WHAT ARE OUTPUTS*

The objective of this chapter is to explain exactly what an output is, and the examples are drawn from individual teams and positions. The basic ideas apply equally well to organization outputs of particular teams and outputs of individual positions. The same principles apply across individual positions, teams and organizations.

There is only one realistic and unambiguous definition of managerial effectiveness. It is: the extent to which a manager achieves the output requirements of the position. When seen in this way, effectiveness becomes a central issue in management. It is every manager's job to make the organization more effective. In fact it is the only job. Once this definition is understood, accepted and applied, it leads directly to changes in the self, and can lead as well to changes in personnel policy, methods, management information system and management structure. The emphasis, in this chapter, will be on managerial and team effectiveness, but the concept does apply to the organization as a whole. Using organization effectiveness examples can sometimes lead to deflecting the issue along the lines of something like, well, I have no control over that - it is someone else's problem. By looking at the managerial and team level we are looking at actual outputs at a concrete level that we can all understand and to which we can relate.

CONCEPTS OF MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS

To understand the nature of managerial effectiveness it is necessary to distinguish the three terms: MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS, APPARENT EFFECTIVENESS and PERSONAL EFFECTIVENESS.

Managerial effectiveness

Managerial effectiveness is not an aspect of personality. It is not something that a manager has.

To see it that way, however, would be a return to the now discarded trait theory of leadership, which suggested that more effective leaders have special qualities not possessed by less effective leaders. Effectiveness is best seen, perhaps, as something a manager produces from a situation by managing it appropriately. In current terminology it represents output, not input. The manager must think in terms of performance, not personality. It is not so much what managers do, but what they achieve. The following is an extreme example.

Managers' true worth to their companies may sometimes be measured by the amount of time they could remain dead in their offices without anyone noticing. The longer time, the more likely it is that they make long-run policy decisions rather than short-run administrative decisions. The key decisions in a company are long-term ones and may refer to market entry, new product introduction, new plant location or to senior appointments. The people who make these decisions should not get involved, as happen with short-run issues. If they do, they have not properly decided on the output measures of the job, nor have they skill or opportunity to create conditions where only policy issues reach them.

Some managers have narrow views of their jobs. What they do, they may do well, but they leave an enormous amount undone. Some managers let the in-basket define the nature of their potential contribution and the clock its limit. Some managers might view their contribution as simply that of managing a going concern and keeping it on an even keel, while others might see the same job as having within it large components of subordinate development and creative problem-solving. Still others might see their position primarily as a link-pin connecting with other parts of the firm, and thus might take a wider view of their responsibilities.
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Apparent effectiveness

It is difficult, if not impossible, to judge managerial effectiveness by observation of behaviour alone. The behaviour must be evaluated in terms of whether or not it is appropriate to the output requirements of the job. For example, the following qualities may be crucial to effectiveness in some jobs, while in others they may well be irrelevant: is usually on time, answers promptly, makes quick decisions, is good at public relations and is a good writer.

These qualities might give an air of apparent effectiveness in whatever context they appear, but apparent effectiveness may or may not lead to managerial effectiveness.

Conventional job descriptions often lead to an emphasis on what could be called managerial efficiency: the ratio of output to input. The problem is that if both input and output are low, efficiency could still be 100 per cent. In fact a manager or department could easily be 100 per cent efficient and 0 per cent effective. Efficient managers are easily identified; they prefer to:

- do things right rather than do the right things
- solve problems rather than produce creative alternatives
- safeguard resources rather than optimize resource utilization
- discharge duties rather than obtain results

Conventional job descriptions lead to the apparent effectiveness of the behaviour as listed in the left-hand column; a job effectiveness description which emphasized managerial effectiveness would lead to performance as listed in the right-hand column.

Normally conventional job descriptions and management audits focus on the internal efficiency of an organization system rather than on its external effectiveness or its outputs. It would be a simple matter to increase internal efficiency, and to decrease external effectiveness, just as sharply. Usually the paperwork is quite unrelated to effectiveness.

The distinction between managerial effectiveness and apparent effectiveness can be further illustrated by what really happens when a hyperactive new manager brings what appears to be chaos to an organization, but the situation is seen to begin to improve. Unless outputs are the focus attention, the result can be serious distortion about what is really going on.

Personal effectiveness

Poorly defined job outputs may also lead to what might be termed as personal effectiveness, that is the satisfying of personal objectives rather than the objectives of the organization. This is particularly likely to occur with ambitious people in an organization having only few closely defined management output measures. Meetings with these people are riddled with hidden agendas, which operate below the surface and lead to poor decision-making. To illustrate, in a three-day meeting to set corporate objectives for a consumer goods firm, one of the four assistant CEOs in attendance initiated a series of proposals for reorganization, arguing for them with great force.

While all had some merit, it was evident as they were outlined the most would not lead to greatly improved team effectiveness. The other team members quickly saw all these proposals were aimed, to some extent unconsciously, at improving the assistant CEO’s power and prestige. This issue was debated for several hours and the team members, many of whom had previously had intentions similar to those of the assistant CEO, finally decided to turn their attention away from improving their personal effectiveness towards improving their managerial effectiveness and thus their total team effectiveness. The top management structure was modified, but in keeping with market, consumer, competitive and organization needs, not with personal needs.

There is nothing wrong with either personal effectiveness or apparent effectiveness. Most of us prefer to operate on our own terms and we all like to appear effective. The problem arises only when either condition is confused with managerial effectiveness. In a well-designed firm all three kinds of effectiveness might occur simultaneously for any particular manager. This would mean that managers who are indeed effective actually look as if they are (apparent
effectiveness), and are rewarded for it (personal effectiveness).

THE DEADLY SIN OF INPUTS

The first step in helping managers to be more effective is to help them to see their job in output terms. Keeping the concept of effectiveness in mind, we can refer to these outputs as EFFECTIVENESS AREAS, but they go by a variety of other names. The problem is that too many jobs are described in terms of inputs, not outputs; and in terms of input areas, not in terms of effectiveness areas.

The source of much of the problem which surrounds effectiveness is found in the way job descriptions are written. Usually, lengthy job descriptions, or crash programmes to write or update them, have little usefulness. As C. Northcote Parkinson has pointed out, the last act of a dying organization is to issue a revised and greatly enlarged rule-book. This observation may hold just as well for crash programmes to write job descriptions.

Many, if not most, managerial jobs are defined in terms of their input and behaviour requirements by such words as: administers, maintains, organizes, plans and schedules. Naturally enough, managers never refer to job descriptions like this; once made, they are not very useful as an operating guide. Initially they are often proposed by those who want to use a seemingly scientific technique to justify a widespread change in salary differentials, or a change in the organization structure; they are a negative influence as they focus on input and behaviour, the less important aspects of the manager's job.

The Training Officer

While many initial attempts to set effectiveness areas turn out to be a list of activities instead, many attempts can go in the other direction: everyone appears to think they are heading a profit centre. Of any proposed effectiveness area, the question should be asked: Why is this being done?, or Why is this important? Training managers, for instance, might go through this kind of process. First, they are asked what is their most important area to which they might reply, To design a management development programme. When asked why, they reply, To improve the quality of managerial decisions. To further interrogation, they reply: To improve profit performance. The correct area of concern for these training managers would probably be increased managerial skill in problem-solving. It cannot be to improve the quality of managerial decisions or to improve profit performance since both of these are influenced by factors over which the training managers have no control and no authority. On the other hand, the correct area cannot be simply that of programme design or putting on courses, which are clearly inputs. The sole objective of industrial training is to change behaviour, and the effectiveness areas and the objectives of a training manager must reflect this.

Most inputs can be converted to outputs if the position is needed at all. Some examples where inputs are converted to outputs include the following: coach subordinates to subordinate effectiveness; church attendance to Christian values; and farmer education to high-value crop acreages. One should be wary of such areas as communication, relationships, liaison, co-ordination and staffing.

FROM INPUTS TO OUTPUTS

The following examples of improved effectiveness areas show both the first and second attempts to establish them. Most often, the first attempt was the result of private work, without consultation; the second attempt showed how first attempts were improved after small-group discussion. Such before and after changes as these are typical. They demonstrate what an imperfect view many - or even most - managers have of their jobs, and how easy it is to change this view, given the appropriate method and conditions. None of the second attempts is claimed to be perfect for the job in question and, in any case, this would be impossible to determine without much more information. The point here is that the second attempt clearly is better than the first.

Chairman of the board

A full-time chairman of the board of a 6,000-employee company produced these two sets of effectiveness areas:
**FIRST ATTEMPT:**

1. Improve value of board
2. Assure good executive meetings
3. Provide useful counsel to company officers
4. Maintain effective remuneration and personnel policies for senior executives
5. Develop high-level corporate image and public relations
6. Initiate sound long-range planning

**SECOND ATTEMPT:**

7. Board decision quality
8. National corporate image
9. Corporate strategy

The realization that the second set of areas was really the chairman’s job led to many changes, particularly in time allocation. Areas 1 (improve value of board) and 2 (assure good executive meetings) could be replaced by area 7 (board decision quality); area 3 (provide useful counsel to company officers) was seen as meddling; area 4 (maintain effective remuneration and personnel policies for senior executives) should be given to the CEO; area 5 (develop good high level corporate image and public relations) was the chairman’s job, but on a national scale, as expressed in area 8 (national corporate image); and area 6 (initiate sound long-range planning) was best replaced by 9 (corporate strategy).

University director of physical education

A newly appointed university director of physical education with a staff of about ten produced the following as first and second attempts:

**FIRST ATTEMPT:**

1. Character-building
2. Health
3. Sports activity
4. Maintenance
5. Staffing
6. Future programmes

**SECOND ATTEMPT:**

7. Utilization of facilities
8. Readiness of facilities
9. Quality of facilities

10. Programme innovation rate
11. Growth of facilities

This director came to see that there could be only partial influence on areas 1 (character building) and 2, (health) and that there was no practical measuring device for the former (character building); areas 3 (sports activity) and 4 (maintenance) were best expressed as 7 (utilization of facilities) and 8 (readiness of facilities); and area 5 (staffing) was an input, and area 6 (future programmes) could be more clearly worded as 10 (programme innovation rate). Unlike some such managers, there was some control over the growth of facilities and it was thought appropriate to include area 11 (growth of facilities).

A food processing company CEO

The CEO of a 5,000-employee food-processing company initially produced the following sets of effectiveness areas:

**FIRST ATTEMPT:**

1. Profitability
2. Planning
3. Top-team quality
4. Profit growth
5. Reputation growth
6. Growth momentum
7. Trade relations
8. Industry relations
9. Government relations
10. Board and employee relations
11. Capital employment
12. Return on investment
13. Management succession plan

**SECOND ATTEMPT:**

14. Profitability
15. Planning
16. Reputation in industry
17. Company climate
18. Customer / top management relations

This CEO decided to retain areas 1 (profitability) and 2 (planning) as areas 14 and 15; area 3 (top team
quality) was identified as a common area; area 4 (profit growth) could be included as a subobjective of 14 (profitability) by using a longer time span; area 5 (reputation growth) was changed to 16 (reputation in industry); this was kept as this marketing-oriented CEO spent much time on customer and industry visits; area 6 (growth momentum) moved to 14 (profitability); area 7 (trade relations) moved to part of 16 (reputation in industry); and area 8 (industry relations) became more specific as area 18 (customer/top management relations) was changed to 17 (company climate); areas 11 (capital employment) and 12 (return on investment) were given to the deputy CEO of finance; and area 13 (management succession plan) was seen as an area belonging to the deputy CEO of personnel.

**JOB OUTPUTS ARE ALWAYS MEASURABLE**

If a so-called effectiveness area or objective is not measurable, we can forget it, for no one will know anyway. The most stern but necessary test of effectiveness areas and objectives is measurability. The rule, then, is if you cannot measure it, ignore it.

In the left-hand column of the following table is a list of qualitative objectives which are used as an illustration in one popular MBO textbook to suggest that such qualitative objectives must sometimes be used; but this has been found to be incorrect. In the right-hand column are my own conversions which show that such qualitative objectives are usually unnecessary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual suggested qualitative objectives in standard management by objectives textbook</th>
<th>Conversion to illustrate that qualitative objectives are found to be activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct monthly management development sessions for superintendents in techniques of standard cost programme</td>
<td>Have 50 percent of superintendents using standard cost programming techniques on at least two projects by end of July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare a programme for patent productions.</td>
<td>Have no patent loopholes in our patents discovered by our own staff, independent agents or competitors during the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and distribute an internal public relations manual.</td>
<td>Obtain average 75 per cent unaided recall by all non-managerial employees of 50 per cent of the key corporate activities or accomplishments of the prior month for each month next year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve statistical reports to reduce time lag between production and publication dates.</td>
<td>Without decreasing usable content, reduce by average of four days time spent distributing the following reports by end-September.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare quality control manual for supervisors.</td>
<td>Eighty-five per cent of first-line supervisors to know eight of the ten key points in company quality control practice by end-December.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve appearance, packaging and design of products.</td>
<td>For each item in product line design a package which receives more consumer jury votes than any competing product by end-November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake to ally research efforts more closely with production needs.</td>
<td>Have at least 80 per cent of proposals to production manager accepted during the year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the above conversions from inputs to outputs involve a broader view of one's job, a greater responsibility for the staff function and a higher cost of measurement.
Measurement of knowledge workers

It is a popular myth that the effectiveness of many knowledge workers cannot be measured; but look at the following disarmingly simple set of effectiveness areas, all of which are capable of measurement if the associated objectives are worded correctly:

1. Consulted in area of competence.
2. Advice accepted.
3. Advice acceptance leads to improvement.

The first area obliges the knowledge worker, not the manager, to ensure that the knowledge worker is consulted. Too many knowledge workers, like some university professors, see themselves as information reservoirs with no responsibility to provide a 'tapping' facility; and usually this is sorely needed. Knowledge workers, more than managers, have the opportunity to develop a relationship such that their advice is sought when appropriate. Industry has no place for knowledge workers who do not themselves create consultative conditions.

The second area reflects that it is all too easy to give advice that is not accepted. Knowledge workers must be evaluated on their effectiveness in giving line managers the advice that they can use. Area 3 records that just as it is too easy to give advice not accepted, it is all too easy to give advice that leads to a 'poorer situation developing'. Knowledge workers have a responsibility for the success of their advice. Personal competence is not listed as an effectiveness area, it is an input; and in any case, if the knowledge worker were not competent, the advice would not lead to improvement.

While the measurement problem can usually be solved with imagination, the cost of the measurement problem may remain. To measure the impact of a training course on behavior necessitates, at least, many telephone calls and questionnaires, and preferably a field survey. The outputs of a public relations' position are hard to measure without some kind of formal survey. Here one needs to ask whether the function is important enough even to have a rough measurement of its effectiveness; if not, then the function is eliminated. However, if it does, then allocate 10 per cent of total appropriate budgets to measurement. Conventional wisdom may well insist that a particular activity is a good thing, but measurement is the only way to test it.

It seems difficult for some managers to accept our philosophy, that: if you cannot measure it, forget it, because no one will know. Yet accurate measurement is central to good management. Some managers see their job as having vague, pervasive and very long-term effects, claiming that it is impossible to measure their performance by normal methods. If such managers also say that they understand what managerial effectiveness really means, then they occupy a position that is unneeded or they have no authority to do their job or they are avoiding responsibility.

As a simple example, the 'good relationship' is often proposed as an effectiveness area. This is not measurable, except by highly subjective methods. A sales manager who once proposed this area later claimed that it was not only non-measurable, but an input as well; effectiveness in this area could be equally well measured by short and long term sales.

IS THERE A JOB AT ALL?

If two people are responsible for the same thing, one of them is not needed.

Some supervisors who misunderstand their jobs believe their task is to ensure that subordinates do what they are supposed to do. This view, if taken to its natural conclusion, means that the sole function of all levels of management is to make sure that the workers get on with it. Logically this would mean that all levels of management existed only to see that workers at the lower levels worked. While this may be true in some technologies, it is hardly true of many. We simply cannot say that superiors' jobs are always well represented simply by a collection of their subordinates' effectiveness areas, or their objectives as the following example shows.

An assistant CEO supervised four managers of profit centres, as shown in Figure 2.1. The assistant CEO knew the difficulty in determining effectiveness areas: one area could not be profit because this was an area of each of the subordinates, and there were
The following questions were asked: What is your unique contribution?, What is the biggest thing which could go wrong?, What do you, or could you do that the managers do not, because (1) they do not have the ability or experience, (2) they do not have the time, or (3) they do not have the information?, Why was your position created?

This personnel manager came to see that the unique contribution was in the areas of: personnel policy, working conditions, organization development and managerial effectiveness. The personnel manager could not accept full responsibility for all of these areas, but was responsible, as any staff person, for giving acceptable advice. When we compare the first set of effectiveness areas with the revised set, a greatly enlarged view of the job is apparent, together with a preparedness to allow subordinates to 'get on with it'.

The Personnel Manager

One personnel manager listed effectiveness areas as: training, wage and salary administration, employment, staffing, safety and security, and industrial relations, as shown in Figure 2.2. The personnel manager was then asked to draw the unit as an organization chart and to identify all the effectiveness areas, starting with those of subordinates and not duplicating any; the result is shown in Figure 2.3. The effectiveness areas ran out before the personnel manager's own position was reached. This meant that the position was seen as having no unique responsibilities. The personnel manager's job, as defined, was either doing the subordinates' work or making sure that they did it. This was a narrow definition of the responsibility. The job was seen in broader terms than that and, surely, the personnel manager has more to contribute.

---

Figure 2.1. The team that did not exist, it looks very important but is not needed.

Figure 2.2. A personnel manager's view of the effectiveness areas (at first glance, this appears to be an accurate description but is not!)

Figure 2.3. What is the job of the personnel manager (when your subordinates share all your effectiveness areas with you, what are you left with)?
As the subordinates were fairly experienced, they could be allowed to work with full authority in their respective positions. If a position in the structure or a key subordinate were lost, the personnel manager might temporarily cover the effectiveness areas of the position concerned.

**How to select effectiveness areas**

Here is a list of simple questions for managers to ask themselves and to develop an initial list of effectiveness areas for their position to text both on the superior and co-workers. There is much overlap, and essentially all the questions really ask: what is the job?

However, some managers find that ideas are triggered when the question is asked in a variety of forms. What is the position's unique contribution? Why is the position needed at all? What would change if I am highly effective in the position? How would I know, with no one telling me, when I am performing effectively? What authority does the position really have? What do the job description and the organization manual say? How do I spend my time? How should I spend my time? What would I be most likely to concentrate on over two or three years if I wanted to make the greatest improvement in my unit or in my superior's unit or in the organization as a whole?

**Guides to testing effectiveness areas**

When effectiveness areas are identified, they should satisfy six tests which check on the adequacy of the effectiveness areas, both individually and collectively. Each effectiveness area should:

1. Represent output, not input
2. Lead to associated objectives which are measurable
3. Be an important part of the position; and
4. Be within the actual limits of authority and responsibility.

In addition, effectiveness areas as a whole should:

5. Represent 100 per cent of the outputs of the position; and

6. Not be so numerous as to avoid dealing with the essence of the job, nor so few as to make planning difficult.

**Flexibility of effectiveness areas**

Managers at the top of any unit usually have some flexibility in the choice of the effectiveness areas that they decide to associate with their own position. This freedom is most marked when they have the ability to create a subordinate and can assign part of their own work to that subordinate. Under these conditions the top persons' areas become fully flexible and they can make them what they want to be. For instance, they could become an 'outside' person with an emphasis on liaison with other organization units or customers. The newly created subordinate could be the 'inside' person concerned with managing the unit. The reverse situation is equally feasible. This demonstrates that, within broad limits, managers who can create a subordinate and can design their subordinates' effectiveness areas have an extensive range of different areas which they can associate with their own job.

It is impossible to look in isolation at the effectiveness areas for a particular position. Such areas are best seen as sets of areas which link together several positions. It is quite possible that if the set of areas for one position changes a great deal, sets of areas for other positions may change as well, and so they should. When setting areas, the question is not 'what are they?', but 'what could they best be?' Clearly, the output orientation is intimately related to both organization design and organization flexibility.

After three years on the job, the plant manager may decide to change the effectiveness areas established, and indeed may have trained one or more subordinates to assume some of them. The important thing is that effectiveness areas should not simply be applied to an existing organization design and then considered to be relatively permanent. Instead the assigning of effectiveness areas should be used as a basis for inducing organization flexibility and ensuring that it is maintained. Normally the effectiveness areas are subject to change when a
new manager is appointed; co-workers change; a manager's skills are increased; power and decision levels move; management by objectives (MBO) is implemented; or any major organization change occurs.

**MAKING OUTPUT ORIENTATION OPERATIONAL**

Output orientation should be linked directly to organization philosophy, induction training and organization development (OD). In this way, it becomes the firm's central value induced by training and OD. Effectiveness areas should be the basis of describing jobs and of linking one job to another - i.e. system design. Measurement areas form the basis of job specifications in determining what kind of manager is required. In manager selection: is this the person we want? In training plans: how do we obtain desired behavior? And in job evaluation: how much should we pay? Objectives form the basis of the link between corporate strategy and managerial appraisal.

So to make the concept of output orientation operational for an organization, it must be linked with objectives. This is easily done by use of the following (linked) ideas:

1. **Managerial effectiveness**: the extent to which a manager achieves the output requirements of the position.
2. **Effectiveness areas**: general output requirements of the managerial position.
3. **Measurement areas**: the way in which an effectiveness area is measured.
4. **Objectives**: effectiveness areas and measurement areas which are as specific, time bounded and as measurable as possible.

While the concept of objectives is central in output orientation, the other three ideas (managerial effectiveness, effectiveness areas and measurement areas) form the foundations of any objectives that are set; and only with an understanding of these will the objectives be sound.

**Managerial effectiveness**

A sound implementation of output orientation must be preceded by the acceptance of managerial effectiveness as the central value or philosophy in management. Unless this is given a primary importance, output orientation will be no more than a highly sophisticated managerial-level work study. A small, or even a large, firm can have values built in which counter the idea of managerial effectiveness. Such values may seriously interfere with - or completely prevent - the implementation of output orientation.

**Effectiveness areas**

The second idea, effectiveness areas, is based on the view that all managerial positions are best seen in terms of the outputs associated with them. However, surprisingly few managers see their positions in this way. Effectiveness areas spring primarily from the strategy of the firm as made operational by the organization structure. To a lesser but significant extent, they depend on the top management's views on the best locus for decision-making.

**Measurement areas**

Measurement areas are subdivisions of effectiveness areas, which incorporate measurement criteria explicitly or implicitly. An effectiveness area of 'sales' might be conveniently broken down into one or more of the following sets of measurement areas:

existing products - existing markets
existing products - new markets
new products - existing markets; and
new products - new markets.

or unit sales by area, product and customer;
or sales of product A, product B and product C;
or sales of product A, gross margin of product A and profitability of product A.

One of the above four sets of standards, or some combination of them, would suit most situations. The set of measurement areas chosen is that which best covers the total job in output terms.

**Objectives**

Essentially, objectives are specific measurement areas with time limits and numerical values attached to them. Thus, for the effectiveness area ‘sales’, we
have seen that one measurement area might be: sales revenue from product A. The associated objective might then be: increase sales revenue for product A by 15,000 for the period 1 January to 31 December. The concepts are related in this way:

**Effectiveness area:** Product A

**Measurement areas:**
1. Sales revenue increase for product A.
2. Gross margin increase in percentage on product A.
3. Profitability increase per unit in money product A.

**Objectives:**
1. Increase sales revenue for product A to 400,000 during ______
2. Increase gross margin on product A to 22 per cent by decreasing distribution cost to 1.10 money units per unit, during ______
3. Increase profitability of product A to 0.22 money units during ______

For each measurement area there is usually one objective, as shown in the above example. All this is relatively straightforward, but it may well be worthless if the effectiveness areas do not represent outputs from the beginning.

**THE JOB EFFECTIVENESS DESCRIPTION**

A job effectiveness description (JED) is needed which describes a managerial position almost exclusively in output terms. It contains first a list of the effectiveness areas of the position. Together with each of the measurement areas, managers develop a specific objective (usually annually), and measure their degree of attainment of the objective by the established measurement area also contained in the job effectiveness description. For most managers this can be put down on one side of a piece of paper.

The only additional content of the job effectiveness descriptions are specific statements of the authority vested in the position. These statements may refer to authority to enlarge or decrease staff, use overtime, change the product or service, rearrange the work flow or modify a production programme. In constructing these job effectiveness descriptions great care is needed to ensure that the authority is sufficient for the specified measurement areas and the objectives derived from them. Either the authority is found, or made sufficient, or the effectiveness areas and measurement areas are passed upwards.

The job effectiveness description is prepared for each managerial position, and for each unit, which include a manager and all the subordinates. Thus managerial objectives are formally linked to team objectives.

Now that the notion of outputs is clearer, we move on to look at your part of the organization, or the organization as a whole, to consider what needs to be changed in order to increase output orientation. Some organizations are highly input-oriented, it is their way of life! Asking them how to change things leads to more ideas on how to improve on their inputs.
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