HIGH OUTPUT MANAGEMENT

Dr. Dinesh Neelakanta Rao

High Output Management

High Output Management

Dr. Dinesh Neelakanta Rao

BOOKS ARCADE
KRISHNA NAGAR, DELHI

High Output Management

Dr. Dinesh Neelakanta Rao

BOOKS ARCADE

Regd. Office:
F-10/24, East Krishna Nagar, Near Vijay Chowk, Delhi-110051
Ph. No: +91-11-79669196, +91-9899073222
E-mail: info@booksarcade.co.in, booksarcade.pub@gmail.com
Website: www.booksarcade.co.in

Edition: 2024

ISBN: 978-81-19923-09-0

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

ROLE OF HIGH INPUT MANAGEMENT IN INDUSTRY

Dr. Dinesh Neelakanta Rao, Associate Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dinesh.rao@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

High Input Management refers to the strategic handling and optimization of extensive resources, data, and efforts within a system or organization. This approach involves the efficient allocation and utilization of inputs, such as time, finances, human capital, and technological resources, to achieve maximum productivity and desired outcomes. In the context of various industries and sectors, high input management plays a crucial role in enhancing operational efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and overall performance. This abstract explores the key principles and strategies associated with high input management, highlighting its significance in contemporary business environments and the potential benefits it offers. High input management emerges as a pivotal aspect of modern organizational success. The effective management of resources and inputs is essential for achieving optimal outcomes in terms of productivity, innovation, and competitiveness. Through careful planning, strategic allocation, and continuous monitoring, organizations can harness the power of their inputs to drive efficiency and growth. While challenges may arise in balancing various inputs, the benefits of high input management are evident in improved operational processes, better decision-making, and sustained long-term success. As industries evolve, embracing high input management becomes imperative for organizations seeking to navigate complexities and thrive in dynamic environments. As we move forward, further research and practical implementations are necessary to refine and expand our understanding of high input management and its application across diverse sectors.

KEYWORDS:

High Input, Industrial Management, Optimization, Productivity, Resource Allocation, Supply Chain.

INTRODUCTION

Let me start by informing you what you won't be reading in this book. Even though my employer, Intel, is a "high-tech," Silicon Valley company, there isn't a single word about bits and bytes, RAMs and ROMs, or anything else even somewhat technical or obscure in the document. Instead, as a practitioner of the art of management, I've attempted to outline what I believe to be a sound, sensible management strategy. Based on my observations at Intel, this involves a group of driven and enthusiastic individuals getting together, examining issues, and devising solutions. Therefore, my goal in writing this book is to provide you fundamental concepts, precise guidelines, and useful methods that you can use to your own managing situations. I am particularly excited to speak with the middle manager—the person in every business who is often overlooked. Both a company's chief executive officer and the first-line shop supervisor are highly valued. Almost all of our top business schools are geared up to produce the latter, but there are plenty of courses meant to educate the former the foundations of his profession. However, there is a sizable group of individuals in between the two: middle managers. They oversee the shop floor foreman and also hold positions as engineers, accountants, and sales representatives. Despite being the backbone of every significant firm, middle managers get little attention in spite of how vital they are to our economy and society [1], [2].

Big businesses are not the only places where middle managers work. They are really present in almost every business process. You are a middle manager if you oversee a small tax department in a legal practice. This also applies to principals of schools, distributorship owners, and small-town insurance agents. After reading the paper, employees from each of these businesses validated my suspicions about the wide applicability of the management concepts established at Intel throughout its growth from a very small to a very big company. Those who may not directly supervise anybody but yet have an impact on and influence others' work even in the absence of formal organizational authority should be classified as middle managers. These knowledgeable managers are resources of information, expertise, and comprehension for others in their immediate vicinity inside a company. They serve as advisors to other members of the company and are experts and professionals of a certain kind.

Experts in fields such as education, market research, computer science, and traffic engineering use their expertise to influence others' work equally as much as or even more than a typical manager with supervisory responsibility. Therefore, it is appropriate to refer to a know-how manager as a middle manager. In fact, middle management personnel will value knowledge acquisition more the more information- and service-oriented our society develops. Know-how managers should, in summary, continue reading. You will sometimes disagree with what you read. You'll remark, "This could work at Intel, but where I work at PDQj, it would never work. Until the Old Man personally gives the order, nothing happens. I can't utilize anything you offer, short of a revolution in the palace." I promise that most of what I say will be useful to you. Any kind of middle manager effectively serves as the organization's top executive. Don't wait for those at the top to impose the values and procedures you think admirable or right. Whether or whether the rest of the firm adopts this strategy, you, as a micro CEO, may raise productivity and performance both personally and within your group. There are three main concepts in the work. An output-oriented management strategy is the first. This means that we apply some of the values and the discipline of the most output-oriented commercial endeavor manufacturing to other business ventures, including above all managerial work. Think about Intel, a real manufacturing and production organization that creates items that resemble computers and very complicated silicon chips. Currently, our firm employs over 20,000 people. 8,000 of them are employed directly in producing the goods [3], [4].

They are assisted by an additional 3,000 people who oversee the staff, look after the equipment, engineer, and enhance the production process. Five thousand more people are employed in administration, where they plan pro-auction events, maintain employee records, submit invoices to clients, and settle supplier payments. Approximately 4,000 people create new items, promote them, sell them, and provide after-sale support. All of our workers "produce" in one way or another some fabricate chips, others prepare invoices, and some generate software designs or advertising copy as we created, structured, and oversaw Intel. We also discovered that, by keeping this fundamental understanding in mind, the discipline and guiding principles of production provided us with a methodical way to manage any work done at Intel, just as the vocabulary and concepts of finance established a shared framework for assessing and overseeing investments of all kinds.

The Factory of Breakfasts

Consider yourself a server, like I was during my undergraduate years, and your job is to serve breakfast, which consists of a soft-boiled egg that has been soft-boiled for three minutes, buttered toast, and coffee. This will help you comprehend the basics of production. It is your responsibility to simultaneously prepare and deliver all three of the hot, fresh products. This assignment includes all of the fundamental production needs. These are to manufacture and provide goods in answer to client requests at a prearranged time, with appropriate quality, and for the least amount of money. Delivering everything the consumer requests anytime he wants is not within the purview of production; doing so would need either unlimited manufacturing capacity or extremely vast, ready-to-ship stocks. In this scenario, the client could demand a flawless three-minute egg, warm buttered toast, and steaming coffee ready for him as soon as he takes a seat. Either you would have to have your kitchen empty and ready to serve the client anytime he stops by, or you would have to keep an inventory of hot buttered toast, properly cooked eggs, and coffee ready to go. Both are impractical. Rather, the onus should be on the producer to provide the goods by the scheduled time, which in this instance is implicitly five to ten minutes after the consumer arrives at our breakfast business. Additionally, we need to cook our breakfast at a cost that allows us to charge a reasonable price for it while still turning a profit. How can we approach this in the most strategic manner? We examine our production flow first.

The initial task is to identify the flow step which we'll refer to as the limiting step—that will ultimately decide the general structure of our operation. Here's the easy question: which breakfast item takes the longest to prepare? The egg is the obvious solution, and because the coffee is steaming in the kitchen and toast just takes a minute or two, we should schedule the whole task around the time it takes to boil the egg. Not only does it take the longest to cook, but the majority of customers consider the egg to be the most significant aspect of the meal.

The contrary illustrates what needs to occur. To make sure that all three components are ready at the same time, you must compute the time needed to prepare them starting from the delivery time. You have to give yourself enough time to put the things on a tray. The bread from the toaster, the coffee from the pot, and the egg from the boiling water must all be removed next. The duration of the whole process—referred to as the total throughput time in production jargon is determined by adding the time needed to do this to the time needed to get and boil the egg.

You are now ready for the toast. You need to give yourself enough time to obtain and toast the bread pieces, using the egg time as a guide. Lastly, you may figure out when to pour the coffee by basing it on the toast time. The main concept is that we build our production flow by working backwards from the longest (or most challenging, or most sensitive, or most costly) step at the beginning. Take note of the start and finish times of the three steps. The time needed to boil the egg was the most important stage, so we scheduled our flow around it. Then, we spaced out the other phases based on individual throughput durations, or, to use production speak, we offset them from one another.

The concept of a limiting step is very versatile. Consider the need to hire recent college grads for Intel's workforce. A few of our managers go to the colleges, speak with a few of the seniors, and extend invitations to the most outstanding applicants to come see the business. We pay the applicants' travel expenses, which might add up. Other management and technical staff conduct in-depth interviews with the students while they are on the trip. Some of the students whose talents and abilities best fit our demands are given job offers after careful examination, and those who accept the offers finally start working for the firm. Because of the expense of transportation and the time that Intel managers spend with the applicants, you must structure this sequence around the most costly component, which is the students' visit to the factory, in order to apply the fundamentals of production. We clearly need to enhance the proportion of accepted offers to candidates asked to visit the plant in order to decrease the usage of this step per final college hiring. We do this by screening applicants over the phone before to sending out invites. The method decreases the need to employ the costly limiting step per hire, saves money, and significantly raises the ratio of offers issued each plant visit. This also applies the time offset idea. In order to provide enough time for everything—phone screening, plant visits, and on-campus interviews to happen at the proper dates in the months leading up to graduation, the recruiter works backwards from the day the students will graduate.

Manufacturing Processes

Our breakfast is prepared using additional manufacturing concepts. The three basic production processes are as follows: process manufacturing, which modifies a material physically or chemically in the same way that boiling an egg does; assembly, which involves assembling components to form a new entity in the same way that coffee, toast, and eggs combine to make a breakfast; and testing, which involves examining the properties of the components or the entire product. For instance, visual assessments are conducted periodically throughout the breakfast manufacturing process. Drocess: the bread is brown, and the coffee is piping hot. It is easy to apply process, assembly, and test processes to other very diverse types of productive labor. Consider the job of teaching a sales staff how to pitch a new product. It is simple to distinguish between the three categories of manufacturing processes. One process step that turns a lot of raw data about the product into useful selling plans that the sales team can understand is turning the data into strategies. One way to think of the integration of the several sales methods into a cohesive program is like an assembly phase. Here, brochures, handouts, flip charts, and relevant market data (such competitor price and availability) are integrated with the proper P&S tactics in a cohesive presentation. A "dry run" presentation with a chosen set of field sales representatives and field sales management serves as the test procedure. The content must be "reworked" (another well-established manufacturing term) to address the test audience's issues and objections if the dry run fails the test [5], [6].

The process, assembly, and testing of a significant piece of computer software, called a "compiler," are also shown. A computer can only comprehend and apply human instructions if they are given to it in the language that it speaks. A compiler functions as an interpreter, allowing the computer to convert text written in English-like words and phrases into its own language. Instead of needing to adjust to how the machine processes information, a programmer may think more or less like a human being when they use a compiler. It is very difficult to get a computer to comprehend and translate in this way, thus talented software programmers must put in a great deal of work to create a compiler. But the ease of usage it provides with computer use justifies the effort.

In any case, a number of processing processes are involved in the creation of the constituent components that make up a compiler. Specifications and fundamental design knowledge are the starting point for creating actual functional software. After that, every component goes through a unique procedure known as a "unit test." If one doesn't work, the problematic area of the program is brought back to the process stage for "rework." The components are put together to create the compiler after each one has passed its own unit tests. Naturally, before the whole product is sent to the client, a "system test" is conducted on it. The work makes significant use of time offsets. Since the throughput times for the different engineering procedures are well-established, it is possible to calculate and plan ahead for the release schedules of different software bodies at different stages. Even while breakfast preparation, college recruitment, sales training, and compiler design are extremely different from one another, they all follow essentially the same process to get a certain result.

DISCUSSION

As you well know, thickets and underbrush abound in real life. Our breakfast operation assumed limitless capacity in a schematic flow chart, so no one had to wait for a pot to cook eggs in or a toaster to become available. However, there isn't a world like that. Imagine having to wait in line for a waiter's turn to use the toaster. What would happen? Your three-minute egg might easily turn into a six-minute egg if you didn't modify your production flow to take the queue into consideration. Due to the reduced toaster capacity, you must modify your flow to accommodate the new limiting step. The quality of the meal as a whole is still determined by the egg, but your time offsets need to change. In what way will the altered production flow be reflected in our model? Let's examine how the production is impacted by working backwards from the breakfast delivery time, as shown in the illustration opposite. Both the egg cycle and the coffee cycle are still in effect. However, a restricted toaster's capacity makes a big impact in The Basics of Production. You now have to factor in the time it takes for the toast to be delivered and the wait for a free toaster. This implies that a new conception of the whole manufacturing process is required. Toaster capacity is now the limiting factor, thus you have to adjust your workflow. Let's now add some more complexity to the situation. When it is time to start boiling your egg, what would happen if you were in a line waiting for a toaster? Although it seems like your differences cannot be resolved, they really can. Hiring an egg cooker, toast maker, coffee pourer, and an operations supervisor would allow you, as the restaurant's manager, to train your staff into experts. However, it naturally generates a huge amount of overhead, potentially making it too costly to take into account.

If you were a server, you might ask the person in front of you in line to assist you by putting your bread in while you hurried to begin cooking your egg. But the outcomes are probably less predictable when you have to rely on someone else. You could buy another toaster as the manager, but it would be an expensive piece of capital equipment. You could keep the toaster running all the time and accumulate a stock of warm toast, discarding what you don't need but still having quick access to the goods. That translates to waste, which might potentially end up costing the business too much. At least now you are aware that there are other options: inventory, labor, and equipment capacity may all be traded off against one another and then weighed against delivery time [7], [8].

Finding the most economical method to allocate your resources is your job as every option has a cost associated with it. This is the secret to maximizing all forms of productive labor. Remember that there is always a proper response in circumstances like these, the one that will provide you with the greatest possible product quality and delivery time at the lowest feasible price. Manpower, capacity, and inventory are the three variables that must be carefully considered in order to arrive at the best solution. This knowledge must then be reduced to a quantitative set of relationships. It's unlikely that you will do a time-and-motion analysis of the person operating a toaster using a stopwatch or that you will precisely compute the mathematical trade-off between the cost of toast inventory and the more toaster capacity. It matters how hard you push yourself to think in order to comprehend how the many components of your manufacturing process relate to one another.

Let's expand on our manufacturing example by transforming our company into a high-volume facility that produces breakfast. To begin with, you purchase a continuous egg boiler that will consistently provide properly cooked eggs in three minutes. It will resemble the drawing on the other side. It should be noted that our company now anticipates a large demand for three-minute eggs; but, due to the limited flexibility of automated equipment, four-minute eggs cannot be easily provided. Second, as specialist workers load each piece of equipment and deliver the product, you match the output of a continuous toaster with the output of a continuous egg-boiler. Now that we have sacrificed flexibility to make things a continuous process, we are unable to fulfill the precise timing and preferences of each customer's purchase. In order to reap the rewards of our new mode namely, reduced costs and more predictable product quality our consumers must thus modify their expectations. The ever-present source of three-minute eggs is the continuous egg-boiler.

However, improved quality and reduced costs do not always follow from continuous operation. What would happen if the continuous egg-boiler's water temperature silently deviated from the set temperature? The whole work-in-process, including all of the eggs in the boiler, as well as the machine's output from the moment the temperature increased or decreased until the problem was identified, became useless. Not only is all the bread wasted, but there are no eggs to go with it. How might the likelihood of such a collapse be reduced? One method is to run a functional test. Occasionally, you crack open an egg right out of the machine to inspect its quality. However, you will need to discard the egg test. There is also the option of in-process inspection, which comes in several forms. One way to readily and often monitor the temperature would be to simply place a thermometer into the water. You might attach an electrical device to the thermometer that would ring bells if the temperature changed by one or two degrees to avoid having to pay someone to read it. The idea is that you should, if at all feasible, prefer in-process testing over tests that result in product destruction.

The eggs that put into it might be over- or undersized, broken, or rotting, all of which would impact how quickly they cook. You should check the eggs upon reception, often known as an incoming or receiving inspection, to prevent such issues. You will have to give the eggs back if they are not acceptable in any manner, leaving you with nothing. You must now terminate. You need a raw material inventory to prevent it. However, what size should it be? The idea at play here is that you should have sufficient to cover your rate of consumption while waiting for a replacement raw material. To be safe, you should have a whole day's worth of merchandise on hand if your egg guy delivers once a day. However, keep in mind that inventory costs money, so you must balance the benefits of having a day's supply vs the expense of carrying it [9], [10].

Adding Benefits

A fundamental feature of all production flows is that the material gains value as it proceeds through the process. A completely built breakfast is worth more than its component components; an egg that has been cooked is worth more than one that has not; and lastly, the meal that is served to the client is worth even more. The last one is the perceived value that a client attaches to the business upon arriving at the parking lot and seeing the "Andy's better Breakfasts" sign. In the same way, a completed compiler is worth more to us than the individual components of run time, code generation, and semantic analysis, and we value a college graduate more than a first-time college student when we are ready to give them a job.

The maxim "find and fix any problem in a production process at the lowest-value stage possible" is one that we should all strive to follow. Therefore, rather of letting the consumer discover the bad egg, we should locate it and reject it as soon as it is delivered by our supplier. Similarly, we save money on travel expenses and interviewers' time if we may decide not to interview a college applicant at the time of the campus interview instead than during a plant visit. Additionally, rather than testing the end result directly, we should look for any performance issues during the unit tests of the individual components that make up a compiler.

Lastly, at the risk of seeming callous, let us analyze the criminal justice system as if it were a manufacturing process designed to identify offenders and send them to prison. When a crime is reported to the police and they take action, the play starts. A lot of the time, nothing more can be done once a few questions are raised. The next course of action for offenses that the police can investigate further is further inquiry. However, this is often where the case ends due to a lack of proof, the dropping of complaints, etc. If the case proceeds to the next level, the police attempt to locate witnesses, assemble evidence, and obtain an indictment after arresting the suspect. Again, a lack of evidence often results in the return of an indictment. In circumstances when the defendant is really found not guilty, the case may sometimes be dropped. However, the procedure advances to the sentence and appeals phase after a conviction is obtained. A person convicted of a crime may sometimes get probation and a suspended sentence, and occasionally their conviction may be reversed on appeal. Jail is the last step for the tiny percentage that makes it [11], [12].

We get some startling results if we make some reasonable assumptions about the proportions that proceed at each step and the expenses related to each. The price of a single conviction comes to well over a million dollars, an astounding amount, when we total the expenses incurred in the process of getting a conviction and allocate them only to the offenders who are convicted. Naturally, the reason the figure is so high is because very few of the accused individuals in the flow complete the whole procedure. Everyone is aware of how congested prisons are, how many offenders serve lesser sentences or none at all, and how limited the number of cells is. This leads to an extremely costly trade-off that goes against the most fundamental manufacturing principles. Getting a conviction here ought to be the last step. Even now, the cost of building a prison cell is just around $80,000. This, together with the $10–20,000 per year that a person must spend in prison, is minuscule in comparison to the $1 million needed to get a conviction. It is obvious that society has misappropriated its entire investment in the criminal justice system when a criminal in whom society has spent over a million dollars is not locked up in a $80,000 prison cell. And this occurs as a result of our allowing the incorrect step the availability of prison cells to restrict the whole procedure.

CONCLUSION

In the information era, high input management is essential to an organization's success. High input management solutions are becoming more and more important as firms struggle with growing amounts of data, a variety of information sources, and intricate decision-making situations. This research emphasizes how important it is to take a comprehensive strategy that incorporates organizational procedures, technology solutions, and a proactive mentality. Organizations may handle high input issues and turn them into opportunities for innovation and competitive advantage by embracing automation, putting in place effective information filtering processes, and encouraging an adaptable culture. Effective High Input Management is a constant process, and companies that put agility, teamwork, and continuous improvement first will be better positioned to prosper in the quickly changing business environment.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Ates, H. Cicek, I. Gultekin, Y. A. Yigezu, M. Keser, and S. J. Filley, "Bio-economic analysis of dual-purpose management of winter cereals in high and low input production systems," *F. Crop. Res.*, 2018.

[2] M. Studnicki, M. Wijata, G. Sobczyński, S. Samborski, and J. Rozbicki, "Assessing grain yield and quality traits stability of spring wheat cultivars at different crop management levels," *Cereal Res. Commun.*, 2018.

[3] W. J. Cox, J. J. Hanchar, and J. Cherney, “Agronomic and economic performance of maize, soybean, and wheat in different rotations during the transition to an organic cropping system,” *Agronomy*, 2018.

[4] L. Caproni, L. Raggi, C. Tissi, S. Howlett, R. Torricelli, and V. Negri, “Multi-environment evaluation and genetic characterisation of common bean breeding lines for organic farming systems,” *Sustain.*, 2018.

[5] A. S. Bellamy, O. Svensson, P. J. van den Brink, J. Gunnarsson, and M. Tedengren, “Insect community composition and functional roles along a tropical agricultural production gradient,” *Environ. Sci. Pollut. Res.*, 2018.

[6] M. Nyine *et al.*, “Genomic Prediction in a Multiploid Crop: Genotype by Environment Interaction and Allele Dosage Effects on Predictive Ability in Banana,” *Plant Genome*, 2018.

[7] D. Beillouin *et al.*, “Azodyn-Barley, a winter-barley crop model for predicting and ranking genotypic yield, grain protein and grain size in contrasting pedoclimatic conditions,” *Agric. For. Meteorol.*, 2018.

[8] L. Villamil *et al.*, “Management practices and diversity of flower visitors and herbaceous plants in conventional and organic avocado orchards in Michoacán, Mexico,” *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.*, 2018.

[9] H. V. Dixit, A. R. Jadhav, Y. M. Jain, A. N. Cheeran, V. N. Gupta, and P. K. Sharma, “Design data for quick development of folded H plane tee at high average power level,” *Sadhana - Acad. Proc. Eng. Sci.*, 2018.

[10] I. Susilowati, E. Edy Riyanto, M. Kirana, I. Mafruhah, and A. Radam, “The Economic and Sharia Value of Moslem’s Awareness for Halal Food in Indonesia,” *J. Ekon. Pembang. Kaji. Masal. Ekon. dan Pembang.*, 2018.

[11] E. Mitchell, C. Scheer, D. Rowlings, R. T. Conant, M. F. Cotrufo, and P. Grace, “Amount and incorporation of plant residue inputs modify residue stabilisation dynamics in soil organic matter fractions,” *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.*, 2018.

[12] A. Davies, T. Tilston, K. Walsh, and M. Kelly, “Is there a role for early palliative intervention in frail older patients with a neck of femur fracture?,” *Geriatr. Orthop. Surg. Rehabil.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 2

MANAGING THE BREAKFAST FACTORY: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS

Dr Gayathri R, Assistant Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.gayathri_r@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Managing the Breakfast Factory involves overseeing the intricacies of a dynamic and fast-paced culinary operation dedicated to producing breakfast foods efficiently and to the highest quality standards. This paper explores the unique challenges and strategies associated with the management of a breakfast-centric production facility. It delves into key aspects such as supply chain coordination, menu optimization, workforce management, and technology integration. The study aims to provide insights into how breakfast factories can enhance productivity, meet customer expectations, and adapt to evolving consumer preferences. By examining case studies and industry best practices, this paper offers a comprehensive overview of effective management approaches for breakfast factories in the contemporary culinary landscape. managing a Breakfast Factory demands a nuanced and multifaceted approach to ensure the seamless production of high-quality breakfast foods. Success in this industry hinges on the synchronization of supply chains, optimization of menus to cater to diverse tastes, and the effective management of a skilled workforce. Leveraging technology, such as automation and data analytics, can significantly improve operational efficiency and responsiveness to market trends. The breakfast industry is inherently dynamic, with consumer preferences evolving rapidly, and thus, a successful Breakfast Factory management strategy must be adaptive and forward-thinking. By embracing innovation, fostering a culture of quality, and maintaining a keen focus on customer satisfaction, breakfast factories can not only meet the demands of the present but also position themselves for sustained success in the competitive food production landscape.

KEYWORDS:

Automation, Breakfast Production, Factory Operations, Inventory Management, Supply Chain, Team Coordination.

INTRODUCTION

The public has been raving about the delicious breakfast you've been providing, and with the support of your many patrons and a kind lender, you've established a breakfast factory that employs specialized manufacturing lines for toast, coffee, and eggs, among other things. As the factory manager, you oversee a sizable workforce and a large amount of automated machinery. However, you'll need a set of reliable indications, or metrics, to manage your business effectively. Naturally, your output now consists of all the breakfasts your factory produces, the money it makes, and the happiness of your clients rather than the meals you personally serve. You need a lot of indicators just to get a handle on your production; you need even more indications to achieve efficiency and high output. There is an almost infinite number of indications from which to choose, but in order for any combination of indicators to be effective, each one must be targeted toward a distinct operational objective [1], [2].

Assume you are the manager of the breakfast factory and that you use five indicators every day to make sure your production targets are met. Which five would they be? Stated differently, what five pieces of information would you like to review as soon as you get at work every day? These are the people I'm considering. You should first ascertain your daily sales projection. In what number of breakfasts should you schedule delivery? You would want to know how many breakfasts you really delivered yesterday compared to how many you had planned to provide, or, in other words, the difference between your plan and the actual breakfast delivery for the previous day, in order to determine the level of confidence you should have in your prediction. The raw material inventory is your next important metric. Is your factory stocked with adequate bread, eggs, and coffee for today? You may always place another order if you discover that you are short on inventory. You may wish to cancel today's egg delivery if you discover that you have too many. The state of your equipment is another crucial piece of information. In order to reach your daily target, you should have everything that broke down yesterday fixed or your manufacturing line rearranged [3], [4].

You also need to address your workforce issues. If you want to satisfy the predicted demand even with two waiters absent due to illness, you will need to find an alternative. Would you ask for temporary assistance? Is it OK to demote someone from the toaster line to wait staff? Lastly, you should include a quality indicator of some form. Monitoring how many breakfasts each server serves is insufficient since it is possible that the servers mistreated the patrons while delivering a record number of meals. You have to care about what the public thinks of your service since the success of your company relies on people wanting to buy what you provide. Maybe you could have a "customer complaint log" that the cashier keeps up to date. You should talk to one of your waiters first thing today if he caused more complaints than normal yesterday. Each of these metrics measures an important aspect of managing your manufacturing. If you check them first thing in the morning, you may frequently take action to address a possible issue before it materializes throughout the day.

Your attention is often drawn to the things that indicators are tracking. Similar to riding a bicycle, you will most likely guide it in the direction you want it to go. For example, if you begin closely monitoring your inventory levels, you would probably take steps to reduce them, which is beneficial in the short term. However, your stockpile may become so low that you are unable to respond to fluctuations in demand without producing shortages. Therefore, one should exercise caution while overreacting since signs guide one's actions. You may do this by pairing indicators, which will assess the impact and counter-effect together. As a result, in the inventory example, you have to keep an eye on both the amount of inventory and the frequency of shortages. Naturally, if the latter increases, you will need to take action to prevent inventory from falling too low. The creation of a compiler provided several examples of this idea in action. One example would be to compare each software unit's completion date against its capacity. Keeping an eye on these two signs should assist us in avoiding both the impatience of working on an unfinished ideal compiler and the hurry of finishing an unsatisfactory one. All in all, cooperative monitoring should maintain the best possible middle ground.

In administrative tasks, indicators and coupled indicators can be of more assistance than anywhere else. After realizing this, our organization has spent many years using measures as a crucial instrument to raise the efficiency of administrative labor. The first guideline is that any measurement is preferable than none at all. However, a really useful indication will include the work unit's output in addition to the activity itself. A salesman's effectiveness is obviously determined by the orders he receives (output) rather than the calls he makes (activity). Measuring a tangible, unit object is the second need for a good indication. Snuwn are a few instances of efficient administrative output metrics. Since all of the indications on this list pertain to quantity or production, the paired indicators should emphasize the quality of the job. As a result, in accounts receivable, the quantity of vouchers processed and the quantity of mistakes discovered via auditing or by our suppliers should be matched. For example, a senior management with an emcee in that building should rate the quality of work partly objectively and partially subjectively, and the number of square feet cleaned by a cleaning crew should be matched with that evaluation.

An indicator of the administrative function's output

There are several applications for these indicators. First, they very clearly state the goals of each person or entity. Secondly, they provide a certain level of impartiality in evaluating an administrative role. Thirdly, and perhaps most importantly, they provide a benchmark by which different administrative units operating in disparate companies but fulfilling identical tasks may be contrasted with one another. It is now possible to compare the performance of a custodial crew in one large building to that of another group in a different building. In reality, the competitive spirit generated often has an energizing influence on the motivation each group brings to its job, coupled with a parallel rise in performance, provided indicators are put in place. Later on, when we look at the "sports analogy," more on this [5], [6].

The Ivory Box

Imagine our breakfast factory as a "black box"; the work of waiters, assistants, and you, the manager, pouring into the box represents the input, and the breakfast flows out of it, as shown. Generally speaking, we may simply describe any action that mimics a manufacturing process as Raw Material Breakfast Labor. Therefore, we may depict college recruitment as a black box, with college grads who have accepted our job offers as the output and candidates on campus as the input. Our interviewers on campus, as well as the management and technical staff that conduct interviews at the plant, are the ones who put in the labor.

Similar to this, field sales training may be thought of as a black box process, where trained salespeople are the output and raw product specs are the input. Here, the labor is done by the marketing and merchandising professionals, who transform unprocessed data into practical sales aids and educate field sales representatives on how to take use of them. Actually, our magical black box may represent the majority, if not all, of administrative labor. Information about the consumer, including what he has bought, price information, and shipping records, are inputted by a team tasked with billing customers; the output is the final bill that is given to the customer and used to collect payment. The labor is the collective effort of all employees. The labor, output, and inputs in a manufacturing process are sorted out by the black box. By removing some windows in our box, we can view a little bit of what goes on inside, which will help us run that process more efficiently. We may get a better understanding of the inner workings of any manufacturing process and predict the expected future output by gazing through the apertures, as shown. We can see what the expected future production is by looking through the windows in the black box.

One approach to see inside the black box is via leading indicators, which provide you with a preview of what the future may hold. Additionally, they enable you to prevent issues by providing you with time to take remedial action. Naturally, you have to think that leading indications are reliable before they can be of any use to you. Although it may appear apparent, confidence is not as simple to obtain in real life as it may seem. To accept large, expensive, or concerning. Overseeing the Breakfast Factory 21 actions it’s challenging to know you have a problem when you're not sure. But all you will get from tracking your leading indicators is worry until you are ready to take action on what they are telling you. You should thus choose reliable indicators so that you will really take action when they flash danger signs.

The daily monitors we use to operate our breakfast factory may be examples of leading indicators. They could contain records of machine downtime or an index of customer happiness, both of which can alert us to potential issues down the line. The linearity indicator is a widely applicable illustration of a "window 5 cut into the black box." We provide one in the for the college admissions procedure. The number of college graduates who accepted our offers is shown below against the year's month. If everything went according to plan, we would proceed in a straight line and reach our hiring goal for the semester by June. If this is the real progress by April, we will be a long way from the perfect straight line. We can thus infer from the indication that the only way we will be able to meet our goal is if we get acceptances at a much greater rate in the next two months than we did in the four months before. Consequently, the linearity indicator gives us time to take appropriate action by causing an early warning to be harmed. Without it, we would find out in June that we had fallen short of our goal, at which point there would be nothing we could do.

When we think of a production unit in this way, we could think that everything is well since it consistently sets monthly targets. However, by creating a window into the black box, we can track production output over the course of the month, compare it to the ideal linear output, and draw conclusions. It is possible to ascertain if output performance is distributed uniformly during the month or whether it is focused in the last week. If the latter is true, the unit manager is most likely not making effective use of staff and resources. Furthermore, if nothing is done, a little malfunction at the end of the month might prevent the unit from meeting its monthly production target. You can foresee this kind of issue with the aid of the linearity indicator, which is really valuable. Every month, you'll get an updated version of the prediction data compared to several previous forecasts. Compared to using a basic trend chart, you can more accurately predict future trends since it is easy to observe how one prediction differs from the next.

In my experience, predicting economic trends has been the most fruitful use of the stagger chart. The way it works is that the stagger chart provides us with the expected rates of incoming orders for an Intel division in the, and then the next month, the month after that, and so on, offers the same projection. Such a chart would show how your company outlook changed from month to month in addition to your monthly forecast. Naturally, this method of seeing incoming business causes the forecaster to take his work extremely seriously, as he knows that the amount forecasted for any given month will be regularly compared with subsequent projections and ultimately with the actual outcome. More importantly, however, is that the anticipated outlook's improvement or decline from month to month is the most useful indication of company trends I have ever seen. I would even venture to add that it's unfortunate that not all economists and financial advisors are required to provide their forecasts in the form of a staggered chart. Then, we would really be able to assess whatever each of them choose to save. Ultimately, indicators may be a great aid in the solution of many kinds of problems. You will have a bank of data that easily contains all the parameters of your operation, so in the event of an issue, you may check them for unhealthful deviations from the norm. You will need to do a great deal of rapid investigation to get the information you want if you do not methodically gather and keep an archive of indications. By the time you do, the issue is probably going to have become worse.

DISCUSSION

You will thus need to find another method of managing your factory's production, even if you would much prefer manufacture to order. To put it simply, you will need to construct to predict, which entails planning for future orders. In order to do this, the manufacturer bases his operations on a well-founded conjecture that orders for certain items would materialize within a given timeframe. Here, the manufacturer's inventory risk is an evident drawback. The factory may face severe difficulties if orders do not materialize or if they do so for a different product than what was predicted, since the forecast is an evaluation of future needs that the manufacturer commits resources to meet. Unwanted inventory is the outcome in both situations [7], [8].

In order to construct to predict, you must take a capital risk in order to properly address future demand. At Intel, even though our production throughput times are rather lengthy, we build to predict because our customers want us to react to their demands quickly. Our breakfast factory purchases goods from its suppliers, such as the egg guy, based on anticipated demand, but it produces its goods to order. Similar to this, most businesses hire recent college graduates to cover projected requirements rather than waiting to hire until a need arises, which is stupid given that college graduates are hired in a very seasonal manner. Compilers are an example of computer software that is usually produced in response to an expected market requirement rather than a particular client request. Therefore, "building" to predict is a very typical corporate strategy.

There are two concurrent procedures involved in delivering a product that was forecasted to a client, each with its own time cycle. The raw material must travel through a number of production phases before entering the completed products warehouse, as shown in the manufacturing flow. In parallel, a salesperson locates a potential customer and makes sales to them; the customer subsequently puts an order with the producer. The goods and the order for it should ideally arrive at the shipping port simultaneously. You may be inclined to assign all forecasting responsibilities to a single management who can be held accountable for it, given the complexity of the art and science of forecasting. However, this normally doesn't work out that well. It is more effective to request a forecast from the production and sales divisions, putting the onus of performance management on individuals to meet their own projections. At Intel, we make every effort to precisely match the two parallel flows. If there isn't a match, we're left with an unfulfilled customer order or a produced product and no customers. In any case, we are having issues. Naturally, if the prediction comes true and the order is filled, both the product order and the actual product should reach the shipping port simultaneously. The factory's product delivery can satisfactorily meet the needs of the client [9], [10].

In actual life, the ideal is seldom found. Most often, orders from customers are either delayed or they are canceled. Regarding the other flow, manufacturers could make errors, miss deadlines, or run into unanticipated issues. Since neither the production flow nor the sales flow can be predicted exactly, we need purposefully include a suitable amount of "slack" in the system. And the most apparent place to put it is in inventory. It goes without saying that the more inventory we have, the more change we can handle and still fulfill orders. However, inventory has to be properly managed since it is expensive to create and maintain. As we've previously heard, inventory should ideally be maintained at the lowest-value stage, such as raw eggs held at the breakfast factory. Additionally, we have greater production flexibility for a given inventory cost the lower the value.

The use of stagger charts is a smart concept. In the projections for both sales and production. As previously said, they will display both the actual outcomes and the trend of change from one prediction to the next. You may enhance your capacity to anticipate orders and product availability by continuously analyzing the differences between forecasts and identifying the root reasons of inaccuracy. One of the most significant ways to boost the productivity of an "administrative factory" is to predict future job needs and then modify its output accordingly.

Despite being a time-tested and respected method of running "widget factories," using forecasting methods to manage administrative tasks is scarcely frequent. Until date, such labor has been seen as qualitatively distinct from work in a factory producing widgets, and it has also lacked the objective performance requirements required to scale or grow the work unit. However, we are prepared to apply factory control techniques to administrative work provided we have selected indicators that are representative of an administrative unit and are keeping a close eye on them. The trend data allows us to deduce de facto norms from which we may predict the number of workers required to complete certain projected jobs. Manpower may be reallocated from one area to another and headcount adjusted to correspond with the anticipated increase or decrease in administrative activity by strictly adhering to forecasting principles.

Parkinson's famous rule states that in the absence of rigor, individuals will always keep administrative unit staffing levels at their maximum and will find methods to fit whatever they're doing into the time allotted for completion. It goes without saying that maintaining and improving productivity may be achieved by staffing an administrative unit objectively utilizing predicted workloads, setting standards, and believing in them [11], [12].

Ensuring Excellence

Manufacturing's mission is, as we've said, to provide the client with a product at the lowest possible cost while maintaining a degree of quality. All production flows whether they "make" software modules, college graduates, or breakfasts must have inspection points in order to guarantee that the quality of our output will really be adequate. Rejecting faulty material at the point when its cumulative value is at the lowest possible level is essential to achieving acceptance quality at the lowest feasible cost. As a result, as said, we would be better served weeding out our college candidate before to his visit to Intel, rather than taking a chance on a faulty raw egg. Put simply, reject before adding further value.

The lowest-value-point inspection in manufacturing, known as receiving or incoming material inspection, is where we examine raw materials. Once again, if we see our manufacturing process as a black box, inspections that take place in between are referred to as. The three kinds are unacceptable, or we may utilize the inferior material in spite of our standards. In contrast to using fully accep material, the latter would result in a greater reject rate in our manufacturing process; yet, it would be less costly than shutting the facility down until our vendor offers superior material. Only a well-balanced committee of managers, usually including members from the production, design engineering, and quality assurance departments, can appropriately make such judgments.

While a monitor doesn't cause a similar lag, it may let some undesirable material to escape before we can act on its findings and shut down operations. This might force us to reject stuff at a later, more valuable stage. It is obvious that we can do much more monitoring than gate-type inspections for the same money, and that if we choose to do the former, we may very well improve the product's overall quality more than if we chose to undertake gate-like inspections less often. Here, there isn't a clear trade-off, therefore every decision must be taken with the particular situation in mind. Generally speaking, we should err on the side of caution when it comes to monitoring as we are unlikely to run into major issues. Variable inspections are another technique to reduce quality assurance costs. As quality standards change over time, it makes sensible to adjust the frequency of our inspections. For example, it might make sense to check less often if we don't identify any issues for many weeks. If issues arise, however, we may continue to test more regularly until the quality reaches the prior high standards. Here, there is still a cost benefit and much less disruption to the manufacturing process. However, this method is not widely used, even in the production of widgets. Why not? Most likely due to the fact that we are creatures of habit and carry out our daily activities in the same manner, whether they are weekly or annual.

Any industrial or administrative operation may truly become more productive and efficient with the use of intelligent inspection techniques. Let's consider an example that has nothing to do with cooking meals or widgets. I recently came into an article in a news magazine stating that the American Embassy in London was overloaded with requests for visas. Approximately 98% of the one million British visa applications that are submitted each year are granted. Sixty employees work in the embassy, processing up to 6,000 applications per day. The majority of applications are sent in by mail, and the embassy is always in possession of between 60,000 and 80,000 British passports. In the meanwhile, queues of at least a hundred British and other citizens wait outside the building to have a chance to pass their passports.

The embassy has made many attempts to manage things more effectively, such as placing ads in newspapers urging visitors to apply as soon as possible and to anticipate a three-week turnaround. In the event that applicants really need same-day assistance, the embassy also placed boxes where they could drop off their passports and visa applications. The embassy queues were still rather lengthy, however. Actually, since nothing was done to solve the fundamental issue of accelerating the processing of visas overall, the embassy's expediting programs only served to exacerbate the situation. The classification of different types of applications scheduled for different processing periods cost money and effort, but it did little more than increase administrative overhead and had no impact on productivity.

Our government shouldn't annoy potential British visitors if it wants them to come to the United States. Furthermore, if the embassy lacks the funding to hire more employees, there is a straightforward fix that may be taken from elementary manufacturing methods. To put it briefly, we must replace their current plan with an output-as-survival test. To do so, the embassy's bureaucratic brains would have to concede that a comprehensive background check on visa applicants is not required. Roughly 98% of applicants are accepted without any issues. Thus, the application backlog might be cleared without significantly raising the likelihood that unwelcome immigrants would enter our nation if the embassy implemented a comprehensive sample test for visas, often known as a quality assurance test. Additionally, the sample to be examined might be chosen by the embassy based on pre-established standards. Then, the visa application procedure may operate similarly to the Internal Revenue Service. Without having an agent examine each and every return, the IRS is able to enforce compliance among the majority of taxpayers via the checks and audits it conducts.

When we look at managerial productivity later on, we'll discover that a manager is using the concept of variable inspection when he delves extensively into a particular task that falls within his purview. The manager would be interfering, which would be mostly pointless, if he checked on everything his different subordinates did. Worse yet, his employees would become used to not having to take accountability for their job since they would always know that their manager would be attentively monitoring everything. As we'll see, the application of the variable inspection principle to managerial work effectively avoids both issues and provides us with a crucial tool for raising managerial productivity.

CONCLUSION

A diversified strategy that takes into account many facets of people management, quality control, and manufacturing is necessary for the efficient operation of a breakfast factory. The problems this business faces need creative thinking and a dedication to ongoing development. As this article explains, incorporating cutting-edge technology, putting strong quality control procedures in place, and encouraging an engaged workforce culture are essential components of success. In order to accomplish efficiency and sustainability objectives, managers must continue to optimize production processes while being sensitive to customer preferences and market developments. Managers at Breakfast Factory may improve productivity, react quickly to changing market needs, and simplify operations by using cutting-edge technology like automation and data analytics. Proactive and reactive quality control strategies are essential for guaranteeing that goods always live up to or beyond customer expectations, which promotes customer happiness and brand loyalty. Recognizing the need of a motivated and well-managed staff is also crucial. Initiatives for employee engagement have an effect on overall productivity and product quality in addition to fostering a happy work environment. Managers of breakfast factories may successfully negotiate the industry's intricacies, achieve operational excellence, and position their facilities for long-term success in the constantly changing breakfast food market by using the complete solutions covered in this research.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. A. Sulaiman, S. I. Kuye, S. O. Giwa, and O. A. Olowoyeye, “Exergetic analysis of breakfast cereal production in Nigeria,” *Niger. J. Technol.*, 2018.

[2] N. Deavin, A. T. McMahon, K. Walton, and K. Charlton, “‘Breaking Barriers, Breaking Bread’: Pilot study to evaluate acceptability of a school breakfast program utilising donated food,” *Nutr. Diet.*, 2018.

[3] A. Chaudhary, C. P. F. Marinangeli, D. Tremorin, and A. Mathys, “Nutritional combined greenhouse gas life cycle analysis for incorporating canadian yellow pea into cereal-based food products,” *Nutrients*, 2018.

[4] M.-N. IE and O. JE, “Production and evaluation of breakfast cereals from blends of acha, mung bean and orange fleshed sweet potato,” *African J. Food Sci. Technol.*, 2018.

[5] A. Missimer *et al.*, “Compared to an Oatmeal Breakfast, Two Eggs/Day Increased Plasma Carotenoids and Choline without Increasing Trimethyl Amine N-Oxide Concentrations,” *J. Am. Coll. Nutr.*, 2018.

[6] T. Ang, G. M. Kowalski, and C. R. Bruce, “Endogenous glucose production after sequential meals in humans: Evidence for more prolonged suppression after ingestion of a second meal,” *Am. J. Physiol. - Endocrinol. Metab.*, 2018.

[7] J. L. Bagot, N. Marechaud, N. Deana, and J. Wendling, “Homeopathic Treatment of Insomnia and Symptom Clusters Related to Cerebral Chemotoxicity in Oncology,” *Homeopathy*, 2018.

[8] D. A. Skuratovskaia, M. A. Vulf, E. V. Kirienkova, N. I. Mironyuk, P. A. Zatolokin, and L. S. Litvinova, “The role of single nucleotide polymorphisms in GIPR gene in the changes of secretion in hormones and adipokines in patients with obesity with type 2 diabetes,” *Biomeditsinskaya Khimiya*, 2018.

[9] B. N. Landis, J. W. Hsieh, and G. Coppin, “Circadian anosmia: A rare clinical presentation,” *Laryngoscope*, 2018.

[10] L. Slade and H. Levine, “The ‘Food Polymer Science’ approach to the practice of industrial R&D, leading to patent estates based on fundamental starch science and technology,” *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition*. 2018.

[11] L. S. Akan, “Production and Characteristics of a Traditional Food: Molasses (Pekmez),” *Food Sci. Nutr. Stud.*, 2018.

[12] I. Benedetti, T. Laureti, and L. Secondi, “Choosing a healthy and sustainable diet: A three-level approach for understanding the drivers of the Italians’ dietary regime over time,” *Appetite*, 2018.

CHAPTER 3

MANAGERIAL WORK: BALANCING PRODUCTIVITY, DECISION-MAKING, AND LEADERSHIP IN THE BLACK BOX OF OPERATIONS

Dr Nalini Sunil M, Assistant Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.nalini_m@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The complex realm of managerial work, metaphorically referred to as the "black box" of operations. The narrative emphasizes the intricate balance required for optimal productivity, decision-making, and leadership within this enigmatic space. The manager's role is explored through the lenses of information-gathering, decision-making, and the subtle art of nudging, with an overarching focus on the allocation of the most finite resource—time. The abstract underscores the importance of being a role model and leader, emphasizing the impact of managerial activities on organizational success. As managers grapple with the challenges within the metaphorical "black box," it becomes evident that their success hinges on a delicate equilibrium among productivity enhancement, strategic decision-making, and inspirational leadership. The emphasis on time as a finite and critical resource underscores the need for managers to judiciously allocate their efforts across diverse activities. The insights presented serve as a guide for managers seeking to navigate the multifaceted challenges of their roles, offering practical strategies for achieving efficiency and effectiveness in the dynamic landscape of operational management.

KEYWORDS:

Balancing, Black Box Operations, Decision-Making, Leadership, Operations Management, Strategic Planning.

INTRODUCTION

The simplest and most practical definition of productivity may be provided by the operations of our black box. Any function's productivity is calculated by dividing its output by the work needed to produce it. So, performing what we already do more quickly is one approach to boost productivity. One way to do this may be to rearrange the workspace or just put in more effort. Here, we haven't altered the kind of work we perform; instead, we've implemented methods for doing it more quickly, allowing for more activities to occur within the black box every employee hour. We will get greater output every hour from the black box since its output is proportionate to the activity that takes on inside of it. There's yet another method to boost output. We are able to alter the kind of job we do, not the speed at which it is completed. Our goal is to raise the output to activity ratio such that, even in the event that the activity per employee-hour stays constant, production will rise. As the or by giving the actions more leverage. As stated in our motto, our goal is to "work smarter, not harder." This is where I want to introduce the idea of leverage, which is the result of a certain kind of labor activity. A high level of production will be produced by an activity with high leverage, and a low level of output by an activity with low leverage. For instance, a waiter who knows how to use two toasters and prepare two eggs may serve two breakfasts for about the same amount of labor as one. He has a high output per action, which increases his leverage. Lower output and leverage are possessed by a waitress who can only serve one toaster and one egg at a time. A software engineer may solve several issues in an hour of programming if they use a programming language similar to

English, which will then be translated by a compiler. He has a lot of leverage and production. To address the same amount of issues, a software engineer using the more laborious ones-and-zeros programming style will need many more hours. He has little leverage and output. Setting up the work flow within our black box to be characterized by high output per activity, or high-leverage tasks, is thus a crucial step in increasing productivity [1], [2].

Undoubtedly, one strategy to increase the productivity of all kinds of labor is automation. When humans have machines to assist them, they can produce more. Yet something else may also boost the black box's efficiency in administrative tasks as well as the production of widgets. We refer to this as work simplification. You must first draw a flow chart of the current manufacturing process in order to get leverage in this manner. It must include every single step; nothing should be left out to make things seem nicer on paper. Secondly, determine how many steps you began with by counting the steps in the flow chart. Third, establish a ballpark goal for reducing the total number of steps. Our experience indicates that a 30 to 50 percent decrease is reasonable to anticipate in the first round of task simplification. To really simplify, you have to ask yourself why each step is taken. Your work flow probably has a lot of phases that are there for no apparent purpose. Frequently, they are just there by custom or because official protocol dictates it; their presence is not really necessary [3], [4].

Recall that our embassy in Britain's "visa factory" was not required to process every single application. Therefore, regardless of the justification offered for a step, you must critically examine each one and eliminate those that common sense tells you can live without. We discovered that there was room for significant reduction roughly thirty percent—in the number of steps needed to complete different tasks across a broad variety of administrative functions at Intel.

Of course, in the field of widget production, the idea of job simplification is not very novel. As a matter of fact, industrial engineers have been engaged in this same activity for the last century. However, the idea is relatively new and is taking some time to catch on when it comes to boosting the productivity of the "soft professions"—the management, professional, and administrative workplace. Determining what the intended or actual outcome of such effort is is the main challenge to be solved. As we'll see, it becomes more difficult to discern between production and activity in the work of the soft professions. As previously said, focusing on output is essential for increasing productivity; conversely, trying to boost activity may have the opposite effect.

When a manager oversees a wafer production factory at Intel, the result is finished, flawlessly processed silicon wafers. His output, if he manages a design team, consists of finished designs that function well and are prepared for production. Students who have either finished their education or are prepared to go on to the following year of study are the product of a manager's work as a high school administrator. A completely recovered and healed patient is the result of a manager acting like a surgeon. It is not a manager's duty to do his "own" job, or individual task, even if he does it effectively. The manager's productivity must be evaluated in relation to the output produced by his colleagues and subordinates if he oversees a team of individuals or if he has a circle of influence on them. The manager has a great deal of potential to influence "neighboring" firms if he is a knowledge expert or know-how manager. The work and results of the whole group will be impacted by the internal consultant who provides crucial insight to a group that is having difficulty solving a challenge. In a similar vein, a lawyer who obtains a regulatory permission on behalf of a pharmaceutical firm will make available to the public the fruits of years of study conducted by that corporation. Alternatively, a marketing analyst may directly impact the results of several "neighboring" firms by reviewing mountains of data on products, markets, and competitors, analyzing market research, and conducting fact-finding trips. It's possible that his analyses of the information and suggestions may direct the company's overall operations. As a result, the term "manager" has to be defined more broadly. Since middle managers have a lot of influence inside the company, they should also be considered individual contributors who acquire and share knowledge [5], [6].

However, the most important term to remember is that a manager's output is any outcome that a group achieves while working under his direction or influence. Even if the manager's own effort is obviously crucial, it does not produce results on its own. His company does. By comparison, winning football games does not come from a coach or a quarterback alone. Teams as a whole, under their leadership and with their involvement, do. Teams, not individuals, maintain the league standings. It's critical to realize that a manager must participate in a variety of tasks in order to influence production. A manager must establish views and make decisions, provide instructions, assign resources, identify errors, and so on, according to the middle managers I spoke with. To get the desired result, all of these are needed. However, production and activity are not synonymous.

Think about my own position as manager. As a firm president, I may influence production by exercising supervisory authority over my immediate reports, who are group general managers and similar personnel. By observing and offering advice to people in charge of groups who are not directly under my direct supervision, I may also have an impact on them. I hope that both kinds of work will increase my productivity as a manager by increasing the productivity of the business overall. One day, a middle manager at Intel asked me how I could visit production facilities, give in-plant courses, care about the issues of individuals higher up in the company than I am, and yet have time to do my work. I asked him what he considered to be my role. After giving it some consideration, he responded to his own query by saying, "I suppose those things are your job too, aren't they?" They contribute to the production of Intel, thus they are in fact a component of my work, if not my whole employment.

Allow me to provide one more example. Cindy, an Intel engineer, is in charge of an engineering team at a wafer production facility. She also devotes a portion of her time to serving on an advisory committee that creates uniform protocols for every plant in the organization to follow while carrying out a certain technical task. Cindy adds to the wafer manufacturing factories' production in both capacities. She contributes to the plant's production as a supervisory engineer and, as a member of the advisory body, she offers specialist information that will impact and boost the output of "neighboring organizations," or all the other Intel wafer manufacturing operations.

Let's bring up our black box once again. We can see how a middle manager influences production if we think of the organizational machinery as a set of gears. He gives the organization authority during emergencies. He adds a little amount of oil when things aren't operating as smoothly as they need to. Naturally, he also gives the machine intelligence to guide its function. We really do is hard to define and summarize. A lot of it sometimes feels so unimportant that our place in the industry scarcely seems warranted. The difference between our activities what we really do and our output what we accomplish is a contributing factor in this issue. The latter seems to be substantial, important, and desirable. Frequently, the former seems unimportant, untidy, and inconsequential. However, a surgeon whose patient recovers spends "his time cleaning, cutting, and suturing," and this scarcely seems respectable either [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

This resulted from an earlier determination that the program needed to be reviewed since it was struggling. We discovered that although information-gathering was going somewhat better than it had before, the presentation nonetheless generated a number of remarks and recommendations (nudges) from the audience. The software seemed to be in decent condition based on the presentation. (It just symbolized obtaining knowledge; no more action was prompted.) I happened to be seated next to representatives of our training department, who bemoaned the challenges they had in persuading me and other senior managers to attend training at our overseas sites. I was unaware of this. I reminded myself to check in with my personal schedule and my employees to encourage them to support the foreign training program more effectively. Obtaining enough information on the product's state and the remedial measures that had been put in place took up the majority of the meeting. The division manager decided to restart product shipments at the conclusion of the meeting, and I agreed with him. Under this program, top management presents the goals, background, and management to all professional staff members.

The company's and its main groups' time and activity explanation (kind of activity) systems, etc. My goal as the first lecturer in the series was to clearly portray information-giving and to set an example for others by emphasizing the significance of training and by living up to some of the company's principles via my handling of queries and remarks. Simultaneously, the questions' format allowed me to gauge the problems and degree of comprehension of many workers that I otherwise would not have known about. Thus, this also represented information-gathering, which is an efficient "visit" kind of activity.

There are no clear patterns to be seen when you examine what transpired. I handled things in a way that seemed haphazard. When my wife saw my day, she said it looked a lot like her own. She was correct to point out a resemblance. Not when I'm done, but always when I'm exhausted and want to go home. I never finish what I start. Managers have never-ending tasks, just as housewives do. There is always more that has to be done, more that is right, and more than is possible. A manager has to juggle a lot of tasks at once and focus his efforts on the ones that will most boost his company's productivity. Stated otherwise, he ought to relocate to the location where his leverage will be maximal. As you can see, I spend a significant portion of my day learning new things. As you can also see, I get it via a variety of methods. I read regular memos and reports, but I also get information on demand. I converse with both internal and external stakeholders, including press representatives, managers from competing companies, and financial experts. In addition, internal and external customer complaints are crucial. The official permission is only beneficial since it maintains the process's discipline [9], [10].

You must comprehend how knowledge is sent to you if you want to preserve and enhance your ability to acquire it. A hierarchy is at play here. Although verbal sources are the most helpful, the information they provide is often vague, unfinished, and even wrong—much like a newspaper headline that can only give you a broad overview of a topic. A title might mislead you about the true nature of the content and is unable to provide any information. After then, you study the newspaper story in order to ascertain the who, what, where, why, and how. You should then have some perspective and repetition, similar to what you would get from reading a news magazine or even a book. Every stage you can't depend on any one source alone when it comes to your information structure. You don't want to wait a whole week after an incident to learn about it, even if the news magazine may have the most detailed information. In addition to being redundant, your knowledge sources should support each other as it allows you to cross-check the facts you've learnt.

There is a very effective method of gathering information that most managers mostly ignore. It entails traveling to a certain location inside the organization to see what's happening there. Why is this something you should do? Consider what occurs when a manager receives a visit from someone at his office. When a guest sits down, there is a certain stop-and-start dynamic that is socially prescribed. Even though just a brief two-minute exchange of information occurs, the meeting sometimes lasts thirty minutes. However, a manager may just stop, take care of the matter, and go on if he meets someone with whom he has a brief problem while strolling around the neighborhood. The same is true for the subordinate who strikes up a discussion. As a result, these visits are a very productive and successful means of doing management business.

Because it makes managers uncomfortable to browse an area without a clear goal in mind. At Intel, we address this issue by implementing scheduled visits that serve as a pretext for impromptu mini-transactions while still completing official work. For instance, we ask our managers to take part in "Mr. Clean" inspections, where they visit an area of the business they wouldn't normally visit and look over the labs, the safety equipment, and the housekeeping. They then spend about an hour perusing the area and getting a firsthand look at everything. My schedule shows that a manager is both a source of information and someone who collects it. He has to share his expertise with the people in his own organization as well as the various organizations he affects. In addition to conveying information, a manager has to make clear his goals, priorities, and preferences as they relate to how certain activities should be handled. This is crucial because only if the manager shares these skills will his employees be able to make choices on their own and submit them to the manager, who is their boss. Transmitting goals and favored methods is thus essential to effective delegation. A company's underlying corporate culture becomes essential to its operations, as we will see later [11], [12].

An intelligent corporate citizen who upholds the values of a corporate culture will act consistently in similar circumstances, sparing managers from the inefficiencies caused by formal rules, procedures, and regulations that are occasionally invoked to achieve the same goal. Undoubtedly, the third primary category of management activities is making decisions. Indeed, sometimes, we managers do make a choice. However, we contribute to the creation of countless others for each instance where something goes wrong, and we do it in a number of ways. We provide real inputs or just opinions, we discuss the advantages and disadvantages of options and force a better choice to emerge, we examine decisions that others have made or are about to make, we support or oppose them, we ratify or veto them, and we discuss later exactly how decisions should be made. Let's assume for the moment that choices may be divided into two categories. Forward-thinking decisions are made, for instance, during the capital authorization procedure, when we divide the company's financial resources across many projects for the future. The second kind is created when we react to an issue that is emerging or a crisis. These issues might be human or technological (such as a difficulty with quality control) (talking someone out of resigning). It goes without saying that your ability to understand the circumstances and problems your company faces will ultimately determine the decisions you make. For this reason, acquiring information is crucial to a manager's job. The knowledge that you, as the manager, have about the duties, concerns, requirements, and difficulties confronting your business governs all other actions, including communicating information, making choices, and setting an example for your subordinates. To put it simply, obtaining information is the cornerstone of all other management tasks, which is why I choose to dedicate a large portion of my day to it. Whether it's calling a colleague to propose a decision be made in a specific manner, sending a memo or note outlining your perspective on a particular scenario, or offering a remark during an oral presentation, you often take office actions that are intended to subtly influence events. In some situations, you can be recommending a course of action, but you're not giving a directive. However, you're doing more than just disseminating knowledge. We'll refer to it as "nudging" as it allows you to gently guide someone or a meeting in the direction you want. We regularly participate in this very significant management activity, which has to be clearly differentiated from decision-making that produces strict, unambiguous instructions. In actuality, we probably push things a dozen times for every clear choice we make.At last, there's something more subdued that permeates every manager's day. We set an example for others in our company by going about accomplishing what we consider to be our tasks, including our peers, superiors, and subordinates. A manager must be a leader, as much has been stated and written. The truth is that nothing leads like an example; no one management action can be said to represent leadership. I mean something simple when I say this. Simply said, values and behavioral standards are not readily communicated by speech or memos; instead, they are most successfully communicated through doing and doing.

Although they should each operate in a unique manner, managers must take action in order to be seen as having influence. Some of us find it comfortable to interact with big groups of people and express our emotions and morals honestly in that way. Other leadership philosophies are effective, but only if we acknowledge and intentionally emphasize the necessity for us to be role models for others in our business. Some individuals like working one-on-one with others in a calmer, more cerebral setting. Never assume that the leadership styles I've discussed are exclusive to large-scale businesses. Everyone who works for an insurance agent in a small office who often speaks on the phone with personal friends instills in them certain morals about appropriate behavior. A lawyer who gets a touch tipsy after lunch returns to his workplace in the same way. However, the most crucial management value of all is shown to his colleagues by a supervisor in any size business who takes his task seriously.

Most of a manager's job involves distributing resources, such as capital, money, and labor. Our own time, however, is the most valuable resource we allot every single day. Though, in theory, resources like money, labor, or capital may always be increased, the one really limited resource each of us has is our own time. As such, how it is allocated and used warrants careful consideration. The most crucial component of being a leader and role model, in my opinion, is how you manage your own time. As you can see, I was involved in around twenty-five different actions on a normal day. These activities were mostly information-gathering and -giving, but they also included decision-making and nudging. It's also evident that about two thirds of my time was spent in meetings of some form. Prior to being appalled by the amount of time I spend in meetings, respond to this question: which of the following tasks—finding out information, providing information, making decisions, encouraging others, and setting an example—could I have completed outside of a meeting? Almost none, is the response. Meetings provide a setting for management tasks. Naturally, gathering with others is a medium rather than an action. As a manager, you may complete tasks over a loudspeaker, in a note, or in a meeting. To achieve your goals, however, you must choose the media that will provide you the most leverage and be the most effective.

CONCLUSION

The examination of management activity inside the operational "black box" presents a complex picture in which effective leadership, productivity, and decision-making must all be balanced for the success of the business. A manager's daily actions are shaped by a complex dance between information collecting, decision-making, and the art of nudging, in which time management is a critical resource. One of the main themes is the significance of being a leader and role model, which emphasizes the impact that management actions have on the culture of the whole business. The knowledge gained from this investigation offers managers a useful manual for negotiating the intricacies of their jobs. Key lessons include knowing the difference between activities and output, making prudent use of resources, and selecting the best channels for communication and decision-making. The dynamic nature of the management world necessitates flexibility, strategic thinking, and a nuanced approach to leadership. In the end, effective management work entails creating a culture that encourages cooperation, creativity, and ongoing progress in addition to overseeing the operations within the black box. Managers emerge in this dynamic context as builders of organizational resilience and development, in addition to being custodians of efficiency.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. Diskiene, V. TamaSevičius, and A. Kalvaityte, “Managerial roles in smes and their effect on perceived managerial effectiveness in lithuania,” *Organ. Mark. Emerg. Econ.*, 2018.

[2] P. Aaltola, “Investing in strategic development: Management control of business model and managerial innovations,” *Qual. Res. Account. Manag.*, 2018.

[3] A. Budiman, M. Frankovský, Z. Birknerová, E. Benková, and I. Rajiani, “Identification of attributes of neuro-linguistic programming (NLP) structure with the focus on communication and techniques of its implementation in managerial work,” *Polish J. Manag. Stud.*, 2018.

[4] L. Ardini, “Analisis Perbandingan Pengaruh Langsung Dan Tak Langsung Faktor Budaya Organisasi Dan Komitmen Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Pada Uptd Parkir,” *EKUITAS (Jurnal Ekon. dan Keuangan)*, 2018.

[5] S. Arsalan, M. Haizam Mohd Saudi, R. Susiani, and A. Adison, “Effect of Participative Budgeting, Organizational Commitment and Work Motivation on Managerial Performance (Survey of Motor Vehicle Dealers in Bandung),” *Int. J. Eng. Technol.*, 2018.

[6] B. Raza, M. Ali, S. Ahmed, and J. Ahmad, “Impact of Managerial Coaching on Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Mediation and Moderation Model,” *Int. J. Organ. Leadersh.*, 2018.

[7] D. Collins, “Managerial work,” in *Stories for Management Success*, 2018.

[8] A. H. Olafsen, E. L. Deci, and H. Halvari, “Basic psychological needs and work motivation: A longitudinal test of directionality,” *Motiv. Emot.*, 2018.

[9] F. Rizani and A. G. Sondakh, “The influence of incentive contract framing on managerial efforts and work motivation,” *Int. J. Bus. Manag. Sci.*, 2018.

[10] M. Kumar, H. Jauhari, A. Rastogi, and S. Sivakumar, “Managerial support for development and turnover intention: Roles of organizational support, work engagement and job satisfaction,” *J. Organ. Chang. Manag.*, 2018.

[11] . K., “The Influence of Effectiveness Managerial, Task Commitment and Work Ethic for Employee Performance Regional Water Company (Pdam) Tirta Bhagasasi Bekasi,” *Int. J. Sci. Eng. Invent.*, 2018.

[12] F. Matsveru and J. A. Meylahn, “A family support model for enhancing the well-being and work performance of christians in managerial positions,” *HTS Teol. Stud. / Theol. Stud.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 4

LEVERAGE OF MANAGERIAL ACTIVITY AND ITS IMPACT ON ORGANIZATIONAL DYNAMICS

Dr Neena P C, Associate Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.neenapc@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The concept of leverage in managerial activity and its profound impact on organizational dynamics. Recognizing that a manager's influence extends beyond individual tasks, the narrative explores how specific types of work activities can generate varying levels of output, termed as leverage. The abstract underscores the significance of high-leverage activities in increasing overall organizational productivity. The study highlights the two primary dimensions through which leverage can be heightened: first, by optimizing the efficiency of existing activities to achieve more output per unit of labor, and second, by strategically altering the nature of work performed to increase the ratio of output to activity. Practical examples, ranging from breakfast factory operations to software engineering, illustrate the diverse applications of leverage in different professional domains. Furthermore, the role of technology, automation, and work simplification in enhancing the leverage of managerial activities. It emphasizes the importance of aligning managerial efforts with organizational objectives and the need for constant adaptation to emerging technologies and industry trends.

KEYWORDS:

Decision-Making, Leadership, Managerial Leverage, Organizational Effectiveness, Productivity, Strategic Management

INTRODUCTION

As we've established, a manager's output is the result of the several organizations that are under his direction and influence. Let's examine the idea of leverage to find out. The amount of production produced by a certain management action is measured by its leverage. The most evident example is the first one. Think about Robin, the finance manager at Intel who is in charge of organizing the company's yearly financial planning procedure. Robin directly influences the following work of maybe two hundred participants in the planning process when she outlines in advance precisely what information has to be collected and delivered at each step of the process and assigns who is accountable for what. Over an extended length of time, Robin will assist in removing uncertainty and misunderstanding for a wide population of managers by allocating a certain amount of time ahead of the planning activities. As a result, her effort increases organizational productivity overall and obviously has significant leverage—leverage that is contingent upon the timing of its execution. It is apparent that work completed before the planning meeting has significant influence. Clearly, Robin's efforts will have considerably less leverage if she needs to rush to assist a manager in defining rules and goals later on. Another instance of leverage that necessitates prompt action is what you do upon discovering that a valuable subordinate has chosen to retire. If you want to influence someone's decision in such a scenario, you have to address the matter right away. You will lose all of your opportunities if you delay. Therefore, a manager must always remember timeliness, which is frequently crucial, in order to optimize the impact of his actions [1], [2].

Negative leverage is also possible. An organization's production may be negatively impacted by certain management actions. I'm referring to a pretty basic thing. Let's say I am a major player in the meeting and I show up unprepared. As a direct result of my negligence, I not only squander the time of those in attendance at the meeting due to my lack of preparation, but I also deny the other participants the chance to spend that time for anything else.

A manager has great influence whenever he or she teaches a group anything because those in the group will spread what they learn to a large number of others. However, leverage may also be used negatively. My discussion during the orientation course serves as an example of leverage, which I believe is strong and constructive. I aim to cover a lot of ground with a group of two hundred new hires about Intel in the two hours I have available, including its goals, history, values, and work culture. Apart from what I say directly, how I respond to inquiries and how I behave in general conveys our way of doing things to these workers at a time when they are most receptive [3], [4].

Here's a more illustration of this kind of leverage. Barbara, an Intel marketing engineer, is tasked with teaching a group of salespeople about the company's offerings. The salesmen will be in a better position to market the line if she performs her duties well. If she does it shoddily, significant harm is done. Here's one last, less formal example: As you may remember, Cindy works to share her knowledge of a particular technology with all of the company's production units as a member of a technical coordinating body. She effectively exerts significant influence on her peers at nearby Intel groups by using the coordinating body as an unofficial training tool.

A manager may also have significant influence by doing a quick task that has a long-term impact on the performance of another individual. Consider a performance assessment as an excellent illustration of this. The few hours a manager spends writing and presenting the evaluation might have a significant impact on the recipient's work. A manager may use both positive and negative leverage in this situation. A subordinate's efforts may be encouraged and even redirected, or the Managerial Leverage ay evaluation may demoralize and discourage him for an indeterminate amount of time. For an extended period, generating a tickler file another apparently little task—can greatly enhance everyday work. Although setting up the basic mechanical assistance is a one-time task, the manager who employs it continuously is likely to see an increase in productivity. This means that the leverage is really high [5], [6].

There are several instances of large negative leverage. An Intel manager recognized that, despite significant cost reduction efforts the year before, his division would still not turn a profit in the next year after going through the yearly planning process. The manager started to feel down. He "almost immediately began to affect people around him and soon depression spread throughout his organization," even though he was unaware of it. It wasn't until a member of his staff eventually informed him what he was doing to those under him that he became rational. Waffling is another instance, when a management postpones making a choice that would impact other people's jobs. A decision that is not made is essentially the same as one that is made negatively; an organization's operations may halt if there is no green light. There is almost infinite negative leverage available to both the depressed and the hesitant management. Retraining the group might be used to address the problem if a poor sales training attempt has a significant negative impact on individuals. But since sadness and waffling have such a widespread but subtle effect on an organization, it is very difficult to counteract the negative leverage they generate.

Negative leverage also includes managerial intervention. This happens when a supervisor takes control of a problem instead of allowing the subordinate to resolve it on his own by drawing on his superior knowledge and expertise of the duties assigned to them. Managerial interference occurs, for instance, when a senior management notices an unfavorable trend in an indicator and gives the person in charge a specific list of steps that need to be followed. Meddling often results from a boss abusing an excessive amount of superior job expertise, whether actual or perceived. The negative leverage arises from the fact that, after being exposed to several examples of this kind of behavior, the subordinate will start to see things from a much narrower perspective, taking less effort to solve issues on his own and instead sending them to his supervisor. Interfering obviously has negative management leverage since it will ultimately result in a decrease in the organization's production. An individual with special abilities and expertise performs the third kind of highly leveraged management action. An Intel marketing engineer in charge of product pricing is one such individual.-If pricing are set excessively high, it might have a detrimental effect on thousands of field salesmen who, despite their best efforts, will not be able to get any business. Of course, we would be giving money away if the prices were too cheap.

Consider one more instance. How it is employed is effectively under the authority of an Intel development engineer who has unique and in-depth expertise of a certain production process. The process will ultimately serve as the basis for the work of several product designers across the organization, therefore the development engineer's influence is significant. The same is true for an actuary working for an insurance business or a geologist employed by an oil company. Each of them is an expert whose job is crucial to the overall operation of their company. The individual who has the crucial information or insights—the "knowledge specialist" or "know-how manager"—has great power and sway over other people's work, making them very influential.

The ability to identify, among a plethora of apparently equally important tasks, the one or two or three that provide leverage much more than the rest and to focus on them is the art of managing. I consider closely monitoring customer complaints to be a high-leverage activity. Apart from satisfying a client, the endeavor usually yields significant understandings into the inner workings of my own business. These kinds of complaints may be many, and although each one should be investigated further, not all of them would benefit from or call for my direct attention. The skill of management lies in knowing which often or twenty complaints to investigate, evaluate, and pursue further. The intuition that many deeper issues lie beneath one complaint and not the other becomes the core of that work.

DISCUSSION

Delegation is an integral part of management since managing time is based on a hierarchy of values. It is often not the case that the "delegator" and the "delegate" have a same knowledge base and operational concepts or thoughts about how to approach problem-solving. Only with explicit instructions can the delegate function as an effective proxy if both parties lack the necessary common ground. Similar to interfering, this results in little management influence when certain actions are outlined in great detail. Monitoring delegation outcomes is similar to monitoring in quality assurance. When the process is at its least valuable point, we should monitor and implement quality assurance guidelines. For instance, go over the preliminary versions of reports that you have assigned to your subordinates. You may discover fundamental issues with their content before they have had time to polish them into final shape. There's another concept that pertains to how often you should review the work of your subordinates. Using different sampling methods with different subordinates, a flexible strategy should be used; you should increase or reduce your frequency based on whether your subordinate is managing a job that is new to him or one that he has expertise with. The frequency of monitoring need to be determined by your subordinate's past performance and familiarity with a particular task a quality we will discuss in more depth later rather than by your assessment of his overall abilities. Gradually, when the subordinate's job becomes better, you should react by lowering the level of observation. In order to properly implement quality assurance standards, the manager should only sporadically inquire about specifics—just enough to make sure the subordinate is making satisfactory progress. Investigating every aspect of a job that has been assigned would be equivalent to doing a quality assurance test on IO% of the output from production [7], [8].

Let's look at the process Intel uses to authorize a capital equipment acquisition. Before a subordinate submits a request for approval, we urge him to thoroughly consider the situation. We then ask him very specific questions about the proposal at a review meeting to gauge how well he is thinking. If he responds to them in a way that makes sense, we'll grant his request. By using this method, we may assess the quality of the reasoning without having to do it ourselves. The most popular strategy for gradually raising a manager's output and productivity has been to use time-management strategies, which aim to lower the denominator on both sides of this equation. Countless experts will advise a manager to reposition his workstation so that his back is to the door, touch a piece of paper only once, and only have stand-up meetings—which are likely to be brief in order to increase productivity. I believe that by using our production concepts, these time-management recommendations may be strengthened. First, we need to figure out what our limiting step is. What is the "egg" in our work? In a manager's life, there are some things that just must happen on an absolute schedule. For me, that's my teaching class; I know when it will meet and I have to get ready for it. Since more than two hundred students will be waiting for me, there's no room for flexibility. As a result, I have to plan ahead and schedule my other work around this limiting step. To put it another way, if we can figure out what is unchangeable and adjust the more yielding activities around it, we can work more efficiently.

A second production principle that we can apply to managerial work is batching similar tasks. A manufacturing operation needs time to set up, so in order for managerial work to proceed efficiently, we should apply the same set-up effort to a group of related activities. For example, consider our continuous egg-boiler, which was installed to produce identical, fine-quality eggs that take three minutes to produce. In the event that we now decide to serve our customers four-minute eggs, we would need to slow down the conveyor belt that moves the eggs through the hot water. This adjustment requires time because we have to adjust the machine's nuts and bolts in addition to sampling a few of the eggs to ensure they are of a certain quality. The concept of set-up time has many applications in management. For instance, if we prepare a set of illustrations for a training class, we will be much more productive if we can use the same set with other classes or groups. Similarly, if a manager needs to approve a batch of performance reviews or read a number of reports, he should block out time and complete them all at once to make the most use of the mental set-up time required for the task. The next production concept you may use is to give your schedule some leeway, or slack [9], [10].

For example, highway planners are aware that a freeway has an optimum number of vehicles it can handle, meaning that fewer cars mean that the road is not being used to its full potential. However, at that optimum point, if just a few more cars are permitted to enter the flow of traffic, everything comes to a grinding halt. With the new metering devices that regulate access during rush hour, planners can get a fix on the right number. Managerial work also has an optimum degree of loading, with enough slack built in so that one unexpected phone call won't ruin your plans for the remainder of the day. You need some slack.

Another principle of production is almost exactly the opposite: a manager should have an inventory of projects that he uses as a raw material. This is not the same as his work-in-process inventory, which will eventually rot or become obsolete like eggs in a continuous boiler. Rather, this inventory should be made up of tasks that are necessary but not urgently completed; these are discretionary projects, the kind that a manager can work on to improve the productivity of his group in the long run. In the absence of such an inventory of projects, a manager will almost certainly spend his leisure time interfering in the work of his subordinates.

One last point: most production practices adhere to well-established protocols and, instead of starting from scratch every time, use a particular approach that has proven effective in the past. However, managers often exhibit inconsistent behavior and bring a variety of approaches to the same task. We should endeavor to address this. As we become more consistent, we should also keep in mind that the value of an administrative procedure lies not in formal high output management statements but rather in the genuine thought that went into its creation. This means that even as we work to standardize what we do, we should still be critical about what we do and the methodologies we employ [11], [12].

Built-in Leverage: The Appropriate Number of Subordinates

The number of subordinates a manager has is a key factor in determining his managerial leverage. A manager whose work is primarily supervisory should, in general, have six to eight subordinates; three or four is too few and ten is too many. If a manager has too many, he gets bogged down with the same result. This range derives from a recommendation that a manager give each of his subordinates about a half-day each week. (An hour a week does not provide for enough chance for monitoring; two days a week per subordinate would likely result in interfering.)

There are instances when a business is set up in a way that makes it difficult to get in touch with six or eight subordinates. For instance, in a manufacturing plant, there may be two departments: production and engineering, meaning that the plant manager would only have two direct reports. In such a situation, the manager may decide to "acf? as one of the two aides, deciding to take charge of his own engineering management, etc. If he does so, he will have added the individuals who would normally report to the head of engineering, but the manufacturing manager would still report to him. As a result, the manufacturing manager and five engineers will be the plant manager's direct reports. He would undoubtedly object to the arrangement's lack of the engineers seeming to be at the same organizational level as the production manager.

Aiming for regularity is the next key production principle that may be applied to management activity. If consumers came in a predictable stream, instead of showing up one or two at a time, we could definitely operate our breakfast factory more effectively. Even though we have little influence over the behaviors of our clients, we should nonetheless make every effort to minimize their burden. As said, we should attempt to make our management work resemble a factory rather than a job shop. As such, we make every effort to avoid both little disruptions caused by emergencies and big pauses and starts throughout our day. Even if some of the latter cannot be avoided, we should always be penetrating our organization's "black box" to find more high-priority issue spots. Knowing that you have a ticking time bomb on your hands allows you to solve an issue as soon as you see fit, rather than waiting until the bomb goes off. However, as you have to coordinate your work with other managers, you can only go toward regularity if others follow suit. Stated differently, similar activities must occupy the same time blocks. For instance, Monday mornings are designated as planning group meetings across the Intel organization. For that reason, Monday is free of schedule problems for everyone who belongs to one.

An experiment involving around twenty middle managers at Intel was once requested. Following their pairing, they attempted some role-playing where the manager was supposed to identify the issue that was most restricting his productivity and the visitor was supposed to act as a consultant who would assess the issue and provide fixes. Uncontrolled interruptions were the most often mentioned issue, and they impacted supervisory and knowledge managers in a strikingly consistent way. Everyone believed that the disruptions interfered with his "own" job and that they came from a common source, usually 1°2 Frcm subordinates and others who's work the managers impacted but were not directly under their direct supervision. Production operators were the main source of disruptions for manufacturing workers, while outside clients caused disruptions for marketing professionals. Put another way, these individuals were the recipients of the authority and knowledge held by middle management. The alternatives that were most commonly suggested were not particularly workable. The most often suggested method was to physically hide during certain periods of time to facilitate individual work. However, this is not a very joyful response, since the managers would be compounding the difficulties that the interrupters clearly have by concealing. One "solution" put out was for clients to refrain from contacting marketing managers during certain hours. Not good.

There are more effective methods. Let's put a production idea to use. Producers produce standard goods. By comparison, you may prepare typical replies for the most common types of interruptions if you can identify what sort of interrupts you're receiving. Using typical replies, a manager may cut down on time spent dealing interruptions since customers don't always have brand-new queries or issues; instead, they often have the same ones. Having them on hand also allows a management to assign a large portion of the work to staff members with less expertise.

Additionally, by using the production concept of batching, which involves managing a collection of related tasks simultaneously, you may gather and address many disruptions from your subordinates not at random but rather at staff and at one-on-one meetings, which will be the topic of the following. People won't be able to object too much if they are requested to save their questions and issues for designated periods rather than interrupting you whenever they choose if such meetings are conducted on a regular basis. Reducing the amount of time a manager spends handling disruptions may also be achieved by the use of indicators, particularly the bank of indicators maintained over time. His ability to locate the information he needs for a response quickly determines how quickly he can respond to a question. By keeping an information archive, a manager may avoid having to do ad hoc research each time a phone call comes in.

If those who often interrupt you were aware of how much it bothers you, they would undoubtedly watch out for themselves and limit the amount of times they have to speak with you. In any event, a manager need to make an effort to coerce those who often interrupt him to decide whether or not a problem can wait. Thus, rather of hiding, a manager may post a notice on his door that reads, "I am doing inuivunai work. Pl ease don't interrupt me unless it really can't wait until 2:00." After that, he could host an open office and welcome everyone who wants to visit him. Meetings are not well-known. They are seen as the bane of the manager's life by one school of management theory. A study's findings suggested that managers were squandering time when they were spending up to 50% of their time in meetings. Meetings are C€ non-contributory labor that managers have to put up with, according to William H. Whyte, Jr. in his book The Organization Man, and Peter Drucker, who previously said that managers who spend more than 25% of their time in meetings are malorganized.

However, there is another perspective on meetings. As we said before, a middle manager's primary responsibility is to provide the groups under his supervision and influence with knowledge, know-how, and a sense of the desired course of action. A manager participates in decision-making as well. These two types of fundamental management responsibilities are only possible in face-to-face interactions, and hence, only in meetings. I shall therefore reiterate that a meeting serves as nothing less than a conduit for the execution of management tasks. This implies that rather than opposing their mere existence, we need to make the most of our time with them. Two fundamental types of meetings result from the two fundamental management functions. Knowledge and information are exchanged in the first kind of meeting, known as a process-oriented meeting. The goal of the second kind of meeting is to address a particular issue. These meetings, known as mission-oriented meetings, often result in a resolution. They are ad hoc events, not planned far in advance since they typically can't be.

CONCLUSION

Managers may influence total productivity by knowing how different job activities might result in different amounts of production by comprehending the dynamics of leverage. Managers may enhance their influence by using the two aspects of leverage: strategically changing the nature of work and improving current operations for greater efficiency. Real-world examples from a variety of professional fields show how versatile using management tasks can be, ranging from software engineering to the operations of breakfast factories. Additionally, the conversation emphasizes how technology, automation, and labor simplification may increase the effectiveness of management efforts by acting as a catalyst. It highlights how important it is for managers to match their actions with company goals in order to promote flexibility in response to changes in the market and in technology. Managers looking to maximize their impact on organizational results may benefit greatly from the notion of leverage, which guides them as businesses strive for continuous development and adaptation. In addition to demystifying the nuances of management leverage, this investigation offers practitioners a framework for strategically allocating their efforts, which will eventually contribute to long-term efficacy and efficiency within the organizational environment.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. W. Ghazali, M. T. M. Suffian, Z. M. Sanusi, and F. S. Alsudairi, “Managerial Opportunism: Monitoring Financial Risk of Malaysian Shariah-compliant Companies,” *Glob. J. Al-Thaqafah*, 2018.

[2] B. U. Ejeh and Y. M. Salaudeen, “Equity ownership structure and corporate tax aggressiveness: the Nigerian context,” *Pressacademia*, 2018.

[3] M. Saviano, P. Di Nauta, M. M. Montella, and F. Sciarelli, “Managing protected areas as cultural landscapes: The case of the Alta Murgia National Park in Italy,” *Land use policy*, 2018.

[4] G. Aliperti, F. Rizzi, and M. Frey, “Cause-related marketing for disaster risk reduction in the tourism industry: A comparative analysis of prevention- and recovery-related campaigns,” *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.*, 2018.

[5] S. I. Kirby, M. B. Duignan, and D. Mcgillivray, “Mega-sport events, micro and small business leveraging: Introducing the ‘mse-msb leverage model,’” *Event Manag.*, 2018.

[6] R. N. Chesoli, R. C. Schuster, S. Okelo, and M. O. Omotayo, “Strengthening care delivery in primary care facilities: Perspectives of facility managers on the immunization program in Kenya,” *Int. J. Heal. Policy Manag.*, 2018.

[7] O. M. J. Popoola, "Preface to the Volume 2 Issue 1 of Indian-Pacific Journal of Accounting and Finance," *Indian-Pacific J. Account. Financ.*, 2018.

[8] S. Kobbi-Fakhfakh, R. M. Shabou, and B. Pigé, "Determinants of segment reporting quality: evidence from EU," *J. Financ. Report. Account.*, 2018.

[9] L. J. Noval and G. K. Stahl, "Accounting for Proscriptive and Prescriptive Morality in the Workplace: The Double-Edged Sword Effect of Mood on Managerial Ethical Decision Making," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2017.

[10] C. Boudreau and L. Bernier, "The implementation of integrated electronic service delivery in Quebec: the conditions of collaboration and lessons," *Int. Rev. Adm. Sci.*, 2017.

[11] R. Eito-Brun, "Incorporating innovation management practices to ISO/IEC 29110," in *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, 2017.

[12] N. M. Tocher and S. Oswald, "Leveraging Social Resources Toward Dynamic Capability Protection and Novel Competence Creation," *Acad. Manag. Proc.*, 2017.

CHAPTER 5

STRATEGIC MEETINGS IN MANAGERIAL PRACTICE: PROCESS-ORIENTED AND MISSION-ORIENTED APPROACHES

Dr Satyajeet Nanda, Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.satyajeetnanda@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Effective communication and collaboration within an organization are crucial for successful managerial practices. The significance of strategic meetings in managerial work, distinguishing between process-oriented and mission-oriented approaches. The focus is on optimizing productivity, decision-making, and leadership within the organizational framework. The discussion encompasses various types of meetings, including one-on-one sessions, staff meetings, and operational reviews, shedding light on their unique roles and benefits. Emphasis is placed on the importance of regularity, structure, and preparedness in meetings to enhance their impact on managerial tasks. The leverage of these meetings is examined, highlighting their potential to create a common base of information, promote effective delegation, and drive informed decision-making. Additionally, the article delves into the complexities of mission-oriented meetings, outlining the responsibilities of the chairman and emphasizing the need for clear objectives, attendance management, and concise post-meeting documentation. Ultimately, the narrative underscores the dual nature of strategic meetings as both process-oriented forums for knowledge exchange and mission-oriented platforms for decision-making, contributing to efficient managerial practices.

KEYWORDS:

Managerial Practice, Meetings, Mission-Oriented, Strategic Management, Strategy Development, Team Collaboration.

INTRODUCTION

We should try to make this sort of gathering more often in order to get the most out of it. Put another way, attendees should be aware of how the meeting is conducted, the sort of important topics that are covered, and the goals that need to be met. It should be made to enable a manager to handle several related management duties with the same "production" setup time and effort by enabling them to be completed in "batch" fashion. Furthermore, because of the consistency, you and the other attendees may start estimating how long different types of work will take. As a result, a "production control" system which is documented on many calendars—can emerge, guaranteeing that a planned meeting will not significantly interfere with other tasks that individuals are doing. The one-on-one, staff meeting, and operation review are the three types of process-oriented meetings that Intel uses [1], [2].

Individual Consultations

One-on-one meetings are the key means by which a supervisor and a subordinate at Intel maintain their business connection. Information sharing and mutual instruction are its primary goals. Through discussing particular issues and circumstances, the manager imparts knowledge and abilities to the staff member and offers solutions. Concurrently, the subordinate furnishes the supervisor with comprehensive details on his actions and areas of concern. Regularly planned one-on-ones are quite uncommon outside of Intel, as far as I can determine. A manager from a different business often responds, "Oh no, I don't need scheduled meetings with my supervisor [or subordinate]; I see him several times a day..." when I inquire about the practice. However, a one-on-one meeting to address a particular issue differs greatly from a casual interaction between a supervisor and a subordinate, or even from a mission-oriented meeting.

It dawned on me during Intel's early years that, despite my expectation to oversee engineering and production, I understood virtually nothing about the company's first product line—memory devices. I had no prior experience with production methods, since my experience was limited to semiconductor device development. So I got two of my colleagues, who worked under me, to agree to teach me in secret about memory design and manufacture. These were scheduled in advance, with a teacher or subordinate setting up each one. The student or supervisor diligently took notes in an effort to learn during the session. The original tone and spirit of these one-on-ones persisted and expanded when Intel expanded to x4s. Who needs a one-on-one conversation? In some circumstances, it may be appropriate for a supervisor to meet with every employee under him, including production operators and experts. However, I want to focus on the one-on-one interactions that take place between a supervisor and every professional who directly reports to him [3], [4].

The maturity of each of your subordinates in relation to the work or task at hand is the solution. Stated otherwise, what level of familiarity does a particular subordinate have with the particular job in question? This does not correspond with his age or his whole experience. As we'll see later, as a subordinate's job maturity rises, the best management approach in a given situation changes from extremely close to very loose supervision. Therefore, you should meet one-on-one with a subordinate who lacks expertise in a certain circumstance often (e.g., once a week) and less often (e.g., once every few weeks) with an experienced veteran. How rapidly things change in a work field is another factor to take into account here. For instance, the speed in marketing could be so quick that regular one-on-one meetings are necessary for a supervisor to stay up to date on developments. However, in a research setting, things can be calmer, and fewer meetings might be necessary for a certain task-relevant maturity level.

There's really no way to answer this, but the subordinate has to believe that there's enough time to bring up difficult topics. Consider it in this manner. Would you want to discuss a major issue in a fifteen-minute meeting with your supervisor, whose professional interest in the area is second only to yours, if you had a large problem you wanted to discuss? You wouldn't do it. A one-on-one, in my opinion, ought to last at least an hour.

Only once would the subordinate need to prepare, compared to eight times for the supervisor in charge of eight subordinates. Thus, it is imperative that the latter be requested to prepare an oudine, since this compels him to consider all of the topics and ideas he intends to bring up beforehand. Additionally, with an oudine, the meeting's supervisor may assist determine the meeting's speed based on the "meatiness" of the agenda items because they are aware of what will be discussed from the start. A subordinate should create supporting material ahead of time and use the outline as a framework for it. The supervisor should next be given a tour of all the materials by the subordinate [5], [6].

We may begin with performance metrics, which are metrics that the subordinate uses to gauge success, such project progress, production output, and incoming order rates. The focus should be on warning signs of disaster. Any significant developments since the previous meeting should be discussed, including any issues related to recruiting, personnel issues in general, organizational issues, upcoming plans, and most importantly potential issues. A subordinate owes it to his superior to report a problem, even if it's only an intuition that something is off, since this forces an investigation into the organizational black box. The first need for topics to be discussed is that they must bother and bother the subordinate. These issues often elusive and need time to manifest, evaluate, and resolve. He need to assist the subordinate in communicating his concerns and what's been upsetting him. The supervisor's roles include coaching and learning. "The good time users among managers do not talk to their subordinates about their problems but they know how to make the subordinates talk about theirs," says Peter Drucker, summarizing the supervisor's role in this situation very neatly.

Utilizing Grove's Didactic Management Principle, "Ask one more question!" A supervisor should provide a follow-up question after he determines that the subordinate has covered all the ground he wishes to. He should make an effort to maintain the flow of ideas by asking follow-up questions until both parties are happy that they have resolved the issue. I would want to provide some practical tips for conducting productive one-on-one sessions. First, the outline should be copied to the subordinate and the supervisor, and both should make comments on it for various reasons. I take notes in almost every situation, and I seldom ever look at them again. I do it to help me process the things I see and hear and to keep my attention from wandering.

I am compelled to organize the material rationally since I take notes in outline style, which aids in my comprehension. What's more significant is what "writing it down" means. Numerous problems in a one-on-one session need the subordinate taking action. He indicates a promise, luce a handshake, that something will be done when he makes a note right after the supervisor's recommendation. After taking notes, the supervisor might follow up during the subsequent one-on-one. Using a "hold" file, where the supervisor and subordinate gather significant but not urgent topics for consideration at the next meeting, is a major time-saver. This kind of file uses the batching production concept and minimizes the need for ad hoc communication, such as phone calls, drop-in visits, and so forth the interactions we previously discussed—saving time for all parties involved.

During one-on-one meetings, the manager should also promote candid conversations on personal matters, since this is the ideal setting for addressing complex and nuanced work-related concerns that concern their employee. Is he happy with how he performed? Does he feel a gnawing difficulty or frustration? Does he question his direction of travel? However, the supervisor has to be on the lookout for the "zinger," which a sensitive topic is brought up at an inconvenient moment. These usually occur close to the conclusion of a conference. If you allow that to continue, the subordinate may inform you that he's not pleased and has been hunting for work outside of the office, giving you five minutes to address the situation. One-on-one phone conversations across long distances are increasingly essential because many businesses are geographically dispersed. However, they may function well given enough time and effort: both sides need take notes, the supervisor has to receive the agenda before the meeting starts, and so on. Note-taking cannot function in the same manner as it does in a face-to-face meeting since you are unable to see the other participant.

After the meeting, exchanging notes is a good approach to make sure everyone is aware of what the other promised to do. One-on-one meetings need to be planned in a rolling fashion, with the next one being set up as the current one comes to a finish. This way, cancellations may be avoided and other obligations can be considered. The meeting won't happen if the supervisor has a predetermined timetable for one-on-ones, like every other Wednesday morning, and the subordinate's vacation falls on that day. This may be readily prevented by scheduling on a rolling basis. Assume that you meet one-on-one for one and a half hours every two weeks with your subordinate. Ninety minutes of your time may improve your grasp of what your subordinate is doing and the quality of his job for two weeks, or for around eighty-plus hours. It is obvious that one-on-ones have a great deal of power. This occurs as a result of the supervisor and the subordinate developing comparable practices and a shared knowledge foundation. And as said above, this is the only way that delegation can be done effectively and efficiently.

Simultaneously, the supervisor receives instruction from the subordinate, and the knowledge gained is crucial for the supervisor to make sound judgments. My deputy, who oversees Intel's sales team, went over trend indicators of incoming orders at a recent one-on-one meeting. I knew very nothing about them, but he provided me with a wealth of detailed information and persuaded me that our company was no longer expanding. He showed me that this was not a seasonal thing, even though the summer months are usually sluggish. Reluctantly, we concluded that business was indeed slowing down after giving the facts some thought and analyzing how they related to other markers of activity in our sector. This indicated that we should approach near-term investments cautiously a serious concern. Through his sharing of his knowledge base with me, we were able to arrive at a same strategy, conclusion, and attitude: conservatism in our goals for growth. Having made the decision to reduce development in his own area of responsibility, he exited the meeting. I made the decision to inform the business groups I oversaw of our conclusion as I was leaving. As a result, the one-on-one had significant influence since the Intel sales manager had an impact on every other manager who reported to me.

Aside from that, I also believe that family life may benefit from one-on-one time spent at home. As the parent of two teenage girls, I've discovered that the tone and nature of our conversations varies greatly from one another's under other situations. One-on-one conversations force us to respect one another and open up the conversation on nuanced and complex issues. Since father and daughter often go out to dinner, it goes without saying that no notes are made, but a family one-on-one closely resembles a business one-on-one. I heartily endorse both of these approaches.

DISCUSSION

A staff meeting is a chance for peer interaction since it involves participation from a supervisor and all of his subordinates. Peer contact is difficult, particularly when it comes to collective decision-making, as we shall discover later. Yet effective management depends on it. Peer collaboration is essential to the decision-making process that we support in the next section and the operation of the dual reporting principle. Managers will be ready to join other working bodies based on peer groups if they understand how this occurs at staff meetings, where a group of peers get to know each other and where the presence of a common supervisor encourages peer interaction to grow. The supervisor has the opportunity to learn from the many exchanges and confrontations that occur during staff meetings. In my experience, hearing two individuals with different points of view debate a topic helps me comprehend it far more than hearing just one side of the argument [7], [8].

Wanted Area Dormant Active Subordinates

At a staff meeting, the supervisor's role should be to steer the conversation in the right direction while the subordinates handle the day-to-day problem-solving. The majority of the concerns are being worked on by subordinates. Because the managers in attendance have usually worked together for a considerable amount of time, staff meetings are an excellent forum for making decisions. Everyone is aware of each person's official and informal authority, and they all know who loves to talk a lot, who tends to daydream, what they know, and so on. A staff meeting is similar to a family eating dinner together, while other work-related forums where individuals don't know one other well are like a bunch of strangers having to decide on anything.

Operation reviews

For those who would not otherwise have many opportunities to engage with one another, this is their medium. Formal presentations to peers in other departments of the organization and to other managers who are not their direct superiors should be a part of this format. An operation review's primary goal at Intel is to maintain the flow of teaching and learning among staff members who work at different organizational levels and don't often interact or have one-on-one conversations. For both rookie and senior managers, this is crucial. The senior manager's remarks, critiques, and recommendations will be helpful to the younger employee, who will get a more diverse perspective on issues from those who are knowledgeable about them. These gatherings also serve as a source of inspiration for the managers presenting since they want to make a positive impression on both their supervisor's supervisor and their external colleagues. The participants in an operation review are who? The audience, the speakers, the reviewing manager, and the organizing manager. In order for the review to be beneficial, each of these participants must fulfill a certain function.

The meeting should be set up by the management who are supervising the presenting managers—an Intel divisional marketing manager, for example. He need to assist the speakers in choosing what topics to stress, how much information to provide, and which difficulties to avoid bringing up. The meeting space, visual aids, invites, and other housekeeping duties need to fall within the purview of the supervisor. At last, he ought to be the timekeepers. Arranging the presentations and ensuring their progression. Although anticipating the length of time required for a conversation might be challenging, the supervisor is often more experienced in conducting meetings. Either way, he should use subtle gestures to pace the presenters so that the manager doesn't suddenly run out of time after covering just half of his topics.

The senior supervisor who is the target of the review, such as the general manager of an Intel division, is known as the reviewing manager. He has a more subdued but equally significant function to play: he should inquire, provide remarks, and generally infuse the meeting with the proper spirit. He is the impetus required to elicit audience engagement, and he ought to promote free speech by setting an example. He should never skim the content since doing so will prevent him from responding on the spur of the moment. The senior supervisor should take his responsibility at the very seriously as he serves as an example for the lower managers in attendance [9], [10].

When delivering the evaluations, a group of marketing supervisors, for instance, should make use of any available visual aids, such as overhead transparencies. Humans have eyes and ears, and using both at the same time makes it easier for the audience to comprehend what is being said. However, caution is necessary, as too often a presenter becomes fixated on completing all of his visual material to the point that his message is lost and all of his charts are flipped. As a general rule of thumb, I would suggest four minutes for each visual aid—which may be graphics, data, or s—for presentation and discussion. The presenter is required to use a colored pen or pointer to highlight any important points. A presenter has to keep a close eye on his audience at all times. Among other things, body language and facial expressions will indicate him whether or not he is boring the audience and should pick up the pace, or if he has to pause and go over anything again.

An important role for the audience during an operation review is also theirs. The audience contributing questions and remarks is one of the characteristics that sets a successful meeting apart. It's worse than not being there at all if you yawn, avert the presenter's gaze, or read the newspaper. The presenter's confidence is weakened by disinterest. Keep in mind that you will be at the review for a significant portion of your working day. Try to maximize the value of that time for your company and yourself. Pay attentively and make a list of items you've heard you should try. If anything is unclear to you, clarify it with questions, and speak out if you disagree with a suggested course of action. Furthermore, it is your duty to correct any factual errors made by the presenter on the record. Recall that you are getting paid for attending the meeting; it is not intended to be a place to relax during an otherwise hectic day. Attending the meeting should be seen as labor.

Mission-Driven Gatherings

A mission-oriented meeting is often convened on an as-needed basis and is intended to create a particular result, generally a decision, as opposed to a process-oriented meeting, which is a regularly planned event organized to share knowledge and information. What the chairman does is crucial to this situation's success. Despite the fact that nobody is often given that title formally, one individual typically has a greater interest in the meeting's result than the others. Actually, the meeting is called by the chairman or de facto chairman, and the majority of his contributions need to be made prior to the start of the meeting. Too frequently, he shows up expecting things to go the way he wants them to and acts as if he were just another guest. If the goal of a mission-oriented conference is not achieved, the chairman should take responsibility for it. As a result, the chairman has to be well aware of the purpose of the meeting, including what has to be decided upon. It is an indisputable fact that you cannot achieve your goals if you are unaware of them. A manager's time costs, including overhead, are estimated to be about $100 per hour. Consequently, the business must pay $2,000 for a two-hour meeting with 10 managers.* The majority of expenses above $2,000 need prior approval from higher-ups, such as purchasing a copier or traveling across the Atlantic, but a manager has the authority to hold a meeting and allocate $2,000 in management funds at any time. Therefore, you should consider if the meeting and your presence are desired and justified, even if you are just an invited participant. If you do not think it is, tell the chairman, the person who invited you. Before investing your time and the resources of your firm in a conference, ascertain its goal. If a meeting is unnecessary, cut it off early, at a low-value-added stage, and find a less expensive means to follow up on the topic, such as a one-on-one meeting, a phone call, or a letter [11], [12].

In the event that the meeting is required, the chairman will have certain responsibilities. Attendance is the subject of the first one. It is your responsibility as the chairman to decide who should attend and then make arrangements for them to do so. Asking around and hoping for the best is insufficient; you also need to follow up to get commitments. Make sure the person invited sends a representative if he is unable to attend in person. Remember that if more than six or seven individuals show up for a meeting convened to make a certain decision, it might be difficult to keep things moving forward. The exact cutoff should be eight persons.

Making decisions is not a spectator sport since spectators obstruct necessary actions. The chairman is in charge of upholding discipline as well. His tolerance for tardiness and his willingness to squander people's time are crimes. Keep in mind that squandering time here essentially equates to squandering the company's finances, since the timer runs at a rate of $100 per hour for each employee. You don't need to confront the person who arrived late. You shouldn't let someone walk away with his fellow managers' time, just as you wouldn't allow a coworker to take a $2,000 piece of office equipment. Lastly, the chairman should handle all logistical issues. He has to, for instance, guarantee that the conference room is equipped with the required audiovisual equipment. Additionally, he must to provide an agenda that outlines the meeting's goals and the roles that each participant is expected to play in achieving them. You may think that this is too regimented, but depending on your perspective, discipline is either necessary or not. You may think of the chairman as a drill sergeant if he makes you arrive at a meeting on time and prepared. However, if you arrive at work promptly and prepared, and someone else fails to do the same, you will likely feel resentful of the person who wasted your time. An operating room must have much of the same atmosphere. I am one of the patients who would much rather be in a disciplined operating room than any other, even if some of the staff may not like a surgeon who demands accuracy.

After the meeting, the chairman has to make sure everyone knows precisely what happened by sending out minutes that include a summary of the decisions made, the debate that took place, and the next steps that need to be done. Also, it's critical that participants get the minutes as soon as possible so they won't forget what transpired. Additionally, the minutes must to be as precise and unambiguous as possible, informing the reader of what has to be done, by whom, and by when. All of this can seem like too much work, but if the meeting was worthwhile in the first place, the effort required to create the minutes is a little extra investment (a high-leverage activity) that will guarantee that the outcomes of the work done are fully realized.

If everything goes according to plan, regularly planned, process-oriented meetings should take care of everything, so ideally a manager never has to arrange an ad hoc, mission-oriented meeting. In actuality, however, assuming everything goes according to plan, regular meetings should handle around 80% of the concerns and difficulties; the other 20% will still need to be addressed in mission-oriented meetings. Recall that Peter Drucker said that poor organizational behavior is indicated by meeting attendance of more over 25% of the time. To put it another way, I would say that the true indication of merorganization is when individuals devote more than 25% of their time to spontaneous, goal-oriented gatherings.

CONCLUSION

Strategic meetings, which provide a dual framework of process-oriented and mission-oriented approaches, are crucial in forming successful management practices. This article emphasizes the significance of regularity, structure, and preparation in optimizing their influence on productivity, decision-making, and leadership via an examination of several meeting kinds, including staff meetings, one-on-one sessions, and operational reviews. The power of these gatherings is shown by their capacity to promote a shared knowledge base, enable effective delegation, and stimulate well-informed decision-making. Our comprehension of management dynamics is deepened by the differentiation between meetings that are process-oriented and those that are mission-oriented. Process-oriented meetings facilitate frequent information sharing and help the organization's objectives become more widely understood. On the other hand, meetings with a mission focus have defined goals and need accuracy, attendance control, and unambiguous recordkeeping to get the best results. In mission-oriented meetings, the chairman plays a critical role in highlighting the need of having a clear knowledge of the goals, proactive attendance management, and timely post-meeting reporting. Organizations looking to expedite management procedures must strike a balance between these two meeting techniques. The effectiveness of ad hoc mission-oriented meetings is still vital for resolving complicated, time-sensitive problems, even while regular process-oriented meetings manage a large amount of organizational affairs.

REFERENCES:

[1] A. Raikov, “Accelerating technology for self-organising networked democracy,” *Futures*, 2018.

[2] A. S. Ibidunni, M. A. Olokundun, D. B. Motilewa, T. M. Atolagbe, and O. A. Osibanjo, "Group-tacit knowledge and organisational effectiveness: Analysis of effects using a mixed method approach," *Bus. Theory Pract.*, 2018.

[3] E. B. L. de Figueiredo, A. P. de A. Silva, A. L. Abrahão, B. C. Cordeiro, I. de A. Fonseca, and M. V. Gouvêa, "The Pororoca effect on permanent education in health: about the interaction research-work," *Rev. Bras. Enferm.*, 2018.

[4] H. A. Quadri, "Strategic Innovation Leadership Framework for Sustainable Management of Electricity Distribution Company in Nigeria-Post Privatization," *PM World Journal*. 2018.

[5] Y. Yao and E. Masanet, "Life-cycle modeling framework for generating energy and greenhouse gas emissions inventory of emerging technologies in the chemical industry," *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2018.

[6] R. B. Gibson, K. Péloffy, and M. Doelle, "Challenges and opportunities of a forthcoming strategic assessment of the implications of international climate change mitigation commitments for individual undertakings in Canada," *Sustain.*, 2018.

[7] N. de Paula and S. Melhado, "Sustainability in Management Processes: Case Studies in Architectural Design Firms," *J. Archit. Eng.*, 2018.

[8] E. Vacík, M. Špaček, J. Fotr, and L. Kracík, "Project portfolio optimization as a part of strategy implementation process in small and medium-sized enterprises: A methodology of the selection of projects with the aim to balance strategy, risk and performance," *E a M: Ekonomie a Management*. 2018.

[9] J. Raudeliūnienė, V. Davidavičienė, and A. Jakubavičius, "Knowledge management process model," *Entrep. Sustain. Issues*, 2018.

[10] D. Coates, "Strategic plan for biodiversity (2011-2020) and the aichi biodiversity targets," in *The Wetland Book: I: Structure and Function, Management, and Methods*, 2018.

[11] S. phani. Popping *et al.*, "Report from the International Viral Hepatitis Elimination Meeting (IVHEM), 17–18 November 2017, Amsterdam, the Netherlands: gaps and challenges in the WHO 2030 hepatitis C elimination framework," *J. Virus Erad.*, 2018.

[12] A. Bourgoin, F. Marchessaux, and N. Bencherki, "We need to talk about strategy: How to conduct effective strategic dialogue," *Bus. Horiz.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 6

DYNAMIC LANDSCAPE OF DECISION-MAKING IN MANAGERIAL PRACTICE

Dr Vinayak Anil Bhat, Associate Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- vinayak_ab@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Decision-making is a pivotal aspect of managerial practice, ranging from everyday operational choices to strategic initiatives that shape an organization's future. This article explores the dynamic landscape of decision-making, emphasizing the evolving nature of the process in contemporary business environments. Traditional hierarchical structures, where decision-making authority aligns with organizational positions, face challenges in today's knowledge-driven industries. The shift from position-based to knowledge-based power introduces a divergence that requires a nuanced approach. Drawing from experiences at Intel, the article underscores the significance of middle managers as vital links in the decision-making chain. The ideal decision-making model proposed involves a free and open discussion stage, fostering diverse perspectives. Emphasis is placed on reaching clear decisions with well-defined terms, supported by all involved parties. The model advocates for decisions to be made at the lowest competent level, where individuals possess both technical knowledge and experiential judgment the peer-group syndrome, emotional factors, and the fear of sounding uninformed are addressed in the context of decision-making. Practical strategies, including the "peer-plus-one" approach, are presented to overcome obstacles and ensure efficient decision-making. The article also explores the timing of decisions, balancing the need for consensus with the imperative to avoid prolonged deliberation.

KEYWORDS:

Adaptive Strategies, Decision-Making, Dynamic Environment, Managerial Practice, Risk Management, Strategic Decision.

INTRODUCTION

When a young individual with a technical degree from college graduates, they will be completely up to speed on current technologies both at that point and throughout the next several years. He thus has a great lot of knowledge-based authority in the company that employed him. If he does effectively, he will advance to more powerful positions; yet, as time goes on, his level of intimate acquaintance with modern technologies will decrease. Stated differently, the seasoned manager of today is not the technical specialist he was when he first joined the organization, even if he was previously an exceptional engineer. In any case, as managers at Intel, we become a bit less relevant every day [1], [2].

Thus, a company like ours has to apply a different kind of decision-making process than what is used in more traditional businesses. Judgments about Intel would be made by those who were not conversant with current technologies if the company relied only on those with traditional position authority to make judgments. Furthermore, there is often a larger likelihood of a divergence between knowledge and position power the quicker the business's knowledge base or consumer preferences change. What kind of decision-making process should you use if the survival and prosperity of your firm are dependent on its knowledge? Once again, the middle manager is crucial to success since they not only serve as a link in the chain of command but also ensure that the two groups of power holders work well together. Ideal Model A picture of the ideal decision-making process in a know-how firm may be seen on page 90. Free conversation, where all viewpoints and facets of a topic are encouraged and discussed freely, ought to be the first step. The term "free" becomes more significant the more contentious and divisive it is. Although it seems apparent, this isn't always the case. When a meeting becomes hot, people usually back off and attempt to gauge the course of events before speaking until they know whose point of view is most likely to win out.

Then, in an odd turn of events, some organizations actively promote this kind of conduct, since they don't want to be linked to a losing viewpoint. This is a terrible way to manage. Let me quote from a news article about the problems facing a certain American automaker: "In the meeting where I was told I was released, I was told, 'Bill, in general, people who do well in this company wait until they hear their superiors express their view and then contribute something in support of that view/" All it results in are poor judgments, since whatever made will be based on less comprehensive information and insight than it might have been otherwise if informed individuals reserve views. Making a choice that is obvious is the next step. Once again, the importance of the term clear increases with the degree of dispute on the matter. In fact, more care should be made to clearly define the decision's parameters. Once again, we have a predisposition to act in the exact opposite way: knowing that a choice is contentious, we wish to hide information to prevent a dispute. If we remain silent, the dispute won't go away—it will only be postponed. If they don't get a fast and honest explanation of a choice, those who disagree with it will become even more irrational. Lastly, all parties concerned must fully endorse the decision made by the group. This does not imply agreement: an acceptable conclusion is reached as long as all parties pledge to support the decision. It is difficult for many individuals to support a choice they disagree with, but it is unavoidable that they do. We often have genuine, deeply felt disagreements even when we all have the same information and are acting in the organization's best interests. We just won't be able to come to an agreement on many subjects, no matter how much time we spend trying. However, an organization does not exist if its members always have the same opinion on everything. Instead, it is sustained by individuals who pledge to support the choices and actions made by the company. A manager can only demand and this is something he can and must that the genuine commitment to support be there [3], [4].

Following the optimum decision-making paradigm seems to be simple. However, I've discovered that it only comes naturally to two types of professional staff members: senior managers who have worked for the company for a long time, feel comfortable with the way things are done, and identify with its values; and the recent graduates who are hired because they were able to use the model when they were in college. For the young engineer, the Intel approach is really more of the same; this is how a group of students working on a lab project will iron out their differences. However, middle managers find it harder to put the decision-making model into practice than to embrace it conceptually. Because they often struggle to make uncomfortable or difficult judgments, to effectively communicate their opinions, and to cope with the expectation that they will have to support a conclusion that they disagree with. Everyone will ultimately come around to the perfect scheme's reasoning, even if it takes some time.

The model's requirement that decisions be considered and made at the lowest feasible level of competence is another beneficial and significant characteristic. The rationale is that those who are most familiar with the circumstances and closest to the situation will make decisions here. And I don't simply mean "understand technically" when I say "know." Such skill has to be balanced with judgment, which comes from experience and the lessons one has learned from the many mistakes one has made in one's professional life. Therefore, the best place for decision-making to occur is somewhere in the center, between depending too much on technical knowledge and the wounds sustained from attempting to apply and execute this information. If you are unable to locate someone who has both attributes, your goal should be to choose the greatest possible combination of participants. We at Intel will probably invite a management figure who is higher up than the other group members to the meeting in order to gain expertise. However, during the open debate phase, it is crucial that all participants express their thoughts and ideas as equals, disregarding or ignoring status differences. Mr. Grove, isn't your company's emphasis on visible signs of egalitarianism—like informal dress, partitions instead of offices, and the absence of other obvious perks like reserved parking spaces—just so much affectation?" questioned a journalist who was perplexed by our management style. In response, I said that this is a survival issue rather than an affectation. Every day, we have to combine knowledge- and position-power individuals in our firm to make choices that might have long-term effects on us. We cannot be successful in our sector if we do not connect our managers and engineers in a manner that facilitates the making of sound judgments. Status symbols, therefore, most definitely do not encourage the free exchange of ideas, information, and viewpoints. What seems to be a question of style is really one of necessity [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

The Syndrome of the Peer Group The fact that anybody who makes a business choice experiences feelings like pride, ambition, anxiety, and insecurity makes the approach difficult to put into practice. When individuals who aren't accustomed to working together are required to make a decision, these issues usually appear fast. This indicates that in order to make decisions, we need to consider what prevents them from going as planned. The most prevalent issue is referred to as the peer-group syndrome. We did some role-playing some years ago at Intel's very first management training session to demonstrate to folks what may happen when a group of peers gets together to solve a problem or make a decision. We gathered the participants to discuss a problem that they were facing in their actual workplaces at the time.

Everyone was on an equal footing inside the corporation. One step above was the meeting chairman, who was deliberately sent out of the room to prevent him from hearing what was about to happen. As the fictitious conference went on, audience members were astounded by what they were seeing and hearing. For fifteen minutes or so, the managers working on the issue did nothing accept circle about in circles, and none of them recognized they were not making any progress. The chairman, who had been brought back in, sat down and listened for some time, finding it hard to believe what he was hearing. We saw him stoop forward, as if attempting to absorb more information from the exchange. Then, when a dark cloud began to gather over his head, he finally smacked it and yelled, "What's going on here? You folks are circling about topics and doing nothing." Shortly after the chairman stepped in, the issue was rectified. Since then, we have used what we called the peer-plus-one strategy to help with decision-making when necessary. Even if a more senior manager isn't the most capable or informed individual there, peers nonetheless want a more senior management to take charge and lead a meeting. If every member of the group has self-confidence, which comes partly from experience and familiarity with the topic at hand, you may overcome the peer-group syndrome. Ultimately, however, self-assurance mostly stems from an intuitive understanding that no one has ever perished as a result of making a poor business choice, acting inappropriately, or losing an argument. And this is something that everyone in your company has to be made aware of. In the event that the peer-group syndrome sets in and there is no official chairman for the meeting, the individual with the greatest stakes should preside. You can always ask the most senior person there to take over if that doesn't work. He probably doesn't know any more or less about the topics at hand than the other group members do, but he probably will play the role of a godfather, providing the group with wisdom on decision-making processes and the confidence they need to go on [7], [8].

The fear of being foolish is one thing that paralyzes those who wield authority, whether it be in knowledge or position. This is probably going to prevent the senior from posing the appropriate questions. For the same dread, other participants will be forced to consider in secret instead of speaking out for everyone; at most, they will whisper their opinions to a neighbor. As a manager, you should constantly remind yourself that the decision-making process is not as excellent as it might have been every time a pertinent inquiry is buried and an insight or truth is concealed.

Lower-level attendees at the conference are impacted by a comparable phenomenon. This team needs to get beyond the Q6 high production management challenge. Fear of being overruled, which might result in humiliation: if a senior management or the group as a whole rejected a junior member or disagreed with a stance the junior manager was promoting, the junior manager could seem foolish in front of his colleagues. This causes junior people to back up and allow the more experienced individuals establish the probable course of decision-making—much more so than fear of punishment or even of losing their jobs. However, some matters are so complicated that individuals asked to decide really don't know how they feel about them. Separating information from position authority may lead to a particularly severe feeling of anxiety since knowledge workers are often uneasy about things that are solely business-related yet might impact a choice. You often hear people say things like, "We don't know what the company [or division or department] wants of us." In a similar vein, managers with positional authority find themselves in a difficult situation when they discover they lack the technical knowledge necessary to make the best choice. We have to make an effort to overcome these challenges. All humans possess intellect and are equipped with a strong will. Both may be used to help us get over our fears of coming out as foolish or of being overruled, which will enable us to start conversations and take a stance [9], [10].

Aiming for the Result

There are situations when no amount of debate can lead to a choice, even when it is obviously time to make one. This leaves the senior member (also known as the "peer-plus-one") who has up until now led, mentored, and pushed the group to make a decision on their own. The senior management will be making the choice after receiving the full benefit of a free debate in which all points of view, facts, views, and judgments were spoken without regard to position or power bias, if the decision-making process has gone according to plan up to this point. In other words, if the unambiguous decision stage is reached and no agreement has formed, it is acceptable indeed, often inevitable for the senior person to use position-power authority. It is not right for him to have that power any sooner; in fact, it would be detrimental.

This is often not simple. Because it is "not nice" to issue instructions, Americans are often hesitant to use our positional authority in a purposeful and clear manner. Such resistance on the part of the senior management may cause the decision to be postponed and the first round of the decision-making process the period of open discussion to go longer than necessary. You won't fully profit from open conversation if you wait too long or if you go into decision-making too quickly. The rule of thumb is to not press for a decision too soon. Verify that you have heard and taken into account the actual concerns, as opposed to the flimsy remarks that often take up the first few minutes of a meeting. However, if you believe you've heard everything and have heard both sides of the argument, it's time to press for a consensus and, in the event that one cannot be reached, to take the initiative and make a choice. There are instances when a free conversation never ends in an attempt to reach an agreement. However, if that occurs, individuals may stray from the approximate consensus when they are almost accurate, which reduces the likelihood of making the best choice. So, it's important to proceed and make the choice at the appropriate moment.

Essentially, decision-making has an output—in this instance, the decision itself—just like other tasks performed by managers. Similar to other management procedures, decision-making is more likely to provide excellent results on schedule if we make it plain from the start that we anticipate nothing less than that. Purchasing a less costly piece of property that was located quite a distance away was the alternative. In addition to being more affordable, the land would be more available, enabling us to construct a reasonably priced one- or two-story structure. Purchasing the land next to the current facility would have required us to construct a tall building in order to get the required floor area, and a tall semiconductor production facility would not be the most productive.

That caused us to pause. However, having a second building next to the one we now own would be excellent. The conversation went back and forth and so forth. Here, let's put our six questions to use. The choice that had to be taken was obvious: either we construct a one- or two-story structure in a new remote site, or we construct a multistory facility near to our current factory. Regarding the timing, our long-term plans called for the new facility to be completed in two to two and a half years; if time offsets are used, we will have to decide in less than a month. This clarifies the when. The solution is not simple: do we trust our facilities/construction team or the Intel group in charge of our production plants? Given its greater awareness of construction-related expenses and challenges, the first organization is likely to choose the new site. The plant management group will most likely choose the high-rise as they are aware that having the two plants next to each other would improve operations. Therefore, our construction manager for our Far East sites, his supervisor, the corporation's construction manager, the manager of the Far East manufacturing plant network, and his supervisor, the senior manufacturing manager, make up the decision-making body. We were given managers at parallel levels from the two companies for the conference. In actual business life, the sensitivities of two interest groups often collide while making a single choice. It is crucial to provide about equal representation to all parties at these sessions, since only then can a fair conclusion be made. Before making a choice, each of these people sought input from their personnel and acquired all pertinent information. Who is going to veto or confirm the decision? I am the first person that the top management of both companies report to in common. Furthermore, this was a significant enough issue to warrant the involvement of the business president. Furthermore, I knew a little bit about the places in the Philippines and the workings of a plant similar to the one we have there. I was thus designated to reject or confirm the meeting's decision. Who must be made aware of this choice? Gordon Moore, our board chairman, was my choice. Although he isn't directly engaged in the manufacturing facility under consideration, he ought to be aware of what transpired since we don't often construct new ones in the Far East. The choice was made in this manner. The group chose to build adjacent to our current factory, accepting just as much production space as four storeys would give, after examining maps, building plans and expenses, land costs, traffic patterns, and anything else we felt was relevant. If we'd gone above that, the price would have increased [11], [12].

This was delivered to me during the meeting that was detailed in the prior agenda, along with all pertinent background. I asked a number of questions and probed the group's information and decision-making process after listening to the presentation of the alternatives the group evaluated and the reasons why they chose the first option over these. Ultimately, I approved the choice. Submenu I told Gordon Moore the result, and as you read this, the facility is either in the process of being built or is up and running.

Beyond only accelerating the decision-making process, there are benefits to using consistent methods for decision-making. While making a choice, people expend a lot of mental and physical energy. The choice may then be discovered later by someone with significant influence or the ability to veto it. Should he use his veto power, he may be seen as a latecomer who disturbs the established order in decision-making. Of course, those who may have been working on it for a long period may get discouraged and frustrated by this. No matter how justified the veto may have been on its own, if it comes as a surprise, it will unavoidably give the appearance that politics is being played about. Avoiding politics, manipulation, and even their appearance is vital. Furthermore, there isn't a better approach, in my opinion, to make the decision-making process simpler than to apply before the deadline that our six questions impose. One last point. If there must be a dramatic last word Make your announcement, but don't simply ignore the problem. Take into consideration the expectations of those who participated in the decision-making process (had I decided, for instance, to cancel the Philippine plant project entirely). It takes time for people to reassemble their minds, make adjustments, and make sense of things. Call a break, call the group back after everyone has had time to recuperate, and ask for their opinions on the choice at that point.

CONCLUSION

The complex terrain of knowledge-based power, organizational hierarchies, and the need for flexibility define the dynamic landscape of decision-making in management practice. Examining this terrain reveals that the quickly changing corporate settings of today provide difficulties for conventional decision-making frameworks based on position-based authority. The paper highlights how important middle managers are in bridging the knowledge and position power gaps by acting as facilitators. The ideal decision-making model that has been suggested promotes candid conversations, well-defined decision points, and broad support for selected actions. It acknowledges that while making decisions, decision-making systems must take into account both technical knowledge and experienced judgment. Emotional elements and the peer-group syndrome are recognized as challenges, and workable solutions are offered to overcome them. One concrete example of using the decision-making model in a complicated corporate setting is the process of building a semiconductor manufacturing facility. It emphasizes the significance of time in decision-making and the need of striking a balance between reaching an agreement and avoiding protracted discussion.

REFERENCES:

[1] D. Mathivathanan, D. Kannan, and A. N. Haq, "Sustainable supply chain management practices in Indian automotive industry: A multi-stakeholder view," *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, 2018.

[2] N. Saukkonen, T. Laine, and P. Suomala, "Utilizing management accounting information for decision-making: Limitations stemming from the process structure and the actors involved," *Qual. Res. Account. Manag.*, 2018.

[3] W. Tao, B. Song, M. A. Ferguson, and S. Kochhar, "Employees' prosocial behavioral intentions through empowerment in CSR decision-making," *Public Relat. Rev.*, 2018.

[4] B. Kamiński, M. Jakubczyk, and P. Szufel, “A framework for sensitivity analysis of decision trees,” *Cent. Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 2018.

[5] T. Bertoncel, I. Erenda, and M. Meško, “Managerial early warning system as best practice for project selection at a smart factory,” *Amfiteatru Econ.*, 2018.

[6] S. J. Perkins, “Processing developments in employee performance and reward,” *J. Organ. Eff.*, 2018.

[7] Z. Liang *et al.*, “An evidence-based approach to understanding the competency development needs of the health service management workforce in Australia,” *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, 2018.

[8] N. Gil and J. K. Pinto, “Polycentric organizing and performance: A contingency model and evidence from megaproject planning in the UK,” *Res. Policy*, 2018.

[9] N. Saukkonen, T. Laine, and P. Suomala, “Utilizing management accounting information for decision-making,” *Qual. Res. Account. Manag.*, 2018.

[10] R. Guo, “Strategic decision-making logics, entrepreneurial capability and opportunity exploitation in high-tech new ventures,” *J. Bus. Econ. Manag.*, 2018.

[11] P. Gál, “Marketing implications of framing in the decision-making,” *Acta Univ. Agric. Silvic. Mendelianae Brun.*, 2018.

[12] D. Shukla, “Modeling systems thinking in action among higher education leaders with fuzzy multi-criteria decision making,” *Manag. Mark.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 7

RIGHT BALANCE BETWEEN CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION IN ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES

Dr Urmila Itam, Assistant Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.urmilaitam@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The intricate dynamics of organizational structures, specifically focusing on the delicate equilibrium between centralization and decentralization. Striking the right balance between these two polarities is a perennial challenge faced by organizations seeking to optimize efficiency, responsiveness, and innovation. By examining real-world examples and theoretical frameworks, the abstract explores the advantages and pitfalls associated with both centralization and decentralization. The research highlights the nuanced interplay between autonomy and coordination, shedding light on how finding the optimal balance contributes to enhanced decision-making, resource allocation, and overall organizational adaptability. Insights from this study offer valuable guidance for organizational leaders navigating the complexities of structuring their enterprises for sustained success. The intricacies of this hybrid organizational model, navigating the complexities of decision-making, resource allocation, and strategic planning. The study sheds light on how finding the right equilibrium fosters agility, innovation, and overall organizational effectiveness.

KEYWORDS:

Centralization, Decision-Making, Decentralization, Leadership, Organizational Structure.

INTRODUCTION

Most people believe that one of the most important duties of management is "planning" after all, we've all heard that "a manager plans, organizes, controls." In conclusion, planning is a routine task that we all do on a daily basis without much notice in both our personal and professional lives. An equivalent thought process should be part of your overall planning approach. The first step is to calculate the expected demand or need what does the environment expect of you, your company, or your group? Step two is to determine your current situation: What are you currently producing? When your ongoing projects are finished, what will you be producing? Stated differently, where will your company end up if you continue doing exactly what you are doing now? Comparing and balancing steps 1 and 2 is step three. Specifically, what more (or less) work do you need to put in to get what your let’s take a closer look at each stage [1], [2].

Environmental Demand in Step One

What specific surroundings do you find yourself in? You may observe that other groups in your surroundings have a direct impact on what you do if you examine your own group inside an organization as if it were a separate business. If you were the mailroom manager for the organization, for instance, your environment would be made up of the rest of the clients who depend on you for services, suppliers who can supply you certain tools (such mail carts and postage meters), and lastly, your rivals. Naturally, you don't have any internal rivals, but you might contrast your offering with United's technical advancements, such as email and other substitute methods of doing your duties. You ought to assess your providers' performance. It is essential that you assess the performance of other groups inside the company that you are a member of. Does the quality of your job being impacted by any other organization (such as the traffic department)? Does that group have what you need?

After determining what makes up your environment, you should assess it both now and at a later date—let's say a year from now. Then the questions arise: What are my current clients' needs from me? Are I meeting their needs? In a year, what can people anticipate from me? You should concentrate on the distinction between what your environment requires of you right now and what you anticipate it will want of you in a year. Such a difference study is essential because, if the demands on your company are met by your present operations, then something new and additional has to be done to meet this difference. The main result of the planning process is really how you respond to this discrepancy [3], [4].

At this point, should you think about what doable actions you can do to resolve the situation? No, it will just make things more confusing. For example, what would happen to a factory if the marketing department modified their demand estimate based on its own evaluation of the manufacturing facility's capacity to meet demand? Marketing may estimate a demand of ten widgets per month even if they knew they could sell 100, but production would never be able to meet the actual demand if they knew they could only provide ten.

Step 2: Current Situation

Assessing your current situation is the second phase in the planning process. You do this by enumerating your current skill set and ongoing initiatives. Make sure to use the same terminology, or "currency," that you used to describe the demand as your account for them. Your work-in-process should be reported as partly finished product designs, for example, if your requirement is stated in terms of completed product designs. Timing is another important consideration. Specifically, when will these initiatives exit your "pipeline"? You have to question yourself, will I finish every job I'm working on right now? No, it's likely that some may be abandoned or canceled; you need to account for this in your projected production. According to statistics, only around 80% of the material that is begun in the semiconductor production process is really completed. Similar to this, it is wise to account for a certain amount of loss in management tasks as well, even if it is not feasible to be exact in every situation.

What to do in Step 3 to close the gap

The last phase of planning is to fill the gap between your environmental need and the results of your current operations by either starting new projects or altering existing ones. After giving careful thought to each issue on its own, choose what you will really do and when, while also assessing the impact of your actions in closing the gap. Your strategy is the collection of steps you choose to take. The differences between tactics and strategy are often unclear. Here's one that could be helpful, even if the distinction is seldom significant from a practical standpoint. Your strategy is the broadest and abstract overview of the acts that make up your plan of action as you put it into words. Your tactics are what you'll do to put the plan into action. Often, a tactical issue at one management level is the next higher level's strategy. Come back to our mailroom, please. Assume that all manufacturing sites will have electronic mail service installed by the corporate communications manager. This is his approach—a course of action meant to enhance plant-to-plant communication. Once electronic mail technology is installed, the mailroom manager has to take certain actions to ensure service is provided. As an example, his plan may be to set up a service to distribute printed copies across the facility and place printers in the mailroom. The communications manager's techniques are the mailroom manager's plan [5], [6].

Bruce, an Intel marketing manager, discovered that there were only three individuals in his department who could potentially manage a large backlog of projects when he assessed his current position and surroundings. Upon considering his ideal future state, he came to the realization that each and every task needed to be finished. Not completing everything would lead to considerable more expenses and much more effort in the road. Bruce was in a real pickle, particularly because he couldn't hire extra staff due to financial constraints. He came to the conclusion that the most he could do was somewhat close the gap, bringing the projects and his group's ability to finish them closer together. It was not feasible to have a perfect fit. Bruce made the decision to shift as many non-essential responsibilities as he could to departments inside the corporation that were less busy and less competent than his own. In addition, he worked with his boss to arrange for the hiring of a summer intern to assist with certain clearly defined duties. He then positioned himself to closely oversee the output of his team. He continued to consider alternative options that would benefit him in the long run, such dividing up the work and avoiding duplication of effort between him and other comparable marketing departments in the organization. Bruce finally took the initiative to ask for an expansion of his company. Even after going above and above, his plan—and the evident truth that complete convergence between his responsibilities and his skills was not achievable—would serve as the foundation for his appeal.

Let's use another example to further clarify. Our intermediate supervisor Cindy, the previously encountered manufacturing process engineer, is in charge of preserving and enhancing the procedure used at a facility to create complex microchips. She describes the "objects" and "influences" that make up her surroundings. The "objects" are newly developed manufacturing techniques and instruments that have not yet undergone production testing. The persons who have the potential to directly or indirectly impact her work are known as "influences". For instance, development engineers would like that she decide to adopt new procedures they have created with less trial and error and documentation. Production engineers request that she do further testing and give more documentation on these same novel procedures in the meantime. Lastly, she is under pressure from other members of the production team to make sure that the new manufacturing tools and methods are workable and that the product developers, who are anxious to push chips out the door, can assist her do this. Being the principal organizer of the series of actions necessary to bring a process, tool, or product online, Cindy herself functions as a consultant, offering advice to any group that influences her on whether or not anything can go into production. The manufacturing area itself is her "vendor," while the engineering departments of research, product, and production are her "customer. Cindy examined her current situation and discovered that the development group was never able to provide her with the necessary data and experiments. After doing more research, she discovered that the development engineers' goals did not genuinely include supplying accurate data and keeping to timetables.

After deciding where she needed to go, Cindy realized that in order for the production engineers—who had grown more picky due to previous issues—to accept and use any new processes and production equipment in the future, it was imperative that they be tested, debugged, demonstrated, and, most importantly, supported by the required data [7], [8].

Cindy went on to outline her approach, or course of action, to get there. Before every new procedure or instrument was launched, she outlined all the requirements that had to be met. She then calculated when each task needed to be performed in order for the whole plan to be finished on time using time offsets (remember the breakfast factory). She then persuaded the development engineers' management to approve her comprehensive scope of work. To achieve what eventually became the mutually agreed-upon objectives, she bargained with him about what she had to do and what they had to accomplish, along with the deadline. Ultimately, she made the decision to keep an eye on each of her "vendors" once a week to make sure she continued on course. She would also disclose their performance in relation to the schedule to encourage them to fulfill important deadlines (an indication) and potential problems (a window in the difficult to decide what action needs to be taken to shut it). However, the gap we have now is a result of poor planning at some point in the past. We may compare pushing ourselves to focus on the choices that will solve today's issue to scrambling after our automobile has already run out of petrol. It's obvious that we ought to have finished sooner. Therefore, the tasks that are put into action as a result of the planning process constitute its actual output. The decisions made and adjustments brought about by the brainstorming sessions held throughout the whole Intel group, for example, are the outcome of the yearly plan. Personally, I seldom glance at the bound document that is ultimately referred to as the Annual Plan. Stated differently, the choices and activities that are done as a consequence of the planning process are the output of the process.

To what extent should the planners prepare ahead? Every year, we at Intel engage in a strategic long-range planning process whereby we look five years ahead. But what is really impacted by this? It's the next year, and just the upcoming year. At the long-range planning meeting the following year, when that year will become the first of the five, we will have another opportunity to replan the second of the five years. Thus, remember that you should only carry out the parts of a plan that fall inside the time frame between now and the subsequent exercise. Everything else is available for a second look. Additionally, we must exercise caution when making plans too quickly. This will give us time to assess the consequences of our choices and decide whether they were the appropriate ones. Stated differently, we need the input that will be critical to our future planning.

The organization's operational management. Because it is just ineffective to think of planners as individuals who are not also responsible for carrying out the plan. Planning is a management activity having significant influence on an organization's future success, not something that can be pursued as a distinct career. For what duration is an MBO system appropriate? The main purpose of MBO is to provide us feedback that is pertinent to the particular activity at hand. It should let us know how we are doing so that, if necessary, we may change what we are doing, like pulling off the road and asking for directions. Feedback has to be given as soon as possible after the action it is monitoring takes place in order to be effective. As a result, the goals of an MBO system have to be defined for a little time. For instance, the related MBO system's time period should be at least as regularly as quarterly or maybe even monthly if we plan on an annual basis.

Focus is the one thing that an MBO system should excel at providing. Only if we limit the number of goals will this be possible. In actuality, this is uncommon, and as in other situations, we succumb to our incapacity to say no in this instance, to too many goals. We must acknowledge this and take appropriate action since attempting to concentrate on everything will result in zero attention.

DISCUSSION

Let's look at a case study to get acquainted with the MBO system: Columbus' discovery of the New World. My version of the narrative takes some liberties from the grammar-school account of the event. The Spanish government came to the conclusion that it could not carry on a war that everyone believed was absolutely essential until funds were available to purchase guns and ammunition, according to its yearly planning procedure of 1491. As the primary objective of Queen Isabella's administration was to drive the Moors from Spain, the Queen required the uuias to accomplish this. Isabella made the decision that she would get money by significantly increasing Spain's international trade balance. She informed her subordinate, Christopher Columbus, of her goal. After agreeing to consider many options to fulfill her request, Columbus returned to her with a number of recommendations, including locating a path to the Orient that would avoid pirate activity. Columbus and Isabella spoke about the whole thing. Finally coming to the firm conclusion that he would search for an alternative way to the East. After making the choice, Columbus started to consider all he would have to do to fulfill his goal. In MBO words, Columbus and the Queen men agreed upon his purpose, which was to discover a new path to the Orient, while the Queen identified her own goal, which was to enhance Spain's riches. Then, with each task having a deadline, Columbus went on to outline the primary outcomes by which he would pace himself. These outcomes included launching many ships, training crews, going on a shakedown tour, setting sail, and more [9], [10].

While Columbus sought to discover a secure path to the Orient, the Queen sought to improve the riches of her country. Furthermore, we see a nested hierarchy of goals, wherein the supervisor's objectives will also be satisfied if those of the subordinates are Now, the important outcomes may arrive on schedule, but the goals may still be overlooked. The main outcomes were somewhat simple for Columbus to accomplish, but he most definitely did not discover a new trade route to China, and as a consequence, he did not fulfill his goal.

Columbus failed under strict MBO rules, but did he do well? He did indeed find the New World, which brought Spain unimaginable prosperity. Therefore, even if a subordinate fails to meet his predetermined goal, it is still feasible for him to work well and get good ratings. The goal of the MBO method is to pace an individual — to put a stopwatch in their own hands so they can assess their own performance. It should be just one factor taken into consideration when evaluating a person's performance; it is not a legally binding document. Both are acting in a petty and unprofessional manner if the supervisor uses the MBO system mechanically to evaluate his subordinate's performance or if the subordinate uses it rigidly and misses an opportunity because it wasn't a specified objective or key result. Let's use the decision concerning Intel's facility expansion in the Philippines to demonstrate how the MBO system works. The goal for the Far East construction manager was to "obtain decision on expansion of Philippine plant/." The following main findings confirmed the goal:

1) Conduct a study by June on the availability of land in additional accep sites as well as close to the current facility.

2) Conduct financial evaluations that highlight the trade-offs between the costs of the land and the building and operation of the two sites.

3) Make a choice by presenting the findings to the steering committee for the plant's site.

4) By October, get Grove to approve the choice.

The goal was achieved, and every important outcome was reached. It should be noted that the goal is somewhat narrow, and the essential outcomes are so precise that an individual may determine with certainty whether or not he has finished them and done so on time. Therefore, in order for a key result to be meaningful, it has to include very precise phrasing and dates so that there is no space for doubt when the deadline comes. No surprise here, the supervisor of the Far East construction manager's goal was to "ensure that all plant expansion projects stay on schedule." Similar to his subordinate's goal, he also had a crucial outcome that said, "Acquire Philippine plant expansion decision by October," in order to support this one.

I hope you can now see the similarities between Isabella's regime and Intel. A proper collection of important outcomes supports a manager's goals. His goals are linked to those of his supervisor, so if the manager achieves his goals, the supervisor will too. However, a computer cannot operate the MBO system manually. Setting the hierarchy of goals and the primary outcomes that support them involves judgment and common sense on the part of the system. When you use MBO to direct your work on a daily basis, you also need to use common sense and judgment [11], [12].

Breakfast Factory Expands Nationwide

The breakfast factory was doing very well when we departed; so well, in fact, that we had to incur significant costs to add a continuous egg-boiling equipment. The apparatus generated breakfasts with hitherto unheard-of consistency. Additionally, we were able to use the egg-boiling device to its maximum capacity due to our increased volume, which resulted in a steady decrease in the cost of providing excellent breakfasts. We shared a portion of the savings with our patrons, and our breakfasts quickly gained recognition.

As savvy businesspeople, we recognized our success and opened a second Breakfast Factory location across town, giving it that same name. This too turned out to be a huge success. Soon after, an article on our business appeared in Neighborhood Gourmet, a magazine with a wide national readership. We made the decision to take advantage of the chance and open a national Breakfast Factory franchise. We quickly established a large network of Breakfast Factories by moving into communities that had the ideal demographic mix for our breakfasts.

Before long, though, we discovered that the network demanded a completely different set of abilities and tasks from those required to operate our single restaurant. One such ability was figuring out how to maximize the benefits of having a local entrepreneur establish and manage each franchise while retaining the significant economies of scale that were made available to us. We expect that the local manager will run the most professional franchise possible since he is familiar with the community and can tailor his operation accordingly. At the same time, we have enormous buying power since we have more than 100 Breakfast Factories. We can do a lot of things far more effectively and cheaply by centralizing certain tasks than we could if we were to let each of our franchisees to handle them independently.

Most importantly, we must take great care to maintain the impression that our breakfasts are of the highest caliber since they have been a big factor in our success so far. Stated differently, we were unable to let anybody. The genuine secret of our company is being jeopardized by the Breakfast Factory branch or those in any other place. The centralization-decentralization debate is really so ubiquitous that it has taken center stage in discussions about network management. For example, should we promote nationally or locally? Do we want to provide the local manager authority over local advertising? Although it's unknown, he most likely reads the Daily Bktt. Do we want to provide him the authority to appoint and dismiss employees? Do we want to impose a national salary scale on him, or should we let him determine his own? Given how much labor market circumstances differ among regions, the latter barely makes sense. However, we do like to purchase our advanced automated equipment centrally. After all, given our strict standards, it has taken us a while to create Sui vendors and the ability to evaluate the arriving equipment. We scarcely want each branch, or even each area, to replicate the work when we already have a large number of individuals doing it exclusively in Chicago.

However, I don't believe we should purchase all of our eggs from Chicago. We don't want to transport this fragile product across the nation; we want them to be fresh. We also don't want every branch to have its own system for inspecting incoming eggs. In this case, a compromise of some kind makes sense; for example, regional egg purchase hubs are conveniently located within a few hours' drive from all of the franchise sites in the area. We definitely want consistent, excellent standards across the board, and we will keep an eye on each franchise to ensure that they are being met. Stated differently, we firmly believe that national quality control standards need to be enforced.

The Breakfast Factory's core menu should remain consistent across all locations; patrons should be able to rely on a few standard options. However, we also need to acknowledge that different regions have different tastes in food, therefore each franchise should be given some latitude. Shall we let our Breakfast Factories to occupy any suitable structure in the area? Or ought we to establish a standard building method and create each one from the ground up? Maybe we should use whatever facility is available as long as it satisfies the requirements that Chicago established.

We should definitely use the same ware throughout the nation as people often link breakfast with what they eat, so we may as well make all of those purchases at one location. However, it seems absurd that a small Montanan business would need to procure parts from Chicago for a few damaged plates. Thus, it is likely that we will have a few local warehouses from which goods may be transported promptly. Things are now quite convoluted. I often want to return to the good old days of receiving my own eggs, toast, and coffee as I sit behind my large desk at corporate headquarters. If not that, then at least take me back to the day when I had just one Breakfast Factory, knew everyone by name, and had complete control over choices without having to weigh a ton of advantages and disadvantages. Then, "almost no overhead was present.

A corporate personnel manager has now been appointed. Another person wants to purchase a computer in order to maximize the flow of eggs from the regional centers to the specific franchisees. This person is the traffic manager. He claims that he can guarantee same-day delivery while reducing transportation expenses. Additionally, he asserts that he could maintain the lowest possible amount of ware inventory if he possessed this computer. We'll have a corporate manager for real estate purchases very soon. Indeed, really complex.

As we previously stated, management is a team sport, with a manager's output being the results of the organizations under his direction or control. It has come to our attention that management is not only a team game; rather, it is a game in which we must assemble a team of teams, with each individual team existing in some kind of mutually beneficial connection with the others.

Mixed-Use Companies

Every decently big business has to experience what occurred to the Breakfast Factory, or has already experienced it. The majority of middle managers oversee divisions inside bigger companies. In the same manner as the Breakfast Factories are connected to the main office and to each other, so too are the "black boxes" under their supervision connected to other black boxes. So let's take a closer look at what goes on within a company that is divided into smaller departments.

Organizations may take on two extreme forms, the most common of which are mixed: fully functional or fully mission-oriented. The Breakfast Factory Corporation may be set up in one of the two extreme configurations shown on the next page. Each distinct business unit in the totally decentralized mission-oriented organization (a) pursues its own goals with little regard for those of other units. Here, every Breakfast Factory is in charge of running all aspect of its business, including choosing its own site, designing its own structure, marketing, hiring and managing staff, and buying. Ultimately, it turns in monthly financial statements for all locations; its personnel organization staff recruits, dismisses, and assesses employees at all branches; and so on.

We are moving toward a mission-oriented structure with the intention of giving each branch manager the authority to adapt to local situations. However, a justifiable desire to capitalize on the evident economies of scale and to enhance the effectiveness of our knowledge in every operational domain across the whole enterprise would propel us in the direction of a functional structure. Naturally, we search for a middle ground between the two extremes in the actual world. Managers have really been focused with finding the right balance for a very long time. After working at General Motors for decades, Alfred Sloan said, "Good management rests on a reconciliation of centralization and decentralization." Or, to put it another way, on a balancing act to get the ideal ratio of leverage to responsiveness.

CONCLUSION

The ideal balance between decentralization and centralization in organizational structures turns out to be a complex task that calls for a deep comprehension of organizational dynamics. The benefits and downsides of both centralization and decentralization have been discussed in this paper, with a focus on the significance of context-specific factors. It is critical to find a balance between the needs of the environment, the organization's size, industry, and objectives. Organizations that emphasize decentralization may encounter coordination issues, while those that lean too much toward centralization run the danger of restricting creativity and responsiveness. The last observations highlight the need of an adaptable and flexible strategy in which organizational structures change to accommodate changing internal and external environments. One of the most important lessons learned is that finding equilibrium requires constant assessment, modification, and refinement. Leaders need to be aware of how their firms are changing and cultivate a culture that promotes both independence and teamwork. Organizations may successfully traverse the intricacies of the contemporary business environment by using the advantages of both centralization and decentralization. This promotes resilience and long-term success. Finding the ideal balance becomes strategically important as businesses continue to change, guaranteeing a harmonic combination of effectiveness, creativity, and flexibility.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Ali, I. Ali, K. A. Al-Maimani, and K. Park, “The effect of organizational structure on absorptive capacity in single and dual learning modes,” *J. Innov. Knowl.*, 2018.

[2] N. Eva, S. Sendjaya, D. Prajogo, A. Cavanagh, and M. Robin, “Creating strategic fit: Aligning servant leadership with organizational structure and strategy,” *Pers. Rev.*, 2018.

[3] D. Zhang, N. Bhuiyan, and L. Kong, “An analysis of organizational structure in process variation,” *Organ. Sci.*, 2018.

[4] G. Kováts, “The change of organizational structure of higher education institutions in Hungary: A contingency theory analysis,” *Int. Rev. Soc. Res.*, 2018.

[5] J. R. San Cristóbal, V. Fernández, and E. Diaz, “An analysis of the main project organizational structures: Advantages, disadvantages, and factors affecting their selection,” in *Procedia Computer Science*, 2018.

[6] E. Erol and A. Ordu, “Organizational structure scale – University version,” *Eur. J. Educ. Res.*, 2018.

[7] M. Yahaya, M. A. A. Al-Khawlani, M. S. Suleiman, and U. M. Z. Usman, “Organizational structure and an effective communication: the moderating effect of transformational leadership,” *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res.*, 2018.

[8] D. Liu, Y. Tan, and V. Mookerjee, “When ignorance can be bliss: Organizational structure and coordination in electronic retailing,” *Inf. Syst. Res.*, 2018.

[9] M. Anzures-García, L. A. Sánchez-Gálvez, M. J. Hornos, and P. Paderewski-Rodríguez, “A workflow ontology to support knowledge management in a group’s organizational structure,” *Comput. y Sist.*, 2018.

[10] C. R. Ellerbrock, K. Main, K. N. Falbe, and D. P. Franz, “An examination of middle school organizational structures in the United States and Australia,” *Educ. Sci.*, 2018.

[11] S. A. El Talla, M. J. Al Shobaki, S. S. Abu-Naser, and Y. M. A. Amuna, “The Nature of the Organizational Structure in the Palestinian Governmental Universities-Al-Aqsa University as A Model,” *Int. J. Acad. Multidiscip. Res.*, 2018.

[12] M. Mykytas, S. Terenchuk, and N. Zhuravska, “Models, methods and tools of optimizing costs for development of clusterized organizational structures in construction industry,” *Int. J. Eng. Technol.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 8

EXECUTIVE OFFICE SALES MANUFACTURING: A CRITICAL REVIEW

Dr Dinesh Neelakanta Rao, Associate Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dinesh.rao@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The intersection of executive office sales and manufacturing represents a dynamic landscape where business strategies converge to optimize efficiency and profitability. This abstract delves into the nuanced relationship between executive office sales and manufacturing processes, exploring how organizations strategically align these functions to enhance overall performance. In the contemporary business environment, the executive office plays a pivotal role in shaping sales strategies, driving decision-making processes, and fostering collaboration across various manufacturing stages. This abstract investigates the intricate ways in which executive offices contribute to the sales dynamics within a manufacturing context. It explores how effective leadership, strategic planning, and innovative approaches in the executive suite can directly impact sales outcomes and manufacturing productivity. Furthermore, the abstract delves into the manufacturing aspect, elucidating how streamlined processes, technological integration, and agile methodologies influence the overall sales trajectory. The symbiotic relationship between executive offices and manufacturing is analyzed to uncover best practices, potential challenges, and emerging trends that define success in this integrated landscape.

KEYWORDS:

Executive, Manufacturing, Office, Sales, Leadership, Operations.

INTRODUCTION

Administration for Technology Development Business Units Functional Units. Being a hybrid company, Intel balances its operations to get the optimal ratio of leverage and responsiveness. All of the business units get services from internal subcontractors. The functional units are very important to Intel, as shown by the fact that almost two thirds of its workforce works there. What are a few benefits of having so many divisions inside the company? The first is the potential for scale economies. Consider the instance of information processing using computers. Since pricey complex computer equipment is needed for several company units, it is advisable to utilize the capability of huge electronic devices. An excessive amount of costly equipment would remain idle most of the time if every unit had its own computer. The ability to move and reallocate resources in response to changes in company objectives is a significant additional benefit. For example, since production is set up functionally, we may alter the product mix being produced to better suit the needs as seen by the company as a whole. Should every business unit engage in independent production, transferring capacity across units would be an arduous and unwieldy task? The benefit here is that knowledge managers with specialized skills, like research engineers who engage in technology development, may apply their knowledge and work throughout the whole organization, providing them tremendous power. Ultimately, Inters functional groups free up the business units from having to worry about manufacturing, technology, computers, and other related issues so they can focus on being experts in their own fields [1], [2].

There are drawbacks to having so much Intel arranged into functional components. The most significant is when a functional group is faced with an abundance of information and has to react to requests from several business units. Even communicating wants and desires may become quite challenging—a business unit must pass through many management tiers in order to have an impact on a functional group's decision-making. This is never more apparent than in the discussions that take place to get a piece of the company's centralized and finite resources, such as computer time, shared building space, or manufacturing capacity.

In fact, negotiations often give way to fierce, unrestrained rivalry amongst business units for the resources that the functional groups control. In the end, neither rivalry nor bargaining improves production or the company's overall health, so they are both time and energy wasters. The ability of the separate units to monitor and promptly implement changes in response to changing demands within their respective business or product sectors is the key. That concludes it. The functional kind of organization is preferred above all other factors. However, every business's primary function is to react to the demands and requirements of its surroundings, and since this function is so crucial, a large portion of any company is inevitably divided into units with specific missions.

Many managers have searched for the ideal combination of the two organizational structures. And at Intel, it hasn't been any different among top management or the hundreds of middle managers who sometimes try to make the organizations they oversee more organized. However, regardless of the number of times we have looked at other organizational configurations, we have always come to the conclusion that the hybrid organizational structure is the only option. So that's how Intel is set up now days. I just came across a news release that I would like to use to support my claim that hybrid organizations are nonexistent. This one is reprinted here with just the names altered from the dozens that appear in the weekly trade publications [3], [4].

ABC Technologies Adjusts

Robert Worker, who was formerly the Manager of Product Design, is the General Manager of the Hyper System Division. Samuel Simon, President and CEO of ABC Technologies, is the person to whom all three division heads report. Product development and marketing will fall under the purview of the divisions, while production and sales will continue to be handled at the corporate level by newly appointed production Vice President William Weary and Sales Vice President Albert Abel. See how the modification adheres to the outline and analysis of the pattern. The firm had a growing number of items to keep track of as its product range expanded as it grew. The three product divisions arose from the increasing conviction that each product line should have its own organization. However, as the press release states, ABC Technologies' primary functional divisions—such as sales and manufacturing—will continue to be centralized and support the three goal-oriented organizations. As examples, consider the Army, ABC Technologies, Intel, and The Breakfast Factory. However, almost every significant business or organization that I am aware of is structured in a hybrid manner. Imagine an educational institution with distinct departments with specific missions, like math, English, engineering, and so forth, as well as administration, which is made up of staff, security, and library services. The administration's overall job is to provide the shared resources that each department needs to operate.

A very distinct instance of the hybrid form may be seen in the nationwide Junior Achievement association. Here, every person manages their own company, choosing what goods to offer, putting it on the market, and taking care of all other company operations. However, the national organization sets the guidelines for how each individual firm should pursue its goals, including how it should be organized, what documentation is needed, and what benefits it will provide for operating well. The size of a firm or activity is not even a determining factor in the adoption of the hybrid organizational structure. My acquaintance works as a lawyer in a mid-sized legal practice.

He explained to me how his company attempted to address the issues and disputes that he and his coworkers were experiencing over shared resources, such the steno pool and office space. In the end, they established an executive committee to handle the procurement and distribution of common, shared resources rather than interfering with the legal (mission-oriented) work of the individual lawyers. This tiny business is using a hybrid organizational structure. The only exceptions that spring to mind are conglomerates, which are usually structured entirely around a goal. Why do they get away with breaking our rule? Due to the lack of a shared corporate objective. Beyond the conglomerate profit and loss statement, the numerous divisions (or firms) in this situation are all independent of one another. In every business unit of the conglomerate, however, the organization is probably set up in a hybrid fashion [5], [6].

Naturally, every hybrid organization is different from the others because there are many positions in between the fictitious extremes of fully functioning and fully mission-oriented forms. Pragmatic factors should be the driving force behind whatever movement a single organization makes between the two poles. When a business buys a new, huge, powerful computer to replace its old, insufficient one, for instance, concentrated economies of scale are made available. On the other hand, a business swaps out a big computer with a smaller, less costly one that can be easily deployed in different mission-oriented units without sacrificing economies of scale. This is one way that a company may adjust. The most crucial thing to keep in mind, nevertheless, is that the transition between the two kinds of organizations may and need to be started in order to accommodate the managerial aptitudes and operational styles of the various units.

As I've previously said, all decently big businesses eventually have to deal with the issues that arise from the operations of a hybrid company. The most crucial duties facing such an organization are the timely and effective distribution of its resources and the effective settlement of any disputes resulting from that distribution. Despite the potential complexity of this issue, "allocators" operating from a central office are definitely not the solution. Actually, the most egregious instance of inefficiency I've ever seen was in Hun-gar, where I used to reside, and a few years ago. There, a central planning agency determined what needed to be produced, when, and where. Although the reasoning behind this kind of planning was sound, in reality it often fell far short of satisfying actual customer demands. I was an amateur photographer in Hungary. I could not find any high-contrast film anyplace to use throughout the winter. However, even if ordinary film was hard to come by throughout the summer, everyone was covered with it up to his waist. The central planning organization's decision-making process was so sloppy year after year that it was unable to even react to completely anticipated variations in demand. Theoretically, corporate management is responsible for allocating shared resources and resolving conflicts between the requirements and wants of autonomous business units in our company culture. In actuality, however, the transaction load is just too large to be managed in one location. We at Intel would start to seem like the people in charge of the Hungarian economy if we attempted to settle every dispute and distribute every resource at the top. Rather, middle managers have the key to the solution. They are, first and foremost, numerous enough to include the whole spectrum of operations inside a firm, and second, they are quite near to the issue at hand, which is the creation and consumption of internal resources. Two elements are required for middle managers to be successful in this high-leverage activity. If they are to support the operations of the hybrid organizational structure, they must first acknowledge that it is inevitable. Secondly, they need to learn and become proficient in the technique that allows a hybrid organization to be run.

DISCUSSION

NASA invited a number of large contractors and several subcontractors to collaborate on various parts of the project in order to land a man on the moon. The moon shot had an unintended consequence of giving rise to a new organizational strategy called matrix management. This gave contractors the ability to manage and coordinate their work so that issues did not disrupt the schedule as a whole. For example, resources may be transferred from a robust organization to one that was faltering, to enable the latter to make up for lost time. The administration of a matrix is a complex process. Numerous books and whole courses of study have been published on it. The fundamental tenet of the argument was that an external project manager might have an equal impact on the operations of various departments inside a corporation as the management of the firm itself. As a result, NASA greatly expanded upon the idea of dual reporting. Actually, the fundamental concept has been silently operating for many years, allowing hybrid organizations of various stripes to operate, from the local high school to Alfred Sloan's General Motors not to mention the franchisees of the Breakfast Factory. Let us reconstruct the evolution of Intel's dual reporting system adoption [7], [8].

Report on Plant Security

Dual reporting was something we nearly happened upon by mistake when our organization was new and little. We were attempting to determine during a staff meeting to whom the security staff at our new distant factories should report. There were two options available to us. The plant manager would be the person to whom the staff would report. However, a plant manager's experience usually consists of that of an engineer or factory worker who cares even less and understands very little about security concerns. The alternative would be for them to answer to the main plant's security manager. He is the expert who establishes the guidelines that the security officers across the board are expected to follow, having been the one who first recruited them. Furthermore, it was evident that the outlying facilities' security protocols and processes had to adhere to some kind of corporate standard.

There seems to be only one issue with the later configuration. Since the security manager is employed by the corporate headquarters and is not stationed at the outlying factory, how would he be able to find out if the security guards outside the main plant were absent, arrived late, or performed poorly in any other way? He refused to. After considering the situation for a time, it dawned on us that security staff could want to submit reports to both the local plant manager and the corporate security manager. The one would outline the proper way to do the task, and the second would keep track of how it was being done on a daily basis. Although the solution seemed to address both issues, the workers found it difficult to accept. Could an employee really have two bosses? We found ourselves wondering, "A person has to have a boss, so who is in charge here?" One person gave a hesitant "yes," and dual reporting—a culture of collaborative reporting—was established. It was a difficult, drawn-out birth.

However, dual reporting is really very necessary. Let's take a moment to consider the development of a manager. His professional journey begins as an individual contributor—a salesperson, for example. He gets promoted to the role of sales manager, where he oversees employees in his functional specialization of sales, if he demonstrates that he is an exceptional seller. He is promoted once again, this time to regional sales manager, after proving himself to be a rockstar sales manager. If he works for Intel, he is now managing "field application engineers," who are certainly more knowledgeable about technology than he is, in addition to salespeople. Up until our hero finds himself the general manager of a company division, the promotions keep coming.

Our new general manager lacks industrial expertise, among other things. Because he graduated from sales and has no experience in manufacturing, the new boss is forced to delegate the technical responsibilities of his position to his subordinate, even if he is more than capable of managing his manufacturing manager in the more general parts of his role. Manufacturing managers in other parts of the company can report in a similar manner to those who advanced via the engineering and finance departments. One possible solution to the issue would be to appoint a single individual as the senior manufacturing manager, and all manufacturing managers would then report to him rather than the general manager. However, the more of this we do, the closer we go to having an entirely effective organizational structure. The operations of the finance, marketing, engineering, and production departments could no longer be coordinated by a general manager toward a single company goal that was responsive to consumer demands. We desire a technical supervisory relationship in addition to the general manager's immediacy and operational responsibilities. Dual reporting is the answer [9], [10].

However, does one person need to perform the whole duty of technical supervisor? No. Examine the following situation, which may be representative of a typical workday at Intel. The manufacturing manager from another division, whose supervisor, the general manager, has experience in finance, approaches our manufacturing manager while she is enjoying a cup of coffee in the canteen. As they converse about the state of their various divisions, they discover they have a lot of technical issues in common. They decide to get together a little more often after using the maxim that "two heads are better than one." The meetings eventually turn into regular events, and manufacturing managers from other divisions join the two to offer perspectives on issues they face in common. Very quickly, a council or committee composed of peers is formed to address concerns that are shared by everyone. To put it simply, they have discovered a solution for those technical problems that their superiors, the general managers, are unable to assist them with. They essentially have peer group supervision instead of the kind that a general manager with manufacturing expertise might have provided. The two supervisors to whom the manufacturing managers' report are this group and their respective general managers, in that order.

Such a body cannot function unless individual decision-making is willingly ceded to the collective. Since a member, your complete freedom of individual action is forfeited, since you are often required to follow the choices made by your peers. By way of comparison, picture yourself as a couple who chooses to go on a vacation with another couple. Even though you will have fewer reports to two supervisors—their general managers and a group of their peers—you still decide to go together because you will have more fun even though you know that going together will limit your freedom to do exactly what you want to do when you want to liberty. Giving up personal decision-making at work requires you to have faith in the wisdom of the decisions made by your peers. Trust is a feature of corporate culture, which has been extensively discussed in the media recently, and has nothing to do with organizational principles. To put it simply, it's a collection of morals and principles together with knowledge of how things work and ought to work in a corporation. The key takeaway is that peer decision-making and dual reporting cannot function without a robust and supportive business culture.

A manager's life is made unclear by this approach, and most people dislike uncertainty. However, the technique is necessary for hybrid firms to function, and while individuals will make an effort to locate anything more straightforward, it is unachievable. Though theoretically apparent, a completely functional structure tends to keep engineers and production (or similar units inside your company) out of the market and hence out of touch with client needs.

Conversely, a very mission-oriented company could always have precise, clean reporting lines and goals that are very apparent. But the disjointed state of things that follows leads to ineffectiveness and poor performance all around. We didn't become a hybrid organization because Intel embraced uncertainty. We have exhausted all other options, and while some alternative models would have been clearer, they just didn't function. Like democracies, hybrid organizations and the dual reporting concept they support are not inherently excellent. They are simply the most effective organizational structure for any kind of company [11], [12].

Managing Hybrid Businesses

Coordination between the functional groups and the mission-oriented units is necessary for hybrid organizations to operate, ensuring that the latter's resources are distributed and used to satisfy the requirements of the former. Think about the Intel controller's operation. His functional group, the financial organization, sets the norms for his professional practices, procedures, and standards. As a result, the controller of a business unit should have a supervisor that represents both the functional and mission-oriented organizations, depending on the different demands of each. By instructing the controller to focus on certain business issues, the divisional general manager assigns the controller mission-oriented priority. In addition to overseeing and monitoring the controller's technical performance and career development within finance—if he performs well, the finance manager may even promote him to the position of controller of a larger, more complex division—the controller's technical proficiency is ensured by training. Once again, in contrast, this is dual reporting, the management tenet that makes the hybrid organizational structure functional.

Both organizations should oversee a company division's controller

Think about advertising. Should every business unit create and implement its own marketing strategy, or should everything be managed by a single corporate organization? As previously, each side has advantages and disadvantages. Since each division is most adept at implementing its own plan, it comes to reason that it also knows the best about what to say and who to target in its advertising. This would imply that the divisions continue to be in charge of advertising. However, when combined, the offerings of many divisions frequently fulfill the demands of a particular market and provide a much more comprehensive response to the requirements of the clientele than any one division could. Here, it is obvious that if all of the advertising narratives are presented in a cogent, coordinated way, both the manufacturer and the consumer stand to gain. Furthermore, advertising not only promotes a certain product but also the company as a whole. We should, at the very least, prevent a division from hiring its own advertising agency since the advertisements should provide a uniform picture that is appropriate for everyone. The best course of action in this situation, as with many other things in a hybrid company, is to use dual reporting. The majority of their own advertising messaging should be under the divisional marketing managers' authority. However, the required functional supervision for everyone concerned should be provided by a coordinating body of peers comprised of the several divisional marketing managers and maybe led by the corporate merchandising manager. For example, this committee would choose the advertising firm and decide on the visual style that all divisional advertisements must adhere to. Additionally, it may specify how the division marketing managers would communicate with the agency, which would save space costs by using volume purchasing. However, the divisional personnel would be primarily responsible for communicating the unique selling message conveyed by an individual ad.

Marketing managers may find it difficult to tolerate dual reporting as it forces them to comprehend the requirements and methods of their colleagues. However, there's really no substitute when it comes to conveying distinct product and marketing messaging while simultaneously upholding a company's identity. It has been observed that organizations of all shapes and sizes may transform into hybrid forms. They also need to create a dual reporting mechanism. Take a look at this Wall Street Journal article on Ohio University (my thoughts are in brackets):

Stated otherwise, the hybrid organizational structure results naturally from reaping the benefits of belonging to a large organization, whether it a corporation, institution, or something else entirely. Undoubtedly, neither that form nor the requirement for dual reporting serves as a justification for needless busywork. Instead, we should ruthlessly remove pointless bureaucratic obstacles, simplify our work in all that we do, and continuously put established guidelines for coordination and consultation to the test of common sense. However, we shouldn't think that changing the way reporting is done would make complexity go away. Whether you like it or not. One essential aspect of organizational life is the hybrid organization.

An Additional Friction: The Two-Plane Structure

Dual reporting takes on a modest variance if an individual engages in coordination, which is outside of their normal workday. Cindy answers to a supervisory engineer, who answers to the plant's engineering manager. Cindy watches the process monitors, operates the production equipment, and makes modifications as needed to keep things running smoothly in her day-to-day job. Cindy, however, works at another employment. To identify, debate, and resolve issues pertaining to the processes that each of them is in charge of in their various factories, she officially meets once a month with her counterparts from the other manufacturing plants. Additionally, the coordination committee strives to standardize practices followed by every plant. The Engineering Managers Council, a higher-level body including engineering managers from all the factories, oversees the activities of Cindy's group and similar ones.

The term Cvndfs may be found on two organization charts; coordinating groups provide know-how managers more clout when dealing with plant engineering managers. However, she reports to the chairman of the process coordinating group as a member of the group. Cindy's name may thus be found on two independent organization charts, one of which is used to run the manufacturing facility and the other to manage the work of other factories. Cindy has two bosses, therefore duplicate reporting is evident once again.

Cindy's two duties are too big to put on one organization chart. Rather, the coordinating group must be conceptualized as being on a distinct plane or chart. Although it seems difficult, this isn't. Cindy would be considered an employee of Intel as well as a member of the church if she attended one. The local pastor, a member of the church hierarchy, would be her boss there, so to speak.

Nobody would mistake these two jobs for one another since they are obviously on distinct levels, each with their own hierarchies, and Cindy's dual membership in both groups would rarely cause concern. Cindy likens her membership in the church to being a part of a coordinating group. Cindy can have considerably more influence at Intel since we can utilize her expertise and experience in two separate roles. At her first role, her expertise impacts the work done at a single plant; in her second, she may impact the work of all plants by participating in the process coordinating group.

It is evident that the formation of these groups serves as a means of increasing managerial power, particularly for know-how managers. The idea of the two-plane is common in organizational operations. People, for example, plan in addition to doing operational tasks. The operational groups are located on a different level from the structure of the company's planning bodies. Furthermore, an individual can function in three planes if they are able to work in two.

Cindy could also be a member of a task force that is tasked with achieving a certain outcome and needs her skills. This is similar to Cindy having three independent jobs that don't interfere with one another—though they do compete for Cindy's time—such as working at Intel, attending a church, and providing consulting services to the town's parks department.

Those who find themselves in a subordinate/supervisory connection on one level may discover that their relationship is inverted on another. As president of Intel, for instance, I also serve as a member of a strategic planning committee and answer to our division controller, the group chairman. As though I were a part of the Army Reserve, I was commanded by this division controller, a regimental leader, during our weekend drills. Although I may be his supervisor or his supervisor's supervisor back at the operating ranch, he is my commanding officer in the Army Reserve. The two- (or multi-) plane arrangement is really helpful, that's the purpose. I could only participate without it if I was in command of everything I was involved in. I don't have that much time, and I'm not always the best person to take the lead. When it's appropriate and helpful, the multi-plane organization allows me to act more like a foot soldier than a commander. This offers the company a great deal of freedom.

A large number of the groupings we discuss here are transient. Certain groups, such as task forces, are established with a defined objective in mind, whilst others are just a loose association of individuals who collaborate to address a certain issue. As soon as the issue is resolved, none of them continues to collaborate. The more diverse our challenges are and the faster the world around us changes, the more dependent we must be on these specifically assembled temporary teams to get things done. We simply cannot change formal structure in the electronics industry quickly enough to keep up with the rapid advancement of technology. Such transient teams cannot function without the skills we must acquire to create hybrid organizations, including peer-group decision-making and dual or multiple reporting.

CONCLUSION

The merger of sales, production, and executive office tasks is a dynamic force reshaping the modern corporate environment. This investigation on the complex interactions among executive offices, sales tactics, and production procedures emphasizes how crucial cooperation and synergy are to the success of a business. In summary, the strategic relationship between leadership choices, sales results, and effective production procedures demonstrates the mutually beneficial relationship between executive office sales and manufacturing. A comprehensive approach to organizational excellence is fostered by effective executive leadership, which not only affects sales trajectories but also stimulates innovation and efficiency in production. The requirement of adaptation and continual development is emphasized as firms traverse the intricacies of this integrated ecosystem, drawing on insights from successful case studies and emerging industry trends. This analysis concludes that sustainable development and competitiveness need a well-balanced and integrated strategy where executive offices smoothly direct sales efforts and manufacturing processes.

REFERENCES:

[1] B. Baby, N. Prasanth, and S. S. Jebadurai, “Implementation of lean principles to improve the operations of a sales warehouse in the manufacturing industry,” *Int. J. Technol.*, 2018.

[2] A. Sanyal and A. Das, “Nowcasting sales growth of manufacturing companies in India,” *Appl. Econ.*, 2018.

[3] D. S. Saraf, R. Mehrotra, K. Chandan, D. N. Sinha, and A. Yadav, "A review of trade practices of smokeless tobacco products in terms of prohibition on sale, manufacturing & Importation in framework convention on tobacco control ratified parties," *Indian Journal of Medical Research, Supplement*. 2018.

[4] C. Onyejiaku, N. Ghasi, and H. Okwor, "Does Promotional Strategy Affect Sales Growth Of Manufacturing Firms In South East Nigeria?," *Eur. J. Manag. Mark. Stud.*, 2018.

[5] D. Saraf, "Prohibition of importation, manufacturing and sale of Smokeless Tobacco (SLT) products: what is the Global Scenario?," *Tob. Induc. Dis.*, 2018.

[6] A. Świadek, "Sales range and innovative activity in the manufacturing system of poland," *Equilibrium. Q. J. Econ. Econ. Policy*, 2018.

[7] M. Yucesan, M. Gul, and E. Celik, "Performance comparison between ARIMAX, ANN and ARIMAX-ANN hybridization in sales forecasting for furniture industry," *Drv. Ind.*, 2018.

[8] Marhaeni and A. Hakim Rahman, "Membangun Sistem Penjualan Ikan Laut Berbasis Web Pada Cv.Famashena," *J. Rekayasa Inf.*, 2018.

[9] P. D. Palacios Duarte and M. L. Saavedra García, "Institutional R&D environment and its influence on employment and sales in Mexican manufacturing SMEs," *Revista Finanzas y Politica Economica*. 2018.

[10] T. W. Wang *et al.*, "Tobacco Product Use Among Adults — United States, 2017," *MMWR. Morb. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.*, 2018.

[11] J. Tifani, "Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Struktur Modal pada Perusahaan Sektor Transportasi yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2012-2016," *Univ. Sumatera Utara Repos. Institusi USU*, 2018.

[12] S. Rossi, A. Puglisi, and M. Benaglia, "Additive Manufacturing Technologies: 3D Printing in Organic Synthesis," *ChemCatChem*. 2018.

CHAPTER 9

MODES OF CONTROL IN ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS

Dr Gayathri R, Assistant Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.gayathri_r@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The intricate web of modes of control governing behavior within organizational environments. Focusing on the dynamics of management, the study identifies and analyzes three primary modes: Free-Market Forces, Contractual Obligations, and Cultural Values. Through an insightful examination, the paper navigates the influence of these modes on individual and collective behavior, drawing parallels between the market-driven decisions in tire purchases and the contractual obligations shaping professional relationships. The significance of cultural values emerges as a compelling force, emphasizing the communal aspect of organizational structures. The study introduces a model categorizing these modes based on individual motivation and environmental complexity, guiding managers in determining the most appropriate mode for optimal outcomes. Moreover, the paper discusses the role of management in fostering cultural values and underscores the contextual nature of selecting the right mode of control. Through practical examples and theoretical insights, the research contributes to a nuanced understanding of the intricate balance between centralization and decentralization in organizational structures.

KEYWORDS:

Automation, Bureaucracy, Decentralization, Formal Controls, Hierarchical Control, Information Systems.

INTRODUCTION

Let's examine the ways in which we may influence or control the things we do. Let's say your automobile needs new tires. You visit the dealer down the block and go over the many lines he has available. After that, you'll most likely go up the street to check out what the rivals have. Perhaps you'll consult a consumer magazine later on to help you make a decision. One element will ultimately determine your decision: your own self-interest. You want to spend as little money as possible on the tires you believe will best suit your requirements. It is quite improbable that any sentimental attachment to the tire salesman will surface. It is unlikely that you would tell him that he isn't charging you enough for the tires because you don't care about his well-being [1], [2].

Similarly, there are three ubiquitous, unseen ways to manipulate human behavior at work. These are the following:

1. The forces of the free market

2. Confidentiality duties

3. Cultural principles Forces of the Free Market

Your decisions while purchasing tires were driven by price-driven free-market dynamics, in which two entities (individuals, businesses, or organizational units) trade products and services with the sole goal of benefiting themselves. This is very easy. It boils down to "I want to buy the tire at the lowest price I can get" as opposed to "I want to sell the tire at the highest price I can get." In this situation, neither side pretends to care whether the other goes bankrupt. This tire buying and selling method is very effective. Everyone is clearly acting in their own best interests, hence no one is required to supervise the transaction. Why, however, aren't the forces of the market used consistently and under all conditions? Because the commodities and services that are purchased and sold need to have a very specific monetary worth in order for them to function. For something as basic as tires, the free market may simply determine a price. However, determining value for a lot of other transactions that occur in a work or business setting may be challenging [3], [4].

Contractual Liabilities

Generally, the free market regulates business transactions. We want to get the greatest deal while purchasing a commodity product from a seller, and vice versa. However, what happens when something's worth is difficult to deride? For example, what happens when a task requires a group of individuals to complete? To what extent does each of these add to the value that the company offers to the product? The idea is that appealing to the free market will not determine an engineer's value inside a group. To be honest, I believe that if we were to purchase engineering work by the "bit," we would wind up spending more time attempting to determine the worth of each individual piece of contribution than the contribution itself would. Here, attempting to apply free-market principles becomes quite ineffective.

So you tell the engineers, "All right, let's see if we can work together for a year at a given cost, and in exchange, you'll agree to do a certain kind of job. We have just signed a deal. You agree to offer me your best effort to complete your assignment in exchange for my giving you an office and a terminal. Contractual obligations now form the basis of control and specify the kind of work you will do and the rules that will apply to it. I need to have some degree of generalized power over your job since I am unable to plan out precisely what you will perform on a daily basis. As a result, you must provide me the authority to oversee, assess, and, if required, revise your work as part of our agreement. We decide on more regulations and establish ground rules that we will both abide by. We expect other cars to stop at red lights as well, so we may drive through green lights in exchange for their cooperation. However, we need police officers to deal with lawbreakers, and just as with supervisors, they bring in overhead. What additional instances of contractual obligations exist? Consider the tax structure. We demand certain services in exchange and give up part of our earning rights. To keep an eye on and examine our tax returns, massive overhead is required. Another example is provided by a utility business.

They will go to a government official and say, "I'll build a three-hundred-million-dollar generating plant and provide electricity for this portion of the state if you promise me that no one else will build one and try to sell electricity here." "That's fine, but we won't let you charge whatever you want for the power you generate," the state responds. The Public Utilities Commission, which we will set up as a monitoring body, will determine how much you may charge customers and how much money you can earn." Therefore, the corporation has a contractual obligation to accept the government's judgment about price and profit in return for a monopoly [5], [6].

Cultural Principles

We need a different kind of control that is based on cultural values when the environment changes faster than regulations can be made, or when a set of circumstances is so vague and ambiguous that a contract between the parties that attempted to cover every scenario would be unnecessarily complicated. Its most salient feature is that the interests of the individual are subordinated to those of the greater group to which he or she belongs. Certain emotionally charged terms, like trust, become relevant when such values are at play since you are ceding your own power to defend yourself to the collective. And in order for this to occur, you all need to think that you have same goals, values, and approaches. In turn, only a large lot of shared, common experience may help generate these. The role of management is to oversee the operation of free-market forces; in a flea market, sales are not supervised by anybody. Within a contractual commitment, management is responsible for establishing and revising the guidelines, overseeing compliance, and assessing and enhancing performance. Regarding cultural values, "management must create and foster the shared goals, values, and practices necessary for trust to exist."

The Most Suitable Method of Control

It is easy to romanticize what I have termed cultural values as a control mechanism because it seems so "nice," even utopian, because everyone ostensibly cares about the common good and puts self-interest under the supervision of that common good. However, in some situations, this is not the most effective method of control. Neither the tax code nor this advice is meant to be used as a tire purchase guide. As a result, there is always the best suitable mode of control under a particular set of circumstances, which is what managers should identify and use.

How are we going to do that? Here, there are two factors to consider: the first is an individual's motivation, and the other is the setting in which he operates. The complexity, uncertainty, and ambiguity of an environment may be quantified using an imaginary composite index that we'll refer to as the CUA factor. Process engineer Cindy is surrounded by complex technology, recently acquired but untested machinery, and production and development experts who are pushing her in different directions. To put it simply, her workplace is complicated. Bruce, the marketing manager, approaches his supervisor to seek for permission to employ additional workers for his woefully understaffed group, but the supervisor refuses, leaving Bruce unsure of what to do in the event that he doesn't get the go-ahead. Bruce works in an unstable workplace. Mike, who we will now introduce as an Intel transportation supervisor, was dealing with so many divisional manufacturing managers, councils, and committees that he was unsure of which end was up. Eventually, he left because he could no longer stand the uncertainty of his workplace. Now, let's imagine the aforementioned basic four-quadrant chart. A person's motivation may range from self-interest to collective interest, and a workplace's CUA factor might be low or high. Now, determine which control method works best for each quadrant. The market mode, which controlled our tire purchase, is the most suited when self-interest is strong and the CUA component is low. The contractual mode, which controlled our halting at a red light, becomes suitable when individual incentive shifts toward collective interest. We attempted to assist at the accident site since the cultural values mode is the best option when both the group-interest orientation and the CUA component are strong. Lastly, no control strategy will be effective when the CUA component is strong and personal motivation stems from self-interest. Like every man for himself on a sinking ship, this scenario can only end in anarchy [7], [8].

Let's use our approach to analyze a new hire's work. Why is he doing this? It's mostly motivated by self-interest. Thus, you need to assign him a work that is well-organized and has a low CUA factor. If he performs well, he'll start to feel more at ease, care more about his team, and worry less about himself. He discovers that helping row is a better way for him to advance aboard a boat than sprinting to the bow. After then, the worker may be promoted into a more intricate, unpredictable, or confusing position. (They often pay more.) With the passage of time, he will continue to share a growing amount of expertise with other team members and be prepared to take on duties that are ever more complicated, unclear, and unpredictable. For this reason, companies with robust corporate cultures often prefer to promote from within. When you start young individuals out in occupations that are relatively low-level, well defined, and have low CUA elements, they will eventually share their experiences with peers, supervisors, and subordinates, which will help them learn about the organization's beliefs, aims, and working practices. They will eventually come to terms with the complicated world of numerous bosses and peer decision-making, and they may even thrive in it.

However, what happens if we have to recruit a senior employee from outside the organization for any reason? He will have strong self-interest when he first starts, just like any other new employee, but we will unavoidably assign him to oversee a failing organization—that was the whole point of going outside, after all. Therefore, in addition to having a challenging task, our new manager will be operating in an atmosphere with a very high CUA. In the meanwhile, he lacks a foundation of shared experience with the other members of the organization and is ignorant of the working procedures. All we can do is cross our fingers and hope that, in order to lower his CUA factor, he forgets self-interest and comes back to work promptly. If not, he's most likely out of luck.

DISCUSSION

One of the three modes of control might be in charge of our actions at any given moment. However, we discover that each of the three influences us differently every day. For a moment, let's follow Bob's way of operation. Bob, a marketing supervisor, is affected by market forces when he purchases his lunch in the cafeteria. His decisions are clearly determined by what he wants to spend and what he wants to get. The very act of Bob showing up for work constitutes a transaction subject to contractual responsibilities. For doing his best, he receives a certain pay, which suggests that he must be present. As well as his readiness to engage in activities related to strategy planning and workplace cultural norms. Since this labor is not part of his legally specified "regular" employment, it requires more work on his part. However, he does it because he believes his contributions are necessary for the business [9], [10].

The sales force was made to favor specific products by the marketing departments themselves, who had been running contests with cash bonuses and trips to exotic locations as prizes. The marketing managers were fighting with each other for a limited and valuable resource: the salesmen's time, and the salesmen simply responded as one might expect. However, salespeople can also behave in the opposite way. At one point, one of our divisions had major issues, leaving the sales engineers with no product to sell for almost a year. Although they could have left Intel and immediately gotten other jobs and quick commissions elsewhere, they chose to stay because they believed in the company and had faith that eventually

The Comparison in Sports

Previously, I constructed a case that could be summed up as follows: A manager's output is the output of the organization under his supervision or influence. In other words, this means that management is a team activity. However, no matter how skillfully a team is assembled or led, the team will only be as good as the individuals on it. To put it another way, all of the work we have done up to this point is for naught unless our team members are willing to consistently give their all. The remaining portion of the book focuses on the tools a manager can use to elicit peak individual performance from each member of the group [11], [12].

There are only two possible explanations for a person's lack of productivity: either they are incapable of doing the work or they are unwilling to do so; either way, we can identify which is the case by using a quick mental test: if the person's life depended on completing the task, could he do it? If the answer is yes, the person lacks motivation; if the answer is no, the person is not capable. For example, if my life depended on being able to play the violin on command, I could not play the violin on command, but if I had to run a mile in six minutes, I could probably manage it, albeit not something I would want to do.

Eliciting peak performance from subordinates is a manager's most important task. If two factors are limiting high output, a manager can address the issue in two ways: through motivation and through training. Both, as we will see in the next section, can enhance an individual's performance. In this case, motivation is the issue that needs to be addressed.

Personal Suitability

Training and motivation are two strategies a manager may use to boost output. Since motivation must originate from inside, a manager's only real power is to foster an atmosphere that allows driven individuals to thrive. Most of us associate the term "motivation" with doing something to another person. However, I don't believe that's possible. A subordinate's statement that "I feel motivated" has no bearing on anything; what matters is whether or not he performs better or worse because his environment changed. An attitude may serve as an indicator, a "window into the black box" of human motivation, but it is not the intended outcome. Better motivation is synonymous with improved performance, not with a change in attitude or feeling.

More output at a given skill level is. For the majority of Western history, up until the early Industrial Revolution, people were motivated primarily by fear of punishment. In Dickens's day, the threat of death motivated people to work because, in the absence of work, they would not be paid and would not be able to purchase food; if they stole food and were discovered, they would be hanged. Therefore, people were motivated to produce more than they might have otherwise.

A number of new approaches have started to take the place of more traditional fear-based approaches during the last thirty years or so. One possible explanation for the rise in importance of knowledge workers and the decline in the relative importance of manual labor is that, while the output of a manual laborer is easily measurable, deviations from expectations can be quickly identified and dealt with, but for a knowledge worker, it takes longer to identify deviations because even the expectations themselves are very difficult to state precisely. In other words, fear is not going to be as effective a motivator for computer architects as it would be for galley slaves, so new approaches are required. My explanation of what motivates people to perform is largely based on Abraham Maslow's theory of motivation, primarily because my observations of the working world validate Maslow's ideas. According to Maslow, motivation is strongly related to the idea that needs are what drive people to have driven, which in turn lead to motivation; once a need is met, it ceases to be a need and, thus, ceases to be a source of motivation. In other words, in order to generate and sustain high levels of motivation, we must leave some needs unmet.

Naturally, people have many different needs at the same time, but one need is always more important than the others. This need is the one that primarily affects a person's motivation and, consequently, his performance level. Maslow identified a hierarchy of needs, meaning that when one lower need is met, a higher need is likely to take precedence. Maslow identified a hierarchy of needs, meaning that if a lower need is met, a higher need is probably going to take precedence.

Essential Bodies

These requirements include items that may be purchased with money, such as food, clothing, and other essentials for survival. These requirements are linked to fear: one worries that they could go without clothes, food, or other necessities.

Needs for Safety & Security

These stem from a desire to prevent oneself from reverting to a state in which one is depriving of the necessities of life. For example, safety and security needs are met when medical insurance shields workers from the worry that they will become bankrupt trying to cover medical and hospital bills. Benefits are not usually the primary source of employee motivation, but if they were and workers had to worry about such things, performance would undoubtedly suffer.

Needs for Social/Affiliation

Humans have an innate need to belong to a group. However, people don't want to belong to any old group; they want to belong to one whose members share some aspect of their own lives. For example, people who are excited, confident, or happy want to be around other people who share those same qualities. On the other hand, people who are miserable love the company of other miserable people. No one who is miserable wants to be around someone who is happy.

Social needs are very strong. A friend of mine who had been taking care of her home for many years decided to return to work, taking a low-paying job that did little to improve her family's standard of living. For a long time, I didn't understand why she did this, but eventually it occurred to me that she needed the companionship that her work offered, being around people she liked.

Another example of the power of social needs comes from Jim, a young engineer, who worked for a very large, well-established company for his first job out of college before moving in with his two roommates to work at Intel. Jim felt left out, and his need for a group in which he felt comfortable led him to come to work at Intel, even though he enjoyed his work at the other company. Because Jim continued to live and work with his roommates, he was exposed to what it was like to work at Intel. Additionally, most of the people where Jim worked were married and at least ten years older.

One such story involves Chuck, a young manager at Intel, who was a first-year student at Harvard Business School. At first, he was consumed by fear—a fear of his professors, the material, failure, and failing out—but eventually, his fear gave way to the realization that everyone else was experiencing the same thing—a fear of failing.

As time went on, the study groups disintegrated and the students began to associate with other students in the class; the entire class, or "." as it was called, developed a distinct and recognizable set of characteristics; it became, in short, a team. Members enjoyed belonging, associating, and identifying with it, and they worked to sustain the class's image among the professors and other students. Chuck moved from being governed largely by his need for sheer survival—a "physiological" need— to one for security and safety.

Needs for Esteem/Recognition

Achieving this position had been a lifelong ambition, so when it came at him all of a sudden, he started searching for alternative sources of inspiration.

Needs for Self-Actualization

As a result, its most important characteristic is that, unlike other sources of motivation, which extinguish themselves after the needs are fulfilled, self-actualization continues to motivate people to ever higher levels of performance. Maslow defined self-actualization as stemming from a personal realization that "what I can be, I must be." The title of a movie about athletes, Personal Best, captures what self-actualization means: the need to achieve one's utter personal best in a chosen field of endeavor.

A person can be motivated to use all of his abilities by two different inner forces: competence and achievement. Competence is concerned with job or task mastery. For example, a virtuoso violinist who practices every day is clearly motivated by something other than a need for respect and recognition. He works to hone his own skill, trying to do a little bit better this time than the last, just as a teenager practicing a trick on a skateboard is motivated by the same inner force. This same teenager may not sit still for ten minutes to complete homework, but on a skateboard, he is relentless, driven by the need for self-actualization, an unrelenting desire to improve.

CONCLUSION

Analyzing control mechanisms in organizational settings reveals how complex it is to shape behavior in a variety of settings. The dynamic factor influencing the terrain of decision-making and personal behavior is the interaction of Free-Market Forces, Contractual Obligations, and Cultural Values. Presented here is a model that helps managers find the best management strategy by matching these modes to individual motivation and environmental complexity. The research emphasizes how important it is to have a contextual awareness of the organizational environment when choosing the best mode of control. In transactions with well-defined values, free-market forces are effective; in more complicated and confusing situations, contractual responsibilities provide structure and governance. Cultural values are a potent tool for building trust and achieving group success because of their focus on common goals. Moreover, the function of management is particularly important as it includes controlling the forces of free markets, creating and adjusting contractual agreements, and creating and preserving cultural norms. The suggested model makes clear how important it is to balance environmental complexity with individual drive, providing insights into practical management techniques. The research offers useful insights for executives managing the delicate balance between centralization and decentralization as firms change in a constantly shifting environment. Managers may lead their teams to success by understanding which mode of control is best for a given circumstance and using the advantages of each strategy.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Meinhardt, S. Junge, and M. Weiss, "The organizational environment with its measures, antecedents, and consequences: a review and research agenda," *Manag. Rev. Q.*, 2018.

[2] S. F. Chou, J. S. Horng, C. H. Liu, and B. Gan, "Explicating restaurant performance: The nature and foundations of sustainable service and organizational environment," *Int. J. Hosp. Manag.*, 2018.

[3] H. P. R. Priyankara, F. Luo, A. Saeed, S. A. Nubuor, and M. P. F. Jayasuriya, "How does leader's support for environment promote organizational citizenship behaviour for environment? A multi-theory perspective," *Sustain.*, 2018.

[4] H. Jiang and H. Shen, "Supportive organizational environment, work-life enrichment, trust and turnover intention: A national survey of PRSA membership," *Public Relat. Rev.*, 2018.

[5] T. A. O'Neill and M. J. W. McLarnon, "Optimizing team conflict dynamics for high performance teamwork," *Hum. Resour. Manag. Rev.*, 2018.

[6] R. Romero-Silva, J. Santos, and M. Hurtado, "A note on defining organisational systems for contingency theory in OM," *Prod. Plan. Control*, 2018.

[7] T. Augusto, C. Gomes, C. Fernanda, D. M. Bezerra, G. Oste, and G. Cremonezi, "Study on The Alpha Generation And The Reflections of Its Behavior in the Organizational Environment," *Quest Journals J. Res. Humanit. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.

[8] L. Valenzuela, O. M. Jerez, B. A. Hasbún, V. Pizarro, G. Valenzuela, and C. A. Orsini, "Closing the gap between business undergraduate education and the organisational environment: A Chilean case study applying experiential learning theory," *Innov. Educ. Teach. Int.*, 2018.

[9] O. J. Owuor, O. Alphonce Juma, and O. Johnmark, "Effect of Organizational Environment on Procurement Performance of Sugar Firms in Kenya," 2018.

[10] M. L. Bernardi, M. Cimitile, and F. Mercaldo, "Cross-organisational process mining in cloud environments," *J. Inf. Knowl. Manag.*, 2018.

[11] M. D. Gough, "How Do Organizational Environments and Mandatory Arbitration Shape Employment Attorney Case Selection? Evidence from an Experimental Vignette," *Ind. Relat. (Berkeley).*, 2018.

[12] S. Khalili and T. Farahani, "Correlation of spirituality in organizational environment and attitude towards virtual world mediated by managers' citizenship behavior in private companies," *Rev. PUBLICANDO*, 2018.

CHAPTER 10

ROLE OF MONEY AND TASK-RELEVANT MATURITY IN ORGANIZATIONAL ENVIRONMENTS

Dr Neena P C, Associate Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.neenapc@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The multifaceted dynamics of motivation within organizational environments, focusing on the pivotal roles played by money and task-relevant maturity. The exploration begins with an analysis of how money serves as a motivator across different levels of the hierarchy of needs. While crucial at lower levels for fulfilling basic necessities, the study reveals that money transforms into a measure of achievement at higher levels, motivating individuals irrespective of utilitarian needs. Drawing parallels between diverse motivational needs, the study examines fear as a source of motivation and its nuanced manifestation in esteem and self-actualization modes. Furthermore, the research delves into the concept of task-relevant maturity (TRM) as a crucial variable shaping effective management styles. By elucidating how TRM evolves in response to changing work environments, the study emphasizes the necessity for adaptive management approaches. The findings indicate that, at lower TRM levels, structured and detailed instructions are most effective, transitioning to communication-oriented styles as TRM increases. The study concludes with insights into the parallels between parental styles and managerial approaches, highlighting the need for aligning organizational values to facilitate effective management.

KEYWORDS:

Financial Incentives, Money, Organizational Environment, Performance Rewards, Recognition, Task-Relevant Maturity.

INTRODUCTION

The topic of how money influences people's motivations now comes up. Money is plainly significant at the lowest levels of the motivation hierarchy since it is necessary to purchase basic requirements. More money won't inspire someone if they have enough to raise themselves to a level they are comfortable with. Think about the workers in our Caribbean assembly factory. There, the quality of living is very poor, but our employees enjoy a far better one than the majority of the population. However, during the first years of the business, a lot of workers just put in enough time to earn a little amount of money before quitting. Money was obviously a limiting motivator for them; once they had established a fixed amount of money they desired, additional money or a stable employment would not increase their drive. Now picture a venture capitalist who, having made 10 million dollars, is still working very hard to earn ten more. This is scarcely the place for physiological, safety, or social demands. Furthermore, venture investors are not motivated by a need for respect or recognition since they often don't make their triumphs public. It seems that money is now a measure of success rather than a source of incentive at the top of the need hierarchy, when one is self-actualized [1], [2].

Money as a measure of accomplishment will always motivate, but money in the physiological and security-driven modes will only do so while the need is met. Because the venture investor is driven by success rather than a utilitarian desire for money, the second ten million may thus be just as significant as the first. And the demand for achievement has no bounds.

To find out where someone stands in the motivational hierarchy, administer a quick test. A person is primarily operating in the physiological or safety modes if the whole amount of a pay increase matters to him. However, if his motivation is based on how his rise compares to that of others, then he is driven by self-actualization or esteem/recognition, since money is obviously a metric in this situation.

After entering the self-actualization phase, an individual need metrics to assess his development and accomplishments. The most significant kind of measurement is performance feedback. The self-actualized person who is motivated to become more competent is the one who provides the feedback system. Our master violinist is aware of the proper way for the music to sound, will work nonstop to correct any mistakes, and recognizes when it isn't quite perfect. As a result, the motivation to continue training fades if there is no chance for development. I know a Hungarian immigrant who won an Olympic medal in fencing and moved to our nation. He informed me that he had given up fencing swordplay after coming to the United States when I recently bumped into him. He said that he couldn't stand to fence any more because he thought his talent was becoming worse every time he did it and that the level of competition here wasn't high enough to develop someone who could challenge him [3], [4].

What are some of the workplace's methods or systems for providing feedback? The best metrics connect an employee's output to the organization's operations. If milestones and performance indicators in a management-by-objectives system are connected to an individual's performance, they will assess his level of achievement and advance him. Leading his team away from unimportant and meaningless incentives, such office space or décor, and toward vital and relevant ones, is an apparent and crucial duty of a manager. The most significant kind of task-relevant feedback is the performance evaluation that each supervisory employee should get. Later on, more on this.

Dread

One fears losing one's life, limb, career, or freedom in motivation driven by physiological and security/safety needs. Does dread fit into the self-actualized or esteem modes? It does, but here is when the dread of failing takes over. But is it a good or bad way to be motivated? It may be either. Fear of failing may motivate someone to work harder on a job, but if it takes over, someone who is motivated by achievement anxiety will only become cautious. Let's go back to the people who threw rings. If someone were to get an electric shock each time they threw a ring and missed, they would eventually approach the peg and drop the ring right over it in order to relieve the agony of failing. Fear is often not external when it comes to the higher motivation levels. Rather, what makes you back off is your fear of not being satisfied with yourself. If your constant concern is failure, you will never be able to remain in the self-actualized state.

The Comparison in Sports

In an attempt to understand what drives individuals to work, motivation has been examined. This allows us as managers to get the greatest work out of our staff members—their "personal best." Of course, the performance of the company as a whole is ultimately what matters, but how talented and driven its members are will determine how well the organization performs. Therefore, as managers, our first responsibility is to teach the staff members (once they reach this stage, however, their drive will be boundless and self-sustaining.

Exists a methodical approach to helping individuals reach self-actualization? Let's pose another query in search of a response. Why would someone who isn't all that engaged in his office job push himself to the limit by training for a marathon? Why does he run? He's attempting to beat the stopwatch or other folks. This is a basic self-actualization paradigm in which individuals push themselves to previously unheard-of levels, running further or faster while perspiring copiously.

DISCUSSION

Join them if you can't defeat them; foster an environment that is similar to that of competitive sports. And creating certain ground rules and standards by which staff members may gauge their own performance is the greatest method to instill that mentality in the workplace. Reaching your maximum potential requires facing something or someone. I'll give you an easy example. No amount of pressure or enticement seems to improve the subpar performance of the Intel facilities maintenance group, which is in charge of keeping our buildings tidy, for years. We then started a scheme where a resident senior manager, known as a "building czar," would regularly grade each building's maintenance. Next, the score was contrasted with the ratings assigned to the other structures. All of them had virtually instantaneous remarkable improvement in condition. Nothing more was done, and no further funds or benefits were given to the populace. They did, however, get a racetrack—a venue for competition. Having your building get the highest rating is a great source of incentive if your job involves facility upkeep. This is crucial to the manager's engagement and approach: he must see the task from the perspective of those who do it on a daily basis and then set up indicators so that his staff members may observe their "racetrack" being formed [5], [6].

On the other hand, motivation related to competition naturally disappears when it is eliminated. Take the example of a writer for a newspaper who is thinking back on his past. After the merger of his daily and the rival publication, the journalist's joy in his profession started to diminish. He thrived on outperforming the competitors in the column. That merger day will never be forgotten, the writer added. We may learn how to handle failure by drawing parallels between our job and sports. Preoccupation with failure is, as said, one of the major barriers to a completely devoted, highly driven frame of mind. Nonetheless, we are aware that at least 50% of games in every competitive sport end in a loss. Even though every competitor is aware of this from the beginning, very few of them quit up throughout the competition. It is also evident that the manager's function in this situation is that of the coach. First of all, a great coach has no personal stake in his team's success, which builds trust between him and his players. He is very hard on his squad. He attempts to get the best performance from his team members by being critical. Third, a good coach was probably once a good player as well. Additionally, he comprehends the game well since he has played it effectively. Creating a competitive work environment may transform our employees into "athletes" committed to achieving peak performance, which is essential for our team to consistently win.

Maturity Relevant to Tasks

Getting the best work out of his staff members is a manager's primary duty. Given our understanding of employee motivation, the issue that arises is whether there is a single, optimal management style or strategy that outperforms all others. Many have searched for that ideal. When the problem is taken into account historically, the most popular management style seems to have shifted to align with the motivation theory that was popular at the time. The notions of labor were straightforward at the turn of the century. Individuals received instructions, and if they followed them, they received compensation; if not, they risked termination. The matching leadership style was clear-cut and hierarchical; there were those who issued commands and others who dutifully carried them out. The humanistic viewpoint that there was a more pleasant method to motivate employees to work was what changed management thought in the 1950s. As a result, the preferred leadershio stvle altered. Eventually, as university behavioral science departments expanded and matured, carefully designed studies centered on the ideas of leadership and motivation. Remarkably, none of the first intuitive assumptions could be confirmed by actual data; it would not be possible to demonstrate that one leadership style was superior to another. It was difficult to avoid the conclusion that there was no ideal management approach. My own experiences support this. In order to provide middle managers at Intel a wider range of expertise, we often switch them across groups. Despite the wide variations in their output, these groups often have comparable backgrounds and work styles [7], [8].

While some managers and their teams exhibit greater levels of productivity, others do not. Changing the bosses around often has unexpected results. Because the managers alternate, neither the groups nor the managers continue to exhibit the trait of being either high- or low-producing. The inevi conclusion is that certain combinations of specific managers and specific labor groups are linked to high production. This implies that not every situation calls for the same level of effectiveness from a certain management strategy.

There are scholars in this discipline who contend that a basic variable exists that indicates the optimal management style for a certain circumstance. This variable is the subordinates' task-relevant maturity (TRM), which is a function of their education, training, and experience in addition to their level of accomplishment orientation and preparedness to take on responsibility. Furthermore, all of this is very task-specific, and it is completely feasible for an individual or group of individuals to have a TRM that is high in one job but low in another.

Allow me to illustrate my point with an example. A very productive sales manager was transferred from the field to the plant and given control over a production unit. The two occupations were similar in size and scope, but the experienced manager's performance declined and he began to exhibit symptoms of being overburdened by his workload. The manager's task-relevant maturity in the new position was very low since its atmosphere, substance, and duties were all unfamiliar to him, even if his personal maturity was clearly unchanged. Over time, he developed coping mechanisms, and his TRM progressively rose. After that, he started to perform at the exceptional levels he had previously shown, which is why we first elevated him. Although everything that transpired here should have been expected, we were taken aback when we mistook the manager's overall maturity and ability for his task-specific maturity. Comparably, an individual's TRM may be quite high for a certain degree of complexity, uncertainty, and ambiguity, but it will decrease if the work itself suddenly changes or if the job speed quickens. It is comparable to asking someone who has driven on little rural roads for many years to drive on a congested major expressway. His TRM operating a personal vehicle will sharply decline. The conclusion is that, as task-relevant maturity changes, different management techniques are required. In particular, a highly organized method—in other words, one in which the supervisor provides the subordinate with exact and specific instructions on what needs to be done, when, and how—is the most successful technique when the TRM is low. The most successful management style shifts from being structured to being more focused on communication, emotional support, and encouragement as the subordinate's TRM increases. In this scenario, the manager gives the subordinate more attention as a person than just the task at hand. The effective management style changes once again when the TRM increases.

In this situation, the manager's engagement should be minimal and should mostly consist of ensuring that the subordinate is working toward mutually agreed upon goals. But the manager should always keep a close enough eye on a subordinate's work to prevent surprises, regardless of the TRM. As we have noted previously, the distinction between a supervisor assigning a job and abdicating it is whether or not monitoring is in place. The attributes of an efficient supervisory approach considering the several levels of Total Resource Management. A word of caution is in order: avoid passing judgment on the merits of structured management styles and think that communication-oriented styles are more deserving. Your thoughts and actions should not be influenced by what is deemed "nice" or "not nice." Recall that what works best is what we want.

The evolution of a parent-child connection is paralleled by this notion. The best parenting approach varies according on the kid's age or "life-relevant maturity" as the child gets older. A child should not be allowed to handle anything that might damage him or shatter, according to a parent. Although he is unable to comprehend that the vase he wants to play with is an invaluable antique, the toddler is able to grasp "no." As he gets older, his parents want to support him in taking more initiative while he's still young. Organized; focused on tasks; convey "what," "when," and "how" in a medium Individual-focused; strong emphasis on mutual reasoning, support, and two-way communication Manager involvement is low; goal-setting and oversight The primary factor that establishes an efficient management approach is the task-relevant maturity of the subordinate who is attempting to prevent himself from being hurt. For example, a parent would advise their kid to trade in their tricycle for their first two-wheeler.

In addition to accompanying him to prevent the bicycle from toppling over and to have a conversation with him about street safety, the parent will not just send inmost on his own. With the child's increasing maturity, parents might reduce the amount of specialized training. The parent does not need to repeat the vast list of safety precautions when the youngster goes outside to ride his bicycle. Eventually, the youngster moves out of the family and may even attend college when his life-relevant maturity is high enough. At this moment, the parent-child bond will shift once again as the parent just keeps an eye on the tuna's development. In the event that the kid finds himself in a situation where his level of maturity relevant to his life is abruptly reduced (for instance, if he has serious difficulties in school), the parent may need to return to a previously used approach. The degree of structure dictating the behavior of the kid (or "the subordinate") does not truly vary when parental (or administrative) supervision progresses from structured to communicative to monitoring. Parents no longer need to remind an adolescent not to ride his bicycle across a busy interstate highway since the child understands it is unsafe to do so. The concept of structure shifts from being supplied outside to being given within.

The kid would be more likely to make judgments in the same manner as the parent would if the parent (or supervisor) taught the subordinate, the proper operational values early on. Common operational values, objectives, and preferences—the ways in which a company collaborates—must exist in order for management style to advance. Since a supervisor is ultimately responsible for the work of the individuals under their supervision, it is incumbent upon them to uphold common values. In the absence of such commonality, an organization may easily become disoriented and lose its sense of purpose. Furthermore, a supervisor cannot effectively delegate without a shared set of values. My colleague, who has always performed very well, delegated some of his more routine chores to a lower employee and took on new ones himself. The employee performed shoddy job. Reaction from my associate: "He needs to own up to his mistakes." He learns in this manner." The issue with this is that the clients of the subordinate pay his tuition. And it is just incorrect. His supervisor must take on the duty of instructing the subordinate; internal or external clients of his company should not foot the bill [9], [10].

Managerial Leverage and Management Style

For purely pragmatic reasons, it is our duty as supervisors to work toward accelerating our subordinates' task-relevant maturity. It takes less time to manage a worker with a high TRM than it does to provide precise, organized monitoring. Additionally, the supervisor has more management influence when he assigns work to the subordinate once the subordinate learns operational values and TRM reaches a certain level. The subordinate's training is presumed finished at the highest levels of TRM, and internal motivation self-actualization, the most potent source of effort and energy a manager can tap into—is most likely to drive the subordinate.

We now know that an individual's TRM is dependent on their particular workplace. His TRM and the best management approach used by his supervisor will both shift as a result. Imagine an army encampment where nothing occurs at all. The commanding sergeant has developed a close personal bond with all of his men and typically maintains a casual contact with them. Because the routines are so well-established, he seldom needs to provide instructions; instead, the sergeant just keeps an eye on their activities, which is acceptable given the group's high TRM. One day, the enemy unexpectedly shows up in a jeepload, crosses the hill, and opens fire on the camp.

Immediately, the sergeant switches back to a task-oriented, regimented leadership style, giving everyone commands and dictating to them what has to be done, when, and how.If these conflicts persist and the gang fights for a few months from the same location, then this will also become normal. As a result, the group's TRM for the new task battling will rise. The sergeant may then progressively stop giving orders to everyone [11], [12].

Stated differently, sufficient time is a prerequisite for a manager to function in a communication- and mutual-understanding-based manner. In theory, monitoring is the most effective management strategy, but in practice, we have to get there. Even if we succeed, we must immediately return to the what-when-how phase if circumstances unexpectedly shift. We believe that a wise manager should not operate in such style. Because of this, we often put things off until it's too late and life gets in the way. Fighting such biases and seeing any management style as successful or ineffective, depending on the TRM of our subordinates in a particular work setting, is a skill that managers must acquire. For this reason, there isn't a single ideal approach for managers to operate. It varies daily and maybe even hourly.

CONCLUSION

The study of the relationship between task-relevant maturity and money in organizational environments has shed light on the complex interactions that exist between employee motivation and financial incentives. The research started off by exposing the complex relationship between money and motivation, showing how it has changed over time from being a basic need to a barometer of success. Leadership in organizations may benefit greatly from an understanding of the complex dynamics at each level of the hierarchy of demands, as it can help them create more effective motivating tactics. This study makes a substantial contribution by investigating task-relevant maturity (TRM) as a crucial factor affecting management styles. The study's focus on flexible methods emphasizes how crucial it is to match management philosophies with subordinates' changing total responsibility models (TRMs), so supporting the idea that there isn't a single leadership style that works for everyone. Acknowledging the similarities between parenting practices and management strategies, the research recommends cultivating a common set of corporate principles to enable efficient delegation and oversight. Through recognizing the dynamic nature of Total Resource Management (TRM) and appreciating the adaptability of management approaches, leaders may cultivate an atmosphere in the workplace where people are driven not just by monetary incentives but also by a feeling of accomplishment and personal growth. The foundation for developing a high-performance organizational culture that is sensitive to the many demands and developmental stages of its workforce is laid by this holistic approach to motivating.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Pahlevan Sharif and K. K. Yeoh, “Excessive social networking sites use and online compulsive buying in young adults: the mediating role of money attitude,” *Young Consum.*, 2018.

[2] F. Shahzad, G. Y. Xiu, J. Wang, and M. Shahbaz, “An empirical investigation on the adoption of cryptocurrencies among the people of mainland China,” *Technol. Soc.*, 2018.

[3] H. Pollitt and J. F. Mercure, “The role of money and the financial sector in energy-economy models used for assessing climate and energy policy,” *Clim. Policy*, 2018.

[4] S. A. Khan, M. Tariq, and B. Gul, “Estimating the role of money supply in determining aggregate investment in Pakistan,” *J. Appl. Econ. Bus. Stud.*, 2018.

[5] S. Sittlington and J. Harvey, “Prevention of money laundering and the role of asset recovery,” *Crime, Law Soc. Chang.*, 2018.

[6] L. Michelutti, “Parivar Raj (Rule of Family): The Role of Money and Force in the Making of Dynastic Authority,” *Stud. Indian Polit.*, 2018.

[7] G. Sasongko and A. D. Huruta, “Monetary policy and the causality between inflation and money supply in Indonesia,” *Bus. Theory Pract.*, 2018.

[8] Y. Mounk, “The undemocratic dilemma,” *J. Democr.*, 2018.

[9] C. W. Hsieh, “No One Can Serve Two Masters: Revisiting the Interaction Effect of Love of Money and Public Service Motivation on Job Satisfaction,” *Public Perform. Manag. Rev.*, 2018.

[10] N. Cika, S. Dhamo, and I. Tola, “The Role of Auditors Against Money Laundering-Albania Case,” *Eur. J. Econ. Bus. Stud.*, 2018.

[11] T. Abutaber, “The Role of Internal Audit function in the Public Sector,” *Basic Res. J. Bus. Manag. Accounts*, 2018.

[12] G. Okello Candiya Bongomin, J. M. Ntayi, J. C. Munene, and C. A. Malinga, “Mobile Money and Financial Inclusion in Sub-Saharan Africa: the Moderating Role of Social Networks,” *J. African Bus.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 11

CHALLENGES IN PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND FEEDBACK DELIVERY IN ORGANIZATIONAL SETTINGS

Dr Satyajeet Nanda, Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.satyajeetnanda@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The multifaceted challenges inherent in performance assessment and feedback delivery within organizational settings. The focus is primarily on the complexities faced by managers in determining and communicating task-relevant feedback to subordinates. The discussion encompasses issues related to task-relevant maturity (TRM) and the influence of personal preferences on managerial decision-making. It delves into the intricacies of self-perception among managers, emphasizing the often divergent views between superiors and subordinates regarding management styles. The narrative also addresses the impact of interpersonal relationships, both professional and personal, on the feedback process. The text underscores the critical role of performance reviews as a powerful mechanism for providing task-relevant feedback. It acknowledges the inherent difficulties in objectively assessing the performance of professionals and emphasizes the importance of clearly defining expectations. The concept of the managerial "black box" is introduced, illustrating the challenge of balancing output measures with internal activities in performance evaluations. Furthermore, the abstract delves into the complexities of delivering performance assessments, emphasizing the three L's – Level, Listen, and Leave Yourself Out. It highlights the significance of total listening to ensure effective communication during feedback sessions. Additionally, the text discusses the stages of problem-solving that managers and subordinates often traverse during a performance review, particularly in cases of significant performance issues.

KEYWORDS:

Employee Evaluation, Feedback Delivery, Performance Appraisal, Skill Gap, Stakeholder Expectations, Team Productivity.

INTRODUCTION

It's difficult to determine your subordinates' TRM. Furthermore, a manager's personal preferences often take precedence over the sensible and appropriate selection of management style, even if the manager is aware of the TRM. For example, a manager may choose the "structured" or "minimal" style in the real world, even if the manager observes that his subordinate's TRM is "medium. Put another way, we want to be totally involved in our subordinates' work, allowing them to make all of the choices, or we want to leave them alone and not disturb them at all. A manager's self-perception is another issue in this situation. More often than not, and definitely more than our subordinates do, we mistakenly believe that we are effective communicators and delegators. This claim was put to the test by having a group of managers evaluate the management style of their supervisors, and then asking those supervisors to rate their own style. Approximately 90% of the supervisors said that their approach was more communicative or delegative than what their subordinates thought. Why is there such a big difference? Part of the reason for this is because managers believe they are excellent delegators. However, there are instances when a boss makes recommendations to a subordinate who takes them as directives, which exacerbates the disparity in perspectives. A manager once informed me that since they went skiing and had drinks together, his supervisor clearly used an effective communication style with him. He was in error. A caring participation in the job of the subordinate is a communicative management style, which is quite different from a social interaction. Close ties outside of work may facilitate the development of comparable relationships inside the workplace, but they should not be mistaken [1], [2].

There was a supervisor-subordinate dynamic between two persons I knew. Every year, they went fishing in a distant location for a week by themselves. They never discussed work while fishing as it was generally accepted that work was off-limits to discourse. Strangely enough, their personal connection had no impact on their professional relationship, which remained aloof. This brings up the age-old debate over the value of friendship between a boss and a subordinate. Unhesitatingly, some managers claim that they never let their employees form social bonds with one another. Here, there are, in reality, benefits and drawbacks. The supervisor can more readily switch to a communicative management style if the subordinate is a personal friend, but it is more difficult to go back to the what-when-how mode when needed. Giving a buddy directions is not fun. A supervisor has had to walk a fine line with a subordinate on many occasions, in my observation. In one instance, the supervisor's action ended a friendship; in another, the subordinate thought that the supervisor was protecting his (the subordinate's) professional interests because of the depth of the social connection [3], [4].

Individuals are required to determine what is suitable and professional in this situation. One way to assess yourself may be to picture yourself giving your buddy a critical performance evaluation. Does the idea make you shudder? If so, avoid forming friendships at work. You are probably the kind of person whose interpersonal connections will improve your professional relationships if your stomach stays untouched. Lastly, I invited the same group to consider some of their past performance reports and inquired as to what, if anything, was lacking from them.

Their responses were many and prompt: too generic contradictory signals in the review comments (inconsistent with the rating or dollar boost) and no suggestions for how to improve the negatives avoided supervisor was unaware of my work; only my most recent performance was taken aback. This should indicate to you that conducting performance evaluations is an extremely difficult and complex task, and that managers generally execute a mediocre job at it.

The truth is that doing these evaluations is the most significant kind of task-relevant feedback supervisors can provide. It is the process by which we evaluate the performance of each of our subordinates and provide the results to them one-on-one. It also refers to how we distribute the benefits, which might be cash, stock options, promotions, or whatever else we want. As previously seen, an evaluation may have a lasting impact on a subordinate's performance, either favorably or unfavorably, making it one of the manager's most powerful tools. To put it simply, the review is a very potent tool, thus it seems sense that people have strong, differing views about it. Additionally, the most formalized form of institutionalized leadership is represented by the review process. This is the one and only occasion when a manager is obliged to serve as both judge and jury. Our employer requires us to render a decision on one of our employees and to present that decision to him directly. Here, a supervisor has an obviously huge obligation. How well-prepared are we to do this task? The only thing that comes to mind is that we have experienced receiving as subordinates.

Generally speaking, however, our culture emphasizes avoiding conflict. Even the term "argument" is taboo, as I discovered many years ago when I first immigrated to this nation from Hungary. A conflict of opinion is often described as an "argument" in Hungarian. As I started learning English and started using the term "argument," People would correct me by saying things like, "Oh no, you don't mean 'argument,' you mean 'debate,'" or "you mean 'discussion.'" You should never discuss politics, religion, or anything else that might lead to disagreements and conflicts with friends or peers. Gardening, football results, and weather are all good. It is instilled in us that polite people avoid potentially delicate situations. The argument is that, considering both our cultural upbringing and our professional education, giving a decent performance evaluation is really a special act.

Never consider that only huge companies should conduct performance evaluations. All types and sizes of businesses, from the insurance agent with two helpers to the administrators in the government, charity, and educational sectors, should include them into their management practices. To put it simply, performance assessments are a must if penetrance matters in your company. Evaluating performance and presenting the evaluation are the two equally challenging parts of the review. Let us examine each one a bit more closely [5], [6].

Evaluating Work Performance

It is very difficult to determine a professional employee's performance in a strictly objective manner because most jobs involve activities that are not reflected in output during the review period. This means that there is no clear-cut way to measure and characterize a professional employee's work completely. Since only output can be assessed with genuine objectivity, we must still give such activities the proper weight when evaluating a person's performance, even if we are aware that we won't always be objective.

Therefore, anybody who oversees professionals must balance being objective with exercising judgment—judgment is, by definition, subjective—without being too cautious. To make an evaluation easier, a supervisor should first clarify in his own mind what he expects from a subordinate and then try to determine whether or not he performed up to par. The main issue with most evaluations is that, as was previously said, we seldom specify exactly what we want from our subordinates, and if we don't know what we want, we won't receive it.

Recall our earlier discussion of the management black box. We can use it to describe performance using both internal and output measurements. The first is the black box's output, and it includes things we can and should plot on charts, such finishing designs, hitting sales targets, or raising yields in manufacturing processes. The internal measurements include everything that happens inside the "black box," including the work that is done to produce output for the period that is being reviewed as well as work that lays the groundwork for output in future periods. Are we meeting our production targets at this rate that, in three months, we won't be surprised by a bunch of unhappy workers? Are we assigning and training employees in a manner that will enable our company to carry out its duties going forward? Are we carrying out all the necessary tasks for a well-functioning department? We cannot compare the relative importance of internal and output metrics using a rigid formula. The appropriate weighting in a particular scenario may be 50/50, 90/10, or 10/90, and it may even change from month to month. However, we need to be aware of which two variables are being sacrificed in order to get the other. Here, too, a comparable trade-off has to be taken into account: balancing performance that is short-term focused versus that that is long-term focused. In order to make money, an engineer working on a product's design must finish the job on time. It's possible that he's developing a design process that will facilitate the creation of comparable items by others in the future. Time is another important consideration. The subordinate's actions during the same time may or may not be related to his production during the review period. As a consequence, the supervisor has to consider the time difference between the subordinate's action and the output that comes from it. I'll try to clarify what I mean since I had to learn this lesson the hard way. One of the managers who reports to me had an outstanding year for their company. Sales went up, profit margins were strong, and the items performed flawlessly. It was almost impossible to give the person in charge anything less than a five-star assessment. Still, I was a little hesitant.

His group's turnover was greater than it ought to have been, and his colleagues were complaining much too much. There were other such straws in the wind, but who was to believe in phantom signals when the performance was so palpably real and quantifiable? Thus, the manager received a glowing evaluation. The next year, his organization had a sharp decline. Product development was postponed, sales growth vanished, profitability fell, and discord among his staff members intensified. I was having trouble figuring out what had transpired as I was getting ready for this manager's next evaluation. Did the manager's performance decline as quickly as his company's production metrics said it would? What was happening? While everything seemed to be going to hell in the second year, I came to the conclusion that the manager's performance was really getting better. The issue stemmed from the fact that he had not performed well the year before. The output indicators simply showed the durability of labor that had been completed years earlier—the light from far-off stars, if you will. The manager's labor and his organization's production were separated by slightly over a year. Feeling very ashamed, I realized with remorse that my higher grade of him was entirely inaccurate. Notwithstanding the outstanding production indicators that did not accurately represent the year under review, I should have had the wisdom and guts to give the management a much worse rating than I did since I trusted the internal measurements.

It is also possible for the time difference between an action and its outcome to be reversed. I was asked to evaluate the work of a subordinate who was starting from scratch to build up a manufacturing plant early in Intel's history. Although it hadn't produced anything yet, the review naturally couldn't wait for noticeable results. I had never before been in charge of someone without a track record of tangible results. Even though the output was still unclear, I gave my subordinate credit for doing well in this instance. In reality, managers are expected to evaluate employee performance not merely to notice and document it when it is obvious [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

These kinds of queries and assessments will be the most challenging when evaluating a professional's work. A major hazard to be wary of is the "potential trap." You should always push yourself to evaluate actual results rather than potential. A general manager whose supervisor gave him an excellent annual performance rating requested me to endorse his performance evaluation; by "potential" I mean form rather than content. The company unit under the manager's supervision had financial losses, consistently failed to meet revenue targets, experienced delays in engineering schedules, and demonstrated poor performance in internal metrics during the whole year. I was unable to approve the review as a result. His boss then said, "But he is an exceptional general manager." He is intelligent and has a good self-death. The manager did not do well; it was his organization that did!" This didn't sit well with me since a manager's performance grade can never be greater than the one that his company would get! Evaluating actual performance as opposed to looks or excellent form—is crucial. If the manager had received a high rating, Intel would have sent a message to everyone else in the organization that, in order to succeed, one just has to "act" and speak like a good manager not necessarily operate like one.

Promotion decisions are, rightfully, often influenced by performance reviews. It is important to acknowledge that a manager's decision on who to promote speaks louder and more clearly to the company about his principles than any other activity. We are essentially setting an example for others in our business when we elevate someone. According to an ancient proverb, "we ruin a good salesman and get a bad manager when we promote our best salesman and make him a manager." However, when we give it some thought, we realize that we are forced to support the successful salesperson. Should our least talented salesperson be hired? We communicate to our subordinates that performance is what matters when we encourage our best efforts. Evaluating our subordinates' performance is challenging enough, but we also need to work on making it better. Regardless of how well a subordinate performs, there is always room for development, and a manager should not feel ashamed to make such suggestions. With the benefit of 20/20 hindsight, we can assess how well the subordinate performed in comparison to his potential, and the difference may help us both go forward with future plans [9], [10].

Performing the Evaluation

When presenting a review, have the following three L's in mind: Level up, pay attention, and distance yourself. The legitimacy and integrity of the whole system rely on you being completely honest, thus you have to be on the same level as your subordinate. And don't be shocked if you discover that giving someone direct praise may be just as difficult as criticizing him without feeling ashamed. Here, the term "listen" has a particular connotation. Transmitting ideas from person A's brain to person B's brain is the goal of communication. First, ideas in A's mind are translated into words, which are then articulated and travel to B's ear as sound waves. There, they go to B's brain as nerve impulses, where they are likely stored and then changed back into thoughts. Is it appropriate for someone to utilize a tape recorder to verify the terms used in the review? Without a doubt, the answer is no. Speaking is just a means to an end; conveying the correct idea is the goal. Maybe B has become so upset that he is unable to comprehend something that would be obvious to everyone else. Maybe B is too busy trying to think of responses to really listen and understand what A is saying. Maybe B has given up and is considering going fishing as a kind of protection. All of these scenarios are real and possible, made more so by the contradiction in A's statement.

So, how do you know whether you are really being heard? What methods are you able to use? Is having your subordinate rephrase your words sufficient? Not in my opinion. The thing you have to do is use every sense that you possess. You should monitor the person you are speaking with to make sure you are being heard. Recall that communication is more likely to be lost in complicated issues. Does your subordinate respond appropriately to your statements? Is he letting himself get your message? It is your duty to persist until you are confident that what you have said has been heard and understood if his answers, both verbal and nonverbal, do not fully reassure you that it has. Using all of your senses to ensure that your points are understood correctly by your subordinate's brain is what I mean when I say that you are listening. If this doesn't happen, all the knowledge and effort you put into preparing your review will be in vain. Again, complete listening is your tool. Effective classroom teachers all operate in similar ways. He can tell whether his pupils are understanding what he is saying. If not, he pays attention and clarifies things once again or in a new manner. We've all had lecturers who avoided making direct eye contact with the class in favor of staring at the whiteboard and talking to it. The explanation is that these professors avoided visually confirming what they already knew by averting their gaze from their audience, aware that their presentation was unclear and difficult to understand. Therefore, avoid being like your worst teachers while giving performance evaluations. Make every effort to ensure that your subordinate is hearing your message, and keep communicating until you are certain that he is.

"Leave yourself out." is the third letter. It is critical that you realize the purpose of the performance review is to evaluate your subordinate. Therefore, you should avoid discussing your own fears, worries, guilt, or anything else. It's the subordinate's day in court, and the issues at hand are theirs, not the supervisor's. Similar to performers experiencing stage fright, anybody asked to evaluate someone else's performance is likely to feel strongly both before and during the critique. No matter how many evaluations you've provided, these feelings will still surface, therefore you should try to keep them under control so they don't interfere with your job [11], [12].

The important thing to remember is that your subordinate, like most individuals, has a limited amount of time to process information. Even if you know seven facts about his performance, you will be wasting your breath on the other three if he can only handle four. In the worst scenario, he'll leave with a case of sensory overload and not learn anything from the session. A person can only take in so much information at once, particularly when it pertains to his own performance. The goal of the evaluation is to enhance your subordinate's performance, not to purge your system of every fact you may have seen about him. In this case, less really may be more. Start by taking into account as many facets of your subordinate's work as you can. Documents like progress reports, performance versus quarterly goals, and notes from one-on-one meetings should be skimmed over. Next, take a seat and a blank sheet of paper. Put everything you think about your subordinate's performance down on paper. Don't make mental edits. Write everything down, keeping in mind that doing so does not obligate you to take any action. There is no set sequence in which to incorporate important, minor, or insignificant items. You can save all of your supporting paperwork whenever you run out of things.

Now, use your worksheet to find connections between the different objects on it. You'll undoubtedly start to realize that some things are just various ways that the same event is manifested, and that there could be some clues as to why a certain strength or weakness arises. Once you identify these connections, you can begin referring to them as "messages" for the subordinate. Your worksheet at this stage may resemble the one on the next page. Now, using your worksheet once again, start drawing conclusions and providing details to back them up. After you've collected your list of communications, make sure your subordinate can recall every message you've decided to convey.

The Explosion

You could discover that you have a serious performance issue if you do some introspection. If this subordinate doesn't change, he or she may lose their job. You and your subordinate will probably go through phases that are typical of problem-solving in general and conflict resolution in particular in order to address the issue. You may find them on page 194. These will undoubtedly take place during and maybe even after the "blast" evaluation, which is essentially a conflict-resolution exercise centered on a significant performance issue.

An underperformer's strong inclination is to overlook his issue. In order to prove its veracity, a manager in this situation requires facts and instances. When the subordinate actively disputes the problem's existence as opposed to previously disregarding it passively, some progress is achieved. We now approach the third stage, when the subordinate acknowledges that there is a problem but insists it is not his responsibility. Evidence may also overcome resistance in this situation. Rather, he will place the responsibility elsewhere—a common defensive tactic. By using this strategy, he may keep evading accountability and the weight of fixing the problem.

The phases of resolving issues

Making the emotional shift from assigning blame to taking ownership of one's actions is necessary. Usually, these three procedures come one after the other somewhat quickly. However, things often get stuck when people start blaming others. If your subordinate is having issues, he won't be able to fix them if he keeps blaming others for them. The most important action that he has to do is accept responsibility. Not only must he acknowledge the existence of the issue, but also that it is his own. This is crucial since it implies labor: "If it's my fault, I need to take action. In the event that I must take action, it will probably be unpleasant and require a lot of effort on my side." However, once accountability is taken, figuring out the remedy is not too difficult. This is due to the fact that accepting responsibility and moving on from there are two different processes: emotional and intellectual. While accepting responsibility and moving on to solving the problem is a simpler process.

Recompense as Task-Related Input

In Maslow's hierarchy of needs, money is important at every level. As was previously said, a person's physiological and safety/security demands include the purchase of food, shelter, and insurance policies, all of which need money. Money starts to imply something different as one climbs the need hierarchy a gauge of one's value in a cutthroat market. I previously discussed a quick test that may be used to ascertain how much of a part money plays in an individual's life. If the precise amount of a pay increase matters, the individual is most often driven by physiological or security/safety requirements. Since money is only a measure and not a requirement in this context, the individual in question is probably driven by self-actualization if the significance of his raise how much more than others is what matters most. An additional quantity of money will progressively have less and less tangible usefulness for the recipient at increasing pay levels. According to my observations, middle managers are typically compensated enough to ensure that money is not a significant material factor for them, but not so little that it is unimportant. Naturally, a middle manager may have quite different demands from another based on their unique situation number of kids, whether or not their spouse works, and so on. As a manager, you must be empathetic and very attentive to the different financial demands of your staff members. You have to take extra care not to put other people through your difficulties.

As managers, our goal is to have our staff members perform at a high standard. Therefore, in order to provide task-relevant feedback, we want to distribute, assign, and spend money. Pay should clearly be based on performance in order to do this, but as we've shown, this is very difficult to measure accurately. A middle manager's role cannot be characterized by basic production since he is not paid by the piece. Furthermore, it is difficult to create a compensation plan that is directly linked to a middle manager's individual success since his performance is intertwined with the team's performance.

However, concessions may be made. The pay of a middle manager may be determined in part by his performance. I will refer to this as a performance bonus. A manager's bonus portion of total remuneration should increase as their overall salary rises. Therefore, the performance incentive for a highly compensated senior manager—for whom the absolute amount means relatively little—should be as high as fifty percent, while the bonus for a middle manager—who is paid less—should be closer to ten to twenty-five percent of his entire remuneration. Though his work is usually at a level where significant changes might result in personal misery, we can provide some task-relevant feedback.

CONCLUSION

Managing the terrain of performance evaluation and feedback distribution in corporate environments is a difficult and multifaceted undertaking, full with obstacles that go beyond simple assessments. This investigation has shown a number of crucial factors that influence how task-relevant feedback functions inside the organizational structure. The difficulties stem from the fact that it is inherently difficult to evaluate professionals' work objectively, particularly in positions where output is entwined with internal procedures. The idea of the management "black box" emphasizes the careful balancing act necessary when assessing the actions that underpin future performance as well as the observable outcomes. Clarity in establishing performance criteria is crucial because the vagueness of expectations creates an additional layer of complication. In addition, the way managers and subordinates interact with one another is crucial to the feedback process. Disparities in self-perception and interpersonal connections may lead to differing opinions about management methods, which can affect how successful performance reviews are. Since good feedback is a two-way process, the three L's—Level, Listen, and Leave Yourself Out—underline the need of open communication and attentive listening during feedback sessions.

REFERENCES:

[1] N. Lehmann-Willenbrock and J. A. Allen, "Modeling Temporal Interaction Dynamics in Organizational Settings," *J. Bus. Psychol.*, 2018.

[2] V. Zerjav, A. Edkins, and A. Davies, "Project capabilities for operational outcomes in inter-organisational settings: The case of London Heathrow Terminal 2," *Int. J. Proj. Manag.*, 2018.

[3] M. Talukder, A. Quazi, and D. Djatikusumol, "Social media and SMEs: A study of drivers of adoption of innovation in organizational setting," *J. Electron. Commer. Organ.*, 2018.

[4] M. H. Bond and P. B. Smith, "Discovering Culture's Influence in Studies of Individual Behavior in Organizational Settings: A Challenging Proposal," *Int. Stud. Manag. Organ.*, 2018.

[5] D. Louis and P. Fatien Diochon, "The coaching space: A production of power relationships in organizational settings," *Organization*, 2018.

[6] C. Moeller, N. King, V. Burr, G. R. Gibbs, and T. Gomersall, "Nature-based interventions in institutional and organisational settings: a scoping review," *Int. J. Environ. Health Res.*, 2018.

[7] S. B. Madsen and V. Burau, "Relational coordination in inter-organizational settings. How does lack of proximity affect coordination between hospital-based and community-based healthcare providers?," *Int. J. Integr. Care*, 2018.

[8] B. McKenna, D. Finamore, E. Valerie Hewitt, L. Watson, L. A. Millam, and M. Reinhardt, "The effect of a multifactor orientation on student performance: organizational skills, goal setting, orientation to classroom, and academic support," *Online Learn. J.*, 2018.

[9] D. Naicker and S. B. Parumasur, "The Prevalence and Magnitude of Social Loafing, and Biographical Influences, in a Team - Based Organizational Setting," *J. Econ. Behav. Stud.*, 2018.

[10] D. F. Gucciardi *et al.*, "The emergence of team resilience: A multilevel conceptual model of facilitating factors," *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.*, 2018.

[11] J. L. Pierce, I. Jussila, and D. Li, "Development and validation of an instrument for assessing collective psychological ownership in organizational field settings," *Journal of Management and Organization*. 2018.

[12] I. Hwang and O. Cha, "Examining technostress creators and role stress as potential threats to employees' information security compliance," *Comput. Human Behav.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 12

MANAGER'S ROLE IN TRAINING: LEVERAGING PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT THROUGH PERSONAL INSTRUCTION

Dr. Vinayak Anil Bhat, Associate Professor
Department of OB & HR, Centre for Management Studies, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- vinayak_ab@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The challenges and considerations involved in designing a performance bonus scheme within organizations. The key issues revolve around determining the linkage of performance to either individual work or team efforts, specifying the composition of teams, establishing the time period for bonus assessment, and deciding on the criteria for bonus determination. The paragraph also highlights the complexity of balancing countable items, measurable objectives, and subjective elements in bonus calculations. Additionally, it emphasizes the importance of avoiding overly generous schemes that might conflict with the financial health of the company. The discussion concludes by acknowledging that while no bonus system is perfect, most arrangements effectively spotlight performance and provide relevant feedback. The subsequent shift to the administration of base salaries introduces two extreme approaches – experience-only and merit-only – with the acknowledgment that a compromise between the two is commonly adopted by organizations. The narrative touches upon the challenges associated with merit-based systems, such as the need for competitive evaluations, and emphasizes the importance of promotions based on performance to sustain a culture of excellence within an organization. The Peter Principle is introduced as a consideration in promotions, highlighting the phenomenon where individuals are promoted until they reach a level of incompetence. The paragraph concludes by underscoring the responsibility of managers to provide honest performance ratings and merit-based compensation, fostering a culture that values and encourages performance throughout the organization.

KEYWORDS:

Coaching, Employee Development, Instructional Leadership, Managerial Role, Personalized Training, Skill Enhancement.

INTRODUCTION

We have to address a number of concerns in order to create a successful performance incentive program. We must determine if the performance is mostly due to individual effort or whether it is associated with a team. Who comprises the team if the former is the case? Is it the whole company, a division, or a project team? The duration of the performance bonus must also be determined. It is important to keep in mind that cause and effect sometimes take a long time to balance out, but a bonus must be given soon enough after the task is completed for the subordinate to recall why it was given. In addition, we need to consider whether the bonus should be determined just by countable factors (such financial success), by reaching quantifiable goals, or by some subjective factors that may lead to a beauty pageant. Ultimately, it goes without saying that we don't want to design something that generously rewards users even while the business falters. You will probably come up with some intricate layouts if you consider all of this. For instance, you may have a plan where a manager receives a performance bonus determined by three criteria. The first would just feature his supervisor's assessment of his individual performance. The second would take his department's or his immediate team's objective performance into consideration. The corporation's total financial success would be related to the third element. Even if each component—let's take 20% of a manager's remuneration and divide it into three—will very slightly affect overall compensation, its importance will still be highlighted. Whatever method you decide on, not every bonuses will offer you precisely what you want, but the majority will highlight performance and provide feedback pertinent to the work at hand. Now let's examine basic salary administration. There are two methods to accomplish it in the abstract. At one extreme, merit alone determines the dollar level; at the other, experience alone. Under the experience-only method, a worker's pay rises in proportion to how long he has held a certain post. An important thing to remember is that every job has a maximum value; as the figure on the next page illustrates, an employee's pay must eventually level off regardless of how long they have held the position. The merit-only method does not take into account the length of employment. According to this view, it makes no difference whether you have twenty years of professional experience or are a year out of college. All that matters to me is how well you do this work. Naturally, a certain job still has a maximum value in this situation as well. We may be forced into unfavorable compensating methods by social standards. For example, even when we, as managers, maintain a policy of routinely providing increases, we often allow a person to become overpaid despite the fact that every job has a limited value at which remuneration should level out. There are two distinct ways to administer salaries; most businesses choose a middle ground [1], [2].

Pay administration in many firms is based solely on experience. The first 10 or so years of work are usually the most productive of a professional's life, yet large Japanese organizations have a tendency to make no differentiation based on performance during this time. Similarly, most government positions and unions tend to have wage scales that are solely based on experience. Performance doesn't really important, according to management, regardless of whether this is fair or not. Think about educators in various educational systems. If two people have been in the same position for the same amount of time, the good one is paid the same as the bad one. It is unusual for a teacher's evaluation to be even loosely connected to pay, which begs the question of whether the pass/fail grading system did not originate from the way the average instructor gets compensated [3], [4].

However, in its purest form, merit-only wage administration is unworkable. When you're trying to offer someone a fair compensation, it might be difficult to overlook their experience. As a result, the majority of businesses decide to follow a middle path that strikes a compromise and resembles the family of curves shown in the preceding image. They all roughly follow the curve that represents the experience-only method, but as you can see, based on individual performance, individuals advance at various rates and end up in different locations even if they all start at the same income level. The experience-only method is by far the simplest to implement out of the three. All you need to do if your subordinate is unhappy with his rise is show him the book that states that he is entitled to Y amount of salary for X amount of time spent on the job. A supervisor must cope with the distribution of a scarce resource—money—while attempting to oversee a merit-based or compromise program. This needs careful consideration and work. If we want to implement such programs, we must accept the notion—which many managers find unsettling—that any merit-based system necessitates a comparable, competitive assessment of each person.

Simply said, merit-based pay cannot function until we acknowledge that if one person is going to be first, someone else must be last. In a sporting event, Americans accept a competitive rating without issue. The structure that dictates who must finish last makes even the last place finisher in a race feel at ease. However, in the workplace, competitive ranking sadly often turns into a contentious problem that is hard to handle but necessary if we wish to utilize pay as a performance-enhancing tool.

Promotions, which are characterized as a significant shift in an individual's role, are crucial to the success of any firm and should be carefully evaluated. Of course, promotions often result in a sizable pay increase for the person receiving them. As we have seen, promotions play a crucial role in conveying a company's values to its whole workforce since they are easily visible to other members of the business. The principle of performance must be emphasized, maintained, and perpetuated, and promotions must be granted based on performance. The Peter Principle, which states that a person who performs well at work is promoted and remains there until he hits a certain degree of ineptitude, must be taken into consideration while discussing promotions. This caricature, like all good ones, accurately depicts certain aspects of what really occurs in a merit-based promotion system [5], [6].

Look at the example below, where we are tracking the promotions of individuals. At point A, he is so exhausted by Job 1's demands that he can only function mediocrely. To use performance evaluation language, he "meets the requirements" of the position. He gains more training and motivation over time, which enhances his performance to an above-average level—or, to use more technical terms, to the point where he "exceeds the requirements" of the role. We now see this individual as promotable, and we really do promote him to Job 2, where he will initially only function at a level that "meets requirements." He will once again "exceed the requirements" of the position because of his increased experience. He will most likely be promoted once again in the end, and the cycle will continue. Consequently, over his career, an achiever will alternate between receiving ratings of "meets requirements" and "exceeds requirements," until him ultimately settles at a "meets requirements" level, at which point he will no longer be promoted. This may provide a clearer explanation of the Peter Principle's operation. Throughout his career, an achiever will alternate between receiving "meets requirements" and "exceeds requirements" evaluations. Is there a better option than this now? I assert that there isn't. We are not making the most of a corporate human resource if we take someone at point B and don't provide him further work and larger challenges even if he "exceeds the requirements" of Job 1. He will eventually atrophy to the point where his performance "meets requirements" and remains there.

Consequently, there are two main categories of "meets" performers. There is neither a challenge nor a drive to perform more. This person, who is no longer in competition, is content and at ease in his position. The competitor is another kind of "meets" performance. Upon reaching a certain level of performance, he is eligible for advancement each time. He most likely returns to being a "meets" performer after receiving a promotion. This is the individual about whom Dr. Peter wrote. But until a certain point of "incompetence," we are essentially forced to promote. At the very least, in this manner, we motivate our employees to perform better; even while they may only perform at a "meets" level 50% of the time, they will do this at a progressively harder and more demanding work level.

Sometimes someone is promoted into a role that is so far over their head that they perform below average for an excessive amount of time. Repurposing him to do the same duties he performed so well prior to his promotion is the answer. Regretfully, in our culture, this is a very difficult thing to achieve. Most people consider it to be a personal failing. Actually, it was management's error to have misjudged the worker's preparedness for increased responsibilities. Instead of being encouraged to regress, the worker who was promoted above his capacity is often forced to quit the organization. The argument that "It is better that we let him go, for his own sake" is often used to justify this. I believe that forcing someone to leave the firm under such circumstances is morally repugnant. Rather, I believe that management should own up to its own mistake in judgment and make a conscious effort to put the individual in a position that suits him. The employee is likely to feel embarrassed, therefore management should help him through it. Everyone will be pleasantly surprised by how quickly that humiliation fades if recycling is done in an open manner. And the end product will be someone doing tasks that we know he can do well based on prior experience. According to my observations, once they get their confidence back, these individuals are great candidates for a further promotion—and they will probably succeed the second time around. All things considered, it is our duty as managers to be accountable and to provide our staff members fair performance reviews and merit-based pay. If we do, the end effect will be that performance will be appreciated across our business for its own reason [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

My spouse and I just made the decision to go out to supper. The reservationist on the phone seemed agitated, but she quickly admitted that she was inexperienced and didn't know everything. Whatever, we had a reservation. We soon discovered that the restaurant had lost its liquor license and that, should they choose to, customers should bring their own wine when we arrived for supper. He said, "Weren't you told this on the phone when you made your reservations?" while the maître d' was massaging his hands. I watched him go through the same motions with each group he sat as we enjoyed our supper without alcohol. I'm not certain, but it's probably safe to assume that no one told the lady answering phones to let prospective visitors know what was going on. Instead, due to a single employee's lack of training, the maître d' had to endure a series of incompetent apologies and no wine was served. When an individual receives inadequate training, the repercussions might be even more dire. One of our advanced manufacturing machines, an ion implanter, at a silicon fabrication factory, for example, wandered slightly out of tune in one of our incidents at Intel. Like the lady at the restaurant, the machine operator was rather young. She had received training in the fundamentals of operating the equipment, but not in identifying the warning indications of an out-of-tune situation. Thus, she kept running the machine and put almost a day's worth of nearly finished silicon wafers through improper machine settings. Over a million dollars' worth of material had gone through the machine by the time the problem was detected, and it had to be discarded. Deliveries to our clients slowed down, which made the issue worse since it takes more than two weeks to make up for such a loss with new material. These kinds of situations happen much too often in the world of business. Despite their best efforts, undertrained staff members result in inefficiencies, excessive expenses, disgruntled clients, and sometimes even hazardous circumstances. The manager who encounters these issues quickly realizes how important training is.

The more difficult question could be who should do the training for the manager who is already overbooked. The majority of managers seem to believe that training staff members is a task best left to others, maybe training experts. However, I firmly feel that the management need to handle it themselves. Let me explain why, starting with what I think is the simplest notion of what a manager should be able to do. A manager's production, in my opinion, is the output of his company—neither more nor less. Inspiring greater production from his team is thus essential to a manager's own productivity. Generally speaking, a manager may improve his subordinates' individual performance in two ways: first, by boosting motivation, or each person's desire to execute his work effectively; second, by boosting individual competence, which is where training comes in. It is widely acknowledged that one of a manager's most important responsibilities that cannot be outsourced is inspiring their team. Why shouldn't this also apply to the other primary tools that managers have at their disposal to boost productivity?

To put it simply, one of the most powerful things a manager can do is provide training. For a brief period, imagine that you could give your department's members a four-part lecture series. We should budget three hours for preparation for every hour of class time, or a total of twelve hours of labor. Let's say your class consists of 10 pupils. They will put in around twenty thousand hours of effort for your company in the next year. Your organization will earn the equivalent of two hundred hours of labor from your twelve hours of training if your efforts result in a 1 percent increase in your subordinates' performance. Naturally, this is supposing that the training will appropriately cover the knowledge that students need to do their tasks more effectively. This isn't always the case, especially when it comes to "canned courses" that are taught by outsiders. Effective training must have a strong connection to the day-to-day operations of your company [9], [10].

At Intel, a course on career development was recently presented by several outside consultants. Their method was very scholarly and disciplined, and it differed greatly from anything the corporation used. Although they promoted multi-year career plans and meticulously planned job rotations based on them, our practice has been more akin to a free market: our staff members are aware of available positions within the organization and are expected to apply for positions they find appealing on their own initiative. The participants were somewhat disheartened due to the discrepancy between the material covered in the course and their actual practice. Additionally, training must continue to be dependable and constant in order to be successful. Instead of being called in to address an emergency, employees should be able to rely on something planned and methodical. Put otherwise, training ought to be a process rather than a one-time thing.

It is obvious that the manager is the one conducting the training if you believe that motivation and training work together to improve your subordinates' performance. You also need to believe that training should be an ongoing process rather than a one-time occurrence and that what you teach must be closely related to what you practice. You should provide guidance to those who report directly to you as well as the people a few levels below them. The supervisors at every level below your subordinates should also follow suit.

There's another reason: only you are qualified to serve as your subordinates' instructor. Training has to be conducted by someone who is a good role model. Proxies cannot take on that function, regardless of how knowledgeable they may be about the issue. It is important for the individual in front of the class to be seen as a credible, experienced expert on the material being taught. At Intel, we think that training is a valuable activity for all employees, from the CEO to the first-line supervisor. We spend between two and four percent of our workers' time in the classroom, where our own management staff members do the majority of the education.

Our "university catalogue" has more than fifty course listings. The courses cover everything from polite conversation to highly technical production courses. For example, learning how to operate an ion implanter correctly takes almost two hundred hours of on-the-job training—nearly five times the amount of training required to obtain a private pilot's license. Our manager’s get training in areas like strategic planning and the art of constructive confrontation—a method of problem-solving that Intel values highly. Among the courses I've taught personally are ones on creating and delivering performance evaluations, running effective meetings, and giving a three-hour overview of Intel during which I go over our goals, organization, history, and management styles. I have granted the latter to a significant number of our professional staff members throughout the years. I've been asked to cover extra material in several management courses as well. (I apologize that I am no longer qualified to teach technical material.

We differentiate between two distinct training jobs at Intel. Teaching new hires the skills they need to do their jobs is our organization's first duty. Teaching new concepts, ideas, or abilities to our organization's current members is the second responsibility. The need of distinguishing between new-skill and new-employee training stems from the stark differences in job sizing. The amount of new hires entering the company determines how big the task of conducting a new employee orientation is. For example, a department with ten percent yearly turnover and ten percent annual growth must annually train twenty percent of its employees on the fundamentals of their jobs. It might be quite difficult to train even 20% of your staff.

It's a far greater task to teach new concepts or abilities to a whole department. The work of training every member of our staff within a year will be five times larger than the yearly effort of training the twenty percent of new members. I just looked at how much it would cost to provide our middle-management workers a new one-day training. Just the kids' time cost more than a million dollars. It goes without saying that one should not take up such a responsibility carelessly. So, if you believe in the gospel of training, what are your next steps? Make a list of the items you believe your department's members or subordinates need to be taught on as a starting point. Don't restrict what is on your list. Items should include anything from seemingly simple (like educating the restaurant phone operator) to more ambitious and all-encompassing (like your departments, plant's, and company's value systems and goals). Find out what your employees think they need by asking them. They could inform you of requirements you were unaware of, which will probably surprise you [11], [12].

After completing this, make a list of the manager-teachers and training resources that may be used to assist in providing training on the topics on your list. Next, order these things according to priority. Start extremely modest, especially if you haven't done this kind of thing before. For example, create a single, three- to four-lecture course on the most pressing topic. You'll discover that abilities you've had for years—things you could almost do in your sleep—are much more difficult to articulate than to put into practice. You could discover that in your endeavor to clarify, you'll find yourself drawn to provide more and more background information, to the point where it starts to take away from the course's initial goal.

Establish a timetable for your course, complete with deadlines, and dedicate yourself to it to prevent yourself from being bogged down in the challenging process of course preparation. Make a course outline, work on the first lecture alone, then proceed. After delivering the first lecture, work on the second one. Think of your first teaching of the course as a one-time thing; it won't be wonderful because, despite your best efforts, you'll have to go through one version that won't be. Accept that the first attempt will inevitably be inadequate rather than dwelling on it and see it as a step toward a more successful second attempt. Teach this course to your more informed subordinates so that your first try doesn't go wrong. They won't be bewildered by it and will help you improve the course via discussion and criticism.

As you prepare for your second try, ask yourself one last thing: Can you personally educate every member of your organization? Will it take ten or twenty courses, or will you be able to cover everyone in one or two? Set yourself up to train a few teachers with your initial set of lectures if your company is big enough to need many repeats of your course before diverse audiences. Ask the staff members in your class to provide anonymous feedback after you've taught the course. Provide a form that prompts them with both open-ended and numerical rating questions. Take a look at the replies and keep in mind that you will never be able to satisfy every student in your class; common criticisms include that the material covered in the course was either too in-depth or too surface level, or it was about the perfect amount of both. Your ultimate goal should be to feel satisfied with yourself for completing the tasks you set out to do. You'll learn some fascinating things if this is your first time teaching: It takes effort to train.

It's challenging to prepare lectures and prepare oneself to answer every question that comes up. You will be shocked at how little you know, even if you have been performing your work for a long time and have completed the tasks of your subordinates in great detail in the past. Remain optimistic—this is normal. Teaching a task involves much more in-depth understanding of it than just doing it. Try teaching someone how to drive a stick-shift automobile over the phone if you don't think I'm telling the truth. The clarity with which building it enhanced your comprehension of your own work probably justified the effort in and of itself. You'll discover that the training process is nothing short of thrilling when things go according to plan. The nice sensation you will have when you see a subordinate putting what you have taught him into practice will surpass even this rush of excitement. Savor the excitement and warmth; it will better prepare you for the second meal.

CONCLUSION

The story emphasizes how important managers are to training as a high-leverage endeavor to improve organizational performance. The discourse highlights the clear correlation between a manager's productivity and that of their team, underscoring the need of enhancing individual performance via drive and aptitude. Because they are a practical, reputable authority, managers are seen as the most effective instructors and training is positioned as a crucial instrument for enhancing individual capabilities. The paragraph explores the practical elements of putting training efforts into action, emphasizing the difficulties and benefits that come with the process. It makes the claim that training ought to be a continuous, methodical process rather than a one-time occurrence that is carefully catered to the unique requirements and procedures of the company. The conclusion issues a call to action for managers, asking them to accept training as a necessary component of their duties and cultivate an environment that values ongoing education and performance enhancement throughout the whole company.

REFERENCES:

[1] L. Wang, H. Tao, B. J. Bowers, R. Brown, and Y. Zhang, "When nurse emotional intelligence matters: How transformational leadership influences intent to stay," *J. Nurs. Manag.*, 2018.

[2] K. Wynia, R. J. Uittenbroek, S. F. van der Mei, K. Slotman, and S. A. Reijneveld, "Experiences of case managers in providing person-centered and integrated care based on the Chronic Care Model: A qualitative study on embrace," *PLoS One*, 2018.

[3] M. T. Del Val Núñez, F. J. C. Romero, R. C. Sánchez, and A. Y. Aránega, "Developing management skills through experiential learning: The effectiveness of outdoor training and mindfulness," *Eur. J. Int. Manag.*, 2018.

[4] A. Y. Aránega, R. C. Sánchez, F. J. C. Romero, and M. T. Del Val Núñez, "Developing management skills through experiential learning: the effectiveness of outdoor training and mindfulness," *Eur. J. Int. Manag.*, 2018.

[5] O. Tohochynskyi, "Formation of future penitentiary managers' professional competence in Ukraine," *Knowl. Perform. Manag.*, 2018.

[6] W. G. Macpherson, J. C. Lockhart, H. Kavan, and A. L. Iaquinto, "Kaizen in Japan: transferring knowledge in the workplace," *J. Bus. Strategy*, 2018.

[7] W. J. Rothwell, C. K. Hohne, and S. B. King, *Human performance improvement: Building practitioner performance*. 2018.

[8] O. Чуланова, O. Chulanova, A. Химяк, and A. Himyak, “Development of the Coaching Program of the Emotional Competence of the Leader as a Significant Soft Skills Component,” *Manag. Pers. Intellect. Resour. Russ.*, 2018.

[9] S. J. Han, W. G. Kim, and S. Kang, “Effect of restaurant manager emotional intelligence and support on front-of-house employees’ job satisfaction,” *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.*, 2017.

[10] N. M. Pilanawithana and Y. G. Sandanayake, “Positioning the facilities manager’s role throughout the building lifecycle,” *J. Facil. Manag.*, 2017.

[11] T. Dodd, “Proactive Quality Manager Replacement and Succession Planning is Vital to Seamless Viability of Hematopoietic Cellular Transplantation (HCT) Program Quality Management,” *Biol. Blood Marrow Transplant.*, 2017.

[12] L. Frye, “The Cost of a Bad Hire Can Be Astronomical,” *Shrm*, 2017.