-32)</td>
<td>Reflect expertise in a particular functional or industry area</td>
<td>Enable managers to communicate effectively with people inside and outside the organisation; they include both team work and leadership skills. Examples: communicate, motivate, inspire</td>
<td>Skills of analysis which enable managers to find solutions to problems. See the organisation as a whole, understand all its activities, interrelationships, position and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbins (1996, p.8)</td>
<td>The ability to apply specialised knowledge or expertise</td>
<td>The ability to work with, understand, and motivate other people, both individually and in groups. Examples: communicate, motivate, delegate</td>
<td>The mental ability to analyse and diagnose complex situations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: A selection of management text definitions of technical skills, human skills, and conceptual skills traditionally required by managers.

Table 1.1 shows that many texts based upon the traditional management perspective agree that managers need to possess and/or develop certain technical management skills that are the

---

1 An alternative model was developed during this research programme that has proven to have predictive superiority over the Katz model, as reported in Section two.
learned tools and techniques of management. Managers also require well developed interpersonal skills relating to working with others, with the component abilities encompassing all and everything concerned with managing and leading people. As Vaughan (1989) suggests, the terms leadership, motivation, and communication are so general and imprecise that they convey nothing of the specific attributes, skills, and training required for each. The conceptual skills category is equally broad in encompassing many different forms of information processing ability.

In these texts, effectiveness is most often defined in terms of an individual’s ability to set and achieve goals, where it is implicitly assumed that managerial effectiveness leads to organisation effectiveness. Some examples of the traditional definitions provided for effectiveness are:

• The ability to choose appropriate goals and achieve them. (Bartol & Martin, 1991, p.20).
• ... is accomplished by achieving a stated objective. (Kreitner, 1980, p.7).
• ... is a measure of the extent to which the prescribed goals are achieved. (Gilbert et al., 1995, p.19).
• ... is defined in terms of the quality and quantity of their performance and the satisfaction and commitment of their subordinates. (Robbins, 1996, p.9).
• ... means achieving the result which you seek. (Inkson & Kolb, 1995, p.10)

In addition, an organisation level definition is provided by Daft (1997, p.10):

• The degree to which the organization achieves a stated goal. (Daft, 1997, p.13).

The theme of these definitions of effectiveness, at both the individual and organisational levels, is goal setting and achievement, with Robbins introducing the idea of quality and quantity of performance, and a manager’s positive impact on others. A problem
with this concept of effectiveness is that there is no evidence to suggest that models of effective management performance are related to organisational performance (Gilbert et al., 1995, p.21), and none of the models explain the relationship between managerial effectiveness and organisational effectiveness. While a measure of the extent of goal achievement is mentioned by Gilbert et al. (1995), there is nothing that details and defines a possible range of effectiveness, from being ineffective to being extremely effective.

Luthans et al. (1988) provide a different aspect on managerial effectiveness in distinguishing between effective and successful managers. Effective managers are described as having satisfied and committed subordinates, and produce organisational results, whereas successful managers are described in terms of rapid promotion (p.62). As is often the case in the management literature, Luthans et al. describe a number of skills associated with effective managers that are stated to be trainable, yet go on to say that above all effective managers need good interpersonal skills, which is left undefined (p.175).

It was this incomplete and rather patchy traditional model of management and managerial effectiveness that began to fail in the face of dramatic changes in the business environment (Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993; Cox, 1990; Frater, Stuart, Rose, & Andrews, 1995; Jackson, 1989).

1.1.2. Change in the Business Environment

Post World War Two, the business environment enjoyed a period of growth and prosperity where markets were relatively stable and predictable. Many economies were protected by tariffs, import restrictions, industry subsidies and market protection, with New Zealand being an extreme example (Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993; Deeks, Parker & Ryan, 1994; Frater, Stuart, Rose & Andrews, 1995). The ability of an organisation to be effective and efficient was equated with having a hierarchical bureaucratic structure, with organisation effectiveness
measured in terms of productivity ratios and profit. The traditional assumptions underpinning management style were that management ought to be directive and autocratic, with little employee involvement beyond their particular job. The perspective on managerial effectiveness during this time was, therefore, a reflection of the stable business environment, and the traditional models of management that had evolved in large bureaucratic organisations.

Then in the 1970s circumstances began to change, and they have continued to change at an accelerating rate. World oil supply and price and quantum leaps in technological advancements introduced dramatic change, while incremental changes in workforce profiles also began to challenge the traditional management style (Wilson, 1992). Both dramatic and incremental changes faced managers with new situations, where what they had done before was no longer effective, and at times could be damaging. The new situations brought about by the changed business environment include the now international and fiercely competitive nature of business (and hence management), and working with a more highly educated, skilled, and often multicultural workforce, with a greater number of working women.

Eccles and Nohria (1992) argue that change is, paradoxically, a constant factor of management, and that managers of the 1990s do not face any more change than at previous times. Wilson (1992, p. 27) suggests that the obsession with change borders upon hysteria. While it is true that incremental change is always occurring, and managers of all epochs have faced dramatic change brought about by wars, for example, it must nevertheless be acknowledged that managers in the last decade have faced more change in a condensed space of time. Furthermore, the nature of the changes have had a direct impact upon changing what managers need to do, as discussed below.
**Technological Influences**

Technological advancements affected managers in a number of different ways. The dramatic rise in computer use demanded that they become computer literate, or at least comprehend the potential benefit (or not) for particular organisation needs. Production technologies also changed dramatically, and kept changing, so that managers needed to keep up to date with advancements in their industry. Advancements in telecommunications technology resulted in a huge increase in the generation and dissemination of information, calling for skills in sourcing and managing vast amounts of information as a valuable, if not critical, resource (Birkett, 1995; Hamel & Prahalad, 1996).

**Political Influences**

Changing world politics also had a dramatic affect on management; as governments became allies or adversaries, so business opportunities and markets arose or died. It is the political influence that has seen markets become global, in the sense that many countries have opened their markets to international competitors, yet at the same time, governments have created a rise in regionalism, where countries in close proximity form joint economic and trade agreements (Naisbett, 1994 p.11). In essence, the world has been divided according to groupings of nations with varying degrees of strategic alliance in trade and economy, where business and management decisions relate to these circumstances.

**International Competition**

It was the high tech, fiercely competitive Japanese approach that shocked Western managers out of their complacency, and to a certain extent prompted nations to co-operate with each other to meet the competition presented by the Japanese. As Western markets opened up during the deregulations of the 1970s managers were faced with fierce international
competition with goods at competitive prices (Frater, Rose & Stuart, 1993). Although initially producing low quality products, over time, the Japanese educated the consumer market to expect high quality goods at a reasonable cost, with good customer service. Moreover, the consumer now had a much wider selection of goods to choose from, as competitors fought to attract the consumer dollar. With a demanding and discriminating consumer base, managers now had to consider consumer attitudes and needs, rather than simply marketing goods and services produced. As a component of consumer attitude and demands, the need for organisations to demonstrate a socially responsible approach to business became important. Consumer driven marketing with an emphasis on quality in its broadest sense, tailored to meet customer needs became a critical factor for organisations in this environment. It was the inflexibility and slow responses of large bureaucratic organisations with their traditional management style that hindered the ability to compete in this environment (Burdett, 1991; Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993; Cockerill, 1989; Frater, Rose & Stuart, 1993).

Cross-cultural Management

The internationalisation of business and management introduced cross-cultural issues to a greater number of managers (Selvarajah & Cutbush-Sabine, 1991). As organisations moved into new markets, expatriate managers were required to learn new languages and/or work through interpreters. New laws and regulations needed to be learned, and/or professional advisors engaged. Managers faced a different type of workforce where, either positively or negatively, they were perceived to be a foreigner, or an outsider. To avoid business disasters expatriate managers, as well as managers conducting business with other countries from home, needed to understand and apply different approaches to doing business, including

Increasing global mobility, national conflicts, and refugee assistance also introduced different ethnic groups to the workforce. New Zealand, in addition, encouraged immigration. These were major changes that forced managers to consider different employee needs (Deeks, Parker & Rose, 1994). Managers who had been used to a workforce comprised of English speaking British stock with a Protestant work ethic, were now facing workers who had difficulty speaking and understanding English, with different values and work ethics. Unlike the expatriate manager who had ethnic managers to work through, this situation demanded the development of managerial skills. To be able to work effectively through these people, a manager needed to develop an understanding and appreciation of diversity, and even greater interpersonal sensitivity.

**Incremental Change**

Over time, mass education and changing social values brought about incremental changes in Western workforce profiles. Employees became generally more highly educated, and as a result, more aware of their rights, and more critical and assertive. Many of these employees were not content with the traditional philosophy that worker involvement stopped at the parameters of their job. This new type of employee wanted more involvement and contribution, forcing managers to consider where, and how, to become more participative (Wilson, 1992).

A number of other challenges were created as many more women entered the workforce. The growing number of women not only changed the dynamics of an organisation, as they progressed and obtained management positions, but challenged the philosophical core of the traditional management style that had been created by men (Shaef, 1985).
Male managers were now required to interact with women as their peers, yet at the same time, gender stereotypical thinking was (and still is) colouring perceptions (Christie, 1994; Quinn, 1988). This circumstance led to a situation where women as managers were paid less for the same job, progressed more slowly than their male peers, and reached a “glass ceiling” in middle management roles - a situation that has not changed (Burton, 1991; Davis, 1996; Jacques, 1987; McGregor, Thompson & Dewe, 1994; O’Leary & Ickovics, 1992). This is despite observations that women as a group tended to have the participative management style and good interpersonal skills required for a “thinking” employee (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Handley, 1990; Loden, 1985). On the other hand, it could be argued that it is those very skills that kept, and still keep, women at the middle management level, where those skills are most critical.

Traditional management thinking about what was effective was, therefore, challenged on many fronts over the 1970s and 1980s, with the rate of change accelerating through the 1990s, where managers face a turbulent and competitive business environment in the extreme. In times of uncertainty and turbulence managers turn to consultants for advice (Dawes, Dowling, & Patterson, 1992; Nohria & Berkley, 1994; O’Driscoll & Eubanks, 1993; Perkins, 1993), and this is, arguably, where the rise of the contemporary management gurus, and management fads and fashions began.

Response to Change

A number of alternative approaches were developed in response to the changed business and management environment, with the competency-based approach being most widespread, even though heavily criticised (Baker, 1991; Canning, 1990; Collin, 1989; Furnham, 1990; Jacobs, 1989; Saul, 1993; Thompson & Carter, 1995; Vaughan, 1989). The non-traditional models recognise the importance of changed and changing product and service technologies, the
information boom, rate and volume of communication and communication technology, and the now global nature of business. In addition to recognising that the nature of managerial work has changed, these emergent models also contextualise management to particular organisation or industry circumstances and contexts (Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Glaze, 1989; Greatrex & Phillips, 1989; Sims & Guest, 1990; Wiersma & Bantel, 1993; Youndt, Scott, Snell, Dean & Lepak, 1996).

There were two main approaches taken to address the issues facing managers in this new environment. One occurred at a strategic level where organisations were restructured in some way, and the other was directed at enhancing the effectiveness of the individual through management development initiatives. Within these two approaches were a further two dimensions, where the objective was to either become “lean and mean”, or to create an environment of warmth and camaraderie. The truly bold attempted to do both; create a lean and mean structure, while at the same time generating esprit de corps in the remaining wary and watchful employees who were also being asked to do more with less (James & Stickels, 1995).

At the strategic level, consultants helped managers to restructure (Balasoglou, 1995), or re-engineer (Hammer & Stanton, 1995; Kinni, 1995) organisations. The emphasis in these models is for strategic leadership to create and communicate a vision and goals for the organisation (Hamel & Prahalad, 1996; Hinterhuber & Popp, 1992; Kotter, 1990; Mintzberg, 1994a; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990). The managerial actions required to manage within that new environment and gain a competitive advantage are prescribed according to the perspective of model. The underpinning theme of these changes was to focus on streamlining operations, and maximise the utilisation of resources, where the people remaining were recognised as being a valuable resource. Strategy, strategic planning, and aligning organisational operations with strategy, became an important issue (Mintzberg, 1994b). As a consequence, the need for
strategic vision, mission statements, and strategic planning took on new significance, and there was a growth in awareness of the importance of strategic human resource management (Delery & Doty, 1996; Iles, 1993; Lado & Wilson, 1994; Torrington & Holden, 1992).

At the level of the individual, a plethora of models emerged to prescribe the technical skills and personal characteristics required for managerial effectiveness, where effectiveness is described and measured in many ways. Luthans, Hodgetts & Rosenkrantz (1988, p.63) provide a table showing 16 categories representing 1942 available measures of managerial effectiveness. Most measures relate to organisational aspects (e.g., production 252 measures, sales 199 measures), with only 44 measures for general managerial effectiveness. According to the perspective taken, managers are exhorted to achieve "excellence" (Jacobs, 1989; Peters & Waterman, 1983), be effective (Luthans et al., 1988) or, in the term of the 1990s, have "competence" (Cockerill, 1989), "competency" (Pearson, 1990), "competences" (Baker, 1991; Miller, 1991), or "competencies" (Dulewicz, 1989) as demonstrated against set performance standards. Performance standards vary according to the model, culture, industry, and organisation, where successful performance is stated as being one or other, or a mix of, managerial inputs, outputs, and outcomes expressed as tasks, process, skills, and personal characteristics.

The rise of the competency approach in the 1980s contributed many different models as both academics and commercial management developers sought ways to revitalise management in a new direction. Unfortunately, the rapid growth and diverse nature of the competency approach introduced a bewildering array of skills and characteristics claimed to underpin managerial effectiveness. As management fads and fashions came and then disappeared as failures, confusion and controversies began to arise over what constitutes managerial effectiveness in the 1990s given the existing models were, at best, only partially valid.
The failure of consultants to adequately address management issues prompted Dunk (1994) to claim that America had undergone the best advised economic decline in history, with others also scornful of the efforts of consultants in different parts of the world (Balasoglou, 1995; Cooley, 1994; Nohria & Berkley, 1994). Many failures were a result of poor implementation, where managers and/or employees were inadequately prepared for change through training initiatives. This reflects a weakness in the model being implemented, in addition to a number of other weaknesses that also served to reduce or limit their applicability, as discussed next.

A major criticism of competency models is the often vague terminology, and the overlapping or intermingling of technical skills with the less overt personal characteristics being defined (Canning, 1990; Furnham, 1990; Worledge, 1992). While all the models in some way list the different aspects of management considered critical to managerial effectiveness from a particular perspective, the terms used for the same thing differ between models. Whereas most models emphasise technical skills (c.f. Baker, 1991; Miller, 1991), others emphasise personal characteristics (c.f. Dulewicz, 1989). To confuse the issue further, some models have measurement of technical skills as performance standards, yet effectiveness is acknowledged to be underpinned by personal characteristics which are not measured (c.f. NZQA, 1995).

An increasing awareness of the influence of contextual factors saw nations, industries, and organisations develop models to incorporate their specific needs (Glaze, 1989; Greatrex & Phillips, 1989; Higgins & Blakeley, 1990; Jackson, 1989; Karpin, 1995). These models suffer the same terminology and measurement weaknesses as the organisation and management development models, and in addition, have been found to have limited transferability across different contexts, thereby limiting their general usefulness. If a
cornerstone of Western government policy is to achieve national competitive advantage through the effectiveness of managers, it is clear that these foundations are shaky.

A serious attempt needs to be made to somehow integrate the rich and varied body of knowledge that now exists on managerial effectiveness, before expecting managers to somehow become more effective through the fragmented offerings available. While there will be pockets of managerial effectiveness/competency/excellence, the majority of managers, especially in New Zealand, are focused on fighting to survive (Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993). This dissertation aims to explore one avenue that may provide a way to integrate some of the different perspectives, in terms of a common core of skills and characteristics perceived to underpin overall managerial effectiveness. The discussion now turns to building a working definition of managerial effectiveness for the purposes of this dissertation.

1.2 Defining Perspectives on Managerial Effectiveness

The previous discussion revealed many different perspectives on what constitutes managerial effectiveness and how the concept may be described and defined. The two major philosophies underpinning the different perspectives are that:

1. Management is a universal activity with fundamental principles that do not change, where it is possible to define a set of core skills and/or personal characteristics which underpin the ability to be effective as a manager. There is an ideal way to manage, and it can be taught and learned.

2. Management is not a universal activity, it is highly contextualised to the industry and/or organisation the manager is operating within, with particular skills and/or characteristics identified according to contextual factors. There is no ideal
way to manage, it depends on the circumstances.

On the surface, these philosophies are in direct opposition to each other. If one takes the first view then context does not have a major influence, and there is an identifiable set of skills and characteristics contributing to managerial effectiveness. If one takes the second view then it is neither possible nor desirable to attempt to derive a set of core skills and characteristics. A more helpful approach in terms of providing managers with what they need would be to include both these perspectives. In other words, continue the search for a core set of skills and characteristics empirically established across contexts, bearing in mind that at the level of the individual, the skills and characteristics demanded by contextual influences may be needed to supplement a fundamental core.

In the concepts and models discussed in the previous section, the objective of the authors is to prescribe the skills and characteristics that managers need to be effective, from a particular perspective. The three major perspectives discussed relate to:

1. The traditional perspective as defined by Fayol, Mintzberg and Katz.
2. Strategic management and international business.
3. The competency approach.

The concepts and models produced from each of these perspectives result in a different concept of managerial effectiveness, and different sets of required skills and characteristics. The next block of this discussion addresses where and how the models differ with respect to defining managerial effectiveness and prescribing requisite skills and characteristics. Areas of commonality are also discussed. A more full discussion of the concepts and models is provided in the literature review presented in Section three. The purpose right now is to
examine the various perspectives on managerial effectiveness in terms of building a definition of managerial effectiveness for this dissertation.

Inherent to the traditional perspective is the idea that managerial effectiveness rests in the ability of the individual to develop the prescribed skills and characteristics, and fulfil the roles required within the management process. A major problem encountered when attempting to apply this thinking in organisations is the broad scope of the terms used. For example, in Katz’s typology the three categories relate to “Technical skills”, “Conceptual skills” and “Human skills”. Authors of contemporary management texts based upon the traditional perspective may have slightly different interpretations of what the category relates to, yet are remarkably similar in the definitions given, as demonstrated in Figure 1.1 on page three.

In essence, technical skills refer to the definable, measurable skills related to being a manager as a specialist. The human skills category is broad in encompassing all and everything to do with interpersonal interactions. The conceptual skills category is equally broad, in that almost all aspects of human information processing are covered, not just conceptual skills. In reality the activities associated with planning, leading, organising and controlling are also extremely broad, as are the skill requirements. In application, managers are left wondering how to develop their human and conceptual skills, and other managers are left wondering how to measure many of these factors.

It is important to note at this point, however, that it is useful for Katz to have made the distinction between the technical skills of management - the learnable and measurable skills related to planning, organising, leading, controlling, and fulfilling the necessary roles - and other factors. While it may be argued forever which particular skills and characteristics fit within each category, it is nevertheless important to distinguish between the skills and characteristics which are definable and measurable, and those which are not. This is a matter
of particular concern for the competency approach which, as discussed earlier, is heavily criticised for overemphasising technical skills because of the need for measurement against predetermined standards.

The position taken in this dissertation is that there are two factors in the skills equation - one factor relates to a definable and measurable set of skills and characteristics, the other relates to the skills and characteristics which are not so easily measurable. Both factors need to be considered if the concept or model generated is intended to be holistic. The term holistic is used to convey the idea that both factors need to be considered, not just those that are convenient to measure. This does, however, introduce the problem of including skills and characteristics that are as unusable as the overly broad categories just discussed. In defence, it can be argued that at least the most critical skills and characteristics would be more clearly identified, and over time techniques can be developed to measure the more problematic skills and characteristics - once we know what they are.

This discussion will be raised again when discussing the competency approach - for now the discussion turns to the concepts and models contributed by strategic management and international business.

To follow on from the discussion presented earlier, strategic management thinking focused managers attention on organisation strategy and structure. The perspective was long term, and broad in scope and influence on the organisation. In the strategic models (e.g., Prahalad and Hamel, 1990; Mintzberg, 1994a) it is long term organisation leadership that appears to be at the heart of this perspective. In these models directed at senior managers, there is a need to create a vision for the organisation, articulate the strategic goals developed to facilitate achieving the vision, and communicate the vision and goals to others inside and outside the organisation. Leadership has become a more important issue in the 1990s, where business leadership can no longer be considered as just another management function ranked
alongside planning, organising and controlling. The difference between managing and leading has become a critical issue, where the differences between strategic leadership of the organisation and the leadership of people also needs to be recognised and defined. Both Kotter (1990) and Zaleznik (1992) distinguish between managing and leading, where managing is associated with the traditional planning, organising, and control functions, whereas leading is about creating and generating change in the organisation through strategy, and initiating and fostering change in and through people.

In a related sense, Bass and Avolio (1994) and Alimo-Metcalfe (1995) discuss how transactional leadership is related to a traditional management style, whereas transformational leadership that values, involves, and empowers others to seek change and development is more effective in the 1990s. In a more general sense, a distinction is being made between managing as technical skills, with effective people leadership being more reliant on the personal characteristics of the individual, such as integrity, credibility, and emotional strength and stability. It would, therefore, be useful to acknowledge the existence of these different processes within the management function in terms of managerial effectiveness.

Changes in the global business environment leading to the internationalisation of business and management led naturally to an increased awareness and interest in international business concepts. This thinking contributed a perspective on increasingly important issues for managers - how to manage multicultural workforces at home and overseas, expatriate adjustment processes, and understanding international competitors. This perspective, unlike the first two perspectives, does not attempt to be universally applicable - what is effective will depend on the cultural circumstances. This perspective therefore aligns more with the contextual philosophy of management. Managerial effectiveness in international business is not defined as such - like the traditional perspective, it is assumed that if managers are aware of what is required they will be more effective.
The final perspective to be discussed is the competency approach. The competency approach to managerial effectiveness is essentially to:

- Define various skills and characteristics considered to underpin managerial effectiveness (either in a generic or contextualised sense)
- Define standards of performance that need to be demonstrated
- Define how performance will be measured

As discussed earlier, this is a wide-spread approach that has been taken on by countries, industries and organisations in the past decade or so, despite heavy criticism. There are two critical issues that need to be addressed - one is that the skills and characteristics considered to underpin managerial effectiveness vary greatly between models, and the earlier discussion on measurability of skills and characteristics involved in management needs to be raised once more.

The first issue to be discussed is the great variability in the skills and characteristics that are included in competency models (a more complete discussion is presented in Section three). Each model prescribe the particular skills and characteristics to be measured against predetermined standards, yet each model contains different skills and characteristics, and classifies or categorises them in different ways. As a result, the same skills and characteristics are referred to in different ways, leaving a manager to wonder which way is the best for them, and worse, may be forced to conform to a prescription that does not work for them.

Managerial effectiveness in the competency approach is not discussed in terms of effectiveness per se. This approach assumes that if an individual can demonstrate competence to some set standard, then by definition they must be effective as managers. A major problem inherent to this approach is that some individuals may be able to demonstrate
a measurable skill, yet they will still be ineffective managers as a result of either a lack of other skills, and/or possess personal characteristics (e.g., lack of self confidence, emotional instability) that are barriers to effectiveness. The result can be managers completing a checklist of competences the organisation/industry/country believes to be core skills for effectiveness as a manager, yet still not actually be effective in real terms.

An additional problem for this approach is that the models may or may not aspire to being universal in application. In general, the models can be classified as being wholly generic in being universally applicable (national models), a mix of generic and industry-specific skills (industry models), or organisation-specific, and hence highly contextualised (like the Glaze’s Cadbury-Schweppes model discussed on page 90). This mix of approaches presents additional dilemmas for managers trying to find the best fit for their needs.

Although the competency approach may have some failings, there has already been a significant international commitment in OECD countries to this approach at all levels of thinking about managerial effectiveness and how managerial effectiveness leads to an organisational - industry - national competitive advantage. As a holistic structure for considering managerial effectiveness the competency approach signals the need to consider different levels and types of effectiveness. This is where individual managerial effectiveness contributes to organisation effectiveness as competitive advantage, which in turn is considered to contribute to a national competitive advantage. Even though the relationships are not explained, the competency approach has nevertheless shown these to be important considerations. In a related sense, the competency approach signals the need for concepts of managerial effectiveness to focus on the individual, on whom the onus to become more effective has been placed. As a reflection of this need, this dissertation focuses upon managerial effectiveness as the individual input to the overall management function of the organisation.
Measurement issues are particularly problematic in the competency approach. In the same way that different models prescribe different skills and so on, competency may be measured in a variety of ways. Measures may be direct (e.g., demonstration of a specific planning skill, unit contribution to organisation performance) or may be indirect (e.g., productivity and/or level of satisfaction of the workgroup/team the manager is responsible for) depending on the model. As a rule of thumb, it seems that the generic models aim for mostly direct measures, whereas the contextualised models incorporate indirect measures as well.

A logical approach to measuring managerial effectiveness in a holistic fashion would be to incorporate both direct and indirect measures targeted toward measuring performance as an individual, as a member of a workgroup/team/system, and for contribution to organisation performance overall, much as described by Handy (1994) and others. Since the competency approach requires an individual to demonstrate competence, the focus is only in the first area. Additionally, since performance standards are predetermined criteria that all must meet, the aim is for objective and direct measures of specific skills. An implication is that national models would have difficulty being implemented as an industry and organisation model, as they do not account for the full dynamics of the individual-management function-organisation effectiveness system suggested by authors like Handy. In contrast, instead of the overly generalised nature of national models, industry and organisation models have limited applicability outside the context they were developed within, and hence measures of managerial effectiveness may not be applicable.

Setting the performance standards for managers has not been an easy task for competency-based models either. There has been controversy and debate from the beginning, and the concerns raised by authors like Canning (1990), Jacobs (1989), Saul (1993), Worledge (1992) and Vaughan (1989) over the past decade have still not been addressed. On
the other hand, it is difficult to imagine how there can ever be one set of measurable performance standards to encompass, for example, the ability of an individual to effectively motivate subordinates in all situations, across all contexts. Precisely how intelligent does one need to be to function effectively as a manager, and is it a general intelligence factor or a specific intelligence factor involved, and how does this change according to which situations? These questions can to a certain extent be answered by psychological research, and the quest continues, yet the influence of intelligence in managerial effectiveness remains only vaguely understood. Competency-based models that include terms such as intelligence, conceptual thinking, motivation, leadership, and so forth need to become much more specific about what is meant in terms of generally agreed meanings and how to measure these factors.

Another source of problem for the competency approach with respect to measurement is the extent to which measuring specific competences is the same or different to measuring managerial effectiveness, as alluded to earlier. The nature of these debates revolve around determining an appropriate level of competence to measure, and whether the competence as measured necessarily equates with effectiveness as a manager. In the first case, determining an appropriate level of competence agreeable to all has been a problem. The issues raised in the first debate relate to whether managerial competency ought to be viewed as demanding average or superior skill, and whether a number of levels of competency can be identified or not.

In the second debate, it has been noted that accredited competence does not always equate with effectiveness on the job for a variety of reasons (e.g., lack of transfer between a learning and job situation, organisation culture does not support new learning, and so on). For the purposes of this discussion, these issues lay outside the scope of this research - yet they need to be acknowledged as key issues to consider in a discussion of managerial effectiveness, but resolution or amelioration of the problems need to be addressed in
competency-based research efforts. The key reason for raising these issues is to highlight the problems encountered when attempting to measure managerial effectiveness, given there is so much that cannot be easily or directly measured, and with little agreement on what ought to be measured, and how.

The position taken in this research is that as far as possible, the skills and characteristics underpinning individual managerial effectiveness need to be operationally definable and able to be objectively measured. Having said that, it is also recognised that certain skills and characteristics central to managerial effectiveness may not be quite so concrete in nature, yet they cannot simply be ignored. As a result of this position, rather than derive skills and characteristics from the perspective of needing to measure them, this research focused more upon what was perceived to underpin managerial effectiveness from many perspectives.

Thus, a substantial foundation has been established for what managers are required to do in their work, the technical skills they need for the work, and the type of person they need to be. On the surface it would appear that much is known about managerial effectiveness, yet this is not the case in reality, where there is much controversy and confusion, and where models have limited applicability (Baker, 1991; Canning, 1990; Collin, 1989; Furnham, 1990; Saul, 1993; Vaughan, 1989).

Some of the confusion about what now constitutes managerial effectiveness is brought about by the different perspectives (e.g. academic management education or commercial management development), and different approaches (e.g. a focus at the strategic, organisational level, or a focus on the individual through management development) that contribute to the body of knowledge. Each perspective introduces new terminology, often to describe the same thing, where there is no agreement on a definition of managerial
effectiveness, where technical skills and personal characteristics are ill-defined and intermingled, and where management and leadership issues are not distinguished.

What is considered to be effective varies according to the perspective taken, where some prefer the term “excellence” (Jacobs, 1989; Peters & Waterman, 1983), while the terms “competency” “competence”, “competences”, or “competencies” are used interchangeably in reference to either the organisation (Prahalad & Hamel, 1990) or the individual (Worledge, 1992), and used interchangeably in discussion (Caird, 1990; Elkin, 1991). Tasks, process, outcomes, outputs, personal skills, and/or personal characteristics (also termed attributes or qualities, Fondas, 1997; Linestead, 1990) may be measured as reflecting effectiveness. Luthans et al. (1988, p.63) provide a table showing sixteen categories representing 1942 available measures of managerial effectiveness. Most measures relate to organisational aspects (e.g. production 252 measures, sales 199 measures), with only 44 measures for general managerial effectiveness.

One controversy is about which of these factors best measures effectiveness, and another concerns whether, or which, personal characteristics can be taught/developed, or measured (Glaze, 1989; Jacobs, 1989). Yet another debate is whether models should emphasise technical skills because they are by nature definable and measurable, yet in the contemporary environment it is the less, or even undefinable, personal characteristics of a manager that are most important (Baker, 1991; Broscow & Kleiner, 1991; Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993; Jacobs, 1989; Kanter, 1977,1983; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Loden, 1985; Osbaldston & Barham, 1992; Sargent, 1983; Saul, 1993; Sinclair & Collins, 1991; Thompson & Carter, 1995). The generic models are criticised for being too broad to be of use without extensive contextualisation (Canning, 1990), and the contextualised organisation or industry models can be criticised for being too narrow in focus to transfer to other context
Diversity aside, authors such as Dulewicz (1989) note the commonalities that are also evident in the various models. Many are set within the traditional planning, leading, organising and controlling management model, albeit with a contemporary national, industry, or organisation flavour. Along with many other skills and characteristics the need for goal setting and planning, human resource management, motivation of others, leadership, interpersonal skills, delegation, and communication skills are immediately observable as being common to most models, for example.

Dulewicz's "guesstimate" was a 70% commonality between models. In essence then, although there is great diversity in the approaches that may be taken to consider managerial effectiveness, there is reason to believe that a common core of skills and characteristics may be derived if the analysis is broad enough to encompass and condense the main perspectives. Contextual skills and characteristics can then be added as and when relevant. Discussion now turns to how managerial effectiveness is defined in this research, by summarising the points drawn to develop a definition from the traditional model, strategic and international business perspectives, and the competency approach.

The traditional model has shown the enduring and seemingly universal need for a systematic management process in an organisation, where specific technical skills can be associated with individual effectiveness in planning, planned change management implementation, and evaluation methods, for example. In a similar fashion, Mintzberg's roles are still relevant in the organisation of the 1990s with, for example, the informational role having increased in importance. This literature does not, however, provide a specific definition of managerial effectiveness, it is just assumed to follow acquisition and application of the prescribed skills.

The strategic management literature and current thinking on the distinctions between management and leadership brings the need to include the concept of strategic organisation
leadership as being a different level and type of leadership in comparison to the transformational leadership of people discussed by Bass and Avolio (1994) for example. A definition of managerial effectiveness in light of this thinking would need to incorporate the need for contribution to balanced management and leadership processes in an effective organisation management function.

The competency approach has highlighted two important areas to be addressed in any definition of managerial effectiveness, one of which is the need to consider contextual factors, and another is to include both measurable and immeasurable factors if they are central to effectiveness as a manager, not just some that happen to be measurable. In support of contextual differences, international business concepts have revealed the influence of culture on appropriate managerial action, and on perceptions of managerial effectiveness.

Overall, it can be seen that economical, political and other external influences are prompting nations to urge and assist managers to develop their management skills in order to enhance national competitive advantage. The requirements of an organisation then drives what is required in terms of the overall effectiveness of the management function (e.g., organisation strategy, industry context) in achieving a competitive advantage. Individuals then provide the skills and characteristics that comprise the human input considered to contribute to effectiveness of the management function, which is the primary area of interest in this dissertation. The construct developed for this research is, therefore, that managerial effectiveness is a multilevel phenomenon, where all levels need to be acknowledged, even if this particular research is focused primarily on the level of the individual.

The definition of managerial effectiveness for this research programme is:
An individual's ability to have a positive impact on others and on organisation performance, across contexts, through the application of technical skills and personal characteristics, within a designated role and in alignment with organisational purpose.

Implicit in this definition is that managers must have and apply the skills and characteristics to operate within the management function, and which permit positive impacts to be made. However, managerial impacts on organisation performance are hard to establish (Woiceshyn, 1989). Luthans et al. (1988) suggest that multiple measures including unit effectiveness in terms of quality and quantity of performance, subordinate satisfaction, and subordinate commitment are relevant measures (p.64). Linking these measures with standard measures of organisation performance in financial, operational, and overall effectiveness (Ketchen & Shook, 1996), or measures of the profitability, productivity, financial, and competitor strength of the organisation (Turner & Crawford, 1995), would be of use.

The term technical skill is used with reference to the learned specialist tools and techniques of management, for example, written communications, planning, evaluation, statistical analysis, and change management implementation. The term personal characteristics subsumes personal skills shaped by social learning in life experience (e.g. interpersonal communication strategies, a "default" cognitive operating style), the definable and measurable aspects of individual traits (e.g. locus of control, self efficacy), as well as the more abstract aspects to be found in the literature, such as empathy, valuing of others, interpersonal sensitivity, intuition, emotional and psychological strength and stability, to name a few.

In this definition of managerial effectiveness the requirement is that managers need certain skills and characteristics that enable them to have a positive impact by contributing to
the management function, and will need other skills and characteristics related to the organisation context they are operating within. Put another way, individual managerial effectiveness rests in the ability to have a positive impact on people and organisation performance in any organisation, provided the relevant contextual influences are also accounted for at the level of individual needs.

The research programme does not encompass context-specific, or cultural influences on effectiveness, or cultural perceptions of effectiveness in any great depth apart from noting the occurrence and implications of these influences where relevant. It is assumed that these influences will always need to be identified for any given situation, and are therefore not generic, or core skills and characteristics. The overall purpose of this research was to establish whether a staged empirical analysis would identify a core set of predictor variables for perceived managerial effectiveness, informed by a wide range of international theoretical perspectives. If such a set of skills and characteristics can be identified it would be a major contribution to this area of research. For instance, management selection and development efforts can only benefit from a validated set of skills and characteristics known to predict overall effectiveness as a manager according to diverse perceptions of what constitutes managerial effectiveness. Even though some of those skills and characteristics may not yet be easily measurable, at least this kind of research will reveal which skills and characteristics warrant immediate attention in terms of developing valid and reliable measures.

The discussion so far has concentrated upon the technical skills and personal characteristics considered in the literature to constitute generic and contextual managerial effectiveness, with no reference to what may constitute ineffectiveness. Gaining a better understanding of managerial ineffectiveness would serve to “round out” the concept of effectiveness, yet there are few studies that systematically map skills and characteristics against ratings of ineffectiveness through to being extremely effective.
Cammock (1991) studied managerial effectiveness and ineffectiveness in a social service public sector organisation with 6,000 employees, where management level was a study variable. The study comprised 88 two-hour Repertory Grid interviews using bipolar statements to elicit what constitutes effectiveness and ineffectiveness, with a follow up survey (n365). The study revealed that interpersonal skills and being intuitive were the most important contributions to being effective. It was concluded that interpersonal skills with a balance of intuitive, analytical, and technical abilities characterised effectiveness (p.11). In a broader sense, the findings were related to effective leadership (p.117).

Rippin (1996), in another New Zealand study, also addressed effectiveness and ineffectiveness, but unlike Cammock (1991), studied only senior managers in large companies (>200 employees). In this study, 235 senior managers in 75 companies, representing eight industry sectors (including the public sector) were interviewed, also using the Repertory Grid technique. Analysis of the interviews revealed 309 behaviours of effective managers, which were subsequently reduced to twelve competencies (the term characteristics is also used) that effective managers were good at, and ineffective managers were poor at, indicating that effectiveness and ineffectiveness are dichotomised relationships. Overall, it was found that what distinguished effective from ineffective managers was that the effective manager possesses five key skill dimensions. These are, 1) the ability to “read” and lead people, 2) being clear, focused, and objective, 3) thinking strategically, 4) being able to solve problems, and 5) being enthusiastic. All of these dimensions relate to internal dimensions of self.

To return to the dichotomy revealed in the Rippin (1996) study, Furnham (1990) raises the question of what is the opposite of competency, with regard to whether it is no competence (lack of skill) or incompetence (not applying skill). Yet another question can be raised. Why dichotomise effectiveness and ineffectiveness at all? It may be, as Cammock
(1991) suggests (despite, or perhaps because of, using bi-polar statements to elicit responses), that effectiveness and ineffectiveness may be qualitatively, not necessarily quantitatively, different in terms of a different mix of skills rather than dichotomised skills (p.128).

It would appear, therefore, that there remain many unanswered questions about what constitutes effectiveness and ineffectiveness as a manager. To add a different dimension to the body of knowledge, the final study in this research programme investigated managerial effectiveness and ineffectiveness by developing profiles across a range of effectiveness and ineffectiveness categories.

1.3 Summary of Study Parameters
The preceding discussion revealed that managerial effectiveness needs to be studied as a multilevel phenomenon, with many factors to consider. While bearing the factors in mind, this research focuses upon the human input to managerial effectiveness - the skills and characteristics an individual brings to the job. More specifically, the parameters for study include an investigation of which skills and characteristics are perceived to underpin the ability to be effective as a manager. The theoretical positions included are the traditional perspective, strategic management, and the competency-based perspective, remembering that the international business perspective has been found to be primarily contextual.

The approach is broad, in that the study encompasses the need to consider effective managerial behaviour (i.e. of the individual) as fundamental human skills and characteristics that have been molded into managerial behaviour through learning and experience. Further, to take a holistic approach, the contextual factors that call upon different skills and behaviours of managers, and the external factors then operating to enhance or reduce potential
effectiveness are investigated, although these are not central concerns. That is, these factors are investigated primarily to empirically validate what has been found in the literature, as opposed to being key research variables. The key research variables are: the skills and characteristics of perceived effectiveness as predictor variables, with categories of effectiveness and ineffectiveness as the response or outcome variable.

There were three phases to the dissertation research programme designed to address the purpose of research. The first phase reviewed the models of the competency-based approach as documented in the international literature, and compared the perceptions of New Zealand managers (including a group identified as outstanding), management educators, and executive management students (also practising managers). The second phase investigated the potential influence of sex and gender differences in managerial effectiveness in some depth. This study comprised an extensive review of the international literature on biological sex differences, and the influences after birth that shape male and female social behaviour. Empirical work was conducted to assess whether managers in New Zealand showed the differences posited in the literature. The third phase derived the predictor list, tested the predictive strength of the set of skills and characteristics revealed through the research process, and refined the set of variables.

Figure 1.1, below, provides a schematic of the overall construct of managerial effectiveness as discussed in this introduction to the research programme, with the shaded areas indicating the place of this research within the overall construct discussed.
Figure 1.1: Schematic representation of the overall research construct showing the place of this research within the overall construct of managerial effectiveness
1.4. Dissertation Structure

For the purpose of clarity, the full literature reviews are presented separately for the pilot study conducted in phase one and the gender study conducted in phase two. The research methods used in the studies conducted in each phase are presented in Section two. Section three presents an in-depth review of the international models contributed by the competency approach and reports the results of an integration of international and New Zealand perceptions of managerial effectiveness. Sex differences and gender issues are reviewed, and the results of an empirical study are reported in Section four. Section five reports the summative study that derived the final predictor list, and conducted a second national survey to empirically test the predictive validity of the set of variables theorised to be core to perceptions of overall managerial effectiveness. A final summary section reviews and integrates all phases and findings of the research.

A list of references is provided at the end of each section, with a full bibliography presented at the back of the thesis. All appendices are presented at the back of the thesis. The underpinning philosophy and rationale for the methods used in the research programme are discussed next, in Section 2.
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2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section discusses the research methods used in each phase of the research, and provides the rationale for using the methods chosen. As such, following a general discussion the section first reviews the broad issues in managerial effectiveness research, and outlines managerial effectiveness research in New Zealand. The methods used in the research programme and the rationale for choosing each method is then provided. The section finishes with a statement on the limitations and delimitations of the overall research programme.

2.1. General Issues

The primary goal of academic management research is to be scientific in approach (Sekaran, 1992). The purpose of the scientific approach is to demonstrate cause-effect relations between variables. This is accomplished by manipulating the levels or values of one variable (the independent variable) and measuring the systematic effect on one or more other variables (the dependent variable), while accounting for as many other influences on the dependent measure as possible (control). Statistical analyses partial out sources of variance in measures, and provide a measure of the extent to which the findings could happen by chance. Research designed to establish a cause-effect relationship in the scientific sense is called experimental, where the manipulation of the independent/causal/predictor variable is the experimental treatment or intervention. Control and identification of other potential influences on the measures to be taken of the dependent variable is achieved primarily through random sampling, control groups, and statistical analyses.

The scientific method serves well in the disciplines of biology, chemistry, and nuclear-physics, where atoms, molecules, and elements are not subject to swings in mood, or able to respond in an unpredictable fashion. Management research, on the other hand, is
research in the social sciences, where the foibles of human affect, cognition, and behaviour, can change according to the situation (different as private individuals and at work, for example) to confound and limit the use of truly experimental designs. This is not to say it is impossible, but may prove to be inordinately difficult.

Being, for the most part unable to operationally define variable characteristics and population characteristics to the extent required for experimental research, social science research tends to use non-experimental research methods, defined as all other research designs not seeking causal relationships (Sekaran, 1992). The basis of statistical analysis for these designs is usually correlational (where strength and direction of a relationship between variables can be demonstrated, but not the influence of one upon the other), with nonparametric assumptions about the population under study. There are, however, statistical techniques like Multiple Discriminant Analysis, Path Analysis and Structured Equation Modelling that enable the relations between variables to be determined in a de facto manner, often referred to as quasi-experimental research. It is in this manner that theories of managerial effectiveness have been developed, and models constructed to demonstrate theorised relations between the variables being discussed.

As discussed earlier, the range and variety of variables that can be used as predictor (having an influence), intervening (also has an influence), moderating (reduces an influence), and response (outcome of influence) measures is huge in managerial effectiveness research. In this regard the research under discussion is simple - there will be a list of independent variables generated and these will be tested for predictive strength using categories of effectiveness and ineffectiveness as the response variable.

The research programme for this dissertation used qualitative non-experimental methods to generate the predictor variables, and quasi-experimental methods to test for predictive strength and statistical external validity. The discussion now turns to an
examination of the managerial effectiveness research literature, and a discussion of common data collection methods.

2.2. Managerial Effectiveness Research

A major drive behind the development of models of managerial effectiveness is a requirement for formal management education or development that may come from a national level perspective (Blakeley, 1994; NZQA, 1995), an organisation level perspective (Turner & Crawford, 1992), or be focused at the level of individual managers (Jackson, 1989). Models are developed by academic educators (Luthans, Hodgetts & Rosenkrantz, 1988; Paton, Boddy & MacDonald, 1992), and commercial management developers (Davis, Hellervik & Sheard, 1986; Mole, Plant & Salaman, 1993).

Most research, however, tends to focus upon specific aspects of effectiveness such as:

- discrepancies between role expectations of superiors, subordinates, and peers, investigating managers' response strategies (Tsui, Ashford, St Clair & Xin, 1995);
- assessment and measurement issues (Baker, 1991; Dalton & Sandholtz, 1990; Dulewicz, 1989; Hall, 1991; Hornby & Thomas, 1989; Saul, 1989), or more general performance issues (Elkin, 1991; Shipper & Dillard, 1994);
- educational/learning issues (Caird, 1990; Linstead, 1990; Thorpe, 1990);
- evaluation of a model (Mole, Plant & Salaman, 1993; Perry & Miller, 1991);
- effectiveness requirements in the public sector (Cammock, 1991; Chaston, 1993; Cox, 1990);
- organisation size factors (Schwenk & Shrader, 1993);
- management level and effectiveness (Arkin, 1992; Cammock, 1991; Feur, 1988; Rajah & Wallace, 1994);
general external environment influences on what managers do or need to do (Covin & Slevin, 1991; Jones, 1990; Wiersema & Bantel, 1993);
industry context environmental issues: for example, health (Sims & Guest, 1990), and banking (Bantel, 1993; Saul, 1989);
a diverse range of gender issues (Cahoon & Rowney, 1991; Christie, 1994; Erlich, 1989; Flynn, 1994; Mann, 1995; McGregor, Thompson & Dewe, 1994; Rosener, 1990; Schaef, 1985; Shipper, 1994; Tannen, 1995);
functional effectiveness: for example, accounting (Payne, 1990; Schofield, 1992), information technology (Applegate & Elam, 1991), or personnel and human resource functions (Caldwell, O'Reilly & Charles 1990; Torrington, Waite & Weightman, 1992);
cultural differences in perspectives on effectiveness: Ireland (Kakabadse, Alderson & Gorman, 1992), Europe (Calori & Dufour, 1995), Brunei Darussalam (Rajah & Wallace, 1994), and expatriate Chinese (Kirkbride & Tang, 1992), for example;
cross-cultural issues (Barham, 1992; Torrington & Holden, 1992); and
the philosophy underpinning managerial research (Collin, 1989; Fagenson, 1990).

This list is not exhaustive. The point to be made is that research on managerial effectiveness usually has a narrow focus in addressing only one or two aspects of effectiveness, with a wide variety of perspectives contributing to the area, hence there is a huge body of knowledge, subject to both controversy and confusion. However, by its very nature, managerial effectiveness research can only focus on a small part of the big picture. No one study could encompass all that would be required. Additionally, management research is still in its infancy, and attempts to encapsulate a complete model of managerial effectiveness would be premature at this time. The contribution made by this present research
is to provide a new perspective on ways in which managerial effectiveness may be researched, and provide an initial set of skills and characteristics that may be generally used for selection and development purposes. It is not an attempt to produce a complete model of managerial effectiveness.

Methods of data collection are just as diverse as the number and types of variables that can be used. The next section discusses data collection procedures commonly used in managerial effectiveness research, which can be characterised as being either interactive or distanced, each with strengths and drawbacks.

2.2.1 Common data collection methods

Although many different procedures are used in managerial effectiveness research, they can be usefully categorised as being either interactive or distanced in nature. Interactive data collection consists of individual or group interviews, questionnaire administration, and naturalistic or participant observation. Note that in cases where the observer is hidden and the individual/s being observed are unaware of the observation, there is no interaction, and hence it is categorised as a distanced procedure.

Observation of effective managerial behaviour underpinned Mintzberg’s early work, and represents the ongoing focus on what managers do as being the way to define managerial effectiveness, despite the limitations to the approach (Baker, 1991; Collin, 1989; Miller, 1991; Worledge, 1992). Three milestone works in managerial effectiveness research have been derived from naturalistic observation. Mintzberg (1973) observed five general managers, Kotter (1982) began with observation of fifteen managers and then moved to interviews and questionnaires to reveal job demands, and Luthans et al. (1988) used naturalistic and participant observation of 44 managers followed by interviews and questionnaires to describe effective and successful managers.
Interviews are a common procedure. Interviews may be unstructured or structured, and then content analysed, or semi-structured using, for example, the popular Repertory Grid technique (Cammock, 1991; Greatrex & Phillips, 1989; Rippin, 1995; Saul, 1989). Semi-structured or structured questionnaires can be administered to groups. Group data collection may also take the form of a focused discussion for functional analysis, a technique favoured in the development of national models (Miller, 1991; NZQA, 1995). Group brainstorming is also a useful technique for gathering rich data (Smith & Smith, 1981; Trochim, 1989a).

There are inherent problems with interactive data collection, in that these procedures are subject to both researcher bias, and to vagaries of respondent characteristics. Researcher bias stems from the framework imposed for data collection in the form of the parameters imposed by the Repertory Grid, functional analysis, or questionnaire used, which limit free expression (Cammock, 1991, p.43), or drive the research focus and methods used (Fagenson, 1990). The unexpected and unpredictable nature of working with human subjects, and the manner in which this can influence research measures, was documented in the Hawthorne experiments (Mayo, 1945), and has been no less a problem in the 1990s (Cunningham, 1992; Sekaran, 1992).

Distanced data collection is usually accomplished by conducting mail or telephone surveys, where the respondent is anonymous, and is by far the most popular method for managerial research in general. Having managers write essays and diaries can also be used (Roach, 1956; Smith, 1993). Distanced data collection serves to reduce the biases arising from personal interactions and social situations, yet there is still the framework imposed in the questions asked in the survey. There are also new problems introduced, such as format and clarity of the questionnaire to minimise ambiguity and misinterpretation, and establishing reasons for non-response.
In summary, apart from the earlier observational techniques, structured interviews to yield items for a survey, or a survey followed by interviews to elaborate on survey findings, are the most popular procedures for data collection. Much of the literature is non-empirical, being a result of the debates surrounding the competency approach, where arguments are put forward for one position or another (c.f. Collin, 1989; Furnham, 1990; Miller, 1991; Vaughan, 1989). It is argued by some that by its nature, managerial effectiveness research must be qualitative (Collin, 1989). However, a blend of both quantitative (to provide numerical substance), and qualitative (to help explain what the numbers mean) is arguably the most sensible and useful approach.

2.3. Managerial Effectiveness Research in New Zealand

In New Zealand there have been a number of different approaches taken to investigate effectiveness. Most, as found in the international literature, tend to focus on one or two aspects of effectiveness, such as the influence of formal and informal learning on skill development (O'Driscoll, Humphries & Larsen, 1989), the public sector context and management level (Cammock, 1991), adaptation to a changed business environment (Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993), gender (McGregor, Thompson & Dewe, 1994), the influences of the external environment on innovation (Frater, Stuart, Rose, & Andrews, 1995), or senior management perspectives in big business (Rippin, 1996). There are no New Zealand studies which have attempted to develop a generic set of skills and characteristics, to which contextual factors need to be added.
2.4. **Thesis Research Methods and Rationale**

The purpose of this section is to provide the methods used in each of the three phases of the research programme under discussion.

2.4.1. **Phase 1: Universal Perceptions of the Skills and Characteristics of Effective and Exceptional Managers (Reported in Section 3).**

The objectives in this phase were to assess and integrate the perceptions of New Zealand managers with those of management educators and developers, as well as the international evidence on what constitutes managerial effectiveness in terms of human input. As exploratory theory building research, this study imposed no framework around what this may be in terms of the demands of the job, the skills and characteristics required to fulfil those demands, or what people may be doing in that job.

An extensive computer-assisted literature search was conducted to reveal existing views on managerial effectiveness, and hence, identify recurrent themes in the international literature. The empirical component consisted of conducting four focus groups to reveal the key factors from the perspective of practising managers across many contexts, followed by a national survey.

*Research Participants*

Participants in one focus group (n70 invited, 10 participating) and the mail survey (n1500; 290 responding) were practising managers drawn from the current membership files of the New Zealand Institute of Management (NZIM) in Auckland. Students from the Auckland University Master of Management Business Administration (MMBA) and Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA) (n84) also participated in focus groups. Respondents (n52) for a mail Concept Mapping procedure (a research technique explained next) were drawn from the academic staff of Auckland University and Polytechnics actively involved in management
development. Respondents for the "exceptional" manager focus group were recommended by executive search firms and the Ministry of Commerce (n=45 invited, 7 participating).

Bearing in mind the limitations imposed by research frameworks, Concept Mapping (Trochim, 1989a, 1989b), a research tool new to managerial effectiveness research, was introduced to enable an iterative process to reveal a core set of skills and characteristics, where some of the relationships between the skills and characteristics can be quantified.

Concept Mapping is a technique used to elicit and visually represent aggregated verbal statements that have been quantified as to their interrelationships and distance in thinking between the concepts/ideas expressed. The method has been used to evaluate a management development programme (Kolb, 1994), to establish stakeholder perceptions of environmental impacts in relation to town planning issues (Logie, 1996), describe organisation culture (Shepard & Kolb, 1994), and gather perceptions of the career track of women scientists (Simpson, 1994). A meta-analysis conducted by Trochim (1993) established that Concept Mapping is a reliable method, and the method itself has recently been integrated into the SPSS analytical package. Concept Mapping was therefore chosen as a descriptive research method that would (i) best serve the purpose of free expression, (ii) provide an objective mathematical analysis to show qualitative verbal statements in quantified relationships, and (iii) provide the means to conduct an iterative distillation process.

Concept mapping has several distinct phases. First, focus groups are used to generate, using focused brainstorming, a listing of issues relating to a central concept. The concepts generated are then reduced to a non-redundant set which is used in a second phase. In the second phase, participants - some of whom have been involved in generating the list in phase one - cluster the phrases by perceived similarity and rate them in terms of importance or some other identified dimension. In the third phase, the sorting and rating information is reduced statistically by sequential Principal Components Analysis, Multi-dimensional Scaling and
Cluster Analysis to produce a Concept Map - a visual representation of the group's combined identification of elements and emphasis. In the fourth phase, the maps are evaluated, interpreted and labelled, either by the researcher, the participants, or a collaboration of both.

Concept maps visually represent similarities and rated significance. There are multiple elements to the consideration of a concept map. First, item proximity represents the degree to which respondents clustered the items. If two items were always sorted together they would appear very close together - almost on top of one another - on the map. If they were never sorted together, and were always sorted with other items that were not associated either, they would be positioned on opposite sides of the map. There are also some counter-intuitive elements of the map, size and centrality. Strongly associated items may be densely clustered on the map - forming small "islands" while more loosely or ambiguously sorted issues may be less dense and appear larger on the map. The larger islands, then, are not of greater significance, they indicate greater variance and ambiguity around the items contained in the cluster.

Secondly, clusters or items in the centre of the map often represent "bridging issues", that is, items that lie between two opposite issues in the map - rather than representing "central" or "key" issues. Finally, the rated importance of clusters are represented by the depth of colour of the cluster (darker clusters are more highly rated). Two simplistic prototype maps are presented below.

![Figure 2.1: Concept map prototype 1](image-url)
Clusters one and two are seen as closely related and distinct from clusters three and four. Cluster one is rated much more highly than other clusters. The clusters are dense and represent fairly clear agreement on the distribution of issues.

Figure 2.2: Concept map prototype 2

Clusters are widely dispersed and less clearly differentiated than in prototype 1. Clusters one, three and five are rated highly, but three may represent a bridging from items on the left to those on the right.

Concept Mapping was used in the focus group sessions in order to generate a map of the concept of managerial effectiveness in New Zealand, and in the mail procedures was used to integrate the international literature and New Zealand findings. In the Concept Mapping focus groups the focus question was simply "What constitutes managerial effectiveness?". Groups brainstormed ideas recorded as short verbal statements expressing the different elements contributing to what constitutes managerial effectiveness. No parameters were placed around what could be raised as a contributing factor. Statements were then independently rated by each participant as to the importance of the element in its contribution to managerial effectiveness in general. Each group member rated each statement on a scale of:
1 = neither adds nor detracts from good management, makes no difference;
2 = unimportant, non-essential, but could assist in some cases;
3 = helpful to good management, desirable;
4 = important to good management, most good managers have this;
5 = critical to good management, an absolute necessity.

Statements were then independently sorted by each participant into groups of statements/ideas perceived to be related in some way. Again, no framework was imposed as to how the participants could sort the statements, apart from the need for more than one group of statements, and less than 99, for statistical purposes. The instruments used in the Concept Mapping sessions are provided in Appendix 2.1.

The sorting and rating data for each participant was then entered into the statistical package developed specifically for Concept Mapping, and maps generated for each group. Data analysis in Concept Mapping consists of two-dimensional multidimensional scaling of the sort data, a hierarchical cluster analysis of the multidimensional scaling co-ordinates, and the computation of average ratings for each statement and cluster of statements.

Ideally, the maps showing the clusters of ideas are taken back to the original group to interpret and label as to the construct expressed by each cluster of statements. However, it was not often feasible to collect the same groups of people twice when they are from many different organisations, in which case the clusters are labelled by the relative strength and sense of the cluster items, much like interpreting a factor analysis.

The participants in the management educators and developers component participated in a mail version of Concept Mapping, by sorting and rating the items revealed by the focus groups and international literature, with redundancies removed. This component served as a pilot test of the intended method for the national survey to follow. In a mail version of Concept Mapping the statements are sent to the participants by mail with instructions for
sorting and rating, and the responses are mailed back, otherwise the procedure is identical to that described for focus groups.

The final items from the four focus groups, the mail Concept Mapping procedure with management educators and developers, and the findings from the literature were combined, checked for redundancies, and used in a national survey of managers in a mail Concept Mapping exercise. This final procedure provided a 'meta-map' of a combined concept of managerial effectiveness - a concept map generated in an approximation of multiple iteration Delphi techniques. The survey also requested participants to differentiate a number of contextual influences on managerial effectiveness, namely business life stage, industry sector, and team versus individual environments of management, to establish whether context is as big an influence in New Zealand as the international literature suggests it may be.

As could be expected, the literature and empirical work revealed literally hundreds of elements considered to contribute to managerial effectiveness. To begin a distillation of the common core, a conceptual framework to guide an objective analysis of the different international models and New Zealand maps needed to be identified, given that no one perspective was generally acceptable. Research such as this has not been attempted before, and there appeared to be only one existing classification method available - Katz's skills typology. However, problems arose when attempting to classify the skills and characteristics in this fashion, where the traditional view of human input as technical skills, human skills, and conceptual skills (Katz, 1974) was too broad to be useful in an area that has now intermingled these measurable skills and less measurable personal characteristics. For instance the term interpersonal skill may relate to generic human skills in interpersonal interaction (e.g. communication strategies, influence on others), or it may refer to a cluster of technical management skills (e.g. presentation to a group, interviewing techniques) being demonstrated in completing a competence unit standard, or measurable outcomes in a
development programme. The learning of motivational theories may provide technical skill, yet it is human skill that determines effectiveness in application. However, no other generally acceptable method of categorising the skills and characteristics of managerial effectiveness has yet emerged.

The approach toward developing a conceptual framework as a device for content analysis was admittedly a matter of trial and error. The concepts underpinning some of the more major models were tried (e.g. the Hay-McBer model, the Dulewicz model) but they did not adequately serve the purpose. At each attempt to use existing models to categorise skills and characteristics the same problem arose - the categorisations were open to criticism and debate in the same way that the models were criticised for being too broad or vague. At this point it was decided to logically derive a concept from the clearly observable commonalities to be seen across the models, a commonality that Dulewicz (1989) has "guesstimated" to be approximately 70%.

Figure 2.3 below shows the 2 x 3 matrix eventually developed to conduct the content analysis. The commonalities observed related to three dimensions of managerial action - one in respect to skills and characteristics related to managing and presenting oneself, the second related to skills and characteristics involving others in the organisation, and the third related to skills and characteristics focused upon internal and external organisation systems and requirements. Although there are still overlaps between some of these categories - such as perceptiveness being clearly related to others, as well as to operating within organisation systems - most skills and characteristics are clearly one category or another. In a very broad sense an attempt was made to classify skills and characteristics as being primarily measurable skills, or primarily personal characteristics that are not so easily measured. Given the nature of these skills and characteristics, there will be overlaps and differences of opinion as to
whether something is a measurable skill or personal characteristic, as indicated by the dashed lines.

![DIMENSION OF MANAGERIAL ACTION](image)

**Figure 2.3:** A framework for categorising the skills and characteristics perceived to contribute to managerial effectiveness

The framework worked well as a content analysis tool\(^1\), with all perspectives fitting this concept - the skills and characteristics contained in all the models analysed in the literature and from empirical work could be categorised and compared on similarities and differences within this framework. Allocation of skills and characteristics to a category was based upon the literature findings in terms of perceived measurability, and the proportions were calculated on a pro rata basis relative to the total number of items contained in each model.

\(^1\) This framework, while intuitively developed, was validated using Structural Equation Modelling. A Massey University working paper with a detailed discussion of methods and criterion validity is currently under review for the 4th International Conference on Competency-based Management, Oslo, June 1998. Within the scope of this thesis, however, the framework has been used only as an analytical tool for a visual comparative analysis of multiple models. As such, it is indicative of key similarities and differences, although as subsequent analysis suggests, it may also have key predictive contributions that warrant further research.
2.4.2. Phase 2: Gender Issues (Reported in Section 4).

The objective of the second phase was to investigate issues raised in the first phase regarding potential sex and gender differences in perspectives on managerial effectiveness, using Concept Mapping again. Concept Mapping was again chosen as the research method because it had been found to avoid the problems with self report (Shipper, 1994) and avoids the subjective nature of interview and other focus group techniques both in data collection and in analysis. The parameters of the issue are not determined by the researcher, the procedure ensures it is not possible for the researcher to bias the responses of participants, and analysis is mathematically objective.

As a side issue this phase consisted of a literature review and a small empirical study seeking only to establish whether a small sample of managers in New Zealand reflected the international research findings on potential sex and gender differences in management. If they did, then subsequent work would need to account for the influence(s). In addition, it can be used as a check for face validity, in that these two groups of managers should not reveal anything that has not already been generated in phase one.

A review of the literature revealed that only one sex difference (male aggression), but many gender-related socially conditioned differences exist that may well influence how an individual will operate in a management position. As a synopsis of the literature, socially conditioned gender-related differences seem to be reflected in observed differences between men and women in their approach to management and leadership, and more specifically, in relation to managing and leading people. In line with assessing New Zealand perspectives against European and North American perspectives, a study was conducted to assess whether a small New Zealand sample would demonstrate the typically "masculine" and "feminine" differences in approach posited in the literature.
Given that the strength of influence of social conditioning is highly variable, it was also of particular interest to investigate the one sex difference to emerge from the literature review - higher aggression for males as a group that is an established sex difference that is characteristically different to females as a group. As a result of this sex difference and subsequent social conditioning it has been suggested that amongst other things, men and women as managers have different communication strategies as managers (Henley, 1977; Tannen, 1995; West, 1979).

In essence, this study set up the circumstances to compare the concepts of managerial effectiveness held by men and women as managers, using one all male group and one all female group. There were only nine per group, although they were matched on years of managerial experience, management level, and size of company, so that one particular context or demographic variable did not dominate responses. Note this is not an attempt to suggest that this group of eighteen people represent the New Zealand perspective, but is rather the opposite. Put another way, it is not a case of claiming to want to generalise these findings. It is more a case of claiming that if these groups produce a similar concept to the first study, then Concept Mapping can be said to be revealing the New Zealand perspective, and if the differences suggested by recent research are reflected, then those influences must be strong indeed.

The design also controlled for group gender identity by measuring participant's gender identity, and included a non-managerial female control group to test the assertion in the literature that women as managers need to assume masculine gender role characteristics and/or inhibit feminine gender characteristics in order to assume a management role. Given the underpinning construct relates to societal stereotypical thinking spilling over into organisation life, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) was used to assess the gender role identity of the participants.
The BSRI is a questionnaire created by Bem (1974), who was interested in establishing femininity and masculinity as dualistic dimensions within each sex, with androgyny as the ideal state of being (Bem, 1974, 1977). The instrument was chosen for the stereotypical nature of the items, on the grounds that it was stereotypical thinking that needed to be measured, as discussed in Section 4 where the study is reported. The BSRI assesses the extent to which an individual identifies with masculine or feminine gender characteristics, to yield a feminine, masculine, or androgynous gender score. The BSRI consists of twenty feminine, twenty masculine, and twenty neutral adjectives, with respondents required to circle a number between one (never, or almost never true), to seven (always, or almost always true), in relation to the extent that they identify with each adjective. The masculinity and femininity scores of the BSRI indicate the extent to which a person considers masculine and feminine personality characteristics to be descriptive of themselves. The androgyny score (femininity minus masculinity) indicates the relative amounts of masculinity and femininity that a person includes in his or her self-description. These scores represent a person's gender role. The average score for the group can then be derived and tested for the predicted differences between groups.

Each participant completed the BSRI during a break in the concept mapping session when the statements were being prepared to bring back to the group for rating and sorting.

Participants: Potential participants were drawn from the membership files of the New Zealand Institute of Management according to the matching criteria, and a letter sent out inviting them to participate in the research. Follow up telephone calls produced a total of 14 female managers who agreed to participate. Male managers were then telephoned and screened for matched selection.
Nine non-managerial female volunteers served as the control group for the female managers. Inclusion criteria for the control group were: no managerial experience, and within the same age range as the female manager group. There was no need to add a male control group, as there was no evidence to indicate any need for male managers to change gender role characteristics - quite the reverse - in an historically male-dominated domain.

Data collection for Concept Mapping consisted of the standard process discussed in phase one, using the same rating scale. This study added two statements to the sorting data, being the terms “male” and “female”, to see whether the groups sorted or rated these terms differently with regard to perceptions about effective management. The focus question for these studies was the same as in the first phase - what constitutes managerial effectiveness - and added “... in the current business environment” to broaden the perspective. In this study the four members of the research team (two psychologists, two psychologist/management), independently interpreted and labelled the maps, then reached a consensus decision on a title for each cluster.

2.4.3. Phase 3: Final distillation of perceived influential variables, testing the predictive strength of independent variables and assessing external validity of results (Reported in Section 5).

The purpose of the final study was to integrate the findings of the first two studies in a large sample survey to test the predictive strength of the set of skills and characteristics and assess the external validity of the findings. An expert panel was utilised to integrate the earlier work, and condense the long list of skills and characteristics considered to contribute to managerial effectiveness. The expert panel consisted of management educators (2) and management psychologists (4), representing traditional and non-traditional perspectives (including feminist). Working independently, each provided recommendations on items to be combined as similar or overlapping, or to be removed as redundant.
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A spreadsheet was created to display a matrix of responses for all items, where items were combined and retained, removed, or retained unchanged according to the following criteria:

1. Retained unchanged if no suggestions provided
2. Removed if more than one recommendation to remove
3. Items combined according to suggestions

This process yielded 78 items to be included as questionnaire items for the final survey, discussed next.

The third phase culminated in a survey that assessed managers on those 78 skills and characteristics - the survey questionnaire is attached as Appendix 2.2. When research addresses generic aspects of managerial effectiveness (i.e. cuts across perspectives), by definition, the population consists of all managers. It is possible to refine that down, as in this study, to all managers operating within Western cultures. Following contemporary methods, this still means that a sample needs to be representative of managers in large, medium, and small organisations, from top, middle, and lower levels of management, from public and private sectors, representing a range of industries, time in business, and also representing years of managerial experience.

To target such a diverse population, a popular management magazine was approached to place a survey as an insert going to manager subscribers nationwide. The magazine describes readership as being predominantly senior managers (approximately 70%), and/or owner/partner/director (34%), in medium to large (>50 employees) organisations (63%), with 17% of the subscribers being female, and 83% male. Although the small business manager is not well represented, there is hence a wide range of perspectives to be found in the readers of the magazine. The magazine is published 11 times a year, with approximately 2,500 individual and institutional subscribers, plus sales through book stores.
Respondents were asked to choose a manager to assess, and provide a rating of effectiveness on a 5-point Likert scale where $1 = $ extremely effective, $3 = $ neither effective nor ineffective, and where $5 = $ extremely ineffective, to establish categories of effectiveness for a Multiple Discriminant Analysis (MDA). Respondents then rated the assessee in levels of proficiency in the skills and characteristics, to use as the primary quasi-independent (predictor) variables in the MDA. A 5-point Likert scale was used again where $1 = $ extremely good, $3 = $ neither good nor poor, and where $5 = $ extremely poor. A measure of the importance of each skill and characteristic to managerial effectiveness in general was also taken on a 5-point Likert scale where $1 = $ extremely important, $3 = $ neither important nor unimportant, and where $5 = $ extremely unimportant. The questionnaire was pre-tested on ten practicing managers and five academics, all of whom provided feedback on structure and ambiguities, and the instrument was refined accordingly. The survey was delivered as a two page (A3 folded in half) insert in the magazine. After completing the questionnaire, the respondent folded the form and sealed it with tape or staples to show the Freepost self addressed portion on the back of the questionnaire. In essence, the survey was a performance evaluation on a national scale, which represents a new research approach that eliminated problems with self report surveys, interviews, and observational methods.

Since a primary objective of the survey was to develop profiles of the manner in which skills and characteristics discriminate between effective and ineffective managers, the MDA technique was used to reveal and maximise the separation of skills and characteristics according to predictive strength. This technique is used in preference to factor or cluster analyses, which are designed more to establish the degree of relatedness of continuous variables. Potential multicolinearity problems are addressed during the data analysis results and discussion, reported in Section five. Demographic and contextual data gathered on respondents and managers chosen for assessment (e.g., years of managerial experience,
organisation size, management level, industry) were used as quasi-independent variables in the initial analysis to determine whether these influences had a systematic effect on responses as a main or interactive effect. Gender was also tested for main and interactive effects.

2.5. Limitations and Delimitations

On the understanding that being able to generalise findings beyond the study population is a key component of academic research which seeks to add to a body of knowledge, this section acknowledges the limitations of the component studies with respect to generalisability. The scope of the research is also summarised.

2.5.2. Limitations

A limitation of the overall research programme is that the first two phases are primarily descriptive and exploratory theory building phases and, therefore, it is not permissible to generalise these findings to include all managers. Additionally, the nature of Concept Mapping prohibits the comparison of different group concepts at a statistical level, as one is not comparing the same thing. However, this limitation is counter-balanced in the third phase, where the findings from qualitative techniques and less than optimal sampling methods are subjected to rigorous empirical and statistical test.

The research can be criticised for claiming to relate to universal aspects of managerial effectiveness, when only New Zealand perspectives have contributed to the empirical work. In defence, it can be argued that the findings can be interpreted within the concepts expressed in the international literature, which indicates a congruence between New Zealand and international perceptions on core underpinning, and major issues. In addition, care has been taken to explore all the contextual factors impacting upon managers, although some of this
evidence is drawn from the existing literature, and is therefore weakened as a secondary source.

The national surveys conducted in phases one and three contain a slight bias toward the perceptions of senior general managers in medium to large organisations. The perceptions of middle and lower level managers, and functional or technical managers, are therefore under-represented, but not unrepresented. On the premise that management as a job is actually gender-neutral, it could be argued that there is also an under-representation of women and their opinions as managers, even though the final survey sample was proportionately representative of the existing profile.

2.5.1. Delimitation
The scope of the research programme was broad, in that all major aspects were either explored or empirically studied to investigate a multidisciplinary and multilevel phenomenon. There is always, however, a focus upon the internal and external factors operating on managerial effectiveness at the level of the individual that serves to define the parameters of research. It is an exploratory study, in that new and more fruitful directions for research were sought, and ways in which to extend thinking were investigated. It is also a hypothesis testing study, in that specific theoretically based predictions were tested in studies two and three. As an area of study, it is a study of human beings in the work environment, where the job of work under consideration happens to be managerial, and where there is confusion and controversy as to what constitutes general effective performance in the job.

The approach is multidisciplinary, in that research literature from anthropology, sociology, individual psychology, social psychology, organisation psychology, neuroscience, cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics, adult learning, management theory, organisation
theory, and management education and development are drawn upon to discuss the human input to managerial effectiveness.

Figure 2.4 below shows a schematic representation of the research process undertaken for the three phases of the research.

Figure 2.4: Schematic representation of the research process
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3. PERCEPTIONS OF EFFECTIVE AND EXCEPTIONAL MANAGEMENT

The objectives in this study were to pilot the research methods, in an assessment of the current perceptions of the skills and characteristics contributing to managerial effectiveness. Concept Mapping (Trochim, 1989a, 1989b), a tool that is relatively new as a management research method, was introduced to “map” perceptions, and a new framework was developed to content analyse the maps generated in this process, as well as the models found in the international literature. This database provided the skills and characteristics used as items in a national survey.

3.1. Why Competencies?

While authors in management development research note the changes within the business environment, a recent report by Harper and Campbell-Hunt (1992) suggests that New Zealand managers have had considerably more, and more diverse changes than any other country. It is of note that New Zealand managers in the private sector will require increasing ability and speed in responding to the changing environment, and better strategic planning and decision-making when they do respond. Marketing and strategic planning skills were considered to be particularly important, and in comparison with overseas managers, New Zealand managers are less formally educated and have less management skills training.

Since New Zealand firms appear to be following an international move to become more competitive and quality oriented, and to cope successfully in the changing environment, managers may require a whole new way of thinking, and a whole new set of skills to lead successful organisations (Cammock, 1991; Cox, 1990; Jackson, 1989). We can gain a certain amount of knowledge based upon overseas experience.

---

1 An abridged version of this section appeared as Ministry of Commerce monograph ‘On the inside, looking in?'.
In the United Kingdom (Sinclair & Collins, 1991), and the United States (Broschow & Kleiner, 1991), it has been found that the changed environment has called upon managers to move away from the traditional/conventional “planning, leading, organising, and controlling” functions of management with an emphasis on regulating and normalising within a stable environment. The move is towards a more flexible and responsive management style to match the now dynamic and turbulent environment organisations face (Cockerill, 1989), much in the manner mooted thirty years ago (Burns, 1963).

In addition to the new or extra skills required to operate more flexibly, responsively, competitively, and with a focus on quality, overseas experience shows that the increasing importance of global business connections requires managers to become competent in cross-cultural interactions (Osbaldeston & Barham, 1992). The increasing acknowledgement that the Human Resource Management (HRM) function (particularly management development) has a major role in running successful organisations (Burdett, 1991; Torrington & Holden, 1992) indicates a particular need for management skills in this area. It would also appear that particular organisational circumstances may require specific management skills over and above any “core competencies” possessed by “good” or “successful” managers (Hamlin & Stewart, 1990).

The models and definitions of management have been evolving for some time. As societal values change, viewpoints alter and new models of management emerge. These models are the cumulative result of academic and popular writers, the practices of managers themselves, and the impact of technical, technological, societal and political change (Mirvis, 1985). Looking across the last century, one of the first emergent models was that of the "rational" manager. The rational manager relied upon the linkage of clear direction and productive outcomes; at the time this was best captured in the work of Frederick Taylor (1911) who promoted clarity in the design of jobs and in the fit of workers to scientifically derived ways of operation. Under this model the assessment of "good" management was in terms of economic rationality and efficiency; the
measure was the bottom line. This rationality was further supported structurally by an internal process model, codified by Fayol (1949) and Weber (1947), that emphasised routinisation and hierarchy. These systems and models, of course, reflected the relative stability and continuity of their times.

Fundamental societal changes in the middle years of the Twentieth Century, coupled with technological advances, led to questions regarding the appropriateness of the rational management approach to the demands of business and society. The work of Chester Barnard, Dale Carnegie and others during this period began to emphasise the informal and relationship oriented tools of effective management practices for the times. By mid-century the emerging orientation focused on the key values of commitment, cohesion and morale, linking involvement to commitment, with a focus on developmental human relations. Managers of the time found this a much harder model to implement effectively in practice (Quinn, Faerman, Thompson & McGrath, 1990) and one which required extensive research and interpretation to gain an effective foothold in contemporary practice.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, technological advance and societal change began to markedly accelerate, leading to acceptance of rational and interpersonal models, but also resulting in acknowledgement of greater ambiguity in the business environment. This latter approach has been characterised as the open systems model, where the organisation is faced with an ambiguous and competitive environment, is assessed in terms of its ability to adapt and secure external support. The key managerial emphases within this model are political adaptability, creative problem-solving and the management of change.

In the last few years, however, there has been an increasingly intense scrutiny of the role and responsibility of management, in a chaotic business environment. Managers and organisations are bombarded by buzzwords like excellence, quality, customer driven, time competition, urgency, loyalty, continuous improvement, culture, diversity, leadership, service,
and ethical integrity. None of the prior models of management effectiveness seemed to meet the needs of the managers or organisations in the new environment. While these models have been integrated as a competing values framework (Quinn, 1988), the framework itself requires more to be an effective spur to the day to day operations of managers and organisations.

Researchers around the world have addressed the issues of developing models of what now makes a good/successful manager. Mintzberg (1975) identified managerial roles, Fayol (1949) characterised management as the functions of planning, organising, controlling and commanding and coordinating. In each case, however, subsequent attempts have translated these academic perspectives into activities, skills or characteristics. Some would prefer to term these practice issues 'management excellence' (Peters and Waterman, 1990), while others refer to “core competencies” (or competences) (Quinn, 1988). Core competencies must be differentiated from the literature on inimitable corporate strengths as the basis for competitive advantage advanced most recently by C.K. Prahalad and Gary Hamel (1990). Both the Quinn managerial approach and the Prahalad and Hamel corporate approach underscore the need to understand the source of advantage at an individual and business level and to structure both development and utilisation around structured self-awareness. The competency models at the managerial level, however, have been developed for differing purposes, with some being firm specific (and therefore not transferable), and others being generic in nature. It may be that generic is, in fact, a better terminology for competencies that are consistent across contingencies, that we might expect from all or most managers, as it clearly differentiates it from the strategic management literature (although it doesn't have the alliterative ring of core competencies).

Two facets that are common to much of the managerial competencies literature, regardless of nomenclature, are the roots of identification in a developmental approach - that is, competencies are identified to be able to address developmental needs of existing and future managers - and the use of existing managerial practice to construct models - which assumes that
the way good managers now do their job is the way it should be done. Both of these facets are substantial limitations, as they fail to deal with immutable characteristics, for instance personal characteristics, as well as ignoring the potential impact of the future changes in the business environment.

With a few minor exceptions and omissions, the general characteristics of the competencies models developed in each country are very similar. Most, as will be seen later, tend to be simple lists or a wheel illustration of management skills and abilities, with only one attempting to explain the interrelationships between the skills and abilities, and another one positing a three-dimensional, hierarchical model. However, the concept of developing a model of management competency reflecting the changed nature of business is relatively new, and there is much room for continuing development. This development is likely to occur, however, given the emphasis placed on the creation of such models by the governments and business communities of Europe (Jackson, 1989; Perkins, 1992), North America (Davis, Hellervik, & Sheard, 1986) and Australasia (Cammock, 1991).

Generic managerial models have been criticised for being too rigid in approach (Canning, 1990; Sinclair & Collins, 1991; Torrington, Waite & Weightman, 1992), not able to measure some important variables in management behaviour/performance (Jacobs, 1989), and for being too vague and unsubstantiated to be applicable (Furnham, 1990; Thorpe, 1990). While that may be the case now, it does not follow that a valid generic model is impossible to develop. It will be suggested later that a generic model for New Zealand is in fact possible, and a potentially powerful policy initiative for global competitiveness. It was suggested earlier that some New Zealand managers were lacking in the skills and abilities required in the current environment. This raises the question of what can be done about the problem. The overseas experience outlined above can be drawn upon, and in conjunction with New Zealand data it
should be possible to determine the core competencies and other competencies now required of managers.

To this end, a search of the literature was conducted, and using the concept mapping method (Trochim, 1989a, 1989b) with practising managers, both "average" and "exceptional", including Executive MBA and Management MBA students, and university and technical college academic staff actively involved in management development. Data was gathered on the elements (skills and characteristics) perceived to form the concept of "a good manager" in the contemporary New Zealand environment. After generating the elements of the concept, respondents were asked to sort and rate the skills and characteristics according to 1) relatedness, and 2) importance. They were further asked whether particular skills and abilities became more or less important under various circumstances, or if additional skills and abilities were required for specific situations. A subsequent multi-level survey continued the conceptual mapping and added differentiation for organisational type, life stage and industry as well as team management issues.

Given that one purpose of developing a model (or models) of relevant competencies is to provide direction for management development, it was also of interest to establish whether all management skills can be taught and measured, and investigate whether management education and development is valued by practising managers.

This section is structured to provide an overview of the literature, with an analytical model developed to integrate the literature with the results that follow. Finally, in point-counterpoint fashion, the feasibility and desirability of developing generic competency-based models is explored and summarised.
3.2. Management Competencies: The International Experience

A literature review was conducted to provide a background against which to compare New Zealand data for similarities and differences, and to ascertain whether overseas experience could be relevant to New Zealand. Database searches were performed against a wide range of international databases. The search included non-English language sources and broad-based English language sources that included translated abstracts, such as ABI-Inform and Psychlit, as well as Kiwinet and local sources, including personal networking for governmental and industrial information sources. It must be acknowledged, however, that no non-English source material was discovered. It is debatable as to whether management competency is culturally or linguistically constrained. Database searches were constrained to a five year period, 1988-1993, to facilitate access and provide the most up-to-date information for the report. Hard copy of materials were accessed through the Auckland University General and Philson Libraries, Auckland Public Library, and the New Zealand Institute of Management library, as well as corporate and government libraries and inter-library loans from throughout Australasia.

A cursory perusal of the research literature on whether there are 'core competencies' required by all managers at all times will reveal arguments both for and against the concept. Deeper investigation reveals a quagmire of debate and confusion over the issues, which have become the subject of international management research.

3.2.1. Definition of Core Competencies

It would appear that researchers are experiencing difficulty in reaching a consensus on what constitutes management competency. Some would argue that the term competency implies mediocrity, and we ought to focus on “excellence” (Jacobs, 1989; Peters & Waterman, 1990). However, most writers appreciate that there are levels of competence, and that outstanding
competence equals excellence (Jacobs, 1989). Since it is not possible to easily conceptualise levels of excellence, the terms competence and competencies will be used in this report. Also, the term excellence infers performance that is comparatively singular and thus unobtainable by the majority of managers. Such an emphasis is not particularly fruitful in the pursuit of a competency core that is the basis for large scale planning, policy and development.

The term competencies has been defined in a number of ways, with some writers referring to generic competencies required by management (e.g. communication skills), while others describe specific competencies (e.g. oral presentation skills). Hornby and Thomas (1989) define competence as the ability to perform effectively the functions associated with management in a work situation. Worledge (1992, p.11) cites a number of different definitions:

"an underlying characteristic of a person in that it may be a motive trait, skill, aspect of one's self image or social role, or a body of knowledge which he or she uses";

"competence is the accumulation of know-how, skills, standards and values, ideas, qualities, traits, motives and such, which successful people bring to their work";

"forms of managerial behaviour which will raise performance beyond adequacy to excellence";

"any characteristic of a manager that enables him/her to perform successfully in a job"

Yet another broadly structured results-oriented definition is "the application of knowledge and skills over time to achieve effective results" (Baker, 1991, p.20). Jones (1990) cites the Boyatzis (1982) definition, "skills, types of behaviour, knowledge or traits that are employed successfully by managers in discharging their duties", and provides his own definition which suggests that competence is "the ability to perform the activities within an occupational area to levels of performance expected in employment" (p.8). While there are undoubtedly more definitions in the literature, this is adequate to demonstrate the point made by Furnham (1990) that the question of what precisely competencies are remains a mystery. Other writers are also
dissatisfied with the unexplained variations in the terms used in the field (Collin, 1989), and the use of terms that are "only vaguely understood" (Vaughan, 1989).

For the purpose of this discussion competencies are defined as the skills, abilities, and personal characteristics required by an effective or "good" manager, acknowledging the terms "good", "effective" and "manager" are equally contestable. The definition thus expresses competency in terms of the managers' observable and unobservable inputs, and observable outputs. A generally effective or good manager must be measurably responsible for contributing to the success of an organisation in terms of quantitative and qualitative measures. Effectiveness can then be assessed by direct means, such as measuring observed performance compared with pre-determined criteria, and by indirect means, such as unit profit contribution, staff satisfaction, customer satisfaction, and many other criteria that could be used. These indirect means would need to account for other positive and negative factors also contributing to organisation profitability (or other objective), staff and customer satisfaction, etc.

A particular grouping of competencies putatively required by all managers can be considered as "core competencies". The inherent assumptions in this approach are that particular competencies can be 1) identified, 2) operationally defined, 3) represent best practice, 4) are universally applicable across a range of management roles and in a diverse range of management contexts (Baker, 1991). There are many different reasons behind the international attempts to create generic models of core competencies, and not surprisingly, there is debate over the feasibility of this endeavour. Those who oppose the concept suggest that it is not possible to develop a model that is applicable to all circumstances, and suggest that organisation-specific models are more desirable. The following discussion presents the arguments for and against the development of a generic model for New Zealand.

The majority of competency models developed have arisen in the context of management development efforts at the organisational, industry or national level. This emphasis has
introduced a bias into the literature, in as much as the competencies sought have tended to be those that are amenable to development efforts. The more essential debate in the management literature has been whether a generic "good manager" exists, in terms of roles, activities or attributes - or if, indeed, it depends on the situation, as the contingency theorists would suggest. The device of core competencies largely circumvents this argument, as it allows for a generic core which may be supplemented by additional skills, or heavier emphases in differing conditions. Core competencies arguments cannot, however, address the phenomenon of managerial descriptions reflecting the attributes of current managers, whether those attributes are optimal or, indeed, even appropriate. While the idea of management has progressed from an administrative to a strategic role (at least in the popular literature), and physical attributes - height and gender, for instance - are no longer central criteria, the majority of managerial literature relies upon case studies of exceptional individuals, or broad based studies of easily accessible managers in traditional and often non-representative roles and organisations. Knowledge of good managerial practice rests not only on knowledge of the criteria to judge goodness (and across what time frame) but also on the characteristics that differentiate good from "bad" managers - on whom there is little information. Despite these methodological problems, the search for key criteria continues, often at a national level, to provide policy guidance and to underpin training initiatives.

In a search of the literature, 143 citations of managerial competencies have appeared since 1985. Table 3.1 overleaf was constructed to show the number of times each competency was expressly reported. Note that while the competency titles do not appear to be mutually exclusive in all cases, the behavioural descriptions of the skills and characteristics differed for each.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERIC COMPETENCY</th>
<th>NUMBER REPORTING</th>
<th>SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement orientation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NZ;UK(3);USA(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>USA(2);UK(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NZ(2);USA;UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NZ(2);USA;UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team builder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK(2);USA;NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical ability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NZ;UK(2);USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy (vision)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK(2);USA(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business acumen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>NZ(2);USA;UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptable, flexible</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>USA(2);UK(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UK(3);USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self confidence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK(2);USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NZ(2);UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USA;UK(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NZ;UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational/Technical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UK;USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UK;USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UK(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental orientation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>UK;NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USA;NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept formation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and initiative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality orientation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: International citations of competences

3.2.2. International Development of Models

In 1981 the British government established the National Council for Vocational Qualifications for the purpose of developing national employment qualification standards. A component of this programme was establishment of the Management Charter Initiative (MCI) whose brief it was to "derive a list of generic management standards." A model representing three levels of management (first-level supervisory, junior, and middle management) was subsequently
developed. A partial listing of the MCI cluster approach (Hamlin & Stewart, 1990), is presented below in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
<th>COMPETENCE</th>
<th>SKILL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal and action</td>
<td>Efficiency Orientation</td>
<td>Goal setting skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
<td>Planning skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diagnostic use of concepts</td>
<td>Skills in organising resources efficiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern with impact</td>
<td>Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information seeking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Pattern identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self confidence</td>
<td>Concept application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of oral presentations</td>
<td>Symbolic influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logical thought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptualisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource management</td>
<td>Use of socialised power</td>
<td>Alliance-producing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive regard</td>
<td>Verbal, non-verbal skills that result in people feeling valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing group process</td>
<td>Instrumental affiliative behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accurate self-assessment</td>
<td>Group process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing subordinates</td>
<td>Developing others</td>
<td>Self-assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of unilateral power</td>
<td>Reality-testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: The MCI model

All industry sectors in the United Kingdom are being encouraged to adopt the MCI model of core competencies, in order to "facilitate credit transfer of competence in core areas.
across vocational qualifications (original emphasis)" (Miller, 1991, p.11). The reason behind developing this model was to standardise and rationalise management qualifications, guide management education and development, and ultimately, to enhance national economic performance (Baker, 1991; Hornby and Thomas, 1989). However, not all organisations appear willing to adopt the MCI model, preferring for one reason or another to develop their own models, and there are doubts expressed about the inherent assumptions of a generic model. Beyond the criticism of the concept of a generic model, some potential users feel that the MCI model is needlessly obscure in its nomenclature and difficult to implement without considerable translation.

Canning (1990) is one of the MCI model critics, believing it is not possible to produce a generic list of competencies outside of the organisational context. He does not criticise the competency approach, however. In his view, organisations ought to be taught how to develop their own models, rather than imposing an external national model. An intermediate approach, adopted by SAFEWAY Corporation, has been to blend the MCI competencies with organisation specific knowledge and skills (Crabb, 1991).

Jacobs (1989) implies that the MCI approach is inadequate, as there are management qualities that cannot be readily observed and assessed. He notes also that a "significant group" (number unspecified) of organisations had tried the competency-based assessment approach and found it not appropriate for their needs. The companies that Jacobs noted as unable to adopt the MCI model tended to operate in changing and turbulent environments. They found that different parts of the organisation developed along different lines, and it was not possible to address management development needs in a uniform manner. Like Canning, Jacobs notes that the softer competencies such as sensitivity, creativity, and intuition for example, are now thought to be critical for superior management performance, yet are not incorporated in the MCI model. Baker (1991) echoes the concerns expressed by Canning and Jacobs and objects to an approach
that "...promotes reductionism and sanitising of managerial roles and performance to fit neatly into a preferred classificatory system. This denies the richness of diversity and leads to a generic system of managerial competences which does not truly reflect best practice, nor are the competences sufficient to meet the needs as determined by differing situations" (p.18). The attempt to develop an acceptable national model of core competencies in Britain has therefore not yet been successful in terms of popular support or widespread use. It may be seen as very successful in promoting active debate of what is required to manage the future of the UK's business establishment.

Similar efforts in the United States have yielded a model (Quinn, 1988) that draws from the four traditional frameworks of management theory - the rational goal, internal process, human relations and open systems models - to generate eight roles and twenty four supporting activities. The Quinn model is shown below in Figure 3.1.

![Quinn Model Diagram](image-url)

Figure 3.1: The Quinn model
Although there are substantial criticisms of the Quinn model, largest among them are that it does not attempt synergies or theoretical harmonisation, but rather continues the theoretical fractionation of management and contributes to it by proposing insular (and quite developable) skills in support. It has been emulated in several venues.

In a similarly shaped and constructed competency model, the United States firm of Personnel Decisions Inc. has developed an assessment and development based "Wheel of Management Success" depicting eight factors of performance/behaviour considered to be important for all levels of management in any organisation, although it is acknowledged that some factors are more important at particular levels.

![Diagram of the Personnel Decisions model](image)

**Figure 3.2:** The Personnel Decisions model

The primary thrust of this generic model, shown in Figure 3.2 above, is to provide direction and methods for management assessment and development. Although academic
research on the wheel is limited, the editors of the book claim the method will increase managerial effectiveness and organisational performance (Davis, Hellervik, & Sheard, 1986). It is also similar in intent and direction to the more widely researched models of the mid-1980s, and bears a striking resemblance to the behavioural approach of the U.K. models, particularly the MCI approach.

In defence of the generic approach, Dulewicz (1989) notes the similarities between the competencies identified in many different kinds of organisations in different industry sectors. As a “guestimate” he suggests that 70% are generic, and the remaining 30% are organisation-specific. He is currently developing a list of core “supra competences” that is claimed will differentiate effective and less effective senior managers from a variety of multinational companies, and advocates the use of assessment centres to assess managers' competencies and level of competence. The model will incorporate the soft competencies lacking in the MCI model, and will include the need for competence in the flexible and adaptable management behaviour required in a turbulent and changing environment, as well as eventually incorporating both middle and senior management levels. The Dulewicz model is presented below in Table 3.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTELLECTUAL</th>
<th>Strategic Perspective</th>
<th>Rises above the detail to see the broader issues and implications; takes account of wide-ranging influences both inside and outside the organisation before planning or acting.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Judgement</td>
<td>Seeks all relevant information; identifies problems, relates relevant data and identifies causes; assimilates numerical data accurately and makes sensible interpretations; work is precise and methodical, and relevant detail is not overlooked. Makes decisions based on logical assumptions that reflect factual information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Organising</td>
<td>Plans priorities, assignments and the allocation of resources; organises resources efficiently and effectively, delegating work to the appropriate staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL</td>
<td>Managing Staff</td>
<td>Adopts appropriate styles for achieving group objectives; monitors and evaluates their work; shows vision and inspiration; develops the skills and competences of staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
<td>Influences and persuades others to give their agreement and commitment; in face of conflict, uses personal influence to communicate proposals, to reach bases for compromise and to reach agreement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertiveness and Decisiveness</td>
<td>Ascendant, forceful dealing with others; can take charge; is willing to take risks and seek new experiences; is decisive, ready to take decisions, even on limited information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Sensitivity</td>
<td>Shows consideration for the needs and feelings of others; listens dispassionately, is not selective, recalls key points and takes account of them; is flexible when dealing with others, will change own position when others' proposal warrants it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>Fluent, speaks clearly and audibly, with good diction; in formal presentations, is enthusiastic and lively, tailors content to audiences' level of understanding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADAPTABILITY</td>
<td>Adaptability and Resilience</td>
<td>Adapts behaviour to new situations; resilient, maintains effectiveness in face of adversity or unfairness. Performance remains stable when under pressure or opposition; does not become irritable and anxious, retains composure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS-ORIENTATION</td>
<td>Energy and Initiative</td>
<td>Makes a strong, positive impression, has authority and credibility; is a self-starter and originator, actively influences events to achieve goals; has energy and vitality, maintains high level of activity and produces a high level of output.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement-Motivation</td>
<td>Sets demanding goals for self and others, and is dissatisfied with average performance; makes full use of own time and resources; sees a task through to completion, irrespective of obstacles and setbacks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Sense</td>
<td>Identifies opportunities that will increase sales or profits; selects and exploits those activities that will result in the largest returns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: The Dulewicz model
Manchester Airport in Britain is an organisation that has developed its own model from the work of Boyatzis, who documented the well known competencies model developed at McBer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTANDING WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE</th>
<th>Critical Reasoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Visioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Know-How</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GETTING THE JOB DONE</td>
<td>Achievement Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern for Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAKING PEOPLE WITH YOU</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concern for Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Influence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: The McBer model

The rationale for development of the model was to establish the criteria for effective job performance and superior achievement, and carry these criteria over into recruitment and selection, promotion considerations, performance review, job design, career development, and succession planning. The motivation to make changes arose when Manchester Airport became a public company in 1986, when the new business plan necessitated changes in business approach and range of activities. A major component of the programme was a change in organisation culture to support the process of developing a 'new breed of manager' (Jackson, 1991, p.10). The Manchester Airport model represents two levels of management with different skill requirements producing two management profiles. The profiles show the levels at which low, moderate, and high performance would result for each competency, and differentiate between the performance of effective management and the superior effective performer. Managers are assessed according
to the models, and an individual development programme is formulated. According to Jackson, the programme is a great success, and has become a part of everyday life and language at the airport.

Gatwick Airport in Britain is another organisation that faced major changes when in 1987 the British Airports Authority was floated on the stock market (Higgins & Blakeley, 1990). This resulted in restructuring to become decentralised with individual business units responsible for achieving business targets. This in turn meant that a different set of skills were now required by management. A major focus in the development of a core competencies model was the perceived need for succession planning within the organisation, and another was the now recognised need for ongoing management development. An analysis of management roles identified the skills required by the organisation, and the skills and competence levels of managers were assessed. A computer programme was developed to provide 1) a skills and performance profile for each individual which linked the overall business criteria for Gatwick 2) a training and development profile, and 3) an individual succession plan with scope to consider alternative succession choices (Higgins & Blakeley, 1990, p.48). An added advantage of this system is that potential succession candidates can be initially evaluated without alerting the grapevine or raising hopes unnecessarily. The Gatwick project has also been described as a success for the use of a core competency model that is organisation-specific (Higgins & Blakeley, 1990).

Another successful organisation-specific model, the Cadbury Schweppes "Dictionary of Competence", is described as being a set of fifty competences expressed as behavioural definitions embedded within a framework of six clusters (i.e. generic or dimensions of competency). This organisation realised the importance of human resources in gaining a competitive advantage, and sought to develop "excellent and adaptable" managers capable of inspiring their colleagues and subordinates alike. The ultimate aim of the project is to use Human Resource Management (HRM) to improve organisation performance, particularly
through management development. Like the Manchester Airport model, Cadbury Schweppes also produce a profile which is known as a “manager description”, against which individual performance can be compared, or it can be used for management selection, deployment, and development (Glaze, 1989).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>DRIVE</th>
<th>INFLUENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vision, critical thinking, innovation, environmental awareness, business sense, contemplation, thoughtfulness</td>
<td>Self-motivation, initiative, tenacity, energy, independence, risk taking, resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociability, impact, acceptability, awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral communication, written communication, flexibility, negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delegation, subordinates development, in command of situations and individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Followership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Listens and adopts ideas of others, loyal, works as team member, accepts direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS</td>
<td>Problem Analysis</td>
<td>Seeking pertinent data, recognising what is important, identifying possible causes, recommending action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Numerical Analysis</td>
<td>Analysing, organising and presenting numerical information to support research and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Drawing out information in face-to-face discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>Introducing fresh ideas and insights, seeing new angles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>Evaluating data and courses of action without bias or prejudice and reaching logical conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>Using hunch, feel and sixth sense to identify issues and possible solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>Planning and organising, decisiveness, organising sensitivity, management control, work standards, detail handling, compliance, stress tolerance, adaptability, commitment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL FACTORS</td>
<td>Integrity, management identification, career ambition, learning ability, technical and professional competence and orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5: The Cadbury Schweppes model
The concept of competency-based assessment is not new to BP International (based in Britain) who have been using this approach, based on competencies developed in the USA, for approximately sixteen years. However, a new system is under development to re-evaluate the criteria for effective management that would meet the challenges of "increasingly complex organisation structures, with the need for people to manage complex boundaries and ambiguity and an increasing trend towards internationalisation." (Greatrex & Phillips, 1989, p.36). A more strategic perspective was desired, managers needed to be able to effectively manage different national and organisational cultures, and now needed a more open and flexible management style to become market-driven and more entrepreneurial in their approach. In-house research revealed eleven competencies that were subsequently grouped into four clusters representing the key requirements for BP managers - strategic leadership, business management, and a flexible management style. Two other differences in the new competency system are the emphases on development of the individual, and on the organisation development approach to the process of managing change within the organisation. The new system is still under development, and it is hoped that company recruitment, appraisal, selection for high-flyer programmes, and management development systems will eventually benefit from the competency approach (Greatrex & Phillips, 1989).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement Orientation</th>
<th>Personal Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Orientation</td>
<td>Awareness of Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persuasiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>Analytical Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Flexibility</td>
<td>Adaptive Orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.6: The BP model
In the United States, the US Office of Personnel Management was responsible for developing and maintaining a competency-based model of effective performance for Federal Executives, managers, and supervisors. The model to be subsequently developed is known as the Management Excellence Framework (MEF), which is a very comprehensive three-dimensional model showing management functions, effectiveness characteristics, and the three management levels. Although this model is organisation-specific, it is used to measure and compare executives, managers, and supervisors in a wide range of Federal positions across the USA, and as such could almost be described as a generic model. As with all the other models discussed, the MEF is used to establish existing levels of competence in various areas, plus identify skill training and development needs, clarify roles and responsibilities, guide career development, and permit an assessment of the distribution of competencies within management teams (USOPM, 1985).

As the schematic demonstrates, the Management Excellence Framework (MEF) builds on a set of basic competencies with additional additive competency for each successive and more responsible layer within the organisation. Predictably, this is a system predicated upon a traditional bureaucracy. Importantly, all but the most senior management competencies are internally focused, which may be appropriate in a very large hierarchy in a stable environment, but is being increasingly questioned when those assumptions are not met. Perry and Miller (1991) investigated whether managerial performance had been improved at the executive level, using survey data from 1700 members of the Senior Executive Service. In general terms they report that the system is working, although they found the existing system to have flaws necessitating a revision of the original model to better depict the empirical relationships found in the survey data. They also found the system to be lacking in implementation process measures.
Other organisations using core competency models adapted or developed for their own purpose to increase managerial effectiveness and organisational competitiveness are Westpac (Australia), Fletcher Challenge, the Bank of New Zealand, and New Zealand Steel (Worledge, 1992; BNZ, FCL and New Zealand Steel company literature). Each of these large organisations, and others, have adopted proprietary competency models to facilitate selection and development for their management teams. The corporate models share the basic functional competencies (e.g., communication, supervision) of their overseas predecessors, and continue the inward focus of many of the international models, with the exception of a marked emphasis on external customer focus, including quality or kaizen. Notably these are models developed to fit the culture and
structure of large and generally bureaucratic organisations, albeit in a more competitive environment.

3.2.3. A Framework For Comparison

While various authors have suggested that the portrait of management and leadership have shifted from a focus on character to one of skills and techniques, most competency models explicitly recognise both a cognitive and manifest component. These characteristics and skills may be further subdivided into the personal (the manager’s characteristics and skills relating to their own person, e.g., intelligence and time management), the interpersonal, and the external (subsuming the relationship with systems as well as true externalities such as the marketplace and customers). This results in a 2x3 matrix of potential areas for categorising competencies, with soft characteristics such as beliefs, values and attitudes on one level, and with skills and techniques on the other, as shown below in Figure 3.4.

![Figure 3.4: A comparative framework](image)
This framework can be used to compare and critique the international models. For example, the MCI model appears equally balanced between all domains, but this is largely because, as in several other models, the assumption is that internal values, attitudes and knowledge are not separately manifest, rather they are reflected through skills and techniques. Thus while the model appears evenly emphasising personal characteristics (soft), as Dulewicz has noted, it is in practice uniquely bottom-heavy.

![Figure 3.5: The MCI model in the framework](image)

In contrast, the Quinn, Dulewicz, McBer and PDI models represented below all show far less emphasis on characteristics than skills, and relatively greater emphasis on the interpersonal realm, with very little focus - in either characteristics or skills - in the external domain.
Figure 3.6: The Quinn model in the framework

Figure 3.7: The Dulewicz model in the framework
Why the diminished focus on external issues? Perhaps these models implicitly encompass that which the MEF model makes extremely explicit - that external awareness and interaction are areas that, in large bureaucratic organisations, were left to executives, while...
middle managers managed themselves and staff, and supervisors dealt with their staff. This concept is shown below.

![Diagram showing MEF concept](image)

Figure 3.10: The MEF concept

3.2.4. Implications For New Zealand

The foregoing framework will be expanded further in the consideration of concept maps developed by New Zealand managers, to begin the articulation of core, or generic competencies for this arena. The implications so far are that the changing business environment has produced world-wide attempts to redefine the work of managers and operationalise the specific sets of skills now required. The information gathered may be used in a variety of useful ways. It is also clear that the concept works in a wide range of business sectors and organisation types, which indicates that the core competency-based approach per se is not limited to certain circumstances, but is universally transferable. The main problem is establishing a set of core competencies that are universally applicable. On the other hand, the need for every organisation to develop a unique model is impractical and would be an onerous programme to co-ordinate. Perhaps a better approach would be to develop a generic model that identifies a particular core of required managerial competencies, similar in idea, but not emphasis to, the MEF or Dulewicz approaches, with additional areas of competence required under specific circumstances. Perhaps a more
realistic approach would be to use a core competency model to balance management teams rather than expecting one individual to possess all the attributes. These ideas will be raised again and expanded upon in later discussion.

Having discussed the findings in the international literature, discussion now turns to the results of the Concept Mapping sessions conducted to reveal the New Zealand perspective, and compare and integrate the international literature just discussed.

3.3. Concept Mapping Results and Commentary

The following discussion presents the concept mapping results, with interpretation and commentary accompany the map for each group. To recap, the method utilised in this study took three forms - a series of concept mapping exercises using a diverse and knowledgeable population, supplemented by a final iterative survey of practising managers, to provide a meta-map and differentiate across managerial environments. In addition, a special concept mapping and focus group of identified "exceptional" managers provided additional information.

3.3.1. Managers and Management Educators

Practising managers generated, sorted and rated up to 99 characteristics to form management concept maps. Maps have been generated for the first NZIM focus group, Executive and Management MBAs, Auckland area management educators and developers, and a mail based survey of NZIM members. The maps are presented on the following pages with commentary, and shown in the comparative framework. The statement lists in cluster form with ratings are presented in Appendix 3.1.
3.3.3. Concept Map - NZIM Focus Group

In progressing from left to right across the map in Figure 3.11 below, the external and internal organisational levels of managerial competency are traversed, with the right representing personal and interpersonal space. The upper right quadrant is self development based, bridging through interpersonal competencies toward a focus on subordinate management and leadership in the lower right quadrant.

Networking, external awareness and specialist skills are rated the least important and are also marginalised in the lower left quadrant of the map. Negotiation forms a bridge between the linking areas of plan & implement and communicate & decide, in the upper left, with the direct supervision and leadership cluster directly opposite. Overall, the emphasis of this group is on the manager as an individual, with the most highly rated items related to personal characteristics and relationships. External awareness is devalued, and customers are not mentioned. Specialist and technical skills are of little use to the manager in this mapping, and negotiation is important as a linkage between levels of the organisation, rather than between external and internal forces. The relative balance of competencies are shown in the framework in Figure 3.12.
Figure 3.11: NZIM focus group concept map

Figure 3.12: The NZIM focus group map in the framework
Figure 3.13: NZIM mail survey map
3.3.4. Concept Map - NZIM Mail Survey

This map, shown in Figure 3.13 has a clear external awareness and supporting concepts on the left of the map. The lower right is self absorbed - the good manager described as personal characteristics, self organising, self-motivating, achieving and innovating, while the upper right reflects the human relations orientation, including team building and human resource management. This group rated team building, planning and personal characteristics most highly - in a balance of personal, interpersonal and task. Two external concept clusters emerge from this map, external-customer and external-international/environmental, with the former rated much more highly. Despite the greater prevalence of external factors amongst this group, international and economic understanding were still down played.

Overall, this map shows the clearest balance between four basic types of factors that emerge across the five concept mapping groups:

- external - customer, environment, international;
- task and organisation;
- personal - characteristics and development; and
- interpersonal - leading, building, directing.

However, as in other maps, interpersonal and personal are emphasised and interlinked, while the systems aspects of the external domain are a clear conceptual band between the internal world and the de minimus development of external orientation.
Figure 3.14: The NZIM mail survey map in the framework

Figure 3.15: Executive MBA managers concept map
3.3.5. Concept Map - Executive MBA Managers

The EMBA map is centred on wisdom and self-awareness, a highly rated set of issues that bridge the personal area at the top of the map with the more task-oriented lower half. The upper right quadrant emphasises the key role of team building and leadership. Leadership plays a more central role for this group than for any other in the study. The lower right quadrant reflects the strategic nature of decision making, shown here as opposite the communicator role, which is also highly rated. This map is notable in two respects, one for the emphasis on the management of diversity, but secondly for a clearly limited reference to the external environment. Once again, the specialist and externally oriented roles competencies are omitted or marginalised.

The map's emphasis is upon interaction between the manager and their followers or subordinates, with little reference to the external environment. The organisation is represented in terms of tasks - organising, planning, managing priorities and exercising analytical controls.

Figure 3.16: The EMBA concept map in the framework
3.3.6. Concept Map - Management MBA Managers

The map constructed by MMBA students is centred on rapid performance of administrative tasks, through a centre core of four clusters - labelled "do it", "rapid", "objective setting" and "change". In contrast to the EMBA chart (reflecting nearly three times the managerial experience) balance and wisdom are not highly valued. Their own self-development (upper right) is closely linked to interactive characteristics, listening skills and feedback. A central precept is communicating vision, although the source of the vision is suspect, as vision is conceptually adrift from any external knowledge, information or awareness. The issue for these managers is communicating vision, not establishing it. The need for industry and specialist knowledge is indicated but not emphasised to the extent that vision and achievement are. This map deals less with self development than most others, although it acknowledges wider needs.
for the management of talent and the use of feedback and understanding in the management of teams and staff.

Figure 3.18: The MMBA concept map in the framework

3.3.7: Concept Map - Management Educators’

The management educators' map is notable for its lack of "softer" competencies and the abstract knowledge oriented focus. Interestingly, academics do not rate education highly. More interestingly, they also de-value intelligence and track record, two of the most empirically validated predictors of managerial success.

The academic group was the only group to rate external awareness highly, and to spatially integrate vision, strategy and external orientation. This map is not unique in its emphasis on rational management, leadership, team management and interpersonal skills,
but it is interesting in its emphasis on management approachability, and of the spatial intermingling of task (such as organising and controlling) and interpersonal (such as team management) characteristics.

This map rates more items highly than any other, with only academic track record (an interesting finding, given the sample are educators) de-emphasised in the profile. Strategic vision and rational management played relatively minor roles in the educators' map, a distinct difference from the maps of the practising managers.
3.3.8. Concept Map - "Exceptional" Managers

The map constructed by the managers selected as "outstanding" differs in several critical ways. Customer focus was seen as the most important element, and is "backed" by staff and culture, then systems, in one of the few maps that does not interpose system issues between staff and the outside/customer. The emphasis, overall, is on characteristics and values over skills and techniques, with a repeated emphasis on creating time to think and reflect. This is the only map that specifically integrates shareholder expectations and is more externally oriented. Change management and innovation are associated with personal creativity, reflection, and effective hiring, as well as individual self-management skills and basic business acumen. Culture and values play a dominant role in this map.
Figure 3.21: 'Exceptional' managers concept map

Figure 3.22: The exceptional manager concept map in the framework
3.4. Contextual Competencies

Responses to the additional survey questions regarding whether the required competencies are the same under various circumstances (or whether specific competencies become more or less important), were subjected to a qualitative content analysis to determine the major themes.

3.4.1. Public and Private Sector

Ten percent of the sample were either unsure or did not respond regarding differences in managerial competencies required in the private and public sector. Two thirds indicated clearly that the skills required in the two sectors were the same, or ought to be. The remaining 24% considered the skills required in the two sectors to be different. Private sector management were thought to be (or need to be) more profit/results oriented, and need more flexibility/adaptability in management thinking and style. Marketing skills were perceived to be more important in the private versus public sector. An interesting perceived difference to arise between the two sectors was an underlying theme of the public sector being perceived as being akin to a monopoly situation, without competitors to deal with.

Public sector management was perceived to require a more service oriented, 'mission driven' management, with strategic planning and political astuteness stated to be the important management competencies required. A sense of working in the public interest was another factor referred to.

In general terms a large proportion (66%) of this sample of practising managers thought the two sectors differed in the competencies required, with 62% reporting that different skills become more important in a given sector.
3.4.2. Team Management

Sixty-nine percent of the sample responded that the required competencies for team versus individual management were different, while 24% thought they were, or ought to be, the same. The remaining 7% were unsure or did not respond. There were comments that there was no such thing as individual management today, or it was made clear that it was taken to be an entrepreneurial situation. A large proportion (86%) thought that different or additional skills were required between the two situations, with 69% reporting that certain competencies became more important in each situation.

The individual manager/entrepreneur was perceived to need vision/broad perspective, and networking, being a generalist, time management, creativity, independence, decision making, and calculated risk-taking skills were considered to be more important. The individual manager also required a “hands on” approach.

In contrast, team management was perceived to require skills pertaining to working closely with others. Competencies to increase in importance were communication, team building, utilising team resources, team leadership and motivation, interpersonal skills, delegation, ability to compromise, and heading meetings.

3.4.3. Managing a Start-up

Eighty-three percent reported that additional or different competencies were required for a new organisation starting up. The remainder thought there were no additional or different competencies required (7%), or were unsure or did not respond (10%). The exceptional manager group noted energy/endurance as being fundamental to this stage.

The competencies reported to be most important for starting up were the need for risk-taking, entrepreneurial vision, market knowledge, planning, organising, implementation,
customer focus, research, flexibility/adaptability, and team building. Another common comment was the need for stamina/energy.

3.4.4. At Maturity

Mature organisations were also thought to require a different skills emphasis, with 79% reporting that different or additional competencies were required. The remainder thought there were no additional or different competencies required (14%), or did not respond or were unsure (7%). Outstanding managers, however, indicated that given the current environment, there were no mature stable organisations, and that "you couldn't be an effective manager if that's what you thought you were managing".

To the majority of managers, however, management of a mature organisation was thought to require skills relating to fine tuning and maintenance. Another strong theme was concerned with administration, control (policies, procedures), cost control, and technical knowledge. In a general sense this conveys the idea of needing to maintain the status quo. There were, however, a few comments that adaptability to change and secondary product/service development (also termed innovation) increased in importance for management of a mature organisation.

3.4.5. Organisational Decline

A small proportion (7%) thought that an organisation in decline did not require any additional or different competencies, with another 7% unsure or not responding. The remaining 86% reported that the situation required a different emphasis. Communication, training, teamwork, human relations, risk-taking, visionary flexibility, creativity/innovation, restructuring, cost focus, change management, and strategic planning were the competencies that become more
important. A major theme was the need to make "tough stuff" decisions. In contrast, the exceptional management group did not espouse a get tough orientation, but stressed the need for creativity and innovation to make the best of bad times.

3.4.6. Turnaround

Seven percent did not believe different or additional competencies are required for organisations in a turnaround situation, and 10% were unsure or did not respond. The remaining 83% considered some competencies to be more important.

Competencies mentioned most often were strategic planning, change management, resource management, cost focus, and team working. Other more general comments were that the competencies required for turnaround were similar to those required for start ups and declining organisations. There was an even stronger theme regarding the need to be "gutsy", "tough", and "ruthless". Outstanding managers, however, added speed and decisiveness to this equation.

3.4.7. Different Sectors/Industries

One third of the sample did not consider different sectors or industries required additional or different competencies unless the organisation was producing a specialist product or service. The remaining 66% thought that certain competencies increased in importance. Industry knowledge was thought to be important, as was the need to be aware of retraining needs and technology in rapidly changing sectors or industries. Specific sectors where it was perceived that different management competencies become more important were import/export, and manufacturing versus retail/commercial versus service, and R&D high technology.
3.4.8. The Need for Contingent Competencies

More than a majority of managers believe that there is an overwhelming case of contingent competencies applicable in different situations. Most appear to take a fairly common sense approach, in that team management requires particular competencies pertaining to working closely with others, while the individual manager is perceived to need more independence and self-reliance, for example.

However, there is cause for concern regarding attitudes towards the management of organisations undergoing turnaround, or in decline. The focus in these situations was to crack down, get cost conscious, and make tough/ruthless decisions. Kiechel (1992) refers to this management attitude as management regression. In essence, organisations that have been fairly enlightened regress back to centralised decision making (Kiechel refers to this as yo-yo empowerment), and cost cutting becomes paramount, both designed to increase the profit margin and reduce room for error. Safe decisions are made and no risks are taken (including new products or directions). Criticism and dissent is actively discouraged, which in turn closes the communication channels, which "... is the first step towards recreating the culture of conformity - the first step towards mediocrity" (p.106). Top management is tough-minded and Rambo-like, "...but all in the service of a corporate vision, which he communicates endlessly" (p.106). According to Kiechel the experts doubt that this management style will lead to global competitiveness. Furthermore, it has been found that employees become disillusioned, bitter, and feel a sense of betrayal and injustice about the clamp downs (Kiechel, 1992). It is, therefore, of concern that practising managers amongst this sample expressed views consistent with management regression. This trend was also noted in the Harper and Campbell-Hunt (1992) Islands Of Excellence report, where this type of management style was described as "survival mode" management tactics.
This area needs further investigation as to the attitudes/motivation/reasons behind a choice to regress, or opt to progress by increasing competitiveness through innovation, enterprise, and calculated risk-taking. Further work would reveal the implications for management development programmes, if derived from a competency model targeting the latter form of management. This section has presented and discussed the finding that different organisational situations call upon different managerial competencies, or can create different emphases. In terms of a New Zealand model as discussed so far, the implication is that in addition to a set of core competencies, plus a team (select/purchase) component, the model will need to specify the contextual competencies which become more or less important in different organisation circumstances.

3.5. Comparing the International Literature and New Zealand Managers: Cause for Concern?

Harper & Campbell-Hunt (1992) conducted a study into private sector management in New Zealand, with a focus on investigating New Zealand adaptation and response to the changing business environment. Their findings did not bode well for the international competitiveness of some New Zealand companies. With the exception of a small entrepreneurial group, largely export niche orientated, New Zealand management was generally found to be slowly adapting to the new environment, but adopting less than optimal strategies (Harper & Campbell-Hunt, 1992). However, these criticisms are also levelled at management in Britain (Jackson, 1991) and the United States (Kiechel, 1992), and it must be acknowledged that the New Zealand business environment has also undergone far more diverse and broad-ranging changes than elsewhere (Harper & Campbell-Hunt, 1992).
The differences between the international literature, however, and the New Zealand managers' profile of management practice are striking. At a fundamental level, there is a philosophical discourse that Stephen Covey has recently labelled the replacement of the management character ethic with the advent of "techniques" for management. Although several of the competency models stress personal characteristics (e.g., motivation, integrity) as key to managerial success, there is a tendency for New Zealand managers (and educators) to downplay personal characteristics that are other-related and emphasise techniques of administration (e.g., delegation, time management). Secondly, there appears to be a very traditional approach to managerial functioning, with the most valued skills being the direction, supervision and control of personnel in a line reporting relationship. The rhetoric of empowerment and valuing diversity is quickly subordinated to "ruthless", "hard-nosed" managerial attitudes when there are difficulties of any kind (this is with the exception of the "outstanding manager" group), despite the empirical evidence that precisely the opposite is required. Although managers note that this is moderated in a team environment, by the need for greater communication and networking, they do not rate these skills as highly, even when describing their organisations as team based. Further, despite the rising importance of attitudes, values and culture in organisational management at all levels - in the popular and empirical literature, the management of culture was not mentioned once by the New Zealand managers surveyed, with the exception of one manager who volunteered the tolerance of other cultures as a managerial competency.

There also appears to be a tremendous emphasis on "hands-on" management, including focus group comments that the manager who "just manages" won't have a job for long. Some of the concept maps, with their "get the job done - now - fast - accountably" orientation reflect a Nike-style "just do it!" approach to management, an approach that has been characterised as doing the wrong thing in the right way, rather than reflecting, and doing the right thing.
(effectiveness). It is interesting that the need for reflection is consistent with the outstanding manager groups' emphasis on creating time to think.

Most disturbingly, however, many New Zealand managers' view of current New Zealand management practice reflects a large company mentality that does not apply to the overwhelming majority of New Zealand companies. Regardless of level or sector, few managers heed the message of the Islands of Excellence... report that the current environment and New Zealand's competitive position requires managers with a balanced awareness of international and national economic and industry factors, as well as basic appreciation of functional competencies such as law (to comprehend the impact of ever-changing legislation), finance (to understand the impact of decisions on organisational profitability and productivity), and marketing (to approach new markets effectively). Most of the managers polled emphasised micro-managerial issues. Some groups never even mentioned external factors outside the sphere of the industry in which their businesses operated. Those that noted economic and international issues, subsequently gave them significantly less weight than personal development and the management of their subordinates. This is even reflected in contemporary reading patterns, where the NZIM's list of top 100 management books includes only four focusing on international trade or the changing economic environment. Not only is this cause for concern from an assessment perspective, but it is possibly the most difficult to approach from a development or supplementation perspective, as an element must be valued before development or consultation for these areas will be approached.

If the aim of the New Zealand Government is to assist private sector management to become more effective in making our companies internationally competitive, using the core competencies approach may be a useful guide for the management development that is clearly required. As the recent TradeNZ presentations have suggested, some spheres of economic development will require a change in managerial attitudes and skills.
Pulling the arguments presented together it is reasonable to propose that a generic model of core competencies could be derived for New Zealand, provided the existing weaknesses in the international models are not repeated. That is, management models for New Zealand would need to incorporate the hard competencies (knowledge and skills), and soft competencies (personal characteristics, including values and attitudes) within a framework that recognises the importance of the greater external environment and the need to respond to change. Furthermore, a New Zealand model could be specifically targeted towards the concept of producing highly competitive, innovative and enterprising organisations, as opposed to the vague concept of "effectiveness", "success", "excellence", or even "competence". A model of management that rests on organisational competitiveness through innovation and enterprise is likely to gain acceptance, and is relatively timeless - these factors will always be needed. Having established the rationale for proposing a generic model for New Zealand the report now turns to defining the precise competencies perceived to be required by New Zealand managers.

3.5.1. Defining the Core Competencies Required

In beginning to define the core competencies that may be required by New Zealand managers by drawing some of the models together in this fashion, it becomes clear that most models rely heavily on the rational "leading, planning, organising, and controlling" competencies. This is in direct contrast to the stated need in the literature to have the softer competencies in balance. The report now turns to providing a tentative list of competencies that New Zealand managers may require to enhance organisational competitiveness.

The following skills and characteristics are described as being critical for achieving the level of competitiveness that now defines good management. Competitiveness in the current environment requires managers and other organisation members to be creative and innovative in
thinking, flexible and adaptable in approach, and enterprising in nature. To create this situation, good managers will be required to master the three areas listed below (or at least have an understanding of the methods, tasks and time frames involved if someone else performs these activities):

1. Understand, think about, and plan long term directions and goals, and plan short and medium term objectives designed to achieve them;

2. Translate plans into specific actions designed to achieve objectives and goals;

3. Achieve results through others.

A competitively oriented manager would therefore need to show competence in these three main areas, hence they can be thought of as mega-competencies. To be considered competent in the three areas, a successful manager would need to demonstrate at least threshold functioning in a number of different domains. These mutually exclusive domains can be broken down into an assortment of personal characteristics and skills that contribute to effectiveness in each domain. These skills and abilities can therefore be expressed within a number of different domains of managerial competence. The skills, in turn, can be broken down into observable behaviours that can be measured and assessed. Of the contributory personal characteristics, some can be observed, while others are best tapped through psychometric instruments. The table below illustrates this nested hierarchy in a simplified format.

NB: Intended as an example, not comprehensive in scope.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEGA-COMPETENCY</th>
<th>Translate plans into specific actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERIC COMPETENCY</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORTING COMPETENCY</td>
<td>Oral presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTING SKILLS</td>
<td>Structure clear and logical steps in a presentation; Clarity of diction and delivery; Comprehensive vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTRIBUTING PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS</td>
<td>Enthusiasm, self-confidence, flair/creativity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.7: Competency hierarchy
The list of competencies required by a good manager as defined earlier was derived from all sources, removing redundancies. The list is far from comprehensive at this point. The intention of this study is to provide initial findings with regard to competencies reported to be critical in managing a competitive organisation, to serve as the basis of future research and subsequent refinement. The competencies listed in Table 3.8 are not presented in order of ranked importance, as this has not been empirically established.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Thinking</th>
<th>Corporate Vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement/Results Orientation</td>
<td>Creative/Innovative Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logical/Rational Thinking</td>
<td>Strategic/Long Term Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Skills</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>Plan Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical/Critical Thinking</td>
<td>Self Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic/Long Term Planning</td>
<td>Change Agent/Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Knowledge</td>
<td>Financial Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Business Acumen</td>
<td>Broad Functional Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Allocation</td>
<td>Self Understanding/Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Stamina/Energy</td>
<td>Flexibility/Adaptability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Confidence</td>
<td>Persistence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Multiple Roles/Tasks/Factors</td>
<td>Quality Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and Acquire Assistance</td>
<td>External Focus and Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting and Adjustment</td>
<td>Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation</td>
<td>Culture Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Leader-Member Balance</td>
<td>Co-ordinate, Integrate Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking, Relationship Building</td>
<td>Receiving and Giving Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness, Objectivity, Detachment</td>
<td>Ethics, Integrity, Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource Management</td>
<td>Enthusiasm, Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Attitude</td>
<td>Presence, Personal Impact, Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation, Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Customer Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding &amp; Integration Diverse Business Disciplines</td>
<td>Research &amp; Information Gathering and Dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8: List of competencies reported as critical

While few would dispute that the competencies reported in Table 3.8 contain worthwhile skills and characteristics for New Zealand management, there may be some discomfort with the
necessity or criticality of such a comprehensive list. For example, feedback receipt and use, fairness and ethical behaviour may not be seen as central by some theorists and practitioners. These, and other similar items are included, however, because they are supported by the literature and concept mapping process, but also because they impact the integrity of the remainder of the listing, that is, other less arguable areas depend for their viability on these potentially marginal competencies. The spread and inter-relationship of these competencies should be clarified by further work.

The sheer length of the listing immediately raises the question of whether it is reasonable or realistic to expect one individual to operate at or above some predetermined level across the spectrum. It is becoming clear that the size of the organisation is going to have an impact on competitiveness as defined in terms of organisational management needs. Smaller organisations with a single manager may require a different approach. That is, the solo manager or small business organisation is self-limiting, because:

1. Organisations will need to "make do" with a manager with as many competencies as possible, always limited by missing competencies;

2. Organisations will have to purchase expertise as required to replace missing or sub-optimal levels of competence in internal managers(s), limited by ability to pay.

Another option for smaller organisations is to look for managerial competencies across a group of individuals, potentially including nonmanagerial staff. This approach requires further investigation. Larger organisations can also select and balance a team - of managers or managerial and non-managerial employees - for competencies, or contract external competency as and when required. The first step in each of these scenarios, however, is that a comprehensive profile of competencies and an assessment of personnel profiles against the requirements are well, even if tacitly, known.
Yet another approach to the core of competencies may be to identify the skills and characteristics that must be internalised, that cannot be supplemented or contracted out. This results in a minimum core that ALL managers must possess, with the remainder to be purchased or selected for amongst other staff within the size and financial limits of the organisation. Once again, this approach requires further development and verification.

In addition to the criteria discussed earlier for developing a New Zealand management competencies model, it will also be necessary to determine an immutable, or generic, set of competencies required by all managers, and distinguish which competencies can be purchased when required. The option of using a model to balance a team (whether the team be entirely composed of managers or plus non managerial staff) has inherent sense, and would serve a far greater range of New Zealand organisations.

3.5.2. Evidence on Managerial Learning and Competence

In addition to the philosophical debates surrounding the competency paradigm presented in Sections 3.6 and 3.7, there are independent debates concerning management learning. The debates concerning managerial learning of competence centre around the following major issues:

- whether all competencies can be taught
- method of learning
- place of learning
- method of measurement
- place of measurement
- forces operating against effective management development
To begin this discussion it would be useful to first define the terms used in the literature, and clarify the assumptions pertaining to competency-based managerial learning and development. Management education can be thought of as the conceptual understanding and skills acquired through formal education channels. Management development is defined as any process that adds to the knowledge and skills of a manager by means other than formal education. Management training is a subset of management development, being more organisation- and position-specific than general development (Broscow & Kleiner, 1991).

When using a competency-based approach the inherent assumptions are that there will be a need to assess the existing areas of competence to be found in an individual, and the level of competence they are currently at. The initial strengths and weaknesses that are revealed serve as the basis for directing development. Ongoing assessment serves to measure the impact of the development programme, and re-evaluates the individual's changing levels of competence and effectiveness, to feed back into the development cycle.

There is debate in the literature as to whether all management competencies can be taught. While the availability of leadership, communication, team building, and other such hard core management competencies development programmes attest to the belief that these skills can be taught, there is doubt expressed about whether the softer, more abstract competencies such as sensitivity, creativity, judgement, and risk taking for example, can be taught/developed and measured (Glaze, 1989; Jacobs, 1989). A common sense approach would suggest that these softer characteristics would exist to various degrees in most individuals just like the hard characteristics, which at least provides a platform for development. Dulewicz (1989) states clearly that levels of sensitivity and creativity are measured at Assessment Centres using established psychometric methods, and many tools from the discipline of psychology are available and used to assess cognitive strategies and personality factors (Cockerill, 1989; Payne, Anderson, & Smith, 1992). It could also be argued that an indication of competence level by
inference is better than no information at all, and an inability to measure does not equate with an inability to develop. On the other hand, the ability to measure does not always equate to the ability to develop, either.

Osbaldeston and Barham (1992) provide a summary of three approaches to management development, with a strong recommendation that organisations should strive to use the third option. The three approaches are shown in Table 3.9 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Fragmented Approach</th>
<th>The Formalised Approach</th>
<th>The Focused Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A cost, not an investment</td>
<td>Systematic, part of career development</td>
<td>A continuous learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not linked to organisation goals</td>
<td>Linked to human resource needs</td>
<td>Essential for business survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived as a luxury</td>
<td>Linked to appraisal-individual needs</td>
<td>A competitive weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Knowledge-based courses, plus a focus on skills</td>
<td>Linked to organisational strategy and individual goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In training department</td>
<td>Linked to career development</td>
<td>On-the-job specialist courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primarily knowledge-based courses</td>
<td>Carried out by trainers and line management</td>
<td>Self-selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About training, not development</td>
<td>Linked to the job by pre/post course work</td>
<td>Usually nondirective, novel methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Line managers responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3.9: Osbaldeston and Barham’s three approaches to management development

It is clear from Osbaldeston and Barham’s summary that the three philosophies underpinning management development approaches are based on differing values, and degrees of structure.

In the fragmented approach, management development is not valued, and is highly structured.
In the formalised approach it is valued, and semi-structured. In the focused approach, management development is highly valued and unstructured. Perhaps these three approaches reflect prevalent attitudes to management development in organisations that steadfastly retain the traditional management style (fragmented approach), or are in transition towards a more contemporary management style (formalised approach), or have a contemporary management style (focused approach). There are a number of methods used in formal management development and training. In summary they are:

- programmed instruction
- computer-assisted learning
- psychodynamic techniques
- action learning
- experiential learning

Depending upon what learning is desired, programmes can be residential, in-house, attending workshops at an outside development/training facility, on-the-job, or conducted in the outdoors environment. These different methods have been developed to address the various learning processes in management learning, which can be categorised as cognitive, attitudinal, and practice (Linstead, 1990; Thorpe, 1990). Canning (1990) makes the important point that much informal management development occurs on an ad hoc basis through everyday occurrences.

There are also university courses addressing management development. Broscow and Kleiner (1991) suggest that university management development programmes such as the MBA focus “...almost entirely on technical areas - and leave the student lacking in cultural expertise.” (p.26). These authors go on to claim that these programmes are designed to produce specialists, when it is generalists that are now required, and note that university courses are a series of
separate topics which are not tied together in a meaningful way. Osterweil (1992) reports that there are "... criticisms of business schools for providing management development programmes which attend to the needs of the faculty rather than those of the participants." (p. 27). New Zealand is not exempt from criticism, with Cammock (1991) noting that "This finding suggests the need for an MBA process that provides for the development of the individuals interpersonal and intuitive skills and insights as well as catering to more conventional technical and analytic development." (p. 11). Osbaldeston and Barham (1992) echo these criticisms with regard to commercial development programmes. These findings raise the question whether the available management development programmes in New Zealand are actually addressing the needs of managers.

The major debate concerning managerial learning is that of which methods do and do not facilitate the transfer of learning back to the workplace. It would appear that a primary requirement for the transfer of knowledge or skills from the learning situation to the organisation is whether the manager has the appropriate support and reinforcement for applying the new knowledge or skills (Jackson, 1989, 1991; Osterweil, 1992). However, the action learning and experiential learning techniques appear to have the most support in general terms, especially if conducted in-house and involving organisational situations and members (Berger, 1989; Broscow & Kleiner, 1991; Thorpe, 1990).

An argument related to method and place of learning is that of the method and place of the learning outcome measurement. One problem appears to be whether inputs, process, outputs, or outcomes. Some researchers use self and/or other ratings (Dulewicz, 1989), others use assessment panels (Jackson, 1991), manager and boss interviews (Berger, 1989) and there is the popular survey/questionnaire method (Blanchard, 1990; Dalton & Sandholtz, 1990; Nowlin & Hickok 1992; Osterweil, 1992).
Another problem posed for measuring competencies concerns whether assessing specific inputs or outputs on certain measures said to demonstrate some level of competence actually relates to a global expression of competency in the workplace. Furnham (1990) asks whether possession of a competency means it will invariably be used on a day-to-day basis, given changes in stress and anxiety levels, for example. Yet another more subtle problem is the need to distinguish between incompetence, which is knowing how to do a task/job and doing it badly, and no competence, which is not knowing how to do it in the first place (Furnham, 1990).

Issues concerning gender and management development were also found in the literature. While noting that the incidence of women holding senior management positions was low (Guerrier & Riley, 1992), writers also suggest that women are restricted in their choice of development programmes by virtue of their gender. That is, women are limited by family obligations in a manner that their male counterparts are not, and cannot participate so easily in residential or other programmes requiring extended time components (Cahoon, 1991). The available options here are to take a “that’s life” approach, or investigate the possibility of a women’s management development programme tailored more to their needs.

To summarise the evidence on managerial learning of competencies so far, it would appear that managers can learn most of the identified competencies, although there are a few areas in need of further investigation and clarification. Management learning seems best accomplished by well-known adult education methods. A cogent and acceptable method to 1) identify incompetence, 2) identify no competence, 3) establish an initial level of competence, 4) measure changes in level of competence, and 5) measure a manager’s impact on organisational performance, has not been identified. Managers need active encouragement and support from those above and around them, and more specifically, require the right organisational culture in which to express new or developed competencies. It may be that existing management
development programmes are not specifically addressing the current needs of New Zealand managers, and this requires investigation.

The final issues to be addressed in this section are the positive and negative forces operating on the development of competencies. Much rests upon the attitude of the individual manager, but some issues concern organisational circumstances.

Management development incurs costs for the organisation in terms of losing the manager for the period of training in addition to the cost of the training programme. This, according to Glaze (1989) leads some managers to choose a course which “...does not interfere significantly with the department's work programme and budget.” (p.46). It is clear that this that this approach will not produce the quality of management development that is required.

Canning (1990) suggests that “...one of the reasons for training being seen as peripheral in organisations is the way it seems to respond relentlessly to professional fads.” (p.13), which is a sentiment expressed by other authors. The inference is that managers are therefore wary or cynical about management development. In terms of individual motivation, Baker (1991) discusses an expectancy model where-by managers assess the relative value of their effort, whether success will lead to a pay-off or reward, and whether they actually value the reward. This indicates a need to ensure that relative inputs and reward/reinforcement system is both balanced, and valued by managers.

Davis, Hellervik, and Sheard (1986, p.4) list a number of obstacles to management development, as shown below.

- those needing development don't recognise their needs
- many people think that all development activities involve missing work to attend some sort of training programme
- most managers feel they don't have time for development activities
- growth and development require planning and hard work
- development involves changing, and change can be difficult
many people feel vulnerable in developmental settings

many think of development as working on weaknesses that they don't want to expose to others

many managers fail to develop specific action plans by which to manage their development

many managers fail to set specific and measurable developmental objectives for themselves

individual development is something that is easy to put off and always takes a "back burner" to other day-to-day priorities - thus, we procrastinate.

In terms of the positive factors operating on management development, it would appear that managers ought to be given the time, support, encouragement, and guidance to formulate their development needs and plan how they can achieve the objectives. If a holistic approach to development is taken (ie health, stress, knowledge, attitudes, skills, etc.), and self responsibility is stressed, it is more likely that managers would be willing and motivated to engage in developmental activities (Davis, Hellervik, & Sheard, 1986). In the same way that an appropriate organisational culture can support transference of learning to the workplace, it can also foster the motivation to develop competencies in the first instance.

3.5.3. Formal Development or Natural Ability?

It was assumed that the EMBA and MMBA study participants and the academic/teaching respondents would tend to rate formal education and development highly, so to avoid a bias in this direction, only practising managers outside the education system were asked to rate the relative value of each factor.

The mail survey respondents were asked to rate the value of formal education and development, and natural ability. A 5-point rating scale was used for both factors:
low-----moderate-----neutral-----valued-----highly valued.

It was clear that this sample of practising managers valued natural ability and experience more highly than formal education and development, with formal education and development rated as being valued by 48%, and highly valued by 48%, while natural ability was rated as being valued (24%), and highly valued (72%).

This is not because this sample were unfamiliar with, or did not value, formal education and development, as nearly half had a bachelor’s degree (45%), 17% had a Masters degree, 14% had some form of Diploma or certificate (14%), or other industry qualification (17%). There was one respondent with a PhD. Although this requires a more in-depth investigation, it may be that valuing natural ability and experience so much more highly than formal education and development may be hindering development motivation in New Zealand managers.

This section has explored the evidence on managerial learning of competencies. It would appear that this is an area urgently in need of further research efforts to provide methods to firstly assess competence (including no competence and incompetence), and then provide the appropriate means to learn the missing skills, strengthen weak skills, and develop the required personal characteristics.

It has also been revealed that there are many and diverse reasons why managers hesitate or may not seek training and development, which may indicate the need to develop a programme targeted to change New Zealand managers attitudes towards development, as a precursor to development attempts. It is of concern that current development programmes may not be addressing current or future management needs, and that female managers may be unfairly disadvantaged by the available programmes, indicating a need for further investigation.
3.6. Management Competencies: Concerns and Caveats

Given the direction of the international literature, and the consistency of the New Zealand concept maps, the case for competencies appears compelling, and articulates well with other significant policy documents regarding New Zealand's managerial future. There are, however, a number of issues and assumptions that are potentially worrisome and deserve consideration within the debate.

3.6.1. Management is Not Defined.

Throughout the competency literature, management - a central tenet of this research - is either not defined (the majority of the literature), glibly and unhelpfully defined (for example, getting results through others), or tautologically defined as the sum of the sub-attributes generated as contributing to "it". Historically, management has been defined in terms of functions and activities, roles and attributions, and is co-mingled with leadership (even more definitionally problematic), organisational structure (for example, "middle" and "senior" management, "line" and "staff" management) and sub-tasks that may not be "managerial" in nature, (for example, time management, meeting management) but have the management title appended to connote efficacy or professionalism.

The chaotic nature of definitions of management contributes to a multiplicity of "evoked sets" (Harper & Campbell-Hunt (1993); Trochim, 1989) from which models are constructed, concept maps are generated, and policy is formulated. It may be argued that definition rests on consensus, but there is considerable ambiguity in definitions that rest on compiled abstractions, which is manifest when managerial definitions are tested in commercial settings to answer foundation questions such as, "Is this management?". It is an even more critical issue in New Zealand organisations, which lack the organisation size and complexity that have traditionally
produced external markers of managerial status and the work specialisation of "management". Similarly the chaotic commercial environment and internal workplace reform have transformed the structure and nature of "managerial" work, such that no historical benchmark may effectively capture contemporary or future "management" definitions.

The idea of definitional probity is scientific in origin, rooted in the fundamental epistemological debates of Greece. It is reinforced by both the mechanistic (company as machine) and organismic (company as biological organism) views of organisations (Morgan, 1986). Many contemporary writers, however, see management more as an expression of artistry than science (see, for example, Bolman and Deal, 1991, Morgan, 1986, and Vaill, 1989). The conceptualisation of management as art side-steps the definitional issue by characterising management as a holistic, unfragmentable interactive performance. In this characterisation, management, like art in general, is something that "we know when we see it", echoing views on pornography and other similar phenomenon that are particularly socially and temporally bound. This view, however, is inherently inconsistent with the process of fractionating management into constituent competencies. Thus, if we pursue management competencies, a foundation definition of management, that does not rely on the competencies to be derived, is essential.

Further, competency models assume not only that management is well understood, but that it is relatively homogeneous. Aside from some intuitive core competencies (for example, some ability to communicate is probably desirable), there is substantial evidence, in this research and others, that environmental factors - among them organisational size and stage of lifecycle - impact at a minimum the mix and relative importance of skills and characteristics.
3.6.2. Competency is Not Defined

While the definition of competency is plagued by similar issues as those confronting the definition of management, there are some additional concerns here as well, that have been well-documented in the attempts to apply competency models to human resource systems in organisations, particularly in the area of pay.

The Oxford Dictionary defines both competence and competency in reference to competent, which is defined as "having the required ability, knowledge or authority; effective, adequate." (emphasis added). While this definition does capture the cognitive characteristics and applied techniques elements of the competency model presented above, it inherently recognises the contextual nature of competence - in that these abilities and knowledge must be present in the amount required - presumably in the judgement of another - for adequacy or effectiveness in a situation. Thus the level judged competent could vary by organisation and scenario. The difficulty of assessing competency is articulated clearly in the training and development literature which differentiates training efficacy in terms of knowledge, application and impact. As an example, take the frequently mentioned "competency" of delegation. There are three potential levels of competency:

1. That the manager understands techniques of delegation, and values the potential outcomes of delegation.
2. That the manager actually delegates activities correctly.
3. That the process of delegation has a positive impact on the organisation.

While these three levels are not independent, they are nested, and can stop at earlier steps without carry through. As pay-for-skill programmes have discovered, employees may develop skills to effect a reward, and then not practice them again or not even believe that their practice is appropriate.
Further, competency is often approached in the management literature as if it were a dichotomous variable - managers, or potential managers, either have “it” or they do not. In reality, shades of grey are far more common than black-and-white determinations, and most of the selection literature emphasises establishing thresholds for adequacy and then appraising relative levels of mastery above the threshold. Managers may be incompetent - do “it” badly, not competent - have no experience, positive or negative, or may demonstrate degrees of competency from apprentice to grand master.

Some organisations develop competency lists and descriptions that reflect “Superman” performance expectations. These organisations defend such practices by citing research and experience that suggests that employees may interpret “average” goals as something which, having been attained, are the endpoint of endeavour. Aside from representing a rather grim view of human nature, an integration with goal-setting literature suggests that “superman” competence levels or “excellences” may de-motivate staff and that moderately achievable levels are more functional. This also leads to the third point, the purpose to which competencies are put.

3.6.3. The Uses (and Abuses) of Competencies
The greatest discomfort encountered in a consideration of the competency literature, is the prevalent conflict of interest that is presented by assessors, trainers and developers establishing competency models which, as it turns out, contain predominantly elements that are assessable, trainable and developable. Again borrowing from the philosophy of science, the competency literature is far from objective, from both the perspective of researcher and source.

Aside from the use-bounded development of competency models, the source of information about the nature of management is quite often current managers (either by means of
observation or self report), who have a vested interest in maintaining a picture of management that corresponds to that which they are capable of performing. Managers' reports particularly, have a high potential for social desirability and may reflect what managers think they should be doing rather than their actual activities and attitudes. This disconnection has long been noted in the research literature regarding managerial feedback seeking behaviour and self-assessment and the well-documented gap between theory-in-action and theory-in-use (Argyris & Schon, 1974).

In asking what good management practice is, subtle nuances in source can have substantial impacts on results. For example, asking subordinates what management is, evokes and reinforces the emphasis on interpersonal/staff management - both attitudinal and skills. Shifting the enquiry to leadership, which several authors have offered as the evolutionary goal of management, can evoke an increased emphasis on “vision” and communication, as well as personal characteristics (it would seem that there are a majority of naive trait theorists), and a shift toward external issues can be evoked by adding “strategic” to management. Beyond this, the context and social meaning of management plays an important role in shaping what is an evoked stereotype.

3.6.4. The Context and History of Management

It has recently been suggested that the alarm bell for the impact of change on management has been rung too loudly and too long to have any remaining credibility. The contextual clause, “never before has management faced such an environment of change and turmoil...” has preceded management prescriptions for close to a century.

If the premise is accepted that organisations, their environments and their managers have been in a continual period of transition, albeit accelerating, for the last century, then looking for a temporal discontinuity in management practice becomes rather meaningless. Within that,
however, the management literature, and particularly the popular understanding of management, has depended upon a perception of relative stability, and of reinforcing hierarchy. Managers were grey-suited, middle aged men from the dominant ethnic group, who inhabited impressive edifices housing organisations of substantial size and hierarchy. The models presented, with their lack of external orientation have implicitly (and in some cases, explicitly) assumed this. These models, however, have considerably less merit in New Zealand's myriad of smaller (less than fifty people) organisations and a deregulated, global marketplace, where the external orientation of Harper and Campbell-Hunt's (1992) sustained adaptation becomes increasingly necessary. At a minimum, the future of management may be radically different to contemporary experience and historical practices.

Despite these caveats, the notion of management competencies may have a compelling place in policy formulation, that of signalling issues that the nation believes are essential to, or underlie, international competitiveness. Whether they have a prescriptive value (thou shalt be competent in...) remains subject to consideration of the concerns stated above.

3.7. Competency in New Zealand: Many Paths, No Short Cuts

Is it possible to not favour increasing managerial competencies in New Zealand? To do so would be to ignore waves of national and international research findings which highlight New Zealand managers' relative lack of formal education and sophistication in the social and interpersonal aspects of management (OECD, 1997). Moreover, increased competency, well-honed skills and well-balanced attitudes will be required by all members of all organisations and all nations - not just New Zealand - hoping to compete internationally in the future. So, to the question, "should we pursue a path of improving the competency (e.g. education, personal development, skills, ability and attitudes) of New Zealand managers?" The answer is yes.
Given that improved managerial competency would be a good thing for New Zealand, the question remains whether or not a national generic competency-based training framework is a) possible to identify, and b) a good thing to have and endorse. This study sheds light on some of the specific skill and attitudes which New Zealand managers would do well to address. Specifically, managers in the study sample emphasised soft interpersonal skills, systems thinking especially with more external focus, and managing culture as skill themes which could be greatly enhanced within the ranks of New Zealand management. Also identified as areas for improvement are attitudes and personal abilities to be creative, reflective, take a long-term view, and be steady and consistent, i.e., "walking the talk," especially when the bottom line becomes an easy excuse for forgetting all else and regressing to tyranny. Underpinning these skill and attitudinal themes are related competencies which are believed to complement and contribute to the success of managers. It is believed that it is possible to identify competencies valued and needed among New Zealand managers. Submitted within this report is a tentative list of generic core competencies identified by New Zealand managers as necessary and/or desirable for more effective management in New Zealand.

Is such a list a good thing to have and endorse? First, let's consider how such a list of core competencies might be useful. Essentially the competencies defined here offer a sound framework upon which to base personal and professional feedback to managers. Knowing that this list of core competencies was produced not by some off-shore training guru, but by New Zealand managers, many other New Zealand managers may want to gather feedback from peers and subordinates regarding their ability to meet these criteria for successful management. Such feedback may lead many managers to seek further education and training in weak areas while reinforcing their demonstrated strengths. It is reasonable, therefore, to believe that one use of the core competencies list would be for individual feedback and subsequent personal development.
Measurement of core competencies might also be useful as a benchmarking tool within or across New Zealand industries. Benchmarking is a form of feedback used by firms to assess strengths and weaknesses and to learn from exemplary organisations. Benchmarking managerial competency, in addition to other measures, usually including quality improvement practices and customer service, could advance the awareness and achievement of large numbers of New Zealand managers. Well-managed companies and organisations could lead the way for others to follow. Perhaps it is time to learn from the tall poppies and to grow everyone up to their highest potential.

Feedback and benchmarking represent the good news about establishing a list of core competencies for New Zealand management. For these and other commercial reasons, competency-based training is already being introduced into New Zealand by consulting firms, training companies and educational institutions. Indeed, the list of competencies reported here may well coincide or overlap with competencies featured in such training programmes. Based on the high usage of competency-based training models in other countries, competency-based training is and will continue being established in New Zealand with or without this study. Given this trend and the insights gained from this research, further research on the topic of New Zealand-specific competencies should be extended in order to inform trainers providing competency-based training in New Zealand. The concept mapping conceptualisation process, in conjunction with other methods should yield valuable understanding into the essential attributes of New Zealand management practices. Such research will have direct applicability in preparing the country for competing internationally in the decades to come.

Given the fact that competency-based training is here to stay for some time and that further research is needed, the question remains as to whether or not a standardised New Zealand-specific competency-based training initiative would serve to upgrade management skills and thereby improve the country’s overall competitiveness. Probably not, or at least not
without the following caveats. While the value of a competencies framework for systematic feedback and widespread focus on upgrading managerial skill levels has been pointed out, there are, nevertheless several serious problems associated with standardising competency-based training. Four key concerns are discussed in the previous section. These include the problems associated with defining “management”, defining “competency”, uses and abuses of standardised testing, and the overall contextual and historical biases inherent in deciding who are “good” managers and what it is that makes them good. Even if these issues could be adequately resolved, and there was some way to feel certain about what would be evaluated in competency assessments, there are still the issues of how standardised testing affects individuals.

In general, most adults experience some level of anxiety when being examined or tested. This reaction is particularly evident in adults with limited formal education, as they have had less experience with sitting tests and exams. Given the low percentage of New Zealander managers with tertiary and other formal educational training, standardised competency tests are likely to produce high levels of anxiety and actually reduce self-confidence, a crucial element of managerial competence. Irv Rubin, reknown corporate trainer and education expert, having worked for many years with New Zealand managers through New Zealand Institute of Management (NZIM) programmes, recently remarked that unlike managers and MBA students in the United States who need to be humbled and brought down, New Zealand managers need to be given confidence and encouragement in training and educational settings. Bearing upon this observed need for support and encouragement in developing New Zealand managers, this study found that, except for the “outstanding” ones, New Zealand managers under duress (and often based on feelings of insecurity) tend to become authoritarian and task-, number- and control-oriented. Assuming that trainers would be empathetic to trainees, there is evidence to suggest that competency-based training which can be quantified could easily be used by insecure and
uninformed managers for comparing individuals and/or groups. If this were the case, competency competition would be intimidating if not devastating for learners. Hence, there is a strong possibility that the act of measuring core competencies might ironically destroy or damage confidence, the very core of competence.

An alternate side effect of extreme attention being paid to one particular training approach is that a form of “competency count-down” might begin to take place among managers. Managers might begin keeping score and competing to “check-off” competencies from a prescribed list, rather than pursue personalised goals of growth and development. Not only would a checklist effect defeat the life-long learning aspect of training, but it could undermine team cohesion in groups and organisations. As Senge (1990) suggests, team learning is a key aspect of a learning organisation. Segmenting learning into discrete particles and counting these on an individual basis runs counter to team-based environments which most organisations are endeavouring to become. Finally, it must be pointed out that the overall goal is not for New Zealand managers to just be “competent”, but for them to be energetic, creative, innovative, and confident. Competency is the short-term objective, but the long-term goal is excellence. While individual excellence is worthwhile, it is of little value to an organisation unless it is somehow connected to team and organisational development.

There are also practical questions of training effectiveness to consider. Will training and development materials and techniques used in New Zealand under a competency-based model be significantly better than models which might be used otherwise? Training is all about improving people’s skills and abilities. Competency is about improved skills and abilities. The fact is, there is virtually no training material or technique which can not be adapted and "re-packaged" as competency-based training. This is important, not because existing training materials and techniques are inadequate, but because re-packaged material will be discovered and participants will become cynical. Cynicism blunts the learning process and soon the “new”
training approach will be lumped with the old and rejected as a passing fad or trendy name for the same old material. Over-rating the potential of the competency movement at a national level will no doubt persuade every training organisation to jump on the competencies band wagon, whether they are properly prepared or not.

Finally, while it is impossible to deny the value of competency-based training and the need for increased competency and training among New Zealand managers, competency-based training tends to oversimplify the nature of management and managerial training. A list of core competencies through which one may progress through workshops and training seminars and thus be certified as competent belies the fact that human growth and development is a long-term, complex and challenging process. Competency models of training, like many other packaged training approaches, make sense at face value and are based on good ideas, but are susceptible to failure by attempting to translate the complexity of human education and development into a deceptively easy set of criteria and training modules. New Zealand managers need to improve their core competencies, but competency is not enough. Managers need to undertake the serious and long-term challenge of becoming the best they can be, to excel in order to be of value in New Zealand's competitive future.

New Zealand managers (and all workers for that matter) should be encouraged and supported in pursuing paths toward personal development, toward competency in a variety of skill areas. Despite a history of pragmatic, pulling one's self up by one's boot straps through the school of hard knocks, most managers now recognise the need for training in order to meet the personal and organisational challenges of successfully managing in today's environment. How will these managers get to the level of proficiency they seek? Many will get structured feedback and skill assessment via competency-based training modules offered by their work organisation and provided by internal and/or external training organisations. Many, more in the future than in the past, will come into organisations with tertiary and school certificate qualifications before
they begin their work and management careers. Many will enrol in post-experience courses such as diploma and MBA degree programmes. Many will enrol in self-development and/or management development programmes offered by a variety of training companies, community service agencies, and professional organisations. And many will wind their own way through overseas experience, arts and other walks of life into management responsibilities.

No one avenue provides all the training a person needs to be competent, let alone excellent. No one best way can be identified as the way to develop competent managers. All learning is a life-long journey, not simply a qualification, a training course, nor is it a checklist of skills to tick off and be done with. So, when considering whether competency-based training is the key to New Zealand's competitive advantage for the future, it is important to remember that there are many paths to the temple of understanding, but there are no short-cuts.

Having discussed the broad issues, discussion now turns to an in-depth investigation of gender issues in managerial effectiveness through an analysis of the literature on sex and gender differences, and an empirical study.
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4. GENDER ISSUES

The first series of studies reported were focused upon an assessment of current perceptions of skills and characteristics contributing to managerial effectiveness in New Zealand, and integrating that with the international literature. During the course of the literature analysis for that study it was noticed that there were many gender issues interwoven with various aspects of effectiveness. Although important issues were revealed, an in-depth analysis of the influence and impacts of the gender factor was beyond the scope of the first studies, indicating a need to address these issues with further research. This section presents a review of the literature on sex and gender differences relevant to managerial effectiveness, and reports the results of an empirical study to extend and validate the literature research and investigate in more depth some of the gender issues to emerge in the first phase of the research. The sample design, methods and procedures used in this study are reported in Section two.

4.1. Introduction

Issues to do with women in management, and sex and gender related issues in general, are recurrent themes in the literature. Efforts have been made to establish whether men and women have similar or different management and leadership styles (Kanter, 1977; Scott, 1986; Shipper, 1994), and where differences are found, whether one style is more effective than the other is of interest (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995; Loden, 1985; Stanford, Oates, & Flores, 1995). Differences in employment conditions and career issues have also been investigated (Arthur, Hall, & Lawrence, 1989; Evetts, 1994; Tharenou, Latimer, & Conroy, 1994).

1 An abridged version of this research appears as 'Managerial effectiveness: What's sex got to do with it?' International Review of Women in Leadership, 2 (2), 30-59, 1996.
Depending upon the perspective taken, differences are expected as a result of 1) sex differences determined by biological factors, or 2) conformity of male and female behaviour to socially constructed gender roles and gender related characteristics.

Most of the management research into sex and gender issues discusses the phenomenon of gender role stereotyping, and how this spills over into organisation politics, activities, and interactions of employees to govern behaviour and perceptions in organisations (Gethman, 1987; Nieva & Gutek, 1981; Russ & McNeilly, 1988). This is where the sex roles of men and women have become social gender roles, with associated gender related characteristics, where occupations are appropriate to one sex and not the other (Christie, 1994), and where the sex of an individual determines appearance and behaviour of the sexes in social situations (Rambo, 1982, p.458).

The impacts of gender role spillover (GRS) in organisations are usually discussed in terms of serious disadvantages to women, and to women managers in particular. There is particular concern over the issues that women managers must face, which men do not. By virtue of their sex, women as managers face:

- Negative stereotyping of women and women’s characteristics, whereby women are perceived to be psychologically and cognitively inferior to men (Kirk & Maddox, 1988; Mann, 1995; Tannen, 1995; Waring, 1988), where the skills and characteristics of women managers are discounted relative to men (Schaef, 1985; Thorne & Henley, 1975), and where women are perceived to possess inherent traits which are inappropriate for managerial roles (Hennig & Jardin, 1977; Fagenson, 1990; Miller, 1986; Schein, 1973, 1975).
- Women being paid less for the same job (Jacques, 1987; Olcott, 1996; McGregor, Thomson, & Dewe, 1994).
• The "Glass Ceiling Effect" where a women’s career path is slower, and does not progress to the same levels as men (Burton, 1991; Davis, 1996; O'Leary & Ickovics, 1992; Olsen & Frieze, 1991; Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990; Quinn, 1987), despite often being equally or more effective as managers (Flynn, 1994), more highly qualified (McGregor, Thomson, & Dewe, 1994), and more experienced (Waring, 1988, p.42) than the male counterparts being promoted above them.

• Balancing the needs of home, family, and career (Berg & Hunter, 1990; Doyle, 1988; Erlich, 1989; Murray, 1987).

• Time involvement, and timing can be a problem, in that managerial work involves long hours at the office, and meetings are often scheduled at breakfast time or evening, making it difficult for managers who are wives and mothers as well (Mann, 1995).

• Exclusion occurs when a peer group of male managers go for a game of golf, or on a night out, where a woman does not fit in well. Men talking about women (often in a condescending or derogatory way), and other male related subjects, also serve to exclude women. Having informal discussions while in the shower room at the club, or in the toilets, are also not options for a woman manager (Mann, 1995).

• Maternity issues to do with needing to make a decision about whether to have, or delay having a family, as well as pregnancy and ongoing child care matters are concerns for women and not men; the “mommy track” debate (Cahoon & Rowney, 1991; Ehrlich, 1989; Schwartz, 1989; Wong, 1987).

• The need for coping strategies in order to operate within a male created environment that is uncomfortable for, and sometimes hostile to, women as managers. Examples of coping strategies are the need to assume a more masculine approach, and/or repressing aspects of femininity which are regarded in a particularly negative way, (for example, asking
questions) (Pringle, 1994; Sargent, 1983; Watson, 1988). In a related sense, many women feel the need to “look like a lady, act like man, and work like a dog” before they are taken seriously as managers (Korndorffer, 1992).

- Sexual harassment and workplace ribaldry treats women as sex objects (Barrett, 1986).
- Appearance is a different issue for women than it is for men, where a woman must be careful not to dress suggestively, and where ultra-feminine attire such as chiffon and organza is also inappropriate for women as managers (Fritz, 1988).
- Overseas posting can also be a different issue for women in comparison to men, where a single woman can be seen as being too vulnerable to be sent overseas, and a married woman could have domestic problems (Kirk & Maddox, 1988).

Apart from the unnecessary stress and angst this situation causes women managers, it reduces their potential effectiveness as managers and leaders, and corporations are losing good managers who leave in frustration to start their own businesses, which they do particularly well (Crosthwaite, 1986; Jacobs & Hardesty, 1987). Unlike most previous research, the purpose of the present study was to explore not only the effects of GRS on women, but to also to discuss GRS as a phenomenon that reduces the effectiveness of both men and women managers. Further, the study begins to explore and measure the differential effect of GRS on men and women managers. This is accomplished by:

1. An investigation of the literature to establish real sex differences which are likely to influence managerial style.

2. An investigation of the literature to establish the effects of GRS on men and women as managers.

3. An empirical study to establish a) whether men and women managers have different perceptions about what constitutes effective management practice in the 1990s, and b) if their perceptions are different, to what extent the difference can be related to the effects of GRS.
4.2. Literature on Sex and Gender Differences

The sex of a fetus is determined at the time of conception. From birth, societal influences operate to either reinforce or moderate innate sex related behaviour to shape gender appropriate behaviour (Carlson, 1981; Le Vay, 1993; Lips, Myers, & Colwill, 1978; Parsons, 1980). This section reviews the literature on established sex differences, then reviews how gender stereotypical thinking, through social conditioning, shapes “masculine” and “feminine” behaviour and appearance.

4.2.1. Aggression

It is a well established principle in neuroscience that without the timely intervention of the steroid testosterone, all human fetuses would be born female (Carlson, 1981; Le Vay, 1993). It would seem that there exists a critical time band where either as a result of the Y chromosome (or steroid medication) testosterone levels rise to androgynise the brain. The outcome is to produce a characteristically male brain, which in turn drives sexual dimorphism and typical male sexual characteristics in terms of genitalia, facial hair, more muscular build, and so on. Without a rise in testosterone within that critical time band the fetus develops female brain organisation and female sexual characteristics by default, hence the need for testosterone to androgynise a female template.

A corollary of having a male brain and higher testosterone levels is more aggressive behaviour, where in all species the male is more aggressive (Carlson, 1981; Josephson & Colwill, 1978; Le Vay, 1993). Aggression has been categorised as being intermale, interspecies, and sexual, where aggression is manifest in strategies of force and dominance. This is not to say that females are without aggression; the evidence on maternal aggression
shows that females will attack much larger animals and kill to protect their young. It is more the case that male aggression is more generalised. There is, however, great individual difference where in some cases women can be more aggressive than some men, but the fact remains that males as a group are predisposed to use more aggressive life strategies than females. It also follows that women are predisposed to use life strategies other than aggression unless their offspring are threatened.

Aggressiveness in a modern human context refers to an internalised need to be in a dominant position, and the idea that men will be more competitive about reaching a perceived position of superiority and dominance (Henley, 1977; Schaef, 1985; Tannen, 1995).

4.2.3. Cognitive Function

Neuropsychology and cognitive psychology have contributed to the understanding of male and female differences by establishing that males are superior to females on tasks involving configural (nonverbal, pictorial patterns) problem solving and creativity, in comparison to female superiority in verbal problem solving and creativity. In these disciplines problem solving is defined as finding a satisfactory method of reaching a goal when that goal is not readily available, and creativity is considered to be a subset of problem solving, where a mental set needs to be broken to find a solution that is both unusual and useful (Matlin, 1983, p.6).

Once again it must be stressed that there is great individual difference and overlap between male and female performance in these tasks, and the differences are relatively small. Even so, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) state that “Female superiority on verbal tasks has been one of the more solidly established generalisations in the field of sex differences.” (p.75). Female brain organisation differs from male in that females have a larger corpus callosum (an
interconnective structure between the hemispheres), and have more right hemisphere language functions than males (Carlson, 1981; LeVay, 1993). Some believe that the better left-right hemisphere interconnection and right hemisphere involvement in language functions underpins female superiority with verbal material (Corballis, 1983, p.97). Verbal differences emerge early, with girls developing language skills faster and earlier than boys, and having better articulation of words (Matlin, 1983, p.366).

Memory functions (such as encoding and retrieval) and capabilities (such as capacity) do not differ between the sexes. However, memory content appears to reveal some differences, where females are better with recall of verbal material and material with social content (Matlin, 1983, p.361).

In all other aspects of human cognitive function and behaviour, there are no other established sex differences, with males and females showing the same range and level of human skills and characteristics. In summary then, the only sex differences likely to impact on management style or effectiveness are differences in aggressive predisposition, and in relative strength and weakness in cognitive strategies used to analyse information. The relative value of these characteristics is not of interest - what is of interest is that both sexes have sex-linked characteristics useful to managerial effectiveness.

These innate sex differences are confounded by social conditioning where from infancy, boys and girls are treated differently in order to train children for their adult roles (Blum & Smith, 1988). The following section discusses managers as human beings, in that basic human skills and characteristics common to both are differentially shaped from birth into "gender appropriate", and dichotomised behaviours considered to be "masculine" or "feminine", and therefore appropriate to the perceived gender role. In other words, human skills and
characteristics become dichotomised into “masculine” skills and characteristics, or “feminine” skills and characteristics for no other reason than through social conditioning.

4.2.4. Social Conditioning (Gender Differences)
From infancy boys are encouraged in exploratory independent play and generally given more freedom, are engaged in more rough-and-tumble play, with aggressive competitiveness for positions of social dominance reinforced (Santrock, 1983). As a result, boys and men interrupt more as a form of conversational dominance (West, 1979), create social situations where one is dominant and the other participants are subordinate or inferior (Fishman, 1983; Henley, 1977; Tannen, 1995), and spread out into available space as a form of spatial dominance (Henley, 1977). Girls are encouraged to express tender emotions, be co-operative, supportive, interdependent upon others, and show affection (Holmes & Stubbe, 1992; Santrock, 1983). Both sexes are discouraged from showing gender inappropriate behaviour (Santrock, 1983, p.237). It is in this manner that girls are prepared for motherhood and family duties, while boys are taught their roles as family breadwinners (ibid. p.221).

Childbearing capacity is universally associated with women being innately soft and nurturing in nature (O’Leary & Ickovics, 1992). While infants elicit a maternal nurturing, protective response in many women (LeVay, 1993, p.68; Lips & Colwill, 1978, p.29), it is not the case for all, and it does not follow that a maternal response is generalised to all matters, as social stereotyping would suggest.

The outcome of social conditioning is that boys and men have, and are restricted to, a characteristically masculine set of behaviours and appearance, and a worldview that reflects a sense of superiority, self reliance, and self worth, especially relative to females. In contrast, girls and women have and are restricted to, a feminine set of behaviours and appearance, a
worldview that reflects an inferior social value relative to males, and a life strategy which subsumes any strong sense of "self" within dependent relationships.

In effect, human society has created two completely different cultures for males and females (e.g. rituals, appearance, values), including different language patterns and word use between the sexes in every known linguistic community (Bodine, 1975; Campbell, 1992; Hass, 1979; Holmes & Stubbe, 1992; Tannen, 1995; Thorne, Kramarae, & Henley, 1983). Human societies everywhere, then, have spent millennia dichotomising and exaggerating the differences between the sexes, to socially construct artificial gender differences, and artificial gender related work roles, with masculine and feminine jobs (Christie, 1994).

As social beings people interact with others, form impressions, and make judgements about each other on the basis of the stereotypical thinking of the culture. Males therefore begin with an advantage, given that those they interact with also believe in the inherent superiority of the male sex and all that goes with that. Conversely, being female puts women at an immediate disadvantage, in an inferior position. Perceptions about relative superiority and inferiority in social relationships determines the manner in which the participants will interact, and the strategies that will be employed (O'Leary & Ickovics, 1992).

Studies in sociology, anthropology, and psychology have all converged in the findings that in social situations (such as in the work environment, Rambo, 1983, p.458), human communications establish the participant's power and status relationships early in the communication process, in order to determine how to behave under the given circumstances. Impressions are formed and judgements are made on the basis of how relationships are negotiated (Oresanu, Slater, & Adler, 1979; Tannen, 1995). The sex of an individual, and aspects of demeanour and appearance are taken into account when establishing these relationships, and is where the real barrier to women as managers exists.
Even if false, societal conditioning has produced men whose demeanour portrays self-efficacy and dominance, and whose appearance is linked with managerial and leadership ability. Even if false, it has produced women who are perceived to be followers of others, lacking in confidence, and inferior to men (Shipper, 1994). These are the ground rules of everyday social interactions and perceptions that are taken into organisations by the men and women employed there (Morrison & Von Glinow, 1990). When stereotypical thinking is transposed over into organisations, both men and women managers' ability to be effective is reduced, and clearly more so for women.

4.2.5. Impacts of GRS on Both Sex Managers

Organisations were created by men as a male domain from within a social construct that equated, and still equates, masculine skills and characteristics with positions of power and status, and the ability to be a manager and leader (Brenner, Tomkiewicz, & Schein, 1989; Christie, 1994; Gregerson, 1979; Rosener, 1990; Schae, 1985; Schein, 1973, 1975; Watson, 1988). In this environment the traditional planning, leading, organising, and control model of management with authoritarian power over others was a comfortable style for men. In these times GRS was helpful to males aspiring to managerial roles, as it was perceived that they had the right skills and characteristics, the right approach, and their appearance was right. For dichotomised reasons, the reverse perceptions were held about women.

Over time the business environment changed considerably, and the large hierarchical bureaucracies that had been created began to fail in the face of high tech international competition (Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993; Frater, Stuart, Rose & Andrews, 1995). The traditional management and leadership style was brought under scrutiny in this new dynamic
environment (Broscow & Kleiner, 1991), and as the workforce became more educated, and multicultural. In this new environment, managers began to lose the power and control they once had, as people now became highly skilled, more aware of their rights, more demanding about good work conditions, with increasing pressure for more participative management and leadership styles (Edwards, Laporte & Livingston, 1991; Jeffery & Ghislaine, 1986).

In the current business environment, effective management and leadership is associated with gaining the participation and involvement of subordinates through the ability to build mutually beneficial relationships, built upon the personal credibility and integrity of a manager (Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Communication, and the need to be communicative, is critical to this style of managing and leading, as are good interpersonal skills (Canning, 1990; Cockerill, 1989; Jacobs, 1989; Kanter, 1983). Men who cling to a stereotypical masculine approach to managing and leading (the command and control approach) will find that what was once effective has become ineffective, and at worst, damaging. It is in this way that the managerial effectiveness of some men is reduced by GRS.

Originally, it was thought that women, because of their feminine characteristics, would be too soft and weak to manage or lead (Campbell, 1992; Hennig & Jardim, 1977; Watson, 1988), and that managerial work would be in conflict with their primary role as mothers and wives (Fagenson, 1990). As well, few women aspired to managerial roles, being also conditioned to believe they would not be effective (Chusmir & Durand, 1988; Shipper, 1994). Women who did undertake managerial roles tended to repress femininity and adopt a characteristically masculine management approach, even wearing masculinised clothing (Fritz, 1988). This androgynous coping strategy was not effective for women, who attracted criticism and hostility for being masculine, aggressive, and unfeminine (Lips, Myers, & Colwill, 1987; Manis, Nelson, & Shedler, 1988). Women who did not adopt an androgynous approach fared
less well, with a feminine approach being perceived to be even less effective (Berg & Hunter, 1990). Women as managers were, therefore, in a no-win situation as a direct result of GRS.

With regard to the perception that management roles conflict with a woman’s primary gender role, there can be no doubt that women managers can require maternity leave, or need time off to care for sick or elderly family members, at an inopportune time for the organisation. What tends to be forgotten is that it is society that has made the care of others an implicit gender role for women, one that has turned into a career disadvantage for women managers. The domestic circumstances of men and women are different, in that the females in the family act in that support role for men, which provides men with the freedom to give priority to work (Lips & Colwill, 1978; Marshall, 1989; Pringle, 1994). Men too, can place organisations in difficult positions through personal reasons, but this is not rationalised as a sex or gender related issue and generalised to disadvantage men as a population.

In the current business environment there are still proportionally few women managers or business leaders in the large corporations, especially at senior levels (McGregor, Thomson & Dewe, 1994; Still, Guerin & Chia, 1994). Women as managers tend to be found in the occupational sectors that fit a stereotypical view of woman as a nurturing caregiver, such as social services (Cull, 1992; O’Leary & Ickovics, 1992), or they are found in their own businesses, in which they are particularly successful (Hill, 1986; Lloyd, 1986). In the traditionally male occupational domains such as the police force and business management, senior positions are still predominantly held by men, and men are perceived to be more effective compared to women when in superior roles (Cartwright & Gale, 1995; Wolff, 1996). The primary reason for this profile in management is that GRS is still negatively biasing perceptions about women as managers and leaders (Christie, 1994).
Increasingly, organisations are being encouraged to adopt a strategic perspective, competency-based model of management with human resource management as the pivotal factor (Becker & Gerhart, 1996; Delery & Doty, 1996; Iles, 1993; Youndt, Scott, Snell, Dean, & Lepak, 1996). While the traditional planning, leading, organising, and control model remains the cornerstone of most management texts (Bartol & Martin, 1991; Daft, 1997; Gilbert, Jones, Vitalis, Walker, & Gilbertson, 1995; Inkson & Kolb, 1996), there is now a need to recognise that different strategies and skills are required within these roles (Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993), and business leadership can no longer be considered as just another management role (Kotter, 1990a, 1990b; Zaleznik, 1992). So, in addition to the traditional skills and techniques of management (such as planning, implementation, and evaluation), there is now more of an emphasis on the leadership of people.

Paradoxically, as a result of their social conditioning, it may be that the management style characteristically used by women as managers may provide women with an advantage in the current business environment (Adler & Izraeli, 1994; Campbell-Hunt & Harper, 1993; Stanford, Oates, & Flores, 1995). Women tend to take a participative approach, where the involvement of others is valued, and where individual interests are subsumed in the collective interest (Bass & Avolio, 1994; Crosthwaite, 1986). Co-operation and support is gained by the development of mutually beneficial relationships in an environment of egalitarianism and valuing of people and their inputs (Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Handley, 1990; Loden, 1985). The literature suggests that women have better interpersonal skills than men (Henley, 1977; Tannen, 1995), and are more communicative with subordinates (Holmes & Stubbe, 1992). In effect, the literature is beginning to differentiate women’s style as being more transformational in nature, while men are described as being more transactional (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995; Bass & Avolio, 1994).
It is, therefore, a pity that GRS still governs perceptions, and still reduces a woman's potential to be effective as a manager, simply because their style of management is not masculine, and is therefore feminine, and discounted as being inferior. There are, however, signs that some aspects of this approach are too important, and too effective, to ignore.

As the threat of international competition has being faced, Western managers and their advisors have begun to realise the importance of involving employees in stimulating innovation, providing quality of product and service, and adding to the big picture jigsaw that is competitive advantage in the current business environment. As a result, more men are now adopting a more participative approach, although the cynical may suggest that the participation of employees is still instrumental, as opposed to the mutually beneficial relationships built by women as transformational managers (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995).

4.2.5. Summary
In summary, it has been posited that male and female infants are born with very few sex differences that are relevant to managerial roles. Males are predisposed to be more aggressive than females, and the sexes show differences in life strategies as a result of differential social conditioning of biological characteristics. Both sexes have the full range of necessary human skills and characteristics for managerial roles, with males showing an advantage with nonverbal material and females showing an advantage with verbal material. Both types of cognitive analysis are useful to managerial roles.

Social conditioning shapes male infants into becoming masculine boys and men, and shapes female infants into becoming feminine girls and women. Male aggressiveness is channeled into becoming individual competitiveness for dominance in social relationships,
with dichotomised behaviour for females, who are trained to equalise social relationships (Schaef, 1985; Tannen, 1995).

Hence GRS in organisations reduces the potential effectiveness of both men and women as managers, by restricting both sexes to specific sets of gender appropriate behaviours. The result is men who are not able to exhibit any approach or behaviour that has been categorised as feminine, and women who are unable to exhibit any approach or behaviour that is masculine.

The evidence suggests that after social conditioning both sexes have skills and characteristics of use in managerial roles, and that both approaches are effective according to circumstances. That is, at times managers need to be directive and even forceful, at other times they need the sensitivity and empathy of Mother Theresa. However, GRS is prohibiting managers from moving up and down these continuums of human behaviour.

It also should be recognised that as a result of GRS, impressions and judgements about managerial effectiveness (both in formal appraisals and in subordinate perceptions) are being made more according to how well a man has been masculine, and how well a woman has balanced being masculine and feminine, than on what is effective managerial behaviour (Edwards, Laporte, & Livingston, 1991). In effect, GRS is producing artificial and counter-productive behaviour in organisations.

GRS has an especially negative effect on women as managers, where women begin from a disadvantaged position in terms of a perception that they have less innate ability to be a manager and leader compared to men. They then remain in a disadvantaged position, despite evidence to the contrary. On the premise that both men and women managers have the full set of human skills and characteristics necessary for managerial roles, it can be argued that talent is being wasted by prohibiting the progression of women managers. Furthermore,
women are being disadvantaged on distinctions that are no more than labels attached to different ends of behavioural continuums which have become stereotypically masculine, or feminine, behaviour, but which in reality are just a range of human behaviour.

In circumstances where women are the primary, or only income earner (a massive growth area in Western cultures, Crouse, 1986; Doyle, 1988), these stereotypical beliefs are unnecessarily damaging. They are damaging in that they firstly prohibit women's ability to earn an equal living in comparison with their male counterparts, and secondly, it is therefore harder to financially support a spouse, or other caregiver, to assume domestic responsibilities.

GRS is a powerful negative force operating to mask and restrict effective managerial behaviour in many organisations. If the key to what constitutes effective management is to be found, the effects of GRS need to have some measurable parameters before the effects can be addressed. Even when identified, it will take generations before any significant change will be made, such is the extent of implicit acceptance of the way things are (Kaufman, 1986). In an effort to begin the inevitable process this study begins to measure the differential effects of GRS on men and women's communication strategies as managers, as a component of a study which examined whether men and women managers held different perceptions about what constitutes effective management in the 1990s.

The pilot study revealed that managerial work in the 1990s still consists of the traditional technical skills of planning, organising, and control, and given that both men and women managers face the same set of universal factors and response options (Kanter, 1977, p.4), it can be predicted that:

1. As a result of managerial experience, both groups will raise similar issues with regard to technical management skills, and place similar emphasis on relative importance of them.
From the preceding discussion a further three predictions can be made:

2. As a result of a biological predisposition towards aggressiveness shaped into a "masculine" approach, the male group will demonstrate a more traditional approach, where power is over others, and where communication is directive and instrumental in approach.

3. As a result of gender role spillover, the female group will hold a more androgynous sense of gender identity in a management situation, and will demonstrate the characteristically "feminine" communication purpose and style that emphasizes collectivism and the building of relationships.

4. The male group will have a masculine gender identity, as they are not required to change for a management situation, given that it is perceived to be a male job, requiring masculine characteristics.

This second exploratory study to some extent replicates the first series of studies, in that the Concept Mapping technique was used to gather data on perceptions of managerial effectiveness. The study was purposely kept small, however, because gender is an exploratory side issue to this thesis, as discussed in Section two.

Table 4.1. below shows the group matching factors, and the end matching of the groups after cancellations and no-shows. It can be seen that overall, the male group (n9) had more years managerial experience than the female group (n9), and there was no male match for the small company, middle management female manager.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Size</th>
<th>Management Level</th>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1-5  6-10  11-20+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1-5  6-10  11-20+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1-5  6-10  11-20+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1-5  6-10  11-20+</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Participant composition according to sex of manager, company size, management level, and years of managerial experience

A Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA by ranks was used to test the null hypothesis that there was no difference between male and female managers on the BSRI, and no difference
between the female managers and the female non-manager control group. At \( p < 0.05 \) the obtained KW score needed to be >3.84 to reach significance.

4.3. Results and Discussion

4.4.1. Group Gender Characteristics

It was predicted that the male group would demonstrate a masculine identity, whereas the female group was expected to demonstrate an androgynous identity.

As predicted, the male group yielded a masculine score (-1.19). The female manager group mean score fell within the androgynous range (-0.28), with the difference between groups reaching significance \( p < 0.05 \), indicating a significant gender identity difference between the groups. The female control group average was +0.21, which is also androgynous, although it is closer to feminine than the female manager group, a difference that reached significance \( p < 0.05 \). Although the difference was small, these results support previous findings that professional women score significantly higher than nonprofessional women on the androgynous to masculine scale (Sargent, 1983).

As it stands, the prediction that women managers would be more androgynous than a nonmanagerial female control group was correct. The difference in gender identity between the two female groups was measurable, and reached significance. It is tempting to speculate that the difference between the scores represents a measure of GRS, but such a measure requires further refinement. Until a study is conducted where both sex participants complete the BSRI once as managers and again as "self", or in a "gender appropriate" role, the issues to do with personal gender identity, and whether or how gender related behaviour needs to change according to occupational role, remain confounded.
In terms of this study, an objective was to establish the possibility that women managers are still needing to adopt masculinised attitudes and behaviours that are different to those they have been socially conditioned to use, whereas men do not. This objective has been met, in that compared to another group of nonmanagerial women, women managers demonstrated a more masculinised gender identity that can be theorised to be related to the GRS effect. This group of women managers have to some extent repressed or rejected a feminine gender identity to avoid negative perceptions, and have assumed masculine beliefs deemed appropriate for a managerial role.

4.4.2. Concept mapping results

To recap, the participants brainstormed what they considered to constitute “good management in the current business environment” as a group, generating a number of statements. Each statement was then rated as to its importance to the overall concept of good management by each participant, and the items sorted into what each person considered to be related groups. The statements, their ratings, and the groupings for each participant were entered into the Concept Mapping programme, to produce a “map” of each group's concept of good management.

Female Manager Statements Discussion

It was predicted that both groups would have similar perceptions about the more technical managerial skills relating to planning, organising, and control mechanisms. As it happened, both groups focused on personal skills and characteristics to the extent that there is inadequate evidence to compare.
The statements contained within each cluster, their individual ratings of importance, and cluster scores are provided in Appendix 4.1. Statements were rated between 1.56 (male) and 4.89 ("good people skills") in importance. The next lowest rated statement was female (1.67), indicating that being male or female did not rate as being an important issue to the overall concept of management for this group. The discounting of gender becomes more clear when it is seen that the next lowest rated statements were "do the do" (3.0), "understand international markets" (3.11), and "understand tradeoffs" (3.22). Note also that for this group, the two gender related items were separated out by themselves and marginalised between a cluster representing self management and another representing self development and ongoing learning. Most other issues were rated at 3.50 or over. Apart from the sex factor, the female manager group therefore considered most issues to be important in the concept of good management.

This group replicated the findings in the first series of studies where overall managerial effectiveness is about personal skills and characteristics, with an inward focus on people, and a devaluing of an external and international awareness. The group raised issues about needing an international perspective, and being market driven and so on, but then rated these statements as being helpful and desirable, but not overly important or critical. It would seem that the more immediate external environment ("good market awareness" (4.56), "customer focused" (4.78)) is more important than the more global, international scene ("understand international markets" (3.11)). Note also that at 3.67 the "external orientation" issue and "understand international markets" were amongst the overall lowest ratings. This means out of 99 statements generated, only five referred to matters outside the organisation, with an overwhelming inward focus on organisation systems and people, and on the personal
skills and characteristics of a manager. In essence, this group replicated the finding of an inward focus by New Zealand managers in the first series of studies, in every way.

The Female Manager Map

The analysis produced nineteen clusters for the female group. Appendix 4.1. shows that the lowest rated cluster was Sex/Gender at 1.61, and the highest was Subordinate Communication at 4.63. The map below shows the female managers concept of effective management can be represented as four (disregarding the gender cluster as a non-issue) distinct, yet linked, areas or aspects of management.

![Female concept map](image)

Figure 4.1: Female concept map
The four areas are:

1) The four clusters in the lefthand quadrant of the map entitled Factor Balancing, Business Acumen, Internal Operations Focus, and Thinking Ahead Strategically are somewhat distanced from other clusters, and an examination of the statements within the clusters reveals this area to be about issues to do with the here and now, linked to the future. There is a sense of focus on the internal workings of the organisation as they relate to strategy.

2) Moving to the right, the five clusters Create Vision & Change, Act Appropriately, Experienced Based Learning, Ongoing Learning, and Pulling It Together, can be interpreted as an attitude of evolution of thinking and behaviour underpinned by the importance of learning.

3) In the upper righthand corner the three clusters Communicate Vision, Motivation of Others, and Value Others are all about communication, building co-operative relationships, and establishing rapport with others, based on the valuing of others. This segment shows a flow between communicating the organisation vision and motivating others to become involved with the vision, based upon a valuing and rewarding of the input of others. The fourth cluster entitled Accountability is linked to this area and denotes a sense of accountability for oneself when in a position of managerial power. This group of managers has, therefore, demonstrated the typical management communication style attributed to women managers, and considered to be most effective in the current business environment. The links between communicating vision, the empowerment of others, and valuing of participation also reflect current thought on effective management practice in general.
The fourth and final segment to be discussed contains Subordinate Communication, which was the highest rated cluster in the map. The other four clusters in this segment are Good Listener, Credibility, Positive Attitude, and Self Management. This segment of the map depicts issues primarily to do with subordinate communication, where effectiveness is considered to lay in a manager's ability to convey warmth, and inner strength and stability as a person, in addition to perceived credibility as a manager. The statements found in these clusters echo Kouzes and Posner's (1993) contention that credibility, integrity, and trust are critical in the leadership of people. They also convey a sense of Rippin's (1996) idea of "E.Q", where emotional and psychological strength and stability are critical.

Overall, the female managers couched many statements in terms used in the literature to describe the effective leadership style now required. In contrast, relatively few statements related to the terms associated with the traditional management and leadership approach, with the statements relating to a masculine approach perhaps reflecting either adopted masculine strategies, or what have been found to be effective. Not only were all the effective leadership issues raised, but were also linked and related in a manner that would be predicted by a nontraditional approach.

Discussion now turns to the male map, which will be followed by a general discussion about the conceptual similarities and differences in the maps, and the implications for effective management.

**Male Manager Statements Discussion**

The statements contained in the male map clusters, and ratings of cluster importance are presented in Appendix 4.2. Statements were rated between "able to type" (1.44) and "leadership" (4.89).
Out of 99 statements, only six were rated at 4.50+, or as being critical to effective management, and only 38% were considered to be either important or critical (a rating of 4-5) compared with the female group, who rated 60% of their statements as being important or critical, indicating a gap between male and female managers perceptions about the importance of many issues to do with effective management. Marlow, Marlow, and Arnold (1995) also found that women perceived issues to do with management to be more important than men did. Their study examined men and women manager’s perceptions about career development, and found that while they agreed on what the criteria were in career development, everything was more important to women than men. This may reflect the need for women managers to pay extra attention to everything they do, and the need to do it all a little bit better than men (Caudran, 1995), hence everything is more important to them.

The six clearly most important or critical issues for the male group were:

- Leadership (4.89)
- Good communicator (4.78)
- Being strategic (4.67)
- Being innovative (4.67)
- Receptive to change (4.67)
- Integrity (4.56)

The statements generated by this group were more orientated towards a traditional management approach, where there is a focus on oneself and status, taking an individualistic perspective. There is a sense of concern about the impact and influence of the manager on others (i.e. doing to, directing, controlling), rather than for the benefit and value of others.

This is in contrast to the female group, where 26% of the statements related to the benefit (e.g. rewards, recognition, development) of others, versus the male managers 5% related to the benefit of others. It would seem that despite their more androgynous gender identity, the women in this study were still using the feminine approach they have been conditioned to use.
It is interesting that the male managers sorted gender with “intelligent” (4.00), “emotional stability” (3.56), and “seeks continuous improvement” (4.44), although difficult to rationalise. The name eventually given to the cluster was Intellectual Growth, which ignores the gender factors completely. However, it needs to be noted that males did actually consider gender to be related to more issues than the females did, given that the female group marginalised gender by itself. It is also worthy of note that both sexes, while not considering sex to be an important issue, rated their own sex more highly than the other (Males: M 1.89, F 1.56; Females: F 1.67, M 1.56), indicating both groups were discriminating a difference.

Once more there is a lack of importance attached to managers having an external orientation, with an emphasis on the manager’s personal characteristics and abilities in relation to managing others within the organisation.

The Male Managers Map

This group’s map has seventeen clusters, with the highest rated cluster being Adaptability at 4.31, which has a sense of doing the best one can with change. Customer Negotiator was also important at 4.19, where verbal skills in customer relationships and negotiation are most important, perhaps reflecting a sales orientation in this group. The lowest cluster was Written Communication (2.19). The first most notable difference between this map and the female map is the separation of aspects of management, where only four clusters are closely related to each other. These four clusters are Impact Within The Organisation, Team Leadership, Controlled and Consistent, and Self Reliance, where the focus is on people management through the personal characteristics of a manager. In this case meaning “being independent”, “having guts”, “being suspicious”, “being skeptical”, and a need to “be respected” within the organisation. The group demonstrates a more controlling influence than the female group,
with issues such as “measure what people are producing” (3.67), “measure staff’s ability” (4.00). Remember also that being non-traditional (2.89) was not highly valued. Leadership is related to leading by example (4.11), and being respected (3.89), with a need to be supportive (3.67) and caring (4.00).

Figure 4.2: Male concept map

A major segment within the male managers map is concerned with thinking and knowledge. Clusters are Strategic Thinking (4.04), Free Thinking (3.65), Innovation (3.89), Broad External Perspective (2.93), and Keeping Up-To-Date (3.83). Not surprisingly, issues regarding free thinking are closely linked to innovation, and is somewhat related to strategic thinking. Although this group related strategic and free thinking with keeping up-to-date (e.g. “understand business they are in” (4.11), “comprehension of what is read” (4.33)) or a broad
external perspective (e.g. "understand the economy of the country" (3.00), "international perspective" (3.11), "wide general knowledge" (2.78)) the relationship is not close.

The communication segment is interesting for the noticeable devaluing of written communication (2.31), for which there is no explanation other than managers tend to have secretaries to perform the typing function and correct grammatical errors etc. made by a manager. It is, however, rather surprising that issues to do with communication and interaction that were rated as being important (e.g. "good listener" (4.11), "management by walking around" (3.63)) are somewhat distanced from people management issues.

The final segment to be discussed is the one containing the clusters which link and bridge other clusters, and which carries a theme about change. The clusters are named Intellectual Growth (3.09), Adaptability (4.31), Multifocused (3.78), and Bridging (3.02). There is a connection between the Customer Negotiator cluster ("external customer empathy") through the Multifocussed cluster ("customer driven") to Keeping Up-To-Date, which may suggest that a customer focus and knowledge gained from customers is related to keeping up-to-date with understanding the business. Apart from this, the positioning of these clusters suggests that the group sorted these issues into a number of different groupings, and are therefore interrelated with the surrounding clusters, but not sufficiently to be placed in a particular cluster. For example, there will be issues in the Intellectual Growth cluster that were often sorted with the issues contained in both the Keeping Up-To-Date and Strategic Thinking clusters, but not enough to be placed in either of those clusters. According to Kotter's (1990b) classification, overall, this group's concept fits more with the planning, organising, and control functions of traditional management roles.
4.4.3. General Discussion

There is evidence that male and female managers hold different perceptions about the issues involved in management and leadership, with the groups following the predicted gender trends. Most of the issues raised by the female group, and the manner in which these issues were linked and interrelated were closely aligned with current thinking on effective leadership, and in particular, a transformational style of leadership that values, involves, and empowers others (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995; Bass & Avolio, 1994). The male group reflected a typically masculine approach, and fit the transactional style Alimo-Metcalfe (1995) and Bass and Avolio (1994) discuss as typifying a male approach, where subordinate performance is based on transactions, and where transactions are based on a manager's positional power.

Both groups demonstrated a lack of external focus, were inward-looking, and emphasised personal skills and characteristics as being most important to good management, which replicates earlier findings. This is despite the fact that the focus question in the original study was "what constitutes good management", whereas the focus question in the present study added "in the current business environment" to open the concept out further.

4.4.4. Conclusions

Despite the female manager group having an androgynous gender identity, over one third of the statements generated for concept mapping were clearly related to a characteristically feminine management style, with very few characteristics that were clearly masculine. In particular, the female managers stressed the valuing and nurturing of others, and personal characteristics to do with relating sensitively to others. Given that this group had rejected more feminine characteristics than masculine yet still produced a stereotypically feminine
conceptual picture, it is indicative of the power of social conditioning, and suggests that this influence warrants further attention.

The study has found evidence to suggest that male and female managers have similarities in their perceptions about "good management", in that both groups raised issues to do with people management, communication, and strategic vision and so on, but there are differences in their approaches to conducting those activities that are probably gender-based. More specifically, the approach predicted and found for women was communication for the purpose of relationship building, and for men was communication for an instrumental purpose.

When linked with current thinking on the distinctions between management and leadership, it may be that the women's approach is more appropriate for effective leadership in the current business environment, and the masculine style more appropriate for management functions. A larger study is required to re-address these issues, where personal gender identity, extent and direction of gender role stereotyping for occupational role, and the need for change in personal gender characteristics to be effective in those roles, can be compared for men and women, and where transactional and transformational styles can be directly compared.

While this study adds to the process of articulating some of the requirements for managerial effectiveness in the current business environment, and has begun to demonstrate the relationships between some of the sex and gender difference issues and major linking themes, there is still a long way to go. Participant numbers were small, and it may be that the significant effects and trends described will disappear in a larger study. On the other hand, if these findings were to be supported, this line of research could produce huge benefits to organisations and providers of management development and education. This would be in
terms of a better understanding of managerial roles in the current business environment, a better understanding about different approaches to management and leadership, and a better understanding of women managers' place within management.

The research evidence suggests that sex has nothing to do with the potential ability of either sex to be effective as managers. Socially conditioned gender characteristics either enhance or reduce the potential ability to be effective, and govern perceptions of effectiveness, with attributions based on stereotypical gender characteristics falsely linked to sex characteristics - the fundamental attribution error of social cognition.

If the goal of nations, industries, and large multinational organisations is to upskill managers and gain a competitive advantage through increased managerial effectiveness (Baker, 1991; Glaze, 1989; Greatrex & Phillips, 1989; Karpin, 1995; Porter, 1985), it needs to be recognised that stereotypical thinking has created a "glass ceiling" for the potential effectiveness of all managers everywhere, not just women.
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5. TESTING THE EMERGENT CORE

To recapitulate, the primary purpose of this final phase of research was to test the predictive strength of the skills and characteristics identified as a generic core across different theoretical perspectives and geographical regions, against a rating of overall effectiveness as a manager. In essence, it is a test of how the skills and characteristics are related to perceptions of effectiveness and ineffectiveness, and then, an assessment of the relative importance of the skills and characteristics to overall managerial effectiveness. A profile of the core skills and characteristics related to effectiveness is developed using Multiple Discriminant Analysis, and tested for external validity.

In this study, traditional and contemporary thinking from Europe, North America and New Zealand is drawn together in a national survey of practising managers. Prior empirical research and the analysis of the literature revealed a list of 160 skills and characteristics considered to underpin managerial effectiveness, and it was these skills and characteristics that in a refined and reduced form (78 items), were used as items in the survey questionnaire. Full methods were presented in Section two.

5.1. Results and Discussion

Data were analysed using appropriate tools from the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. The key purpose here is to establish that there is a core set of skills and characteristics perceived to underpin managerial effectiveness, and that levels of proficiency in these skills and characteristics can predict perceived effectiveness and ineffectiveness as a manager.

---

1 An abridged version of this research is currently under review with the Journal of Management.
5.3.1. Response Rate

After removal of incomplete and invalidated (such as double responses) questionnaires a response rate of 29% (n437) was achieved from a sampling frame of approximately 1500, which compares favourably with other studies conducted in Australasia (Frater, Stuart, Rose & Andrews, 1995; Smith & Still, 1996). Using the insert method, while reaching a large number of managers, predicts a lower than optimal response rate in comparison to personally addressed letters, use of an incentive, and follow up, which can yield a response rate of 68% (Page, 1995).

There were a number of factors that served to reduce the response rate to the survey. For example, in questionnaire format a trade-off was made between clarity and simplicity and the need to constrain the size. Hence, the questionnaire was dense, and required the respondent to change mind sets for different parts, indicating that some may have perceived it to be too complicated. The response sections for skill ratings and for ratings of importance were alongside each other, one with white circles, the other with black. A number of respondents found this confusing, as there were thirty returns discarded for having one section incomplete. On the other hand, it is indicative of the general level of interest in the subject and relative ease of completion for most, that well over four hundred individuals bothered to respond despite the indirect approach and the time and effort required.

An opportunity sample survey of individuals known to receive the magazine revealed that not all magazines contained a questionnaire, indicating that some unknown number were lost during transit. Also, there are subscribers to the magazine who may have an interest in management, but who had as yet no managerial experience on which to base responses to section four on the importance of the items to managerial effectiveness.
### 5.3.2. Respondent and Assessee Profiles

Table 5.1 shows the respondent and assessee profiles. The majority of the respondents had either general management (56%) or functional management (27%) roles in top (34%) or senior (30%) positions. The three most represented sectors are Sales/Service (42%), Government Departments (24%), from companies with over 101 employees (53%), with the rest spread fairly evenly over the size range. Respondents were principally male (72%), which reflects the ratio of men and women in management positions in the management population, with perhaps a slightly higher representation of women in the sample at (26%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>Govt. Dept SOE</th>
<th>Local Govt.</th>
<th>Mfg.</th>
<th>Sales/Service</th>
<th>Not-For Profit</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>105 (24%)</td>
<td>23 (5%)</td>
<td>80 (19%)</td>
<td>180 (42%)</td>
<td>45 (10%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessee</strong></td>
<td>120 (27%)</td>
<td>27 (6%)</td>
<td>96 (22%)</td>
<td>152 (35%)</td>
<td>37 (8%)</td>
<td>5 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>Sole Owner</th>
<th>Top Supervisory</th>
<th>Sen.</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Other Supervisory</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>44 (10%)</td>
<td>148 (34%)</td>
<td>131 (30%)</td>
<td>79 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (1.5%)</td>
<td>26 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessee</strong></td>
<td>37 (8%)</td>
<td>156 (36%)</td>
<td>190 (44%)</td>
<td>49 (11%)</td>
<td>2 (.5%)</td>
<td>Combined 3 (.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>General Mgmt</th>
<th>Tech. Expertise</th>
<th>Functional</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>243 (56%)</td>
<td>68 (16%)</td>
<td>118 (27%)</td>
<td>8 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessee</strong></td>
<td>333 (76%)</td>
<td>35 (8%)</td>
<td>66 (15%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS EXPER.</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21+</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>68 (16%)</td>
<td>107 (24%)</td>
<td>97 (22%)</td>
<td>68 (16%)</td>
<td>91 (21%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessee</strong></td>
<td>52 (12%)</td>
<td>106 (24%)</td>
<td>112 (25.5%)</td>
<td>90 (21%)</td>
<td>66 (15%)</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF EMPLOY.</th>
<th>&lt;10</th>
<th>11-25</th>
<th>26-50</th>
<th>51-100</th>
<th>101+</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>66 (15%)</td>
<td>47 (11%)</td>
<td>41 (9.5%)</td>
<td>49 (11%)</td>
<td>233 (53%)</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessee</strong></td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent</strong></td>
<td>317 (72%)</td>
<td>112 (26%)</td>
<td>8 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessee</strong></td>
<td>354 (81%)</td>
<td>79 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Respondent and assessee characteristics
(2% no response). Table 5.1 shows there was a roughly even representation of years of managerial experience of between one and five years up to over 21 years of experience.

Overall, the sample provides a good representation of managers in most contexts, with a slight bias towards the perceptions of senior managers in large organisations. The profile of the managers chosen for assessment tended to follow that of the respondent, in being from the same sector, in similar positions, with similar number of years experience. The differences were that more men (81%) than women (18%) were assessed, and more assessed managers held general management positions (76%). Most assessments related to now (78%), or one or two years ago (12.5%). Most assessed managers were rated as being mostly effective (51%) or extremely effective (19%), with relatively few being rated as ineffective (19% in total).

Overall, the assessed managers scored (where 1 is the highest and 5 is the lowest score) most highly in intelligence (1.68), self confidence (1.74), and industry knowledge (1.77). Lowest ratings were in internal public relations (2.76), in being transformational/inspirational (2.76), and in interpersonal sensitivity (2.74).

Crosstabulations on the demographic data with overall rating of effectiveness revealed few differences. The null hypothesis was tested using the Kruskal-Wallis test for nonparametric data from more than two independent samples, which revealed that ratings of overall effectiveness were influenced by respondent position, and respondent sex. In the first case, the six supervisory level respondents in the sample gave lower ratings of effectiveness (mean 3, p = .02) than the other role categories (all means between 2 and 2.5). Respondent sex influenced ratings, in that men gave slightly higher ratings in comparison with women (mean 2.2 and 2.5, respectively, p = .009). This finding means that respondent position and gender will need to be tested for potential main or interactive effects in further analyses.

Apart from these differences, the sample appears to be relatively homogenous in their responses, there being no subpopulations to emerge when mean ratings of importance and
mean skill rating were compared across demographic groups. This finding is of extreme importance for this study. In an area where it could be expected that the different demographic and context groups would show some differences there were none to be found, implying that the perceptions of how these skills and characteristics contribute to overall managerial effectiveness is similar across the sample. Overall, it can be assumed that the perspectives of most managers are represented by this sample, although not in a fully proportional sense.

5.3.3. Multiple Discriminant Analyses

Multiple Discriminant Analysis (MDA) is appropriately applied when the dependent variables are categorical with two or more levels, the independent variables are metric, and where a predictive profile is sought (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1992, pp91,94). In this case, the dependent variable can be defined as being ordinal categories, in that there are ordered categories of effectiveness and ineffectiveness, yet the scale points are nevertheless categorical, as opposed to being metric. Although the independent variables are not metric, the use of ordinal variables as the independent variables in MDA is commonplace (ibid. p121). The assumptions underpinning the use of MDA are: 1) multivariate normality of the independent variables (skill ratings), 2) and an unknown, but equal, dispersion and covariance structures for the groups as defined by the dependent variable (overall ratings of effectiveness). In this study, a normal distribution cannot be assumed, and multicollinearity among the independent variables indicates that some items will be overshadowed by the multicollinearity of other items. A diagnostic check on the extent of multicollinearity in the independent variables revealed variance inflation factor values of 1.26 to 3.25, well below the test statistic of 5, and a condition index summative value of 18.86, well below the test
statistic of 40 (Hair et al., 1992, p48). To be conservative, a stepwise procedure to remove redundancies was used for the MDA\(^2\).

In acknowledging the violations in assumptions, it is possible to use additional methods to provide converging evidence of soundness, or to suggest caution in interpretation. One method used in this study is to set the acceptable significance level at \(p<.01\), and the other is to use alternative sources of evidence to triangulate and validate findings.

Two canonical stepwise MDAs were performed, using the responses for the skill items to classify effective and ineffective groups. While 437 is a good sample size, it must be remembered that there are 78 variables involved, demanding that the whole sample be used to develop the discriminatory model as opposed to keeping a holdout sample against which to test the model. However, once the model was derived, a random half sample MDA was run to assess internal validity. Canonical discriminant analysis is related to principal components analysis and canonical correlation. The procedure derives canonical functions, which are linear combinations of the quantitative variables (skill ratings) that summarise the between group (classes of effective-ineffective) variation in a similar fashion to the manner in which principal components summarises total variation (SAS/STAT User’s Guide, 1990, p.387), and canonical correlation summarises total correlation between two groups of variables.

The stepwise procedure begins with no variables in the model that discriminates, in this case, classes of effectiveness. The stepwise process takes each variable one at a time, establishes its discriminatory power in the model, and determines its significance level as calculated by Wilks’ Lambda. Variables are added to the model one at a time, as long as they

---

\(^2\) The greatest controversy in working with scaled data is the most effective analysis to use given the characteristics of the data. Scale data are rarely truly metric; in considering scale data as ordinal or categorical, alternative methods may apply. Whilst categorical models are relatively robust, they may compromise the ordering implicit in the scale. On the other hand, treating the data as interval, as in regression modelling for example, makes untenable assumptions about perceptual equality between scale points. Stepwise MDA was selected to minimise the violation of statistical assumptions. However, both logistical and stepwise regression models have corroborated the MDA findings.
significantly improve it's discriminatory power. At each step, the variable that contributes least to the discriminatory model is removed if it does not meet the criteria to remain as a significant discriminatory variable (SAS/STAT User's Guide, 1990, p.1495).

In the first analysis the whole sample was used. In the second analysis a half sample was used to check the internal validity of the first analysis, using a random selection of only half the observations. Both analyses produced canonical functions designed to produce optimal discrimination between effectiveness levels. There is evidence that the construct revealed in the first analysis is sound, in that the half sample analysis revealed more similarities than differences. The results given in Tables 5.2 and 5.3 show the similarity between the outcomes of the first and second analyses.

As indicated in Table 5.2, the whole sample analysis suggested that three of the canonical functions significantly discriminated between the effectiveness levels. For the half sample analysis only two of the canonical functions did so. Table 5.2 shows that the first function has an 88% correlation with the effectiveness groups in the full sample analysis, and 89% in the half sample analysis. However, the significance levels are only reliable if certain assumptions, including normality, are valid. This is not the case, so the true significance of the canonical functions shown in Table 5.2 is in doubt. Table 5.3 suggests how the canonical functions should be interpreted. For both analyses the first function measures ineffectiveness; the more positive the function score the more ineffective the manager, the more negative the function score, the more effective the manager.
Table 5.2: Canonical discriminant functions for both analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHOLE SAMPLE ANALYSIS</th>
<th>Canonical Function Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Func 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Extremely effective</td>
<td>-2.18213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mostly effective</td>
<td>-.65548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Neither nor</td>
<td>1.56636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Mostly ineffective</td>
<td>3.04779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Extremely ineffective</td>
<td>4.26471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3: Canonical discriminant functions evaluated at group centroids

Table 5.3 shows that higher means in function one in both analyses were associated with the extremely effective group, with mean group scores reducing as overall ratings of effectiveness reduced. The group centroids in Table 5.3 represent the mean discriminant score for the group, and show the number of standard deviations each group is away from a
standardised overall mean of zero, where in this case, a negative sign indicates a high effectiveness rating. Although function one did not discriminate the mostly effective or mediocre (neither effective nor ineffective) well, it did achieve correctly ordered means. The extremely effective group were distinguished by being on average two standard deviations above the overall effectiveness mean, and both the ineffective groups (mostly and extremely, respectively) were distinguished by being three or four standard deviations below the overall effectiveness mean.

Clearly, function one discriminates well between the groups, accounting for almost ninety percent of the variance between groups. The remaining functions are more difficult to interpret and, in view of their unreliable significance level and relatively weak contribution to predicting effectiveness, cannot be included in a statistically robust model. Their small eigenvalues (less than one) are another justification for dismissing these functions (Hair et al., 1992, p.242). However, for completeness of reporting, Table 5.4 below shows the three significant (all at p<.0000) predictor variable loadings for the four functions revealed in the whole sample MDA, and their components are discussed further. Table 5.4 shows that influence on others, verbal communication, valuing of people, credibility, and conceptual thinking load positively on function one. Managing immediate/current change loads equally on functions one and two. Interestingly, a high score in function two shows a moderate negative correlation with high ratings in ability to work under pressure, although this may be an artifact of analysis, given the small function two eigenvalue (.25). In a similar vein, it can be seen that generating/contributing to revenue shows a negative correlation with function three (eigenvalue of .15). Limitations to the interpretations of functions two and three rest upon their low eigenvalues and require that only function one be considered a sound predictor. Table 5.4 shows that function one is the primary discriminant function, with an
eigenvalue of 3.3, and almost ninety percent of the variance between groups accounted for.

Commentary on all discriminant functions is presented, however, for completeness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Eigenvalue)</th>
<th>Standardised Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function 1</strong> (p=.0000) (3.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on others</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value people</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manage current/immediate change</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual thinking</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function 2</strong> (p=.0000) (.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self confidence</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal public relations</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work under pressure</td>
<td>-.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand international politics</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative/innovative thinking</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following company policies</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Manage current/immediate change</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function 3</strong> (p=.0002) (.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/outcome/achievement focus</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate/contribute to revenue</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal networking</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function 4</strong> (p=.39; n.s.) (.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/time management</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation diagnosis</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public speaking</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4: Significant predictor variable loadings on the four functions

As a check on the external validity of the model, the Press statistic was used to test the discriminatory power of the two classification matrices compared to a chance model (Hair et al., 1992, p.106), with both models discriminating significantly better than by chance. In the whole sample analysis 76% of the sample were correctly classified (p <.001), and in the half sample 79% were correctly classified (>p.001). The similarity in classification rates for the two samples supports internal validity.
Table 5.5: Classification matrix for full sample, with half sample shown in brackets

Table 5.5 shows both classification matrices correctly predicted group membership according to a prior classification, with the whole sample model classifying extremely effective managers as extremely effective (70%) or mostly effective (30%). Eighty-five percent of the mostly effective group were correctly classified into the mostly effective category, with another 9% misclassified as extremely effective. There was some confusion seen with the neither effective nor ineffective group, where correct classification was low (55%), with 29% classified as mostly effective and 14% classified as mostly ineffective. The significant predictor variables discriminated the mostly ineffective group well (77%), with a further 12% classified as neither effective nor ineffective. The extremely ineffective group were also well discriminated, being classified as extremely ineffective (57%), or mostly ineffective (36%).

The discriminant model is, therefore, fairly sound in predicting an individual’s classification as effective or ineffective, with a weakness in classifying the mediocre, which is to be expected for MDA with scaled data involving a neutral midpoint. Both analyses
showed the same pattern, where function one scores were particularly good at discriminating the mostly effective and mostly ineffective groups, and significant predictor variables were similar. Note that this was found even though the half sample analysis used only 218 random cases, meaning that there were only 2.7 observations per variable used in the calculations, and fewer degrees of freedom - a weaker version.

A further check on the validity of the first function as a discriminator for managerial effectiveness involved a comparison with demographic variables. The full sample function one scores were compared with respondent role and gender to test for differences using Kruskal-Wallis tests. There was a significant difference in function one scores, where the standardised mean for ineffectiveness of the functional manager group (.81) was significantly higher (p = .006) than the means for general management (-.09) and technical manager groups (-.13). This confirms the relationship between role, and lower ratings of overall effectiveness identified previously for the supervisory group. The test for gender differences in function one scores revealed a trend for assessed women managers to have lower scores in function one (i.e. more effective), but this failed to reach significance (p = .09). This result supports the previously identified relationship between gender and overall effectiveness rating.

As a source of convergent data, simple pooled within groups linear correlations were used to assess the extent that function one predictor variables were correlated with function one when all other variables were considered at the same time. Table 5.6 shows function one predictor variables as they correlate with function one. Note that consistent with earlier phases of research and the international literature, all six variables relate to managing and presenting oneself, and interactions with others. This finding confirms that despite the need to be globally and externally aware, managers tend to perceive the immediate job requirements as being more critical to overall effectiveness.
Four of the six significant predictor variables were found to be amongst the items with the strongest (>0.50) correlation with function one, with credibility, influence on others, valuing people, and managing immediate/current change appearing in the seven strongest correlations with function one. These variables reflect thinking in the current managerial effectiveness literature, where credibility, valuing of people as a critical resource, and the ability to have a positive influence on others are stressed as personal characteristics contributing to managerial effectiveness, and more specifically, to effective leadership (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995; Bass & Avolio, 1994; Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Given earlier discussion on the need to cope with change, it is no surprise that managing change has emerged as a critical skill. Verbal communication and conceptual thinking are not quite so strongly correlated with function one when all variables are considered together. These results are consistent with previous findings with New Zealand samples, where similar personal characteristics are valued over technical management skills (Cammock, 1991). However,

---

3 Being a role model (.60), perceptiveness (.55) and being transformational (.51) were also amongst the items positively correlated with function one, but would have been excluded from the MDA through multicollinearity with other variables, as confirmed in the VIF analyses, which revealed these variables to have the highest VIF values.
another New Zealand study of 235 senior managers in 75 companies found that functional role technical skills were highly valued (Rippin, 1996), which is in direct contrast, and highlights the need to interpret results within the parameters of the sample. As discussed earlier, the skills that Rippon (1996) refers to are considered to be learnable technical management skills related to a particular business function required by an organisation (for example, HRM and marketing). Organisation context will have an influence on the specific skills required (for example, relative emphases on marketing services and goods, or only services; managing a paid versus voluntary workforce). In addition, the present study had few technical skill items, not being generated in large numbers in the first instance, and then generally being rated low in importance in the first and second phases of theory building. The expert panel in the third phase then combined items or assigned no great importance to the remaining technical skills. Further research is required into the issues surrounding the differentiation of technical skills and personal characteristics, and their relative impacts on managerial effectiveness, where particular attention is paid to creating operational definitions for what characterises a personal characteristic and what characterises a technical skill as mutually independent categories, and where relations between the categories and effectiveness are defined.

It may be that this research has provided the groundwork to begin forming those definitions, with personal characteristics being the human attributes that are differentially shaped for males and females into a personal repertoire of social behaviour, and technical skills being the measurable skills relating directly to holding a management position. Note that in terms of the comparative framework, these skills would be located in the lower right quadrant, in organisation skills. In terms of the framework there are then non-technical skills relating to managing oneself and others (self/time management, delegation and interpersonal skills), where it is debatable whether there are valid and reliable measures for all contexts.
Table 5.7 shows how the significant predictor one variables relate to the empirical research conducted to generate them, where some interesting patterns can be observed. For

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>NZIM Focus</th>
<th>NZIM Survey</th>
<th>EMBA</th>
<th>MMBA</th>
<th>Mgmt Educ.'s</th>
<th>Except. Mngrs</th>
<th>Gender M</th>
<th>Gender F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence on others</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage immed./current change</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7: Significant function one predictor variables generated by phase one and two research

example, it is notable that the group of managers identified as exceptional in the first phase should be distinguished again in explicitly raising five of the six most important core skills and characteristics, in comparison with other groups who explicitly raised two or three. It may be no coincidence that the exceptional group did not raise influencing others as being a key issue, as the idea of exerting influence on others would not fit the concept they generated, being more concerned with having creative, self-motivated people that they did not need to influence.

Table 5.7 shows that the need for good verbal communication skills and managing immediate/current change were the two variables raised most often across the groups. The need for good verbal communication skills is documented in the literature on competency models (Davis, Hellervik & Sheard, 1986; Dulewicz, 1989; Quinn, 1988), and is implicit in the human skills category of Katz’s typology (see page three). The need to communicate the strategic vision through personal interactions and people leadership has been shown by Kotter (1990a) and Kouzes and Posner (1993) amongst others. Managing change, much of it
needing a rapid response to external events, is also well documented in the literature (Stace & Dunphy, 1996; Wilson, 1992).

Conceptual thinking was raised only by the exceptional manager group, and is a category in Katz's typology, even though vaguely defined. Hinterhuber and Popp (1992), and Mintzberg (1994b) are probably referring to this ability when they discuss the ability to go beyond the obvious/data to develop new concepts for operating. Another issue raised only by the exceptional manager group was the need for credibility. Other groups raised issues that may be related to credibility, like integrity, being trusted, being fair and so on, but none explicitly raised credibility as an issue. It is noteworthy that the discriminant analysis has revealed credibility as being amongst the strongest predictors of effectiveness according to ratings of effectiveness, given that only the exceptional manager group raised the issue. It is noteworthy because it is indicative of the problems faced in management research, and underscores the need to include effective managers in the theory building process when attempting to build managerial effectiveness theory. If this group had not raised the issue, it would not have been identified as a key predictor of managerial effectiveness.

In a more general sense these findings indicate problems for the competency-based approach to management theory and practice. Kouzes and Posner (1993) have documented the way in which credibility and leadership are linked, and have provided some means to assess elements of credibility. However, finding generally acceptable definitions for what characterises credibility or the other five variables, and an explanation of how they relate to managerial effectiveness is some way off. In turn, the competency-based approach will find difficulty in setting predetermined standards and measures of performance. In essence, it may be that the MDA has revealed the core personal characteristics relating to managerial effectiveness, and the competency-based approach could well serve the purpose of identifying and measuring contextual technical skills. The discussion now turns to the analysis of the
rated importance of each skill and characteristic, and the findings from both analyses are integrated within the comparative framework.

To have an indication of a set of skills and characteristics likely to predict managerial effectiveness and ineffectiveness is useful, and knowing the relative importance of those skills and characteristics in their contribution to managerial effectiveness is even more useful. In this study, the same items used to assess a manager were used to rate the relative importance of the item to being an effective manager. While the discriminant analysis has revealed that effective managers have high skill levels in a particular set of personal characteristics, and ineffective managers have poor skill levels in that same set, the question remains as to how important those skills are to being effective in an overall sense.

5.3.4. Importance of Items

The mean rating for items ranged between extremely important credibility at 1.17, with understanding international politics (2.68) verging on being neither important nor unimportant.

Each of the analyses in this research programme has found a distinct lack of importance attached to the external environment that is confirmed once more. Of the seven items directly relating to the external environment, four had the lowest ratings of importance, along with physical fitness. Understanding international politics (2.68) had the lowest mean, then understanding international economics (2.56), physical fitness (2.36), understanding national politics (2.36), and understanding national economics (2.26) were the next lowest rated items. External public relations (1.91), external networking (1.87), industry knowledge (1.74), and an understanding of industry economy (1.73) were rated as being more important, yet all were in the bottom half of the ratings for all items.
It must be noted, however, that ratings for all items tended to be high, indicating that an external perspective is perceived to be important, but less important than other aspects of managerial effectiveness. Table 5.8 shows the mean ratings of importance, where a cut-off point of <1.50 average or less was chosen to represent the most important items (more towards extremely important). All significant predictor variables shown in Table 5.6 (the skills and characteristics perceived to characterise overall effectiveness according to ratings of skill level) are shown to be amongst the items perceived to also be most important, as presented in Table 5.8. Items are ranked according to their relative importance, where it can be seen that what effective managers are good at are not necessarily perceived to be the most important aspects of managerial effectiveness, with the exceptions of credibility and valuing people.

Credibility was one of the two strongest (equal to influence on others) predictor variable for function one, and is also rated as being the most important item contributing to managerial effectiveness, with influence on others ranked fifteenth in relative importance. Credibility then, as suggested by Kouzes and Posner, is the single most influential perception by others that managers require. Put another way, to be judged as being effective it is critical that others perceive a manager to be credible, and it is also most important that this is so (unlike for example, influence on others - which effective managers do well, yet is not considered to be as important as fourteen other skills and characteristics).

The valuing of people was another function one predictor variable to emerge as also being important, ranked third in overall importance to positive attitude which was ranked second in overall importance. The exceptional manager and female manager groups particularly stressed the need to value people and their input. Having a positive attitude did not emerge as a function one predictor variable, yet has been ranked second in importance to credibility in terms of overall effectiveness. This finding suggests a separation between what
managers rated as effective are perceived to be good at, and what is perceived to be generally important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Ranked Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility**</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value people**</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate objectives</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate vision</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create strategic vision</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/time management</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative/proactive</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal communication**</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/goal focus</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptiveness</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work under pressure</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on others**</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role model</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual thinking**</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage immediate/current change**</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
** denotes that the item was a significant function one predictor variable, and had a strong positive pooled within groups’ correlation with function one

Table 5.8: Ratings of item importance

To follow on with that argument, verbal communication, having influence on others, managing immediate/current change, and conceptual thinking were other significant function one predictor variables, but these items were not considered to be as important as many other items such as - having a positive attitude, interpersonal skills, communicating objectives, vision, create strategic vision, self/time management, being proactive, having a results/goal focus, being able to delegate, ability to work under pressure, being a role model, and critical thinking. This finding suggests that ratings of skill level in these items for different groups of managers had a relatively lower impact in differentiating effective and ineffective groups, yet
are perceived to be important contributing factors to being effective as a manager, and are, therefore, factors worthy of examination in further research. Figure 5.1 below shows the six function one predictor variables and the items revealed to be in the top quartile of importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>SELF</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Self/time management</td>
<td>Delegate</td>
<td>Communication vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive attitude</td>
<td>Initiative/proactive</td>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Business planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness/adapt</td>
<td>Work under pressure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate obj's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative/proactive</td>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Perceptiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work under pressure</td>
<td>Conceptual thinking</td>
<td>Verbal communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking</td>
<td>Manage inmed. change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual thinking</td>
<td>Manage inmed. change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage inmed. change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: italics denote a predictor variable

Figure 5.1: Key predictive variables, and variables to emerge as most important, shown in the comparative framework

as they fit within the comparative framework, and showing the contextual factors that may be needed to supplement the core. Overall, the variables to emerge as significant predictor variables relate to personal characteristics to do with managing and presenting oneself as a manager, and to communication in interpersonal interactions. Unfortunately for the competency-based approach to management theory and practice, most of these personal characteristics are an outcome of cognitive styles and social conditioning (as discussed in Section 4 and to be discussed in Section 6), aspects that are not considered in measurement of competence.
At this stage the six variables derived as being core to overall perceived managerial effectiveness have no generally acceptable definitions, nor can they be reliably measured in all contexts. It would, therefore, benefit management research to develop operational definitions, and valid and reliable measures for these key characteristics. An alternative approach is suggested in Section 6, where the research programme and findings are summarised and integrated.

Skills and characteristics that were perceived to be most important also comprise variables that are difficult to measure at this time, such as perceptiveness. As the results of the gender study revealed, the subtleties and nuances of verbal communication and interpersonal skills are many, and there is a gender interaction to consider in measurement and comparisons. However, there are a few, such as delegation, business planning, and self/time management that a number of management development programmes target for development, indicating these may be more measurable technical skills. The problem remains, however, that even if these skills are enhanced, without perceived credibility and valuing of people, and if not skilled in managing immediate/current change, conceptual thinking, verbal communication, and in influencing others, the individual is not likely to be perceived as being effective.

5.3.5. Conclusions
The primary objective of this study, put in simplistic terms, was to derive and statistically validate a core set of skills and characteristics perceived by many perspectives to underpin managerial effectiveness. That objective was met, in that a set of six personal characteristics common to the traditional perspective, the international strategic management, competency-based management, the management effectiveness literature and New Zealand perspectives
emerged. The emergent core was then found to have statistical support for external validity, as tested against a chance model.

The sources of evidence on the validity of this emergent core were many. In a general sense the emergent core has strong face validity. These core variables were raised by several distinctly different, large and small groups throughout the research programme, and there has been consistent congruence between the findings of this overall research programme and the international literature.

The MDA revealed these six variables, when compared with every other variable in turn, to have an independent influence on ratings of effectiveness, in terms of correctly classifying assessed managers into categories of effectiveness and ineffectiveness on skill level ratings. Another source of evidence are the simple pooled within group correlations for function one, where credibility, influence on others, valuing people and managing immediate/current change retained their primary position even when 72 other variables were considered together. Verbal communication and conceptual thinking nevertheless still had moderate positive relationships. The third empirical source of evidence for these characteristics being core to managerial effectiveness was provided by ratings of importance, where once again, five MDA predictor variables appeared in the upper quartile of perceived importance. Finally, and perhaps most importantly and incredibly, there were no differences between the responses of the subgroups representing all the different perspectives (as shown in Table 5.1), indicating this is indeed a common core set of variables.

The results suggest that what effective managers were perceived to be good at (and what ineffective managers were poor at) was important, but did not necessarily equate with what were perceived to be the most important factors contributing to managerial effectiveness in general. These anomalies that serve to confound management research need to be identified and clarified, and it is helpful that this study has revealed this discrepancy. It is also a clear
signal that the concerns expressed about the reliance on what managers do may indeed leave much undiscovered (Collin, 1989; Worledge, 1992).

The results of this study provide a platform for further research to develop the model for generalisation beyond this sample frame that relates predominantly to male senior managers in medium to large organisations. For example, taking the characteristics identified as significant predictor variables in function one, and adding the items rated in the top quartile of importance (but not identified as significant predictor variables), would provide a well rounded set of items with which to replicate this study, and strengthen the discriminatory power of the model. By using a stratified sampling design, such research would extend perspectives to smaller organisations and middle management, that in the present research were under-represented.

The results of this study have high face and construct validity, in that the findings make sense, and the set of skills and characteristics identified as being associated with effectiveness echo those claimed in the New Zealand and international literature to underpin managerial effectiveness. Three converging sources of empirical evidence have demonstrated construct validity. There was also a measure of reliability, in that the second MDA using only half the sample yielded similar results. Evidence for external validity was provided, in that the emergent core correctly classified managers to classes of effectiveness and ineffectiveness significantly better than a chance model.

This study completes a research programme that has taken a different approach toward researching managerial effectiveness. Rather than focus on one or two aspects the research sought to establish if there was a discernible core set of skills and characteristics perceived to be critical across many perspectives. The major contributions of this research have been to firstly identify such a core, and then find the core has predictive validity. Another major contribution made by this study was the introduction of Concept Mapping to managerial
effectiveness research. The method was shown to be a useful vehicle for generating group and national concepts of effectiveness without imposing any research frameworks around the data generated, and where qualitative data can be visually represented, and relations between ideas quantified. It is particularly useful when attempting to reduce large amounts of qualitative data in an iterative process.

A replication study using the skills and characteristics shown in Figure 5.1, with a more rigorous sampling procedure, would refine the findings from this study to produce a model with high predictive power. Ongoing development would need to test the model in different contexts, and develop sets of context-specific skills and characteristics to add to the generic core revealed by this research.

Prior to this research, there were no models that could be used to predict managerial effectiveness by levels of specified predictor variables, apart from vaguely defined concepts of intelligence, and perhaps some intensive assessment centre measures. The overall outcomes of this cumulative study were to reveal the core skills and characteristics of perceived managerial effectiveness, establish perceived importance to overall effectiveness, and provided a validated model (c.f. footnote one in Section 2) of how the skills and characteristics may relate to domains of managerial action.
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6. SUMMARY AND INTEGRATION OF THE RESEARCH PROGRAMME

The research programme for this thesis was prompted by the observation that while there is an international call for managers to become more effective as a cornerstone of Government policy to enhance the competitive advantage of nations, at the same time, managers worldwide are accused of being lacking in skill (Karpin, 1995; Porter, 1985; Thorpe, 1990), and there are inadequacies in management education and development programmes (Broscow & Kleiner, 1991; Cammock, 1991; Osbaldeston & Barham, 1992; Osterweil, 1992; Syrett, 1993). In addition, the array of "quick fix" management and organisation development fads and fashions that emerged over the past ten to fifteen years (Nohria & Berkley, 1994), have created an uncertainty and ambiguity about what constitutes individual effectiveness that is matched only by the business environment within which managers operate.

A research programme was initiated to establish perceptions of what constitutes managerial effectiveness from many different perspectives, to provide an in-depth investigation of what now constitutes managerial effectiveness. The initial study revealed that human skills and personal characteristics of individuals were perceived to underpin managerial effectiveness, and that these skills and characteristics related to either generic or contextual aspects of managerial effectiveness. It was this construct that guided the subsequent research programme.

6.1. Objectives of the Research Programme

The first part of the research problem was to integrate the traditional and contemporary literature within the overall context of an internationally competitive business environment.
The second part of the problem was to define the skills and characteristics that underpin those practical needs.

The broad research question was "What constitutes managerial effectiveness in the current business environment?". The key factors to be addressed in answering this broad question were 1) what constitutes effectiveness in a managerial context, 2) what have been the enduring principles of managerial effectiveness over time, and 3) what are the new considerations. The end objective was to develop a more generalisable model of effectiveness encompassing the needs of many different perspectives. The issues addressed in answering the research question were 1) what did managers and management educators and developers think managerial effectiveness was (empirical work conducted), 2) what did the international literature claim it to be (analysis of common themes and distillation), and 3) what was missing (new model to be presented).

The first objectives were to assess managers', management educators', and developers' perceptions of managerial effectiveness, and to extract common themes in a comparative analysis of the international literature. This objective was achieved in the pilot study (reported in Section 3). The second objective was to explore whether these common themes would be supported by an empirical study, and investigate the particularly strong gender theme in more depth. This objective was met in Study 2 (reported in Section 4). The third objective was to conduct an empirical study to establish which skills and characteristics discriminated between effective and ineffective managers. This objective was achieved in Study 3 (in Section 5). The fourth, and final, objective was to suggest a more generally applicable model of managerial effectiveness that integrates the traditional and contemporary models considered in the analysis. The potential model is presented at the end of this summary section.
6.2. Phase One: Key Findings

The first study revealed through the comparative framework developed, that the common themes in the current models categorised managerial input either as hard definable and measurable skills, or as soft personal characteristics. Further to this, skills and characteristics could be classified as being related either to oneself, or to others, or relating to organisation systems and context. The majority of the models were found to emphasise hard technical skills, while recognising the importance of the “soft” characteristics. It was found that New Zealand managers, and management educators and developers reflect international thinking insomuch as their list of contributing skills and characteristics is closely correlated with contemporary publications. A major problem revealed in the literature, yet not addressed in the study, concerned gender issues in management that have a significant impact on managerial effectiveness. Overall, the controversies and confusions revealed in the literature confirmed the need to redefine managerial effectiveness in practice.

6.3. Phase Two: Key Findings

The second study, with a much smaller sample, elicited similar statements about the skills and characteristics contributing to managerial effectiveness as generated in the first study, which can be considered indicative of the appropriateness and reliability of the approach taken.

The context for this second study was an investigation of gender issues, where it was found that a societal obsession with dichotomising male and female behaviour artificially influences the behaviour of men and women as managers. A poignant paradox was found, where women as managers (whose skills and characteristics have traditionally been devalued), as a result of their social conditioning, reflect in their nontraditional management style the contemporary literature on effective people leadership. The male group reflected
more of the traditional management approach, yet also considered a number of the nontraditional skills and characteristics to be important. In particular, the two groups reflected the communication differences posited in the literature to be gender-related. The literature shows that gender stereotypical thinking also influences others' perceptions and judgements of managerial effectiveness in men and women, highlighting that issues concerning actual versus perceived effectiveness need to be considered.

An avenue of research in need of exploration was revealed by the study, where there is a need for women managers to face issues not raised for men as managers. For example, the need for women to behave differently, and often in opposition to, the behaviour shaped by social conditioning. This is probably not restricted to management issues, being equally relevant in the "true" professions (i.e. medicine, law), which are also male dominated work domains. As a study of more broad interest and relevance, these issues could be addressed as an investigation of the need for both men and women to change conditioned gender role identity characteristics to undertake different occupational roles traditionally reserved for one or other sex (i.e. male nurses and house husbands would fit into this category, as well as female managers).

To be considered effective, women managers need to be that much better than their male counterparts, simply because they are women (Korndorffer, 1992). They thereby, in addition to being measurably effective, need to also prove they are not subject to the feminine characteristics deemed to be inappropriate to managerial roles. To be a man is to be attributed with the innate characteristics valued in management, and to be a woman is to be attributed with innate characteristics that until recently, have been thought to be inappropriate to management roles. These perceptions introduce a need to consider perceived versus actual effectiveness in models of managerial effectiveness, where assessment procedures recognise
that male effectiveness is overestimated, and female effectiveness underestimated, and balance measures accordingly.

Finally, there is a need to investigate how domestic circumstances influence managerial effectiveness, in terms of how different circumstances enhance or moderate the ability to be effective as a manager, and enhance or moderate the ability to undertake management education and development.

6.4. Phase Three: Key Findings

The findings from the international literature and the first and second studies were integrated into a list of 160 skills and characteristics that were subsequently reduced by an expert panel into 78 items to be used in the third study survey.

A striking similarity in all three studies is a relative lack of importance attached by New Zealand managers to an external perspective. The reason for this is unclear, given that New Zealand managers have had to face a dramatic and sudden influx of international competition over the past decade or so. Another similarity between the three studies is the emphasis on personal characteristics over technical skills as being the primary contribution to managerial effectiveness. This has been found in one other New Zealand study addressing managerial effectiveness (Cammock, 1991), and is echoed in the international literature, yet another New Zealand study by Rippin (1996) found that technical skills were more important to senior managers in her sample than is reflected in the international literature. Rather than the traditional technical management skills of planning and so on, the technical skills valued relate to the technical skills of functional management roles such as marketing and accounting, for example. In the present study most of the respondents, and most of those chosen for assessment, were in general roles. There is evidence, therefore, for what may prove
to be an interesting interaction between management role, and whether technical skills or personal characteristics are of more use in that role. Further research is needed to address this issue.

The profile of skills and characteristics to emerge as discriminating effective managers by high scores, and ineffective managers by low scores, reflects the literature on effective leadership. Cammock (1991) also suggests that his New Zealand public sector sample demonstrated leadership as opposed to managerial effectiveness (p.117). While an ethos of strong leadership skills must bode well for New Zealand, there is a danger that 1) respondents are simply espousing a commonly held belief (Ginsburg, 1989), and/or 2) organisations are being overled and undermanaged, rather than having a balance between both processes (c.f. Kotter, 1990, p.8).

A particularly interesting finding in the third study was that not all of what effective managers do, and do well, are considered to be the most important factors contributing to effectiveness in general. There were, however, two characteristics revealed to be associated with high ratings for effective managers, and low ratings for ineffective managers, and which were also perceived to be important. Above all else credibility was a key factor in perceived effectiveness, in discriminating effective and ineffective managers, and in being the most important contributor to effectiveness. Valuing of people also discriminated between effective and ineffective managers, and was important as well.

In all other cases, factors other than those identified as what effective managers do (and do well), were considered to be more important. It is precisely this kind of discrepancy between what effective managers do, and what may actually be required that is different to what they happen to do well, that needs research attention. It also highlights the need to use differing sources of evidence to draw out the discrepancies, in procedures that do not rely wholly on observation or self report.
6.5. Critical Issues Revealed in the Research Programme

Managerial effectiveness research is characterised by being multidisciplinary, multifocused, and operating without an enunciated definition of a concept of effectiveness. The resultant overly large, confused, and unwieldy body of knowledge (Elkin, 1991) is, therefore, in need of integration and refinement, to develop a more coherent and widely applicable model for the current business environment. Over the research period a number of issues critical to the development of a model of managerial effectiveness were revealed.

In the pre-1980s business environment, before the full impacts of technological advancements and the internationalisation of business and management were felt, the traditional command and control style of management in large hierarchical bureaucracies was the norm. This style of management, and what was considered to be effective, had evolved from the earlier works of Taylor (1911), Fayol (1916), Katz (1972), and Mintzberg (1973), where particular aspects of management had been identified as being generic to all circumstances. However, the traditional approach began to fail in the new environment, being too rigid and controlling in philosophy.

The proliferation of models that subsequently emerged, and continue to emerge, take many different approaches to prescribe what is now required. Some focus upon a strategic level change in the structure of the organisation, suggesting the managerial skills and characteristics required in the new structure (Hamel & Prahalad, 1996; Prahalad & Hamel, 1990, 1994). Others take a management education or development approach focused upon skill development of the individual (Cammock, 1991; Mole, Plant & Salaman, 1993). Either way, the onus is on managers to become more effective, thereby increasing the competitive advantage of the organisation, and ultimately, the nation. A critical issue here is that these two approaches need to be integrated, so that organisation factors and individual factors are both accounted for in a model of managerial effectiveness. Another critical issue is that
effectiveness of an organisation can be equated with competitive advantage, where the
effectiveness of the overall management function of the organisation enhances or reduces
competitive advantage.

The broad and generic traditional approach has been replaced by a narrow focus on
specific contextual factors (e.g. organisation or industry models, or size issues) or on specific
aspects of effectiveness (e.g. gender similarities or differences, differences between
management levels) in contemporary models. This fractionation is indicative of the atheretic
state of managerial effectiveness research overall. The multiplicity of approaches need to be
integrated, so that the enduring traditional needs of the organisation for planning, organising,
and controlling of resources in strategic, tactical, and operational dimensions are reconciled
with contextual and other specific contingencies identified in the new environment.

The increasing awareness of the importance of distinguishing between managing and
leading in organisations indicates that these are critical issues to consider in a model of
managerial effectiveness. The bulk of the evidence suggests that leadership in an organisation
can be conceptualised as being related to a process of 1) strategic organisation leadership,
enshrining the concepts of Bartlett and Ghoshal (1994), Hamel & Prahahalad (1996),
Kotter (1990), Mintzberg (1994), Prahalad and Hamel (1990, 1994), and Zaleznik, (1992),
which drives the organisation in a purposeful direction, and 2) people leadership (interactive
one to one, and group leadership) encompassing the management education and development
models. The synergy between these two areas is reflected in the centrality of credibility to
managerial effectiveness as revealed in this research, and leadership as discussed by Kouzes

Strategic organisation leadership creates a future vision, develops strategic goals, and
initiates change in the organisation in order to achieve strategic goals. People leadership is
the ability to communicate the vision, strategic goals, and other objectives, and influence and
inspire others to achieve the goals and objectives. Managing is now best conceptualised as being related to the traditional planning, organising and control functions required to translate a strategic vision and goals into effective and efficient strategic, tactical, and operational action plans designed to implement and monitor adherence to plans. The contemporary literature (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995; Bass & Avolio, 1994) suggests that the typically masculine (and traditional) management style is best suited to managing, whereas the typically feminine management style is actually more reflective of effective people leadership. There is also the discrepancy between actual and perceived effectiveness according to attributions based upon the sex of a manager that need to be accounted for. Models of managerial effectiveness need to recognise these factors and identify the implications for individual effectiveness.

A critical issue at the heart of this debate is the terminology used throughout the literature. The wide range of disciplines and perspectives contributing to managerial effectiveness research provide a huge database with which to work, although at the same time, introduce a variety of different terms for the same thing. In all models, it is possible to identify three distinct aspects contributing to managerial effectiveness. One is the need for management specific technical skills which are clearly definable and measurable, another is the need for clearly definable and measurable life skills, and the third aspect relates to less definable and measurable personal characteristics.

A paper not formally presented as a component of this thesis (provided with reviewer's comments, as Appendices 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3) suggests that the emphasis on recording what managers do has excluded an alternative approach to conceptualising the human input that underpins individual effectiveness. As it stands, technical management skills do not pose too much of a problem to define, although there is debate over appropriate measurements and standards of performance. Measurable personal life skills and the less/non measurable personal characteristics are inextricably commingled, with debate over which are
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measurable, and how best to measure those it is possible to measure, with criticism of the validity and reliability of measures. Standards of performance are also problematic.

To address these issues, the paper investigated the psychological profile underpinning the skills and characteristics discussed in the literature, and revealed in the empirical work conducted for the dissertation. This was not to undermine the importance of the issues revealed in this research and the international literature, but was an effort to explore all avenues that may assist to differentiate personal characteristics and technical management skill, and how they may be measured.

It was posited in that paper that managerial effectiveness is underpinned by the application of technical management skills plus personal characteristics that are relatively stable traits. Personal characteristics were defined as fundamental human attributes shaped through life learning into a personalised set of cognitive skills and a worldview concerning self concept, and how an individual will relate to others. The conclusions drawn from that study are presented in Figure 6.2, in relation to a discussion of a complete concept of managerial effectiveness.

In conclusion, the critical issues to be addressed when further developing a model of managerial effectiveness are:

1. The place of managing and leading in the new environment.
2. The integration of organisation and individual dimensions of effectiveness.
3. The identification of critical technical management skills and personal characteristics underpinning individual effectiveness, in relation to different circumstances.
5. To go beyond gathering data on what managers report they do, or are observed to do.
As a first cut at developing a model along these lines, a model of managerial effectiveness as revealed by this research is now presented.

6.6. **A Proposed Model of Managerial Effectiveness**

This section of the dissertation presents a draft model of managerial effectiveness as a platform for further research. The model represents an integration of the traditional and contemporary models of effectiveness and the empirical findings from this research. The model is large, needing to be split into two figures. The first figure represents the generic and contextual factors driving what is required in terms of managerial input, with the second figure representing the human input underpinning managerial input.

6.6.1. **Toward A Model of Managerial Effectiveness**

In the proposed model of effectiveness as a complete concept, organisation effectiveness is equated with competitive advantage, which depends upon the effectiveness of the overall management function, which in turn depends upon the effectiveness of the individuals contributing to the management function. Figure 6.1 shows these relationships, where the management function is comprised of a generic need for strategic, tactical, and operational dimensions in management and leadership of the organisation. Another generic need of organisations is the need for managers (in small organisations, one or two managers) to assume responsibility for all, or parts of, the management function as indicated by the general and functional/technical management roles.

According to the contemporary research literature there is a generic need for a balance of both management and leadership processes in organisations, with neither process
overpowering the other. The management process is conceptualised as being the planning, organising, and controlling of organisation resources, where resources are defined as all and everything an organisation draws upon for its existence. Within this broad definition,
resources can be usefully classified according to the different skills and characteristics called upon to manage people, versus inanimate plant and equipment and organisation systems, for example.

Note that within this model, human resource management as a function is regarded as a set of technical skills (e.g. recruitment, selection, compensation systems, induction, and so on) in a similar manner as marketing and accounting are regarded as technical specialist management functions. While the human resource function may extrinsically motivate employees to behave in a particular manner through appropriate reinforcement and punishment systems, this is not the intrinsic motivation inspired by transformational leadership.

The leadership process, as characterised in the strategic models of Prahalad and Hamel (1990, 1994), and Stace and Dunphy (1996), for example, is a process that creates, initiates, and fosters change at the level of the organisation and individual. It is, therefore, fundamentally different in purpose to managing, where the primary purpose is to implement and adhere to what has been planned. The leadership process is therefore in conflict with the management process (Kotter, 1990, p.7), and calls upon fundamentally different skills and characteristics that appear to be more related to personal skills and characteristics than technical skills.

The last factor shown to be driving what skills and characteristics are required from the perspective of generic organisation needs is the organisation context and culture within which a manager operates, which although a consistent consideration in the present research programme, has not been included as a testable research variable. The elements found to contribute to the emphases on different skills and characteristics according to the organisation context literature were the lifecycle stage (Stace & Dunphy, 1996), industry sector (Bantel, 1993; Sims & Guest, 1990), size (Schwenk & Shrader, 1993), management level (Cammock,
1991; Luthans, Hodgetts & Rosenkrantz, 1988), and the external environment (Jones, 1990; Wiersema & Bantel, 1993), where in each case, particular skills and characteristics can be identified. The survey in phase one also explored these contextual factors, and confirmed that the New Zealand perspective conformed to the thinking expressed in the literature. The positive and negative impacts of organisation culture are well documented (Covin & Slevin, 1991; Morgan, 1986).

Figure 6.1 ends by positing that organisation needs drive which skills and characteristics are required of managers in a given organisation context and culture, where the managerial input required is in reality, the human input required. In effect, Figure 6.1 places the demands of the job according to generic needs and contextual contingencies, and Figure 6.2 now shows the skills and characteristics suggested to be required to fulfill the demands of the job. Human input in Figure 6.2 is seen as consisting of the technical management skills and personal characteristics suggested to underpin individual effectiveness. At the bottom of Figure 6.2 it is suggested that human input to the management function is based upon fundamental human attributes common to all, which includes a need for social contact, interpersonal communication skills, and cognitive information processing skills. These attributes will be subject to genetic individual difference in the first instance, and then subject to differential social conditioning between the sexes. The outcome is a psychological profile relating to an individual's personalised cognitive information processing strategies, interpersonal communication style, and social behaviour. When an individual first chooses, or is unexpectedly thrust into, a management position there is a need to learn how to now apply personal skills and characteristics in management roles, given that their place in the organisation hierarchy of responsibility and authority (either general or functional) has increased. By definition, a new manager must now learn to work through, and have a positive impact upon, individuals who are subordinate to them. They
Figure 6.2: The human input underpinning managerial effectiveness

Therefore need to learn the tools and techniques of the new job and learn to use positional and personal power. Learning is shown to be acquired on the job, and/or through education and development efforts. It is this management learning that results in the technical skills and
personal characteristics reflected in the popular and academic literature, and espoused by managers as underpinning managerial effectiveness.

The human input category integrates Figures 6.1 and 6.2, where Figure 6.2 additionally shows that the outcome of human input is actual and perceived managerial effectiveness. While gender stereotypical thinking remains a societal norm there will be a spillover of these biases into organisations to affect perceptions of effectiveness. It is, therefore, difficult to suggest the means to ameliorate or resolve the problem apart from sweeping worldwide societal change. As a model of managerial effectiveness, however, it is necessary to identify all factors that influence the ability to be effective as a manager, and gender stereotypical thinking must be signalled as being a major factor. Moreover, it is a factor that has no role in increasing actual effectiveness, yet serves to reduce the potential effectiveness of both men and women as managers, and particularly disadvantages women as managers. On the grounds that women as a group have been found to possess skills and characteristics now considered critical to contributing to the management function (i.e. people leadership), and underpinning managerial effectiveness in general (i.e. interpersonal skills) research attention is imperative.

This model has been provided to display the key factors to be included when considering what constitutes managerial effectiveness in the current business environment. It is in essence a meta-model, from which organisation and industry specific models of effectiveness can be developed. Having said that, it must be recognised that the model now needs the relationships between the key variables clarified, as well as field empirical validation.
6.7. Future Research and Model Development

The research programme revealed the key factors contributing to managerial effectiveness in terms of assessment ratings and perceived importance as credibility, valuing people, verbal communication, influence on others, conceptual thinking, and managing immediate/current change. The tentative first arrangement of the variables shown in Figures 6.1, 6.2 and 5.1 goes some way towards explaining the existing literature and the empirical work conducted, as a representation of perceived skills and characteristics of managerial effectiveness.

The pilot study revealed the key issues concerning the need to differentiate between technical management skills and the personal characteristics of individuals, and revealed the importance of considering organisation context and culture as key variables. That first study also provided through the literature analysis the enduring traditional needs for leading, planning, organising, and controlling from strategic, tactical, and operational time frames and perspectives, with general or functional management roles, as shown in Figure 6.1. Figure 6.1, therefore, encapsulates the external factors operating on what is required to be effective in a generic sense, and under particular organisation circumstances, and Figure 6.2 encapsulates the internal factors contributing to individual effectiveness.

In Figure 6.2, the key variables and their relationships were derived using the conceptual framework developed in the first study, where it was revealed that individual effectiveness is perceived to be underpinned by technical skills and personal characteristics relating to self, others, and the organisation. The skills and characteristics shown in Figure 6.2 represent an integration of the findings from the research programme, where the second study revealed the need to consider actual and perceived effectiveness as a core gender issue. The second study also revealed the importance of considering social conditioning as a major influence on managerial style. This is where human attributes are shaped by life experience, and these perspectives are taken into management learning, and practice. An exploration and
analysis of the psychological literature (Appendix 6.1) suggested that a more firm platform than currently exists for the consideration of personal characteristics may be found in identifying a psychological profile associated with managerial effectiveness, as shown in Figure 6.2. The characteristics shown exist in all managers, have long been associated with managerial and personal effectiveness, and are definable and measurable.

There are, therefore, two clear avenues of research that need to be undertaken in future. The first avenue relates to the generic and contextual aspects of managerial effectiveness (as shown in Figure 6.1), where further research is required to more clearly specify the demands of different organisation contexts and cultures, in terms of the underpinning skills and characteristics shown in Figure 6.2. The existing literature holds most of the technical skills relating to the major categories shown, but there is a need to clarify changing relationships according to contextual issues. For example, to establish how the mix or emphases change according to organisation size, stage in lifecycle, and what needs to change when the competitive advantage sought is for the consumer dollar, or for public and government funding.

The second avenue of research is the need to establish the predictive validity of the model in terms of showing a strong relationship between the skills and characteristics shown, and effective managerial performance. In a related sense, it is necessary to establish whether the psychological profile underpins all human input, or whether it is complementary to the personal characteristics perceived by managers, and management educators’ and developers’ to underpin managerial effectiveness.

Societal thinking brought into organisations by the people who work there have spawned controversial and thorny gender issues. Of the many and diverse gender issues revealed in study two, perceptions of effectiveness, and the manner in which domestic circumstances enhance or hinder the ability to be effective, are considered to be the most
practical avenues of research likely to reveal findings to be usefully applied. In a more general sense, the need to change socially conditioned gender characteristics in order to assume “cross-gender” occupations also requires investigation.

The series of studies undertaken for this thesis were focused upon effectiveness and ineffectiveness. There is also a need to investigate what constitutes “excellence”, and whether this equates with the “extremely effective” group identified in phase one. It may be, for example, that the notion of natural talent discussed by Hinterhuber and Popp (1992), or the “X-factor” discussed by Worledge (1992) relates to a strong natural inclination toward either or both the set of characteristics revealed in study three, and/or the psychological profile suggested to underpin all human input. In the same vein, the current notion of “competence” needs to be reconciled within this model as a desired level of effective performance.

Much of this work can be achieved by transposing existing models into the format of the proposed model, and making adjustments to the proposed model to fit the data if required. This will provide a measure of face and construct validity. From there, however, the strengthened model will need to be tested in the field with empirical study designed to assess the extent to which the model can be used to develop industry and organisation specific models of managerial effectiveness, and whether organisation effectiveness is increased by using the model.

In conclusion, the doctoral research programme was designed to characterise managerial effectiveness in the current business environment, across many perspectives. It was a mammoth task to tackle. However, by constantly focusing upon the influences and impacts upon the individual effectiveness of managers, a coherent framework of generic and contextual influences was identified. In contrast to the majority of other studies, which describe what managers do, this series of studies explored the demands of the job, and the skills and characteristics required to fulfil the demands of the job. Rather than producing yet
another list of skills and characteristics, this research has documented the perceptions of the skills and characteristics of managerial effectiveness, and has revealed the parameters of, and started to articulate the relationships between, many different aspects of effectiveness.
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CORE COMPETENCIES OF GOOD/EFFECTIVE MANAGERS

FOCUS GROUP INSTRUCTIONS

We are working with the Ministry of Commerce and the New Zealand Institute of Management to identify perceptions of “core competencies” for New Zealand managers. The focus group you are about to participate in is designed to gather your ideas and opinions about managerial skills and abilities required in New Zealand. A number of these focus groups are being conducted with practicing managers, and management educators and developers. The results of this research will be summarised for your own use, as well as forming a part of a report by University of Auckland researchers to the Ministry of Commerce. The information gathered will only be analysed and reported in an aggregated form - no individuals will be identified.

Researchers: Carole Page and Marie Wilson, University of Auckland, Department of Management Studies.

INSTRUCTIONS

STEP 1: The focus question is “What constitutes good/effective management?” As a group, brain storm ideas on what characterises good/effective management practice. Normal brain storming rules apply - please do not criticise or debate the ideas being expressed. You will have the opportunity to state your opinion on each idea a little later, in step two.

STEP 2: Remaining focused upon what characterises good/effective management, rate each item presented as it relates to overall effectiveness as a manager. Record your rating in the lower righthand corner of the box.

5 = critical to good management, an absolute necessity
4 = important to good management, most good managers have this
3 = helpful to good management, a desirable characteristic
2 = unimportant, nonessential, but could assist in some cases
1 = neither adds nor detracts from good management, makes no difference

STEP 3: Sort the slips into groups that make sense to you. You may have only one slip in a group, and there may be different numbers of slips in each group. The only restriction is that there must be more than one group. When the slips are sorted into groups, record the item numbers contained in each group in the spaces provided on the sorting sheet. The order of the items does not matter - i.e. items do not need to be in numerical order when recording groupings.

Thank you for your time, it is greatly appreciated. PLEASE HELP YOURSELF TO REFRESHMENTS DURING THE SESSION
RATING SHEET

____ 1 planning
____ 2 human relations
____ 3 interpersonal skills
____ 4 rational decision making
____ 5 multiple tasks roles
____ 6 listening
____ 7 written communications
____ 8 presentations
____ 9 personal impact/impression
____10 strategic vision/sense
____11 organising self
____12 change agent/management
____13 sense of history
____14 broad/big picture oriented
____15 decisive, not a procrastinator
____16 fosters growth/development
____17 team leadership
____18 responsible for own work
____19 communicate vision / philosophy
____20 analytical/critical thinking
____21 positive attitude
____22 caring
____23 aware of others’ needs
____24 consistency
____25 democratic
____26 balance between participative and independent decision making
____27 leadership
____28 responsive to external influences
____29 responsive to market needs
____30 business/industry/knowledge
____31 financial acumen/ability
____32 contract negotiation
____33 project management
____34 general academic background
____35 objectivity/detachment
____36 open to reflection/learning
____37 fosters vision
____38 generalist
____39 systematic/logical thinking
____40 external awareness
____41 courage of convictions
____42 problem solving
____43 self-awareness
____44 problem focus
____45 self-discipline
____46 self-control
____47 organisational skills
____48 organisational skills
____49 organisational skills
____50 organisational skills
____51 organisational skills
____52 organisational skills
____53 organisational skills
____54 organisational skills
____55 organisational skills
____56 organisational skills
____57 organisational skills
____58 organisational skills
____59 subordinate motivation
____60 facilitating
____61 retains sense of humour under pressure
____62 coach/develop all subordinates
____63 goal setting and adjusting
____64 needs assessment
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42 persuasion  65 realistic/reasonable expectations
43 oral communication  66 consistency
44 organising others  67 open, approachable
45 time management  68 proactive, anticipative
46 overseeing subordinates’ work  69 lead by example, role model
47 adaptable/flexible  70 providing explanations, reasons
48 open to new ideas  71 fair, just
49 consult/hire appropriate people  72 takes responsibility
50 staff recruitment/selection  73 up-to-date on relevant issues
51 staff appraisal  74 rewards/reinforces good work
52 recognises opportunities threats  75 tolerance of ambiguity, uncertainty
53 delegation  76 fragmentation
54 recognise, appreciate and develop talent  77 balance of internal and external focus
55 industrial democracy  78 inspirational leadership
56 information dissemination  79 reading environmental change
57 calculated risk-taking  80 liaise at all levels
81 networking  91 rapid decisionmaking
82 focus attention on key issues  92 provides direction
83 team building  93 statistical knowledge, use
84 generates loyalty, commitment  94 open to uses of hard and soft data in problem-solving, decision making
85 needs assessment of others  95 sense of history
86 able to be wrong makes  96 understanding uses of
Mistakes

Successful history

Empowering

Enthusiasm

Administration

Information technology

Creates challenging environment

Appropriate technical base

Intelligence
SORTING SHEET

For each grouping, record the numbers of the slips you have sorted into that group.

EXAMPLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPING # 1</th>
<th>GROUPING # 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please mark your choices CLEARLY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#3</th>
<th>#4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#5</th>
<th>#6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#7</th>
<th>#8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#9</th>
<th>#10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#11</th>
<th>#12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEW ZEALAND INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT MAIL SURVEY

This survey is designed to gather your ideas and opinions about management skills and abilities in New Zealand. The results of this survey will be summarised for your own use, as well as forming part of a report by University of Auckland researchers to the Ministry of Commerce. Your response is completely anonymous and confidential. Your quick response is essential. PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN THE SURVEY TODAY.

INSTRUCTIONS

STEP ONE. Complete the questions on the first two pages (INFORMATION SHEET) relating to differences in skills and abilities for different types of management environments.

STEP TWO. Turn to the third page of the survey, labelled CONCEPT RATING SHEET. Focus on the characteristic skills and abilities of a good manager. Rate all the phrases, using the rating scheme provided, as they relate to being a GOOD/EFFECTIVE manager. Record your ratings next to the phrase on the sheet marked CONCEPT RATING SHEET.

5 = critical to good management, an absolute necessity
4 = important to good management, most good managers have this
3 = helpful to good management, a desirable characteristic
2 = unimportant, non-essential, but could assist in some cases
1 = neither adds nor detracts from good management, makes no difference

STEP THREE. Turn to the pages that include the same phrases as step two above, but presented in “boxes”. Separate the phrases by cutting them apart, yielding 99 slips with a phrase on each.

Reflect again on the nature of good management. Sort the slips into groupings that make sense to you. There may be only one slip in a group, or there may be many - you may NOT, however, put all the phrases into one group. When you have sorted them all out, record your groupings on the last sheet of the survey (marked CONCEPT RATING SHEET). The order in which you enter them does not matter, as long as you have captured the numbers of the phrases and the groups you see them as belonging to.

STEP FOUR. Return the TWO INFORMATION SHEETS, CONCEPT RATING SHEET and CONCEPT SORTING SHEET to:

Management Competencies
Attention: Carole Page

by mail  Management Studies
         University of Auckland
         Private Bag 92019
         Auckland

by fax:   (09) 413-9640
INFORMATION SHEET

1. Do any characteristics become more or less important for organisations....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>that are just starting up?</th>
<th>declining?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>that are mature/stable?</th>
<th>that are in turn around situations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any additional skills required in these situations?

2. What, if any, additional characteristics are required for the public sector?

3. What, if any, additional characteristics are required in a team-based environment?

4. Are there industries or sectors that require different characteristics?
INFORMATION SHEET

Current title

Number of years of management experience

Industry in which you are employed

Highest educational and/or professional qualification(s)

Experience in hiring, training, developing, appraising, etc. other managers

Please mark on the following continuum your experience in assessing the ability of managers in your organisation.

I value management education I value management education I value natural ability
and development more than and development and natural more than management
natural ability ability about equally education and development
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Please reflect on the skills and abilities of a “good/effective” manager in New Zealand today. Then rate each item (phrase) using the following scale:

- 5 = critical to good management, an absolute necessity
- 4 = important to good management, most good managers have this
- 3 = helpful to good management, a desirable characteristic
- 2 = unimportant, non-essential, but could assist in some cases
- 1 = neither adds nor detracts from good management, makes no difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 planning</th>
<th>19 communicate vision / philosophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>human relations</td>
<td>20 analytical/critical thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>interpersonal skills</td>
<td>21 positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>rational decision making</td>
<td>22 caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>multiple tasks roles</td>
<td>23 aware of others’ needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>listening</td>
<td>24 consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>written communications</td>
<td>25 democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>presentations</td>
<td>26 balance between participative and independent decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>personal impact/impression</td>
<td>27 leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>strategic vision/sense</td>
<td>28 responsive to external influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>organising self</td>
<td>29 responsive to market needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>change agent/management</td>
<td>30 business/industry/knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sense of history</td>
<td>31 financial acumen/ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>broad/big picture oriented</td>
<td>32 contract negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>decisive, not a procrastinator</td>
<td>33 project management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>fosters growth/development</td>
<td>34 general academic background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>team leadership</td>
<td>35 objectivity/detachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>36 open to reflection/learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>37 fosters vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>59 subordinate motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>60 facilitating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
84 generates loyalty, commitment
85 needs assessment of others
86 able to be wrong makes mistakes
87 successful history
88 empowering
89 enthusiasm
90 administration
94 open to uses of hard and soft data in problem-solving, decision making
95 sense of history
96 understanding uses of information technology
97 creates challenging environment
98 appropriate technical base
99 intelligence
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Planning</th>
<th>2. Human relations</th>
<th>3. Interpersonal skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Rational decision making</td>
<td>5. Multiple task roles</td>
<td>6. Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Fosters growth, development</td>
<td>17. Team leadership</td>
<td>18. Team member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Responsive to external influences</td>
<td>29. Responsive to market needs</td>
<td>30. Business/industry knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONCEPT SORTING SHEET

Use the attached sheet of concepts. Cut each slip apart and consider all 99 items in light of good/effective management practice. Sort the slips into groups that represent like or related items.

For each grouping, record the numbers of the slips you have sorted into that group.

EXAMPLE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPING # 1</th>
<th>GROUPING # 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please mark your choices CLEARLY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1</th>
<th>#2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>#8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>#10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>#12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carole Page, Massey University (Albany Campus), and Marie Wilson, University of Auckland, believe there is a need for a better understanding of what constitutes effective management, beyond the fads and fashions that come and go. To this end, this survey is the culmination of three years of research into the issues involved with being an effective manager in the 1990s. You are asked to contribute a few minutes of your time to this research by completing this form in an assessment of the skills and characteristics of a manager whose work you know well. Your responses are guaranteed to be completely confidential.

The information from this survey will assist us in assessing the skills, characteristics, and external factors that contribute to management effectiveness in New Zealand. A summary of the findings will be published in Management Magazine early in the new year.

Effectiveness is defined as performance that has a positive effect on the organisation or on others. In contrast, ineffectiveness is seen as having a negative impact on the organisation and or on others. The purpose of this study is to assess what is associated with effectiveness and ineffectiveness, by asking managers to evaluate another manager using the form overleaf. In this evaluation we need to know: 1) how good or poor the person is with each item, and 2) how important or unimportant each item is with regard to being an effective manager.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. In the first set of questions, we are looking for the factors that in a general sense help or hinder the ability to be effective as a manager in the 1990s. On the understanding that for all items it depends on the person and situation, please answer these questions from a general perspective, where the extent of help or hindrance is considered.

2. Please then think about a manager that you know well with whom you currently work, or have worked with in the past. Then go through the form and answer the second and third parts as they relate to that manager. The last section then relates back to general perspectives.

3. Please provide an answer to all questions and then fold the form where indicated, tape, and post (no stamp required).
THE SURVEY: The survey has four parts - please complete each part

Please tick, cross, or circle the appropriate numbered circle provided, as directed by the arrows

### PART ONE

In general, to what extent do the following factors help or hinder the ability to be effective as a manager?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where: 1 = Can Help a Lot</th>
<th>2 = Sometimes Helpful</th>
<th>3 = Neither a Help nor a Hindrance</th>
<th>4 = Sometimes a Hindrance</th>
<th>5 = Can Hinder a Lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innate characteristics of a person</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Learned life skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned management skills</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Tertiary education</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job training/learning</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Outside skills development programmes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation size large</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Organisation size small - medium</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management level middle</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Management level senior</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive organisation culture</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Negative organisation culture</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong organisation resource base</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Weak organisation resource base</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good superiors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Poor superiors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good subordinates</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Poor subordinates</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good management consultant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Poor management consultant</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good professional services (e.g. legal)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Poor professional services</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a spouse as domestic support</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Family responsibilities &amp; commitments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household responsibilities &amp; duties</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Balancing needs of home and career</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART TWO

Please tell us a few things about yourself and the manager you have chosen to assess:

### ABOUT YOU:

Please place your response here

- **Number of employees in your company:**
  - <10  1  11-25  2  26-50  3  51-100  4  101+ 5
- **Company Sector:**
  - Govt. Dept./SOE 1  Local Govt. 2  Manufacturing 3  Sales/Service 4  Not-for-profit 5
- **Management Position:**
  - Sole Owner 1  Top (e.g. CEO, Director) 2  Senior 3  Middle 4  Supervisory 5  Other 6
- **My role is mostly:**
  - General management 1  Technical Expertise 2  Functional (e.g. HRM) 3
- **I am:**
  - Male 1  Female 2
- **Number of years managerial experience (years):**
  - 1-5 1  6-10 2  11-15 3  16-20 4  21+ 5  None 6

### ABOUT THE PERSON CHOSEN FOR ASSESSMENT:

- **The person is or was:**
  - Male 1  Female 2
- **Management Position is or was:**
  - Sole Owner 1  Top 2  Senior 3  Middle 4  Supervisory 5  Other 6
- **The sector relating to him/her:**
  - Govt. Dept./SOE 1  Local Govt. 2  Manufacturing 3  Sales/Service 4  Not-for-profit 5
- **His/her role is or was mostly:**
  - General management 1  Technical expertise 2  Functional 3
- **Number of years managerial experience (years):**
  - 1-5 1  6-10 2  11-15 3  16-20 4  21+ 5  Don’t Know 6
- **The assessment relates to the person:**
  - Now 1  1-2 yrs ago 2  3-5 yrs ago 3  5+ yrs ago 4

Please now rate the overall effectiveness of this person as a manager where:

- 1 = Extremely Effective
- 2 = Mostly Effective
- 3 = Neither Effective nor Ineffective
- 4 = Mostly Ineffective
- 5 = Extremely Ineffective
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### PART THREE

Keeping that same manager in mind, please rate them where:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Extremely Good</th>
<th>2 = Mostly Good</th>
<th>3 = Neither Good nor Poor</th>
<th>4 = Mostly Poor</th>
<th>5 = Extremely Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**USING ONLY THE WHITE CIRCLES in the list below**

| Industry knowledge | Participative approach | Intercultural sensitivity | Value people | Physical fitness | Goal setting for self | Ongoing development | Reflection | Learning attitude | Influence on others | Credibility | Self-confidence | Interpersonal skills | Socially adept | Communicate objectives | Verbal communication | Prepare proposals | Internal public relations | Small group leadership | Internal networking | Conceptual thinking | Implement plans | Goal setting for others | Informal learning | Problem diagnosis | Business planning | Delegate | Intelligece | Evaluate proposals | Crisis management | Recruit & select employees | Understand national politics | Generate/create strategic vision | Understand international economics | Understand international politics | Ability to work under pressure | Formal organisation communication | Creative/innovative thinking | Planned use of human resources | Understand industry economy | Interpersonal sensitivity | Empathy | Stress management | Self/time management | Emotional balance | Critical thinking | Self awareness | Self development | Professional development | Positive attitude | Transformational/inspirational | Organisation diagnosis | Sales/presentation skills | Written communication | Public speaking | External public relations | Prepare reports | External networking | Responsiveness; adaptability | Plan change | Following company policies | Cost control | Business acumen | Negotiation/conflict resolution | Role model | Perceptiveness | Entrepreneurial attitude | Communicate vision | Initiative/proactive | Results/Outcome/Goal achievement attitude | Manage current/immediate change | Organisation culture management | Understand national economy | Psychological strength & stability | Personal presence/charisma | Understand organisational politics | Generate/contribute to revenue | Broad functional understanding |

### PART FOUR

Now thinking from a general perspective and using the BLACK CIRCLES above, please rate the importance of the items to being an effective manager, where:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 = Extremely Important</th>
<th>2 = Important</th>
<th>3 = Neither Important nor Unimportant</th>
<th>4 = Unimportant</th>
<th>5 = Extremely Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### APPENDIX 3.1

#### CONCEPT MAP CLUSTERS AND RATINGS

**3.1.1. Concept Map - NZIM Focus Group Clusters and Ratings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER (RATING)</th>
<th>Concept (rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISION AND STRATEGY (4.36)</strong></td>
<td>* ability to conceptualise (4.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* vision (5.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* achievement, results oriented (4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* creative, innovative thinking (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* logical thought (3.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* sees the big picture (4.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* strategic thinking (4.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* presentation skills (3.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATION &amp; DECISION MAKING</strong></td>
<td>* good oral presentations (3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.88)</td>
<td>* reading skills (3.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* oral, verbal communication (4.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* written communication (3.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ability to make decisions (4.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* problem analysis (4.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* reporting (3.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ability to weigh alternatives in decision making (4.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLAN AND IMPLEMENT (4.27)</strong></td>
<td>* rational, problem solving (3.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* prioritising (4.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* able to implement plans (4.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* strategic thinker/planner (4.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* identifies relevant from irrelevant information (4.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* business planning (4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* change management (4.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIALIST TECHNICAL SKILLS</strong></td>
<td>* special sector knowledge (2.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.43)</td>
<td>* marketing awareness (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* financial understanding (3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* understanding of commercial law (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* industry knowledge (3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUSINESS SYSTEMS KNOWLEDGE</strong></td>
<td>* commercial/business acumen (4.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.92)</td>
<td>* general functional understanding (3.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* understanding of information technology (3.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td>* time management (3.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.88)</td>
<td>* resource allocation (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL AWARENESS (3.90)</strong></td>
<td>* customer awareness (4.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* global perspective (4.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* understanding of NZ economy (3.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* global economic awareness (3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* environmental steward (3.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SELF AWARENESS, CONFIDENCE (3.99) | * accurate self assessment (3.88)  
| | * high energy (4.25)  
| | * self control (2.88)  
| | * self motivated (4.63)  
| | * flexibility (4.50)  
| | * humour, sense of fun (4.38)  
| | * self confidence (3.88)  
| | * maturity (3.50)  
| | * persistence (4.00)  |
| POSITIVE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS (4.20) | * presence (4.00)  
| | * positive attitude (4.63)  
| | * humility (3.50)  
| | * adaptable (4.25)  
| | * commitment (4.63)  |
| MANAGE STRESS AND RISKS (3.83) | * objectivity (4.00)  
| | * stress management (3.63)  
| | * personal risk taking (3.88)  |
| INFORMED THINKER (4.17) | * listening skills (4.25)  
| | * independent thinker (4.00)  
| | * self organisation (4.25)  |
| FEEDBACK (4.63) | * open to feedback (4.63)  
| | * learns from feedback (4.75)  
| | * receptive attitude (4.25)  
| | * integrity, loyalty (4.75)  
| | * fair (4.75)  |
| MANAGES SUBORDINATES (4.08) | * ability to develop others (4.50)  
| | * subordinate organisation (3.50)  
| | * communicates objective and purpose (4.63)  
| | * organisational culture knowledge, awareness (3.75)  
| | * values ongoing education of self and others (4.13)  
| | * nurtures challenge (4.00)  |
| INTERNAL NETWORKING (3.63) | * a corporate citizen (3.38)  
| | * networker (3.88)  |
| NEGOTIATE (4.13) | * negotiation (4.25)  
| | * conflict resolution (3.75)  
| | * able to explain complex information in a simple way (4.13)  
| | * setting challenging and achievable goals (4.38)  |
| LEADS OTHERS - INDIVIDUAL AND GROUP (4.23) | * manage the group process (4.13)  
| | * ability to motivate others (4.38)  
| | * interacts with all employees (3.38)  
| | * lead others (4.75)  
| | * inspires subordinates (4.50)  
| | * develops subordinates (4.75)  
| | * ability to influence others (4.38)  
| | * availability to others (3.63)  |
| INTEGRATOR DELEGATOR (3.68)       | * achieves results through others (3.75)  
|                                  | * good delegator (4.25)                    
|                                  | * promotes interconnectedness (3.88)       
|                                  | * team person (3.38)                       
|                                  | * knows employees by name (3.13)           |
| INTERPERSONAL (3.98)             | * empathy (4.25)                           
|                                  | * interpersonal skills (4.63)              
|                                  | * socially aware, skilled (3.75)           
|                                  | * tolerance of ambiguity (3.63)            
|                                  | * generates trust (4.63)                   
|                                  | * accepts decisions made by others (3.00)  |
| RELATIONSHIP MANAGEMENT (4.45)   | * sensitivity to others (4.38)             
|                                  | * team leader (4.75)                       
|                                  | * relationship builder (4.50)              
|                                  | * lead by example (4.50)                   
<p>|                                  | * supportive (4.13)                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER (RATING)</th>
<th>Concept (rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPING OTHERS (4.13)</td>
<td>* develop others (4.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* fosters creativity and innovation in others (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* reinforces staff participation and input (3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* empowers others (4.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* subordinate motivation (4.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* actively develops subordinates (4.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* recognise and harness individual potential (4.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* subordinate encouragement, support (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* values development of self and others (4.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* appreciation of impact of lower level staff (3.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (3.86)</td>
<td>* relationship building (3.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* respect for other viewpoints (3.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* integrator of resources, people (3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* available and approachable for subordinates (4.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* human resource management (3.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* effective in rewarding staff (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST BUILDING (3.96)</td>
<td>* generates trust (4.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* role model, lead by example (4.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* oral communication (4.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* inspires others (4.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* sensitivity, empathy (3.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* listening skills (4.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* creates an open, trusting environment (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* non-judgmental, not blaming (3.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM BUILDER (4.04)</td>
<td>* team builder (4.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* human relations (3.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* team member (3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEAM LEADER (3.89)</td>
<td>* conflict resolution (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* liaise at all levels (3.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* creates a challenging environment (3.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* team leader (4.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIDGING (4.00)</td>
<td>* negotiation (3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* communicate company philosophy (4.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* manage diversity (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE AGENT (4.00)</td>
<td>* change management (3.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* seeks advice from appropriate sources (4.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINTAINS NETWORK (3.92)</td>
<td>* influencing others, persuasiveness (4.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* delegator (4.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* seeks, accepts feedback (3.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* networker (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* following through on commitments, queries (4.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* constructive feedback, criticism (3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **POSITIVE PERSONAL CHARACTER (4.09)**       | * self confidence (4.10)  
* high energy (4.21)  
* positive attitude (4.21)  
* psychological, emotional maturity (3.93)  
* persistence (4.00)  
* integrity, ethics (4.32)  
* consistency (3.86) |
| **SELF MOTIVATION (3.55)**                   | * self motivation (4.72)  
* tolerance of ambiguity (3.15)  
* presence, charisma (3.28)  
* tactful, diplomatic (3.39)  
* socially skilled, aware (3.21) |
| **ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH INNOVATION (3.83)**    | * achievements, results oriented (4.48)  
* well educated (3.61)  
* creative, innovative thinking (4.21)  
* self organisation (4.21)  
* intuition (3.45)  
* performs well under pressure (4.21)  
* independent (2.82)  
* balance of work and private life (3.68) |
| **PERCEPTIVE (3.85)**                        | * logical approach to decision making (3.66)  
* perceptive (3.79)  
* visionary (4.11) |
| **SELF ORGANISED (3.95)**                   | * rapid information processing (3.68)  
* opportunity seeking (4.00)  
* forward thinking (4.39)  
* balances, prioritise commitments (4.14)  
* generalist (3.54) |
| **PRESENTATION (3.84)**                      | * presentation skills (3.59)  
* ability to sell an idea (4.00)  
* openness with information (3.89)  
* written communication (3.89) |
| **EXTERNAL AWARENESS (CUSTOMER) (3.75)**    | * customer awareness (4.48)  
* environmentally responsible (3.43)  
* culturally aware (3.18)  
* marketing awareness (4.25)  
* understanding and use of political environment (3.18)  
* quality awareness (3.96) |
| **KNOW OWN ORGANISATION (3.97)**            | * knowledge of own organisation (4.45)  
* resource allocation (3.50) |
| **EXTERNAL AWARENESS (INTERNATIONAL, ECONOMIC) (3.31)** | * aware of NZ economic environment (3.41)  
* external scanning (3.15)  
* aware of global economic environment (2.93)  
* thinks in terms of international markets (3.18)  
* industry knowledge (3.97)  
* research oriented (2.82)  
* global "big picture" awareness (3.68)  
* commercial, business acumen (4.31) |
| PROBLEM ANALYSIS (3.70) | * logical, rational approach to problem analysis (3.83)  
|                        | * calculated risk taking (3.50)  
|                        | * systems thinker (3.14)  
| PLANNING (3.97)        | * planning (4.14)  
|                        | * plan implementation (3.71)  
|                        | * strategic planning (4.39)  
|                        | * contingency planning (3.64)  
|                        | * goal setting (4.14)  
|                        | * monitoring and evaluating (3.81)  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER (RATING)</th>
<th>Concept (rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LIAISON (3.61)     | * bridge between inside and outside organisation (3.83)  
                        * knows NZ and internal business environment (3.51)  
                        * generalist (3.40)  
                        * understands, uses political environment (3.71) |
| CUSTOMER FOCUSED   | * customer focused (4.23)  
                        * looks for opportunities (4.46)  
                        * clarity of verbal communication (3.88)  
                        * command of the language (3.74)  
                        * written skills (3.67) |
| (4.14)             |                                                                                                                                                   |
| QUANTITATIVE       | * controls work (3.50)  
                        * analytical skills (3.90)  
                        * creates profits, returns (4.32)  
                        * research (3.38) |
| CONTROL (3.77)     |                                                                                                                                                   |
| RESOURCES MANAGER  | * mobilise effective, efficient use of resources (3.97)  
                        * monitor the process of activities (3.50)  
                        * well educated (3.48)  
                        * presentation skills (3.68)  
                        * seeks top professional advice (3.71) |
| and PROCESS        |                                                                                                                                                   |
| MONITOR (3.67)     |                                                                                                                                                   |
| MEDIATE FEEDBACK   | * lack of ego (3.03)  
                        * seek feedback - internal, external (3.88)  
                        * mediate conflicts (3.83) |
| (3.58)             |                                                                                                                                                   |
| CLEAR AND          | * networking (3.85)  
                        * clear job description (3.41)  
                        * consistency (3.75)  
                        * stress management (3.80) |
| CONSISTENT (3.70)   |                                                                                                                                                   |
| WISDOM AND SELF    | * know strengths, weaknesses (4.39)  
                        * seeks advice from appropriate sources (3.75) |
| AWARENESS (4.07)   |                                                                                                                                                   |
| MULTIPLE PRIORITIES| * handle multiple priorities (3.95)  
                        * risk taking (3.64)  
                        * process information rapidly (3.55) |
| (3.71)             |                                                                                                                                                   |
| FOCUS AND BALANCE  | * focus - see problems clearly (4.27)  
                        * realistic short and long term perspectives (3.90)  
                        * functions well under pressure (4.38) |
| (4.18)             |                                                                                                                                                   |
| ORGANISATION AND   | * time management (3.97)  
                        * organised (3.85)  
                        * systems thinker (3.46)  
                        * meets deadlines (4.17)  
                        * planning (4.32)  
                        * contingency planning (4.00)  
                        * advance planning (4.26) |
| PLANNING (4.01)    |                                                                                                                                                   |
| TECHNICAL SPECIALIST (3.48) | * good technical understanding (3.08)  
* financial control (3.78)  
* marketing knowledge (3.75)  
* business systems (3.46) |
|---|---|
| DIVERSITY (4.10) | * manage diversity (4.24)  
* coordinate diverse parts of the organisation (3.93)  
* negotiation (4.12) |
| STRATEGIC THINKING (4.15) | * vision (4.71)  
* goal setting (4.22)  
* innovative (3.88)  
* link ideas from different areas, fields (3.63)  
* lateral thinking (4.00)  
* forward thinking (4.45) |
| LEADERSHIP AND ENERGY (4.15) | * enthusiasm and passion (4.07)  
* positive attitude (4.27)  
* responsible (4.25)  
* leadership (4.57)  
* flexibility (3.88)  
* value quality (4.34)  
* delegation (4.14)  
* accessible (3.83)  
* ethical standards seen and practised (3.95) |
| PEOPLE MANAGEMENT (3.65) | * get buy in of staff (3.44)  
* don't be mean on remuneration of staff (3.29)  
* interested in staff as individuals (4.07)  
* reward staff effectively (3.80) |
| GOOD DECISION MAKING (4.04) | * breadth of general understanding (3.62)  
* keep abreast, up to date (3.85)  
* recognise key factors for success (4.29)  
* decisive (4.35)  
* make quality decisions (4.24)  
* follow through on decisions (4.14)  
* synthesise (3.51)  
* communicate clear strategy, goals (4.33) |
| LEAD PEOPLE (3.87) | * empathy with others feelings and attitudes (3.73)  
* encourager (3.95)  
* reinforce participation, communication (3.95)  
* caring (3.51)  
* team player (3.88)  
* get staff input on changes and improvements (3.68)  
* recognise and develop staff potential (4.07)  
* develop subordinates (3.90)  
* honest and fair to others (4.13) |
| TEAM BUILDER (3.92) | * empowering others (4.05)  
|                    | * respect for other viewpoints (3.82)  
|                    | * motivate others (4.34)  
|                    | * build teams (4.05)  
|                    | * charisma, warmth (3.47)  
|                    | * active listening (4.07)  
|                    | * openness with information (3.46)  
| EMPOWER (3.83)     | * enable group decision making (3.78)  
|                    | * appreciate importance of "lower levels" (3.63)  
|                    | * emotionally stable (4.02)  
|                    | * interpersonal (3.95)  
|                    | * tolerance of culture (3.78)  |
### Concept Map - Management MBA Managers Clusters and Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster (Rating)</th>
<th>Concept (Rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TALENT MANAGEMENT (3.60)</strong></td>
<td>* recognises talent (3.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* recognises mistakes, avoids blame (3.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* patience with lesser skilled staff (3.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* influence others (4.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* lead by example (3.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPATHY (3.38)</strong></td>
<td>* know the feeling and attitude of subordinates (3.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* recognise importance of all employees to firm performance (3.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* emphasises common values (2.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* tolerance of different work habits (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* appreciates other points of view (3.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STAFF MANAGEMENT (3.55)</strong></td>
<td>* create an open environment (3.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* network (3.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* communicate staff strengths and weaknesses (3.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* back up staff with delegated tasks (3.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* harness the potential of individuals (3.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* reward staff (3.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* foster education and development of staff (3.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPOWER TEAM (3.73)</strong></td>
<td>* comprehend human aspects of business (3.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* coordinate groups (3.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* involve staff in participative problem solving (3.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* make group work as team (3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* get results through people (4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEEDBACK (3.98)</strong></td>
<td>* give positive feedback and credit (3.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* motivating others to perform (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* delegate and empower (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMUNICATE VISION (3.91)</strong></td>
<td>* communicate, instil the vision in others (4.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* build loyalty, commitment (3.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* create synergies with others (3.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* encourage others to succeed (3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* available to staff (3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* foster communication and feedback to staff (3.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* long term view with regard to human resources (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDUSTRY KNOWLEDGE (3.57)</strong></td>
<td>* vision of the business (4.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* international knowledge (2.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* industry knowledge (3.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* knowledge of the business they are in (3.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* understand financial operations, bottom line (3.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* continuing education to stay abreast (3.61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DO IT (3.94)                  | * get things done (4.00)  
|                              | * decision making (4.50)  
|                              | * prioritises (4.06)      
|                              | * plan (4.22)             
|                              | * political awareness (2.94) |
| IMPACT ANALYSIS (3.43)       | * assess the impact of change (3.74) 
|                              | * focus on quality (3.56) 
|                              | * research and information gathering (3.00) |
| CUSTOMER FOCUS (3.46)        | * focus on core business (3.63)  
|                              | * customer focused - external (4.35) 
|                              | * monitor trends and adapt to environment (3.68)  
|                              | * write reports (2.28)   
|                              | * understand power of technology (3.33) |
| CHANGE (4.01)                | * manage change (4.10)    
|                              | * identifies areas in need of change (4.11)  
|                              | * set attainable goals (3.95) |
| DEAL WITH STRESS (3.98)      | * operate effectively under pressure (4.00)  
|                              | * accept challenge (4.29) 
|                              | * personal discipline and instil in others (3.37)  
|                              | * think laterally (3.84)  
|                              | * creativity in problem resolution (3.83)  
|                              | * take responsibility for decisions (4.53) |
| RAPID OPERATIONS (3.88)      | * stress management (3.37)  
|                              | * thinks ahead (4.05)     
|                              | * reacts rapidly (3.78)   
|                              | * leadership under fire (4.32) |
| ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT (3.55) | * negotiate without getting bogged down (3.37) 
|                              | * chairs productive meetings (3.17) 
|                              | * understands organisational strengths, weaknesses (3.89)  
|                              | * follow through on queries, commitments (3.37)  
|                              | * foster quality culture (2.94) |
| OBJECTIVE SETTING (3.98)     | * communicate a clear strategy (4.53)  
|                              | * internal customer focused (3.83) 
|                              | * set objectives for self, team, organisation (4.00)  
|                              | * liaise with all levels (3.63)  
|                              | * lead teams toward clear goals (3.89) |
| LISTEN (4.10)                | * active listening (4.05)  
|                              | * interpersonal skills (4.32) 
|                              | * recognise own limitations, accept input (3.94) |
| CHARACTER OF INTERACTION (3.74) | * respect trust (3.63)  
|                              | * inspirational (3.72)    
|                              | * enjoy their work (4.00) 
|                              | * persuasive (3.58)       
|                              | * approachable (3.78)     |
| PERSONAL CHARACTER (3.65) | * consistent yet flexible (3.26)  
| | * tactful, diplomatic (3.58)  
| | * open to new ideas (4.17)  
| | * positive thinking, attitude (4.16)  
| | * sense of humour (3.50)  
| | * responsive (3.84)  
| | * integrity - honest, fair (4.00)  
| | * authoritative (2.61)  
| | * strong sense of self (3.72)  
| BALANCE AND WISDOM (2.98) | * physically fit (2.22)  
| | * ability to relax and socialise (3.18)  
| | * looks and acts the part (2.47)  
| | * lead balanced lives (3.17)  
| | * organised, time management (3.47)  
| | * wisdom, including life experience (3.22)  
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### Concept Map - Management Educators Clusters and Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER (RATING)</th>
<th>Concept (rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL IMPACT (3.74)</td>
<td>* personal impression, impact (3.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* enthusiasm (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* persuasion (3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* fair, just (4.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE ATTITUDE (3.32)</td>
<td>* positive attitude (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* retains sense of humour under pressure (2.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* courage of convictions (3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* self-motivated (4.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* open to reflection, learning (3.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPERSONAL (3.77)</td>
<td>* human relations (4.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* balance between participative and individual decision making (3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* needs assessment of others (2.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* interpersonal skills (4.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC TRACK RECORD (2.72)</td>
<td>* general academic background (2.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* intelligence (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* successful job history (2.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSISTENCY AND OBJECTIVITY (3.35)</td>
<td>* flexible (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* consistency (3.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* objectivity, detachment (2.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* takes responsibility (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* able to make mistakes (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROACHABLE (3.86)</td>
<td>* listening (4.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* caring (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* approachable (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* self organised (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* available to staff (3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* oral communication (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* networking (3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATOR (3.32)</td>
<td>* written communication (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* presentations (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* reasonable expectations (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* providing reasons (3.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANISE AND CONTROL (3.62)</td>
<td>* organise others (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* generate loyalty, commitment (4.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* oversee subordinates' work (2.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* delegate (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* lead by example (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* provide direction (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Subcategories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEAM MANAGEMENT (3.78)</strong></td>
<td>* team leadership (4.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* reward, reinforce good work (4.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* team member (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* aware of others' needs (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* recognise, appreciate, develop talent (4.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* team building (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* recruit, select staff (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* democratic (2.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* staff appraisal (3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* subordinate motivation (4.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* facilitating (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* coach and develop subordinates (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISIONARY LIAISON (3.40)</strong></td>
<td>* change agent, management (3.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* communicate vision (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* fosters vision (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* liaise at all levels (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* assess needs (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMPOWERMENT and INFORMATION DISSEMINATION (3.38)</strong></td>
<td>* fosters growth, development (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* information dissemination (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* industrial democracy (2.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEADERSHIP (3.51)</strong></td>
<td>* leadership (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* inspirational leadership (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* consult/hire appropriate people (4.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* empowering (3.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* creates challenging environment (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROACTIVE (3.25)</strong></td>
<td>* multiple task roles (2.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* proactive (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* generalist (2.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* calculated risk taking (3.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* focus attention on key issues (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RATIONAL MANAGEMENT (3.03)</strong></td>
<td>* sense of history (2.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* statistical knowledge (2.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* analytical, critical thinking (3.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* time management (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* rapid decision making (3.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL INDUSTRY (3.32)</strong></td>
<td>* business, industry knowledge (3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* recognise opportunities, threats (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* balance internal and external focus (3.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING (3.26)</strong></td>
<td>* planning (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* project management (3.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* financial acumen (3.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* contract negotiation (2.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* administration (2.71)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| MULTI-FACETED VISION (3.15) | * strategic vision (4.00)  
|                           | * appropriate technical base (3.00)  
|                           | * uses hard and soft data (3.57)  
|                           | * sets and adjusts goals (3.71)  
|                           | * understand information technology (3.14)  
|                           | * fragment vision into tasks (1.50)  
| EXTERNALLY ORIENTED (3.86) | * big picture orientation (3.43)  
|                           | * responsive to external influences (4.00)  
|                           | * read environmental change (3.86)  
|                           | * responds to market needs (4.43)  
|                           | * up to date on issues (3.86)  
|                           | * externally aware (3.57)  
| RATIONAL (3.48)            | * rational decision making (3.29)  
|                           | * systematic, logical thinking (3.57)  
|                           | * tolerates ambiguity, uncertainty (3.57)  

### 3.1.6. Concept Map - “Exceptional” Managers Clusters and Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER (RATING)</th>
<th>Concept (rating)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRUSTED (4.37)</td>
<td>* open (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* consistent, fair (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* can trust others (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* generating revenue ($) (4.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRITY (4.03)</td>
<td>* sensitive (3.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* not arrogant (3.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* credible (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* honesty (4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ethical standards (4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNICATOR (4.21)</td>
<td>* communicator (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* good listener (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* communicate face-to-face with all (4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* sharing of information (3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPATHIC (3.81)</td>
<td>* empathic (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* balance (3.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* willingness (3.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* aware of ownership responsibility (4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUES (3.94)</td>
<td>* ability to assess/decide culture (4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* not cynical (3.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* values (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REINFORCE GOOD PERFORMANCE (4.06)</td>
<td>* commitment to development of people (4.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* understand motivation (4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* open mind (4.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* drive out fear (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* solutions not blame (3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ability to share success (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* reward success (3.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOMER FOCUS (4.75)</td>
<td>* external customer focus (4.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* develop a customer culture (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNOVATION (4.29)</td>
<td>* risk taking (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* seek, welcome innovation (4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* conviction (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* belief in cause (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRING (4.17)</td>
<td>* risk in type of people you hire (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* prepared to hire people smarter than you (4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* celebrate success (4.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* using people’s differences (4.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHANGE AGENT (4.15) | * visionary (4.00)  
|                    | * cope with change, be an agent (4.67)  
|                    | * see big picture (4.50)  
|                    | * promote ideas (4.33)  
|                    | * ability to pick up new concepts (4.17)  
|                    | * creativity (4.33)  
|                    | * unpredictable, surprise (3.50)  
|                    | * self confident (4.67)  
|                    | * desire to win (4.50)  
|                    | * optimism (4.00)  
|                    | * healthy sense of scepticism (3.00)  
| BASIC SKILLS (3.89) and THINKING TIME (4.00) | * basic practical skills (3.67)  
|                    | * progress not process (3.83)  
|                    | * language use (4.17)  
|                    | * knowledgeable (3.33)  
|                    | * learning to think (4.00)  
|                    | * create thinking time (4.00)  
| COMPETENT (4.33) | * demonstrate competent (4.33)  
|                    | * strategic elements (4.17)  
|                    | * courage to make time (3.83)  
|                    | * organise (3.83)  
|                    | * pragmatic (4.00)  
|                    | * controlling cost (4.17)  
| DELEGATE (3.71) | * delegate (4.00)  
|                    | * logical thought processes (3.67)  
|                    | * separate wheat from chaff (3.50)  
|                    | * realism (3.67)  
| LONG VIEW (3.72) | * ability to manage upward (3.50)  
|                    | * endurance (3.67)  
|                    | * prioritise (4.00)  
| TAKE CHARGE (3.69) | * determined (4.17)  
|                    | * take charge (3.83)  
|                    | * a bit one-eyed (3.50)  
|                    | * hard nosed (3.67)  
|                    | * ability to not be loved (3.17)  
| DECIDE (4.20) | * make decisions (4.50)  
|                    | * over rule (4.00)  
|                    | * ability to say no or go (4.20)  
|                    | * make difficult decisions and be supported (4.50)  
|                    | * decisive (4.33)  
|                    | * know when decisions should be made (3.83)  
|                    | * persistent (4.60)  
|                    | * demanding (3.67)  
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**APPENDIX 4.1**

**FEMALE GROUP STATEMENT LIST AND CLUSTER RATINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1] SUBORDINATE COMMUNICATION</th>
<th>2] ACCOUNTABILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicative (4.78)</td>
<td>Accountable (4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good judgement (4.78)</td>
<td>Understand self and impact on others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader (4.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Average: 4.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3] BUSINESS ACUMEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macro view of organisation (4.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>them (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make final decisions for the good of the business (4.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good market awareness (4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand international markets (3.11) (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise commercial opportunities (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know what their business is (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer focused (4.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External orientation (3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Average: 4.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4] ACT APPROPRIATELY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open to new ideas &amp; able to evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk the talk (3.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the appropriate authority (4.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on most important things first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Average: 4.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5] THINKING AHEAD STRATEGICALLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forward thinking (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think strategically (4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand legal framework (3.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Average: 4.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6] CREDIBILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open minded (3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be trusted (4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to take criticism (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical (4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty and integrity (4.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive without being aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Average: 4.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7] EXPERIENCED BASED LEARNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge what exists (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Win-win negotiation (3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronts problems early (4.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn from mistakes (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept responsibility for bad decisions (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice what you preach (4.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidentiality (4.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Average: 4.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8] GOOD LISTENER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good listener (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be approachable (3.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster Average: 4.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9] COMMUNICATE VISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate vision (4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish short term goals so people understand where they are (3.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10] SELF MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organised (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive (4.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full of energy (3.78)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work as a team (4.33)
Knows how to make good hiring decisions (3.89)
Understand interplay of individuals (3.56)
Create environment for risk taking (3.67)
Motivate others to achieve vision (4.67)
Make people believe in vision (3.78)
Ability to delegate (4.56)
Ability to retain good people (4.22)

Cluster Average: 4.10

11] POSITIVE ATTITUDE
Persistent (3.44)
Sense of humour (3.67)
Healthy (3.67)
Handle stress (4.22)
Personally well balanced (4.56)
Enthusiastic (4.0)
Positive attitude (4.44)
Confidence (4.33)

Cluster Average: 4.04

12] VALUE OTHERS
Good people skills (4.89)
Trust others (4.11)
Value top people’s knowledge (3.78)
Recognise the ‘whole person’ (3.78)
Treat people as individuals (3.67)

Cluster Average: 4.04

13] MOTIVATION OF OTHERS
Reward success (4.22)
Conduct performance appraisal (3.56)
Develop their people (4.44)
Vary recognition to suit individuals (3.56)
(4.0)
Links / facilitates others (4.11)
Challenge others to perform (3.67)
Give feedback in a way that leaves people motivated (4.25)
Pulls best from others (4.33)
Coaching skills (3.89)
Ability to empathise (3.56)
Value people (4.44)

Cluster Average: 4.0

14] ONGOING LEARNING
Courage/calculated risk taking (4.22)
Show willingness to learn (3.89)
‘Can do’ mentality (3.89)
Maintain self training/keeping up to date
Intelligent (4.11)
Analyse (3.67)

Cluster Average: 3.96

15] GENDER
Female (1.67)
Male (1.56)

Cluster Average: 1.61

16] CREATE VISION AND CHANGE
Create a vision (3.67)
around them (3.89)
Implement a vision (3.56)
Manage change (4.33)
Set objectives (4.22)

Cluster Average: 3.94

17] FACTOR BALANCING
Don’t lose sight of what is happening
Understand trade-offs (3.22)

Cluster Average: 3.56

18] INTERNAL OPERATIONS FOCUS
External as well as internal focus (3.67)
Focus on quality (4.11)
Do the do / operations base (3.0)

Cluster Average: 3.59

19] PULLING IT ALL TOGETHER
Learn from failures (4.22)
Financially astute (4.0)
Multi-disciplined (4.0)
Good networks (3.56)

Cluster Average: 3.94
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MALE GROUP STATEMENT LIST AND CLUSTER RATINGS

1] ADAPTABILITY
Receptive to change (4.67)
Performance driven (4.44)
Accept mistakes and learn from them (4.11)
Take hard decisions (4.0)

Cluster Average: 4.31

2] CUSTOMER NEGOTIATION
Customer empathy (external) (4.44)
Speak good English (3.89)
Good negotiator (4.22)

Cluster Average: 4.19

3] PRODUCTIVITY OF SUBORDINATES
Build culture (3.63)
Measure what people are producing (3.67)
Establish right role for people (4.33)
Measure staffs ability (4.0)
Recognise and reward performers (4.44)
Grow/develop people (4.0)
Select people who will create legitimate innovative ideas (4.11)
Recognise skills that are missing (4.22)

Cluster Average: 4.05

4] STRATEGIC THINKING
Lateral thinker (3.89)
Sees new opportunities (4.33)
Prepared to take risks (3.78)
Think short term (3.67)
Sees total picture (4.22)
Strategic (4.67)
Bit of a visionary (4.11)
Reduce complexity to simple issues (3.44)
Think long term (4.22)

Cluster Average: 4.04

5] IMPACT WITHIN ORGANISATION
People skills (4.33)
Able to delegate (4.44)
Able to manage up (3.56)
Role model (3.67)

Cluster Average: 4.0

6] INTERPERSONAL SKILLS
Good listener (4.11)
Customer empathy (internal) (4.25)
Good communicator (4.78)
Management by walking around (3.63)
Sack people (3.22)

Cluster Average: 4.0

7] INNOVATION
Innovative (4.67)
Emotional drive (3.67)
Curious (3.33)

Cluster Average: 3.89

8] KEEPING UP TO DATE
Comprehension of what is read (4.33)
Know laws relating to business environment

Comprehension of what is read (4.33)
Understand the business they are in (4.11)

Cluster Average: 3.83

9] MULTI-FOCUSED
Broad managerial experience (3.44)
Juggle lots of balls/issues at same time (3.78)
Customer driven (4.11)

Cluster Average: 3.78

10] CONTROLLED AND CONSISTENT
Decisive (4.33)
Stickability and persistence (4.11)
Focused (3.89)
Punctual (2.44)
Ethical (4.0)
Not a missile gone haywire (3.89)
Loyalty (3.56)
Respectful (2.89)

Cluster Average: 3.74
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11] TEAM LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>12] FREE THINKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (4.89)</td>
<td>Nontraditional (2.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive (3.67)</td>
<td>Not restricted to conventional thinking (3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads by example (4.11)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial in the right sense (3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a cold fish (2.44)</td>
<td>Analytical (3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuinely concerned about people (4.0)</td>
<td>Logical (3.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team player (3.44)</td>
<td>Gut feel (3.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates enthusiasm in others (4.25)</td>
<td>Intuition (3.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respected (3.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive/sells ideas (4.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to manage down (3.89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster average: 3.73

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13] SELF RELIANCE</th>
<th>14] INTELLECTUAL GROWTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible (3.78)</td>
<td>Intelligent (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent (3.11)</td>
<td>Emotional stability (3.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open (3.76)</td>
<td>Seeks continuous improvement (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guts (3.79)</td>
<td>Female (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not solipsistic (3.0)</td>
<td>Male (1.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious (2.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sceptical (3.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster Average: 3.33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15] BRIDGING</th>
<th>16] BROAD EXTERNAL FOCUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Healthy (3.22)</td>
<td>Understanding of economics (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 'knock out' factors (2.75)</td>
<td>Understanding of the economics of the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.0)</td>
<td>Predict the business environment 8 years out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suit the right size (2.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.67)</td>
<td>Wide general knowledge (2.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Succinct (2.78)</td>
<td>World experience (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate change (4.22)</td>
<td>International perspective (3.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self control (3.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster Average: 3.02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17] WRITTEN COMMUNICATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good grammar (2.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read quickly (2.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to type 70wpm (1.44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology literate (2.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer literate (2.33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cluster Average: 2.31
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INNOVATION IN MANAGEMENT SELECTION: THE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS PROFILE OF AN EFFECTIVE MANAGER

Introduction

From the middle of the twentieth century, fundamental and accelerating societal changes and technological advances have led to an international business environment characterised by turbulence and ambiguity. Associated with these changes has been a drive to develop a competitive advantage at national, industry and organisational levels (Glaze, 1989; Greatrex & Phillips, Karpin, 1995; 1989; Porter, 1985), requiring firms to be more competitive and quality orientated. Accordingly, managers have been called upon to adopt more flexible and responsive management and leadership styles to be more effective in leading successful organisations (Cammock, 1991; Cox, 1990; Jackson, 1989). However, while models and definitions of management have been evolving for some time, no model exists, as yet, that can fully explain what constitutes managerial effectiveness, nor what the particular contribution of managers is to the overall management function of an organisation. Related to this, there are no sound predictors of effectiveness for use in management recruitment, selection, or training and development (Cammock, 1991).

While many models of management effectiveness have been developed at national (Karpin, 1995; New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), 1995; Thompson & Carter, 1995), industry and organisational levels (Glaze, 1989; Greatrex & Phillips, 1989; Jackson, 1989), none have been well accepted. Heavy criticisms of these models have highlighted the hierarchical, bureaucratic nature and consequent inappropriateness of national models for small to medium sized businesses, while industry and organisation specific models share these weaknesses along with limited usefulness outside their own context. In particular, the emphasis of existing models is on technical or “hard” skills (Baker, 1991; Canning, 1990;
Jacobs, 1989; Saul, 1993; Silver, 1991; Thompson & Carter, 1995). The focus of these models is, thus, on what managers need to do in order to be effective; that is, on the managerial skills, tasks, outputs and outcomes expected for managerial effectiveness.

A major weakness in these models is their failure to incorporate the “soft” human skills and characteristics that are currently believed to be critical to effective management and leadership (Baker, 1991; Canning, 1990; Kouzes & Posner, 1993; Jacobs, 1989). Not only do the existing models fail to address the soft skills and characteristics that underpin managerial behaviour; they also fail to specify how a personal representation of these human skills and abilities might be shaped; that is, how a given individual will utilise the technical skills in terms of preferential strategies and working style.

The literature indicates that personal characteristics rather than technical skills seem to underpin the acquisition of skills and superior managerial performance (Broscow & Kleiner, 1991; Canning, 1990; Harper & Campbell-Hunt, 1992; Jacobs, 1989; Kanter, 1983; Kouzes & Posner; 1993; Loden, 1985; Os baldston & Burnham, 1992; Sargent, 1983; Sinclair & Collins, 1991). However, while management models and development programmes measure and assess the hard competences, doubt is expressed in the literature about whether the softer, more abstract competencies being discussed (e.g. interpersonal sensitivity, perceptiveness, integrity) can be taught/developed or measured (Glaze, 1989; Jacobs, 1989).

Given the universal need for managers to upskill in response to an increasingly dynamic environment, and the inadequacy of current approaches, there is a need to revisit and define the human skills and characteristics that underpin managerial behaviour. This paper draws together traditional and current thinking within a concept of managerial effecti veness as learned technical skills and the underpinning personal characteristics of an individual. With the ability to define and measure both skills and personal characteristics,
this concept represents a new approach to selecting and developing managers on the personal characteristics associated with managerial effectiveness.

Discussion

The first issue to be discussed is how an individual acquires their personal characteristics, which is then followed by a description of the characteristics associated with managerial effectiveness, and measurement of them.

*Personal Characteristics*

Personal characteristics are best thought of as being a summation of the effects of social learning on innate human characteristics, and represents who, and what, a person is. As such, the worldview held by an individual and the cognitive strategies preferentially used are extremely important to know.

Human skills and characteristics are broadly defined (in this paper) as being the cognitive and emotional processes and behavioural outcomes that are universal to all members of the human species. The fundamental human skills suggested (in this paper) to underpin management and leadership functions are information processing and communication. Information processing refers to the cognitive processing of all information that comes in through the senses. Communication refers to the linguistic ability of humans, and includes nonverbal communication. The term human characteristics refers to those things that all normal humans share, such as a need for social contact, and the "rules" governing how that contact is regulated and evaluated.

From birth, data input is different for boys and girls, which is thought to drive differential developmental tracks for the sexes. For example, the well established female
superiority with verbal material versus male superiority with spatial information (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Matlin, 1983) is thought to be the result of boys being encouraged to independently explore the environment, while girls are encouraged to stay close and communicate. This has relevance in management, insofar as men and women managers, if subject to social conditioning, will be predisposed to handle different kinds of information better. It is, therefore, content in information processing that is the issue rather than ability, where men will process spatial information better than women, and women will process verbal information better than men. These differences are reflected in all cognitive processes, where (for example), men are better than women in solving spatial and analog problems, whereas women are better at verbal problem solving and creativity, and have better recall of verbal material, especially when social content is involved (Matlin, 1983).

In addition to gender differences in cognitive function there are gender differences in communication, where males and females develop different communication skills, and use different communication strategies (Tannen, 1995; Thorne, Kramarae & Henley, 1983). From infancy boys are encouraged in exploratory independent play and generally given more freedom. They are engaged in more rough-and-tumble play, with aggressive competitiveness for positions of social dominance reinforced (Santrock, 1983). As a result, boys and men interrupt more as a form of conversational dominance (West, 1979), create social situations where one is dominant and the other participants are subordinate or inferior (Fishman, 1983; Henley, 1977; Tannen, 1995), and spread out into available space as a form of spatial dominance (Henley, 1977).

In contrast, girls are encouraged to express tender emotions, be co-operative, supportive, interdependent upon others, and show affection (Holmes & Stubbe, 1992; Santrock, 1983). All forms of dominance and/or aggressiveness are disapproved of. As a consequence, female communication seeks to equalise the participants in interpersonal
communications, and build the rapport and strength in relationships that will provide mutual support and co-operation (Caudron, 1995; Tannen, 1995). Both sexes are discouraged from showing gender inappropriate behaviour (Santrock, 1983, p237). It is in this manner that girls are prepared for motherhood and family duties, while boys are taught their roles as family breadwinners (ibid. p221). When stereotypical thinking is carried over into the workplace there are serious repercussions on a manager's ability to be effective, and has an impact on perceptions of effectiveness, despite how ineffective or effective a manager may actually be.

The traditional organisation was dominated by male managers, male values, and a belief that women could not be as effective as men in managerial roles (Kirk & Maddox, 1988; Mann, 1995). Over time this myth has been debunked, but still the residual stereotypical thinking of employees and male managers remains to disadvantage women as managers (Berg & Hunter, 1990; Christie, 1994; Quinn, 1987; Schaeff, 1985). The outcome of this situation is that men as managers are perceived to be more effective than women even if they are not. In contrast, women who are effective are perceived to be less effective than they actually are, or effectiveness is attributed to some external factor other than the skill of the woman manager, such as being lucky (Cartwright & Gale, 1995; Christie, 1994; Wolff, 1996). Identical behaviour in men and women managers (e.g. forcefulness) is also perceived differently, so that the behaviour for a man is considered to be positive and effective, whereas a woman is perceived to be aggressive and obnoxious (Lips, Myers, & Colwill, 1978; Watson, 1988).

To summarise, it has been posited that fundamental human skills and characteristics are shaped by social learning to produce different skills and characteristics between the sexes, and each individual will have built their own repertoire out of the basic building blocks. There is no evidence to suggest that either set of "masculine" or "feminine" skills and characteristics are superior or inferior to the other when it comes to managerial
effectiveness, yet perceptions about the effectiveness of men and women differ. A clear implication to be taken from this situation is that actual effectiveness and perceived effectiveness do not necessarily go hand in hand, and any effort to explain, or measure, effective managerial behaviour must account for this anomaly.

Having discussed how human skills and characteristics are shaped by social learning at a macro level, discussion now turns to how this is manifest in personal characteristics at a micro level. Put another way, it is a discussion about how it is possible to establish what cognitive strategies and approaches can be thought of as characterising an individual's preferred style of operating, what drives and needs motivate them, and how this has implications for effectiveness as a manager.

**Personal Characteristics Associated With Managerial Effectiveness**

**Worldview**

The concept of worldview encompasses the way in which an individual views the world and their place within it. Boys and men have a worldview that reflects a sense of superiority, self reliance, and self worth, especially relative to females. In contrast, girls and women have a worldview that reflects an inferior social value relative to males, and a life strategy that subsumes any strong sense of self within dependent relationships (Christie, 1994; Shipper, 1994). As always, there is great individual difference as to how far, or how deep, this holds true for a given individual. However, as a general heuristic about life, this thinking reflects a strong universal trend.

Men as managers therefore tend to value individualism, and are self assertive in establishing a superior position in social relationships, including managerial roles (perceived to be a masculine job, Christie, 1994). Subordinates are viewed instrumentally, in that they
are instruments to be utilised towards achieving management ends (Alimo-Metcalfe, 1995; Schaeff, 1985). In contrast, women as managers attract negativity if they attempt to emulate this behaviour (Manis, Nelson, & Shedler, 1988), and further, they have been conditioned to operate differently (Tannen, 1995). Women as managers therefore tend to operate from a more egalitarian worldview based on collectivism, where participation and cooperation is sought from subordinates, who are valued as individuals in their own right (Crosthwaite, 1986; Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Johnson, 1990; Handley, 1991; Loden, 1985)

With regard to a sense of self in worldview, there are a number of well established concepts about how people perceive themselves to be, and what that means in terms of their motivation and behaviour. The concepts to be discussed as being relevant to the managerial context are 1) McClelland's (1961) needs for achievement, affiliation, and power, 2) Locus of control (Rotter, 1966), and 3) Self efficacy (Bandura, 1977).

*Need For Achievement (nAch):* nAch is defined as the tendency for people to strive to overcome obstacles - to do something difficult as well and as quickly as possible (Carlson, 1990, p.409). Rambo (1982) states that nAch is ‘...one of the more potent motives that underlie social behaviour...and psychologists have been able to show that this drive is associated with many aspects of performance effectiveness’ (p.410). In this concept it is the motivation to get things done, and done well, rather than rewards and recognition that is important, with high nAch being characteristic of successful business managers. Rambo (1982) cites the study conducted by Warner and Abegglen (1955) which found that this characteristic is found early, during teenage years, and Carlson (1990) considers this and other psychological needs (such as for affiliation and power) to be intrinsic and stable personality traits (p.410). Robbins (1996) adds a cautionary note that managers high in nAch do not necessarily make good managers, as nAch is about personal achievement, not
influencing others to achieve well (p.221). However, a healthy level of nAch must be required for effective managers. People high in nAch prefer jobs where they have personal responsibility, feedback, and where there are moderate risks involved, doing well in their own businesses, or running a unit within a large organisation (p.221).

Need For Affiliation (nAff): nAff is a need to maintain social relationships with others (Carlson, 1990, p.412). People high in this need tend to want to be social, in wanting to meet people and establish friendships. Social skills are important to people with a strong nAff, who demonstrate anxiety when their social skills are being assessed. Interestingly, a strong nAff does not necessarily mean a need for interpersonal contact, where people strong in nAff, yet who prefer solitude, spend a lot of time writing letters to people so that ties were maintained or strengthened, yet personal solitude was preserved (Carlson, 1990, p.411). It can be argued that in a management context, it can be expected that managers must feel the need for affiliation with others by virtue of their job, and the current emphasis on relationship building calls upon affiliation with teams. Yet to be too high on nAff would tend to detract from their ability to distance themselves from relationships and remain objective when required. McClelland discussed this issue in terms of executives not overly high on nAff being able to deal with issues without worrying about whether or not they are liked for their actions (cited in Rambo, 1982, p.411). Robbins (1996) suggests that the best managers are low in nAff (p.221).

Need For Power (nPow): nPow (originally called Dominance by Murray, 1936) is the motivation to assert authority and control over the behaviour of others (Carlson, 1990, p.411), with McClelland contending that nPow is a principal motivational factor underlying executive behaviour. However, for effective executives power is exerted as a social
influence to get things done, as opposed to a domination of others for the purpose of self-aggrandisement (cited in Rambo, 1990, p.411). For management purposes, then, it is necessary to distinguish between people who have high nPow as a need for personal power and self enhancement, as opposed to those who have a high nPow as the means to achieve organisational goals. As would be expected, people high in nPow are attracted to positions of authority. Robbins (1996) discusses nPow as a need to be influential, having an impact and control over others. These people want to be in charge, and like competitive and status-orientated situations that offer personal prestige. Further, Robbins (1996) suggests that "...a high-power motive may be a requirement for managerial effectiveness" (p.221)

Measuring nAch, nAff, and nPow: The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) developed by Murray (1936) is used to measure these needs. Subsequent work by Atkinson (1964) has elaborated upon and tightened the concept (Landy, 1989, p.373). In the TAT, participants are shown a series of cards with extremely ambiguous pictures on them for which they must construct a story about what has happened, what the people in the pictures are feeling, and what is going to happen. The test is projective, in that people project their own personality and beliefs into the story, providing an insight into unconscious and hidden motives and feelings. Shipley and Veroff (1952) developed a scoring technique specifically for nAff, and Winter (1973) has developed a scoring technique for nPow.

Locus of Control: The concept of locus of control relates to the perception of an individual about the agents of change that influence events in their lives; whether the causal links between events are perceived to be a consequence of internal or external influences. "Internals" perceive life events to be related to their own behaviour. "Externals" attribute happenings to external influences beyond their control, such as luck/chance, the influence of
a more powerful person, or forces they do not understand. Perceptions about locus of control determine the impact that various forms of feedback may have as well. This is where an internal person will be more responsive to feedback that arises from the task or from self evaluation, whereas the external person will be more responsive to feedback from external sources (Rambo, 1982, p.118).

The external person has been found to be less satisfied with their jobs, have higher absenteeism, are more alienated from the work environment, and are less involved with their jobs than internal types. Externals are more compliant, and willing to follow directions, being better suited to well structured and routine jobs (Robbins, 1996, p.95). The internal type generally perform better in their jobs, actively search for information before making a decision, are more motivated to achieve, and make better attempts to control their environment. Internals are most suited to professional jobs such as management, that require complex information processing, initiative, and independence of action. Since internals take more responsibility for what happens to them they tend to take better care of themselves, and hence have fewer incidences of sickness and absenteeism (Robbins, 1996, p.96).

Clearly, in a management context people with an internal locus of control would be more likely to be effective as managers, given they believe that they are in control of events that impact upon them. Conversely, a person who has an external locus of control is unlikely to be as effective, given that they believe events are beyond their control.

**Measurement of locus of control:** An individual's locus of control can be measured by questionnaire. Lefcourt (1982) provides an in-depth discussion on locus of control, and presents a number of scales and questionnaires as appendices.
Self Efficacy: Bandura (1977) combined two issues important to social learning theory, self-concept and self-control, to develop a concept he termed self efficacy. Self-concept is defined as an individual's perception about their personality and abilities. Self-control is defined as the ability to withhold a response. Self efficacy is the individual’s belief in their ability to succeed in the tasks they undertake, hence how a person perceives themselves to be, and degree of self-control contributes to successful achievement. According to social learning theory, the more a self efficacious person succeeds in overcoming obstacles to achieve objectives, the more likely the person is to try tackling other difficult situations, on the grounds that they believe they can do it if they try hard enough.

In a management context it seems sensible to expect that managers who have a strong positive self concept and believe in their ability to succeed in the tasks undertaken, (probably with a history of successful undertakings), is likely to be more effective than one who has a weak or negative self concept and is unsure of their abilities.

People with high self efficacy will set higher goals, and when achieved will set even higher goals. Even if thwarted in an attempt, they will continue to believe in their efficacy, and continue to set high goals. People with low self efficacy will set lower goals, and even if achieving them, tend to then set lower goals, believing they could not be that successful again (Landy, 1989, p.412). Negative feedback to people high in self efficacy will increase their efforts and motivation, whereas people low in self efficacy are likely to reduce their efforts (Robbins, 1996, p.225)

Measurement of self efficacy: Self efficacy can be measured with simple tasks that ask the participant whether they believe they can find novel uses for common place objects. Locke, Lee, and Bobko, (1984) provided participants with a list with one column that said: I can list 2 uses in 1 minute, I can list 4 uses in 1 minute, I can list 6 uses in 1 minute... up to 16 uses...
in 1 minute, with a second column asking them to state their certainty as 0-100%. Measures of self control and self concept would also be relevant.

The last two factors to be discussed relate to the way in which people process information - their cognitive styles. While there have been many variations on the theme regarding how people organise and process information, the two most established and well recognised cognitive styles are Field Dependence-Independence, and Reflection-Impulsivity (Matlin, 1983, p.377). It needs to be stressed here that one style is not considered to be superior or inferior to another, as each has its benefits and disadvantages in general, and with regard to managerial roles in particular.

**Field Dependence-Independence (FD-FI):** The terms FD-FI do not denote two groups of people with different cognitive styles. It is a continuum, where most people are either more FD or more FI. Although classified as cognitive styles, FD and FI are also associated with other kinds of behaviour as well. As a general rule, FD people prefer others who are FD, and likewise, FI people prefer those who are also FI, with each cognitive type having negative perceptions about the other type.

FI-FD is discussed in the literature as having a genetic base (Egorova, 1987), influenced by social learning (Paramo, Dosil, & Tinajero, 1991), and is a stable trait from childhood (Blake, 1985; Young & Fouts, 1993). Studies of FI-FD have assessed differences in learning styles (Canino & Cicchelli, 1988; Chinien & Boutin, 1992), and managerial performance (Gruenfield & Lin, 1984). Cultural influences have also been found (Nah, Lane, & Fuqua, 1990).

FD people experience events globally, having difficulty in separating out an object from its background. They are dominated by the most salient features in a concept formation task, such that they will use the most noticeable features on which to base their
categorisations, such as colour, or size. FD people are passive in their approach to learning, so that (for example) FD people are content with listening to a lecture as a learning exercise, and do not seek discussion and involvement in the learning process.

FD people have a good memory for socially relevant material, such as photographs of faces (although Stickle & Pellegrino, 1986, found that FIs were the ones who were better able to label affect) and spend more time looking at the faces of people they interact with. Overall, they tend to have good social skills. FD people tend to respond well to praise, but are sensitive to criticism. FD people are influenced by authority figures and peer pressure. A number of studies using personality tests show FD people to be socially dependent, eager to make a good impression, conforming, and sensitive to their social surroundings (Coren, Porac, & Ward, 1984, p.511).

In contrast, FI people can easily separate out an object from its background, using more, and less salient features on which to base their categorisations in a concept formation task (e.g. they will use thickness and thinness of borders). As FD are global, FI are analytical (Young & Fouts, 1993) FI people can analyse and restructure experiences in new ways. FI people will be more active in the learning process, getting involved in discussion, and even restructuring the learning situation. FI people also react well to praise, although they are less sensitive to criticism. FI people are not as easily influenced by authority or by peer groups. Personality testing has shown these people to be self-reliant, inner-directed, and individualistic (Coren, Porac, & Ward, 1984, p.512).

If a particular management position requires a lot of attention to detail, then a more FD person would be better. If the position requires more global efforts, with someone else taking care of the details, then a more FI person would be more suitable. An individual who is nearer the middle of the continuum, leaning towards FI is probably an ideal choice, given they will see the whole picture, and while not missing the details, neither will they get
bogged down in detail. Another implication is that a manager who is FD will interact and get on better with their subordinates if they too are FD, as will FI managers and subordinates (Garlinger & Frank, 1986). A mismatch between manager and subordinates may well explain difficulties for each in understanding the perspective of the other.

This is not advocating the position that all managers and subordinates ought to be completely matched for FD-FI, but is a signal that a large imbalance may cause problems. Indeed, a manager and team composed of only FD people may be good at social interactions, but would be easily swayed, be unable to cope with criticism, and would not actively seek learning. A manager and team composed only of FI people would not be easy to influence away from a stance, and would not listen to relevant criticism. Balance, and an awareness of the differences are what is required.

**Measuring FD-FI:** The most commonly used tests of FD-FI are the Embedded Figures Test, and the Rod and Frame Test. The Embedded Figures Test involves showing people pictures where a “target” shape has to be found within a complex picture where the target shape is not immediately visible. FI people have no problems discerning the target in the picture, whereas FD people often never see it. The Rod and Frame Test has people in a darkened room with a slightly tilted frame containing a rod (both luminous), where participants must tilt the rod within the frame so that it is upright. FI people can move the rod to upright without difficulty, whereas FD people tend to have the rod slightly tilted in the direction of the frame tilt (Matlin, 1983, p.377).

**Reflection-Impulsivity:** The Reflection-Impulsivity continuum involves the speed and accuracy with which people consider alternative hypotheses in solving problems (Matlin, 1983, p.379). People tend to become more reflective with age. A reflective person will
take longer to reach a decision, as they very carefully consider all the available alternatives. As a result, they tend to be accurate (or pick the best alternative) when they decide on a solution. An association has been found between being reflective, and being FI. This is not surprising, when it is remembered that FI people look at more features in a stimulus, which takes more time.

There has also been a relationship found between reflectiveness and intelligence, although the relationship is not strong. As can be expected, a person who is extremely reflective may spend an inordinate amount of time pondering various alternatives, and not get around to actually making a decision, or may "miss the boat" if a quick decision is required. In the problem solving process reflective people will ask questions that eliminate a number of alternatives at once, thereby reducing the amount of information to be considered.

Impulsive people are quick to respond, and are more inaccurate than reflective people as a consequence. Children are highly impulsive in their cognitive style, becoming more reflective with maturity, some more than others. The tendency to be impulsive produces a more superficial response, where for example, when people are faced with having to complete the sentence "five is to number as black is to ----" the impulsive person quickly answers "white" as a simple association (Matlin, 1983, p.380). In the problem solving process impulsive people ask questions relating to one hypothesis or alternative, instead of eliminating a number at one time.

Implications for management are that either extreme should be avoided. However, those who are somewhat more reflective and those who are somewhat more impulsive can contribute well to management. With a balance of both, problems will be well considered, and the impulsive ones will spur the more reflective into making a decision, even if only to avoid the wrong decision being made.
**Measurement of Reflection-Impulsivity:** The most commonly used measure of reflective-impulsive strategies is the Matching Familiar Figures Test. In this test people are required to find the match for the figure which appears at the top of the page, out of a selection of figures that are similar, but where only one matches the target figure. Speed and accuracy are the measures, where reflective people take more time but are more accurate, whereas impulsive people tend to respond faster, but are more inaccurate (Matlin, 1983, p.379).

The discussion to this point has argued that the current concept of the personal characteristics underpinning managerial effectiveness are too broad and vague to be of practical use in management selection and development, and an alternative perspective has been suggested. In essence, it has been posited that management research needs to step back and address the human characteristics of information processing, communication, self concept, and social learning as underpinning effective managerial behaviour, rather than the expressed outcomes of these characteristics, such as self confidence. Furthermore, it is particular “package” of information processing, communication, self concept, and social learning characteristics that individuals take into management roles, and into their learning about management. The ideas expressed are not new, and this is one of the strengths of the suggestion. The dimensions of personality discussed have been the subject of psychological research for decades, having been found to be valid and reliable measures of an individual’s behaviour over time. In contrast to the vague concepts discussed in the contemporary management literature, the factors contributing to the profile suggested in this paper to underpin managerial effectiveness are fully definable and measurable.

It has also been posited that the technical skills contributing to managerial effectiveness are by nature definable, measurable, and learnable. An implication here is that selection needs to be based upon personal characteristics rather than technical skills, which
can be more easily learned and developed. Ideally, a selection profile should incorporate an "ideal" psychological profile for the position, plus the specific technical skill requirements for the particular job. The selection emphasis would be on the closest match to the psychological profile, with a secondary importance attached to technical skills, which can be learned after recruitment. In the discussion that follows, a schematic representation of the psychological profile is presented as a tool for management selection.

Management Selection

This paper was prompted by the need to establish firmer grounds for objective management selection, with those firmer grounds established in research drawn from over the decades in the psychological literature on personal and managerial effectiveness. An analysis of that literature revealed a psychological profile associated with personal effectiveness as a human being, and effectiveness as a manager, that can serve as a template for management selection.

In Figure 6.1.2, the findings in the literature are shown as an "ideal", all purpose profile of managerial effectiveness, against which candidates are matched. The technical skill requirements would depend upon the position. On testing with the TAT, Embedded Figures Test, and a questionnaire that integrates items to assess motivating needs, self efficacy, locus of control, stereotypical thinking, and communication strategies, candidates could be matched against the profile shown in Figure 6.2.1. Being predominantly questionnaire based, testing would not be an overly long or arduous process for either assessor or candidate. Candidates who most closely match the profile in Figure 6.2.1 are the candidates most likely to be effective as managers.
Table 6.2.1: A schematic representation of the psychological profile suggested to underpin managerial effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Characteristics</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Mid</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nAch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nAff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nPow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impulsive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.2.1: A schematic representation of the psychological profile suggested to underpin managerial effectiveness

This can be assumed in that:

1. Strong needs for achievement and power, in association with a mid to low need for affiliation, have long been associated with managerial effectiveness.

2. A strong sense of self efficacy and an internal locus of control underpin the ability to be assertive and self confident.

3. Interpersonal communication style determines the impressions formed by others, and influences their reactions to the communication, both being critical components of interpersonal communication in management.

4. High stereotypical thinking in organisations produces artificial and counter-productive behaviours in both men and women as managers, and poses additional unnecessary
frustrations and obstacles for women as a group. Individual’s with low stereotypical thinking would be more likely to move across continuums of human behaviour as required for the situation, and permit others to do so, thereby reducing the negative impacts of gender stereotypical thinking in organisations.

4. Knowing an individual’s cognitive style predicts behaviour, in that it can be predicted that a field dependent individual would be more comfortable and effective in a job where the structure was provided, whereas a field independent individual would rather develop their own structure. Knowing that an individual is somewhat reflective in cognitive style, but not overly so, predicts that problems and alternatives will be thought about carefully, and the probability of a correct decision being made is high. Other predictions that can be made are that field dependent individuals will not seek learning, but field independent individuals will.

In conclusion, this paper has provided a different perspective on management selection, in suggesting that old concepts are better than the new. Of particular importance is the distinction made between technical skills and personal characteristics, and the definition of personal characteristics as fundamental human attributes shaped by life experience, and taken into management roles.

While using the profile in Figure 6.2.1 to base management selection decisions would provide a depth and objectivity to the process that is currently lacking, the concept still needs to be tested. A study is planned to test the concept by assessing a group of managers against the profile, and compare these results with evaluations of effectiveness gathered from the manager, a subordinate of the manager, and the manager’s direct superior (or peer), using items representing the contemporary view of managerial effectiveness.

As a study designed to analyse the psychological literature for a better way to define personal characteristics in management, the objectives have been achieved - there is a better way. However, the degree to which the profile can predict managerial effectiveness remains to be determined. It may be that the profile complements contemporary thinking, in that credibility, valuing of people, and emotional strength and stability, for example, are independent factors influencing effectiveness not explained by the profile, yet the profile
adds to the power to predict effectiveness. Or, it may be that credibility, valuing of people, and emotional strength and stability are subsumed in a particular type of psychological profile yet to be revealed. Whichever way it goes, to have a selection procedure that includes objective measures of the critical human attributes underpinning personal and managerial effectiveness has got to be a step in the right direction.
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