AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE WORK OF MANAGERS IN GREAT BRITAIN: WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES; AND THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE USED

TEXT

MONK, R.E. Ph.D. 1994

Date	Name	Signature	Student ID
8/10/2005	Sayo Onbo	[signature]	2348636
10/10/05	Okwuosa. A.	[signature]	2344774

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE WORK OF MANAGERS IN GREAT BRITAIN: WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES; AND THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE USED

SUBMITTED BY
ROGER EDWARD MONK

TO
MIDDLESEX UNIVERSITY

FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

OCTOBER 1994

Abstract

Submitted by Roger Edward Monk for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE WORK OF MANAGERS IN GREAT BRITAIN: WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE MANAGEMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES; AND THE SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE USED

The Study is in four parts. The first part provides a background to the original research through a short twentieth century history of management and synopses of the work of selected earlier writers and researchers.

The second part provides the results of a new empirical study of managerial work in Great Britain in the early nineteen-nineties. This study follows the lead of earlier researchers such as Carlson, Stewart and Mintzberg and invstigates managerial work using three methodologies. A quantitative study through a questionnaire survey is complemented by a smaller diary study and thirty face to face interviews with a range of managers from widely differing organisations and jobs.

A statistical analysis of the data provides a very detailed review of how managers spend their time, requirements for effective performance, how performance is measured, major changes which have affected them, and the skills and knowledge used. Analysis of the diary data provides a very detailed profile of managerial work. Factor analysis is used to identify a new managerial typology; and using data from the various elements of the study a series of detailed managerial models, identifying both similarities and differences, is provided for an average manager, a general manager, five types of functional manager and five hierarchical levels of manager.

Using information from the interview case studies, together with the statistical analysis, the management of human resouces, or "getting things done through other people", is addressed and a range of abilities, skills and knowledge required for effective people management identified. This section, particularly, contributes to the field of knowledge and provides guidance for the development of management education and training.

Part three provides a comparison of the present study with earlier researches and shows that whilst the fundamental nature of managerial work changes relatively little, the environment within which it takes place is constantly changing. Recent changes identified include greater customer orientation and demands for quality, new legislation, "de-layering" and the very rapid development of new technologies within both offices and factories. The evidence suggests that the work of managers is becoming continually more demanding and increasingly difficult.

Part four provides a range of very detailed appendices in support of the main text.

Acknowledgements

This study could not have been completed without the kind co-operation of the 289 managers who took the time to complete and return the questionnaire. In particular thanks are due to Joan Allen, P Almond, D W Baldwin, Philip Ball, Stewart Bayram, A J Bench,Paul Blunt, David Boland, Paul Bonnett, Andrew Bradmore, Peter Burns, John Burrows, Lewis Chard, Chris Chivers, Ruth Cole, Lorne Duncan, Fiona Fothergill, Dr Malcolm Franks, Michael Freeman, Susan Gilbert, S D Guy, Mike Harris, Ivar Hauff, Nigel Higgins, Shirley Horn, Michael Howle, R S D Jones, T L Jones, Tony Jowett, Stuart Knowles, Ruth Maynard, Roger Owen, David Price, H Price, Roger Richardson, John Stewart, Neil Stone, Duncan Taylor, John Topp, Nishi Varma, Steve Verdon, Malcolm Wall, Chris Weston and Peter Wigley who gave much of their valuable time and provided invaluable information in the interview and/or diary surveys.

Tibor Kiss who provided invaluable help and advice with the computing/ statistical analysis. The staff of the Institute of Management and Middlesex University Libraries and the Middlesex University Computer Department. My Director of Studies Professor Abby Ghobadian and second supervisor Professor Alan Cowling. Abby's enthusiasm provided the necessary extra inspiration to keep going throughout a long study period.

Thanks are also due to the students who participated in the testing of the questionnaires. Ibis Information Services who provided the sampling frame. Dr Rosemary Stewart for her comments on my proposals and both the London Institute and the University of Westminster (formerly the Polytechnic of Central London - Harrow College) for their support at various stages of the study.

My Mother for infinite patience and cups of tea whilst I have been 'computing'.

Roger Monk

October 1994

CONTENTS

Part One
Introduction to the Study & Managerial Literature Survey

Part Two
The Results of the Investigation

Part Three
The Conclusions

Part Four
Appendices & Bibliography

Part One

Introduction to the Study

and

Managerial Literature Survey

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

AIMS

The overall aim of the study was to undertake a wide ranging investigation into the work of managers with particular regard to the human resource implications and the skills and knowledge required for effective management.

The outcomes of the study being of potential value in the design of management education and training through filling some of the gaps, identified twenty years ago by Mintzberg, which still remain:

> "The management school will significantly influence management practice only when it becomes capable of teaching a specific set of skills associated with the job of managing....We must be able to answer a number of specific questions before we can expect managerial training and management science to have any real impact on practice. What kinds of activities does the manager perform? What kinds of information does he process? With whom must he work? Where? How frequently? Although an enormous amount of material has been published on the manager's job we continue to know very little about it."
>
> Mintzberg(1973)

Since the above quotation was written the teaching of *management* has not altered radically, and Mintzberg continues to make similar comments.[1] The study reviews some of the twentieth century writings on the subject and contributes to the existing field of knowledge through original research. It identifies similarities and differences in the work of managers and develops models of *managerial work*. Like all research it starts with assumptions and preconceptions, and attempts to arrive at objective conclusions based on the evidence obtained. The researcher's experience as an industrial manager and management teacher inevitably influences those

1 Mintzberg (1989a/1990)

assumptions. The basic assumption being: that managerial work, regardless of level, function, or organisational type, has a common concern with people. Managers are perceived to be people who achieve the outputs of their work, inter alia, through the agency of other people. These people may include, bosses, senior colleagues, peers, subordinates, junior colleagues, and a range of people outside their organisation. The research, therefore, is particularly concerned with the expected common elements relating to interactions with other people; in the words of a practising manager:

> "My job is dealing with human beings rather than with the work."[2]

and testing the hypothesis:

> The part of managerial work which involves getting things done through other people requires similar and transferable skills and knowledge.

In order to achieve the aims an empirical study examines the work of managers in Great Britain employed in a variety of different job functions, sizes and types of employing organisations. It identifies what kind of activities managers perform; with whom they work, where they work, how they spend their time; what skills and knowledge they use; how their performance is measured; what type of experience, education or training is required for their job; and whether they have been affected by certain major changes. Secondary research is used as a background to the investigation and findings from this are compared with those of the primary research in reaching conclusions.

---

2 'a working supervisor' quoted in Lickert(1961)

OBJECTIVES

To achieve the research aims four specific objectives were pursued, these were:

Objective 1

To identify the extent and nature of various aspects of managerial work and the relative importance of various skills and knowledge used in its performance.

Objective 2

To gain an insight into the personal views of a representative sample of practising managers and thereby gain a better understanding of the work involved in managing people.

Objective 3

To use the information obtained through the study to construct realistic models of those aspects of managerial work not specifically concerned with specialist or technical aspects of a manager's job.

Objective 4

To compare the findings of the original research with perspectives on managerial work provided by previous writers and researchers and develop a realistic model of managerial work in the nineteen-nineties.

1.2 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In designing the study the methods of earlier researchers were considered and various possible methodologies were identified which could provide the necesssary data/information to achieve the overall aims and the specific objectives. In reaching the decisions the following were persuasive:

> "There are neither good nor bad methods, but only methods that are more or less effective under particular circumstances in reaching objectives on the way to a distant goal."
>
> Homans(1951)

Oppenheim(1968) advocated the design of an investigation as a whole, and Abrahamson(1983) advocated the use of several different methods, as all tend to be 'flawed in some way'. Todd(1979) advocated the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods.

The study was designed as a whole and employed several different methods, both quantitative and qualitative. In order to study a wide range of organisations, job functions, and job levels which would provide evidence of either similarities or differences in managerial work, a quantitative method was required. A postal or a telephone questionnaire survey were the only practical possibilities. It was considered that a telephone survey would probably produce a high response rate but that it would be likely to yield short interviews and reactive responses which may be of little value unless a more complex approach such as that of Stewart[3] was used. A postal survey was therefore chosen. Oppenheim(1968) pointed out that a postal questionnaire is cheap and easy to process and analyse. Thus it is particularly well

---

3 Stewart's(1982) two year study involved, inter alia, "lengthy face-to-face quarterly interviews and telephone interviews every two or three weeks".

suited to a study, such as this, with strictly limited resources available."

The next requirement was to identify a suitable sample of the managerial population which could be approached by this method.

The following possible sampling frames were considered:

a) Members of the British Institute of Management.[4]
b) Members of the Institution of Industrial Managers.
c) Members of the Association of Masters of Business Administration.
d) Members of the Institute of Personnel Management.[5]
e) Commercial Data Bases.

Each of the above has its advantages and disadvantages:

a) Consists of managers who have chosen to, and are eligible to, join the Institute. Although such managers may differ from the general population in particular ways the Institute is known to have in membership a very wide range of managers which would include those required for the survey. The Institute was, therefore, approached but declined to offer access to its Membership data base and was only prepared to undertake a survey which was precluded by the proposed price.

b) It was decided that the strong membership bias towards manufacturing industries and production management would not provide the necessary breadth of managerial types for the study.

c) This association consists entirely of members who have completed an 'MBA' with an approved Business School. The data base of this association is readily available

4 Since merged with the Institution of Industrial Managers to form The Institute of Management.
5 Now the Institute of Personnel and Development.

without cost[6] and as such attractive. However, although the members are employed across a wide range of industries and job functions it was decided that such an 'elite group' could not be representative of managers in general and it was eliminated.

d) This Institute was eliminated on the grounds that, although all its members are likely to be deeply involved in 'human resource management' they are also mainly functional specialists employed in personnel management.

e) Because of the perceived weaknesses of the above possible samples a suitable commercially available data base was sought. It had to consist of the necessary wide range of managers and be within an acceptable cost limit. A commercial marketing services company was found which was able and willing to supply a random list from a large sample which included a wide range of organisational types, job functions, and middle and senior job levels across the United Kingdom.[7] A random sample of some 3,500 names, ten percent of the data base, was purchased.

In order to achieve Objective 1 a postal questionnaire survey of c3,400[8] practising managers was undertaken. In the words of the researcher whose work this study follows:

> "One problem is that those who want to study managerial work have either to study managerial behaviour or to ask managers questions about what they do thus relying on managers' perceptions as influenced by the types of questions that are asked."
>
> Stewart(1989)

---

6 To members - the researcher is a member.

7 Ibis Information Services Limited kindly provided a mailing list for a nominal price.

8 The sample included managers in Ireland who were eliminated in order to restrict the study to Great Britain.

However, whilst recognising that there are weaknesses in the use of a questionnaire survey it the most practical way in which to obtain data from a large sample, and they have been shown to be reliable.

> "Questionnaires, and generally to a lesser extent interviews, using a random sample can be generalised to wider populations with confidence, can easily be replicated and are hence reliable."
>
> Gill & Johnson(1991)

Care was taken in the design of the form and in the decision to also undertake the Diary Survey and the Case Study Interviews in order to increase the validity of the outcomes. The questionnaire was designed to provide a wide range of data suitable for computer analysis using commercially available sofware;[9] and provide information to assist in the planning of a loosely structured format for the subsequent interviews.

The questionnaire was designed and then piloted with a sample of practising managers. A form was created which could be easily understood and completed reasonably quickly and provide comprehensive data. Ease of response was perceived to be a necessary pre-requisite when seeking the time and cooperation of busy managers. Equally important was to obtain the *right* data as a second opportunity would not be available. Pilot forms were completed by, and discussed with, a sample of some thirty practising managers undertaking a part-time Diploma in Management Studies course. This process involved making initial assumptions about content, length etcetera and then testing the forms by asking the managers to complete them, time how long this took and to identify any difficulties, e.g. in understanding what was required, the relevance of a particular question, or a question which might be misleading or particulary difficult to answer.

9 See SPSS Nie et al (1975)

The final questionnaire, consisting of four size A4 pages folded from an A3 sheet,[10] provided for information under the following headings: organisation name and address, number of employees in the organisation and at the respondent's location, and the industry sector by standard industrial classification[11]. Respondents name, gender, job title, function, budget, responsibility level, numbers of direct and indirect subordinates, number of years a manager, in present job and at present level, qualifications obtained, and time spent in on and off the job management training.

It then asked how the respondent's time was spent, what activities were undertaken, what skills and knowledge were used, how much of total time was spent in various activities, requirements to do the job well, performance measures used and recent major changes. All of which were perceived to be important to creating a detailed model of managerial work; and the skills and knowledge required to undertake such work. Respondents were asked whether they were agreeable to a subsequent interview.

The penultimate version of the questionnaire was submitted to Dr Rosemary Stewart for comment before the final version was printed. The forms were mailed to the sample, but limited funds precluded the inclusion of either a reply paid return envelope or a follow-up mailing which are recommended by market researchers.[12] It was hoped that the ready availability of a corporate postal system, forms were mailed to work addresses, would enable and encourage easy replies. The 289 completed questionnaires some 8.5% of the mailing,[13] although not

10 See Appendix 1

11 Standard Industrial Classification 1980, since revised.

12 See e.g. Clifton et al(1992)

13 This is in line with direct mail market research response rates, see e.g. Clifton et al(1992)p93 "A normal rate of response without any kind of follow-up is less than 10%."

precisely representative of the managerial population, nonetheless provided a data base of managers covering a wide spectrum of organisational types and sizes, and occupational types and levels.[14] Analysis was completed using the popular computer package, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

Whilst the questionnaire survey provided a wide range of information it relied upon managers estimates of how they spent their time, it was therefore decided to undertake a more structured approach using a work diary based on those used by Stewart(1967). This method has been used successfully by a number of earlier researchers:

> "The diary method of Carlson, Stewart, and others has proven to be a useful tool for the study of managerial work characteristics."
>
> Mintzberg(1971)

Whereas the questionnaire relies on the managers perceptions and 'guestimates' of what he is doing completion of a diary should provide an accurate survey of both what he is doing, where and with whom he is, and for how long he is doing it. Other possible methodologies considered included the critical incident technique but this suffers from the fact that respondents are able to select those incidents which they consider critical, see e.g. Flanagan(1951) and Kelly(1964). Activity sampling involving observations at random intervals, see e.g. Wirdenius(1958) and Kelly(1964). However, this method is impractical where the subjects are at a series of widely distributed locations. The structured observation, see e.g. Mintzberg(1968), Landsberger(1962); or the unstructured observation, see e.g. Dalton(1959), Hodgson et al(1965). Full-time observational methods are only practical where the number of subjects is very limited or the observer is able to devote a very substantial amount of time to the study.

14 See Chapter 7 below for full details of the sample.

For example, Luijk(1963) spent 5 days each studying his 25 Dutch directors; similarly the observations of Stewart(1982) each involved a week of study.

Each of the interview subjects agreed to complete an activity diary[15] for a period of one week, however, only 16 interviewees completed their diaries within the agreed time scale. To increase the size of the sample a number of respondents to the questionnaire survey were asked, and agreed, to complete a diary for a single day.[16] The design of the diary drew heavily on Stewart[17] and showed: each *activity* of the week by; where it took place, with whom, how it was conducted, the nature of its content, and its duration. The diary was designed to confirm or deny certain elements of the original questionnaire, particulary in relation to how time is actually spent, as opposed to the perceptions reflected in the questionnaires.

The attainment of Objective 2, gaining insight into manager's views required a qualitative method. In the words of Stewart(1982):

> "The prime concern of the qualitative researcher is to try and understand the nature of the subject being studied and to develop fresh insights into what should be studied."

The most appropriate method to achieve this objective, the face-to-face interview, was used.

> "(the interview is) the opportunity for the researcher to probe deeply, to uncover new clues, open up new dimensions of a problem and to secure vivid, accurate, inclusive accounts that are based on personal experience." Burgess(1982)

15 See Appendix 2

16 Two members of the interview sample subsequently completed single day diaries and a further 14 single day diaries were completed by other members of the questionnaire sample, see Appendix 4 for list.

17 Stewart(1965)

Oppenheim(1968) argued for the interview's flexibility and the richness and spontanaity of information which it can provide. A sample had to be selected from the 113 respondents to the questionnaire survey who had agreed to be interviewed. This sample needed to include the full range of the 'managerial types' which had been studied in the initial survey, i.e. it must exhibit the full range of organisational and job characteristics of the sample.[18] It was found that this could be achieved by selecting 30 respondents.

The sample[19] selected included managers from each main job function and a variety of organisations in terms of size, industry type and ownership. The interviews, which were tape recorded, were very loosely structured to enable the managers to talk relatively freely about their work and lasted for about two hours in the majority of cases.[20] However, to provide a pattern, and produce results which could be subjected to a degree of comparison and analysis, subjects were led to discuss certain specific topics. Each was asked to talk about his or her[21] concept of management, and unless it appeared inappropriate, specifically about recruitment and selection, motivation, payment systems, staff appraisal, and recent significant changes which had affected his work with particular reference to Information Technology, quality and de-manning. All of which are of importance in managerial work, and in particular in the management of human resources.

---

18 Consideration was given to the possibility that geographical location might be an important variable. However, it was concluded that the probabilty was too small to justify the high costs, in money and time, involved in journeys which would preclude two interviews per day, travelling by road.

19 See Appendix 4

20 The tapes are available as a detailed oral record.

21 Throughout the report the masculine he is generally used; unless otherwise stated this should be read as he or she; where there are gender specific connotations she is used.

To achieve Objective 3, models were constructed from an analysis of the data obtained through the three phases of the survey.[22] These models provide a series of profiles of managers by both job function and responsibility level and compare them with a profile of a *modal or average manager* derived from the modal values of all the questionnaire data, and the arithmetic means of the diary data.

To achieve Objective 4 the findings from the various phases of the research are brought together and common elements related to the *getting of things done through other people* or *management of human resources* identified. A simple model, *management in the nineteen -ninties*,[23] is then offered as a possible aid in the design and development of management education and training activities.

22 See Chapter 13
23 See page 559

1.3 STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

ABOUT THE SAMPLE

The most reliable indication of the total number of managers in the United Kingdom is 2,864,000[24] which includes a substantial number of junior or supervisory managers.[25] The study sample is, therefore, >0.01% of the total managerial population.[26] However, if the managers below middle level are excluded from both the sample and the total managerial population, the representation of middle and more senior managers in the study is >.02% of the total senior and middle managerial population.[27]

The sampling frame from which the study sample is taken is a commercial mailing list stated by the suppliers to consist of managers, mainly of middle rank and above, across the full range of industries in both the private and public sectors. The list includes names, job titles and business addresses.

A random sample of 10% was taken by the suppliers from the sampling frame, which included addressses throughout the United Kingdom and Ireland. The initial address list of c3,500 was reduced to c3,400 by the elimination of Irish addresses, both in the Republic and Northern Ireland

---

24 Labour Force Survey number 5 Sept 1993.

25 Constable & McCormick(1987) estimated some 1.1 million managers to be at middle and senior levels.

26 Market research undertaken by commercial organisations such as Gallup and MORI frequently uses a similar or smaller sample size to draw conclusions for the whole population. e.g. a sample of 1000 to identify 'voting intentions'; this is substantially smaller as a proportion of the population eligible to vote than the proportion of the study sample to ALL managers.

27 Using the figure supplied by Constable & McCormick op cit.

The 289 respondents who completed questionnaires,[28] all of which were usable, are considered to adequately represent the total managerial population of middle and senior managers.[29]

Representation by size of employing unit

The only available national statistics are for all employees by the size of employment units. Figures are not available for size of employing organisations or the numbers of managers employed:

Size of Unit	All Employees	Sample
<100 people	57.0%	59.5%
100-499 people	28.0%	29.8%
>500 people	15.0%	10.7%

The sample closely matches the employed population with the exception that large units, which employ only a small proportion of the national workforce, are under represented

Representation by Industry

National statistics are only available for all employees. Every industry shown in the Standard Industrial Classification(1981) is represented. However, because of the small numbers within each category they have been consolidated into two major groups for analysis:

Industry	All Employees	Sample
Service	72.0%	38.1%
Manufacturing	28.0%	61.6%

28 See Appendices 3,4

29 No account is taken of the possibility that managers who completed questionnaires differed significantly, in any other characteristics, from those who did not.

Whilst both groupings are well represented there is a bias in the sample towards manufacturing industry. The later statistical analyses exhibit many strong associations between Industry and the range of other variables and the degree of 'unrepresentativeness' of the sample does not invalidate the conclusions.

Representation by Ownership

National statistics are only available for all employees. Respondents were grouped by either private or public sector ownership.

Ownership	All Employees	Sample
Public	17.0%	11.4%
Private	83.0%	88.6%

Whilst both sectors are adequately represented there is a bias in the sample towards the private sector. The later statistical analyses exhibit many strong associations between Ownership and the range of other variables and the degree of 'unrepresentativeness' of the sample does not invalidate the conclusions.

Representation by Gender

Gender	All Managers	Sample[30]
Female	9.5%	10.4%

The representation by gender is very close to the national managerial population.

30 This is very close to the estimated female proportion of the managerial population at the time of the survey.

Representation by Job Function

Almost ninety-four percent of the sample consisted of managers in 13 major functional categories, the remaining 6.3% were in *other* jobs. Only a limited number of the chosen categories can be readily identified in available national population statistics:

Job Function	All Managers	Sample
Manufacturing/production	10.0%	11.4%
Finance/administration	18.0%	20.1%
General Managers	8.7%	43.3%

An earlier study of managers included:

Job Function	Earlier Study	Sample
Marketing	11.0%	12.1%
Manufacturing	6.0%	11.4%
Finance/administration	20.0%	20.1%
Personnel	6.0%	13.1%
General Managers	29.0%	43.3%
International Management	2.0%	n/a
Others	26.0%	n/a

Based on the available statistics General Managers are over represented in the sample. However, the sampling frame is biased towards senior managers, a category likely to include a high proportion of general managers. Whereas the total managerial population includes more than 60% of junior managers. The earlier study and the fact that there are 1,284,475 employing units in Great Britain,[31] all of which must have at least one manager with a similar role to a 'general manager', suggest that this category may in fact be reasonably representative of the total managerial population. The representation of

31 Census of Employment op cit

the other two nationally identified categories is very close to the national proportions, but it is probable that the personnel function is somewhat over represented.

There are sufficient respondents in each category to provide representative data for each major job function.

Representation by Qualifications

The only readily available national statistic is for the proportion of managers who are graduates:

Graduates	All Managers[32]	Sample
Graduates	33.8%	39.4%

It can be hypothesised that the number of graduates in management is increasing in line with the output from higher education of graduates with relevant degrees.[33] Whether or not the sample is fully representative it suggests the possibilty that the above hypothesis is correct.

STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY

Chapters 7-13 are based on statistical analyses of the survey data using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS:PC version).

The questionnaires provided over 100 different sets of data which were coded, entered and analysed. Chapters seven to ten provide descriptive tables of these analyses showing the number of respondents affected and the percentage of the sample which they represent. These tables provide the reader with a comprehensive overview of the survey findings. The questionnaires were

32 Poole et al (1980)
33 Between 1975-85 there was a growth in output of graduates with business degrees of c300%. Constable & McCormick op cit

carefully checked for accurate completion before analysis.

For each set of data tables were produced similar to the example shown below:

Respondents Experience as Managers

Experience	Frequency	Percent	Valid%	Cumul've%
Under 1 year	8	2.8	3.0	3.0
1-2 years	11	3.8	4.1	7.1
3-4 years	22	7.6	8.2	15.3
5-9 years	44	15.2	16.5	31.8
>10 years	182	63.0	68.2	100.0
missing	22	7.6		
Total	289	100.0	100.0	

The first column shows the number of years of managerial experience, the second column shows the number of respondents with that length of experience, the third column shows the percentage of respondents reporting that length of experience and the fourth column corrects the percentage to take account of 'missing values', the fifth column shows the cumulative percentage. The table shows, inter alia, that more than two thirds of the respondents who completed this answer have had in excess of 10 years managerial experience.

Chapter eleven provides detailed managerial profiles derived from an analysis by cross-tabulation of all the diary survey data.

The following is an example of the type of tables produced:

The number of people respondent is working with: by Job Function

Present	**Product'n**	**Market'g**	**Person'l**	**Admin'**	**General Mgr**	
Alone(obs)	22	*22*	*46*	**189**	*108*	Row
(expect'd)	18.9	33.8	55.1	159.3	120.1	Total
	5.7%	5.7%	11.9%	48.8%	27.9%	387
	50.0%	28.2%	35.9%	51.1%	38.7%	43%
With 1	*6*	**38**	**56**	*122*	**110**	332
other	16.2	28.8	47.3	136.6	103	37%
	1.8%	11.4%	16.9%	36.7%	33.1%	
	13.6%	48.7%	43.8%	33.0%	39.4%	
With 2	**16**	18	26	59	**61**	180
or more	8.8	15.6	25.6	74.1	55.9	20%
others	8.9%	10.0%	14.4%	32.8%	33.9%	
	36.4%	23.1%	20.3%	15.9%	21.9%	
Column	44	78	128	370	379	899
Total	4.9%	8.7%	14.2%	41.2%	31.0%	100%

Pearson Chi-square value 35.58730
Significance level .00002

The first line of each section shows the observed frequencies of incidents alone etc, the second line shows the expected frequencies, the third line shows the row percentages, the fourth line shows the column percentages. The first column shows whether alone or with others, the second - sixth columns show the observations by job function, and the seventh column shows the row totals. Greater than expected values are highlighted in **bold** and less than expected values are

highlighted in *italic*. The chi-square values and significance levels are shown below.

This table shows, inter alia, that administration managers are the most likely function to spend time alone, that marketing managers are the most likely function to spend time with one other person, and that production managers are the most likely managers to spend time with two or more other people.

Chapter twelve provides a managerial typology derived using factor analysis: principal components analysis with Varimax iterations. This type of analysis is frequently used in the Social Sciences to identify sets of closely related variables and it was used in the study specifically to identify groups of characteristics which would be either similar to, or different from, the 'managerial types' identified by Stewart and Mintzberg. This analysis identified clusters of responses under each of the sets of 'dependent' variables. These were then compared with the 'key' variables and those with greater than expected values are reported. Details of these associations are provided at Appendix 6.

The following is an example of the tables produced:

Skills Factor 6 - The Operations Manager

Organisation Size		**<-0.5**	**-0.5/0.5**	**>0.5**	**Row Total percentage**
<100	(observed)	*18*	41	49	108
	(expected)	32.4	42.1	33.5	39.0%
	(row %age)	16.7%	38.0%	45.4%	
	(col'%age)	21.7%	38.0%	57.0%	
100-499		*13*	27	16	56
		16.8	21.8	17.4	20.2%
		23.2	48.2	28.6%	
		15.7%	25.0%	18.6%	
500-999		4	11	4	19
		5.7	7.4	5.9	6.9%
		21.1%	57.9%	21.1%	
		4.8%	10.2%	4.7%	
1000-5000		**18**	20	*10*	48
		14.4	18.7	14.9	17.3%
		37.5%	41.7%	20.8%	
		21.7%	18.5%	11.6%	
>5000		**30**	*9*	7	46
		13.8	17.9	14.3	16.6%
		65.2%	19.6%	15.2%	
		36.1%	8.3%	8.1%	
Column Total		83	108	86	277
Column percentage		30.0%	39.0%	31.0%	100%

Pearson Chi-square value 48.43394
Significance level .00000

The first column shows the size of organisation, the second column shows the observations negatively associated with the factor, the third column shows the observations not strongly associated with the factor, the fourth column shows the observations positively asociated with the factor. The lines in each section show the values similarly to the previous table. Greater than expected values are highlighted in **bold** and less than expected values are highlighted in *italic*. The chi-square values and significance levels are shown below.

It can be readily seen that there is an association between this factor and organisation size, with the skill more likely to be used in smaller rather than larger organisations.

Chapter thirteen provides a series of managerial profiles or models by job function using data derived from the analysis of both the questionnaire survey and the similar analysis of the diary survey data. Models are also provided by hierarchical level using data from the questionnaire survey. These profiles include summaries of the significant associations identified using cross tabulations to obtain measures of association between the various sets of data.

Relationships were examined between nine *key* variables[34] and the remaining ten groups of variables. The results are not in any sense indicators of cause or effect. The Pearson chi-square test of significance for non-parametric statistics was used and only those associations with a significance level of <.05000 were considered. This level is generally accepted in Social Science studies as indicating a sufficiently strong relationship to reach valid conclusions. Details of these associations are provided at Appendix 5.

34 As listed at p8 above.

The following is an example of the type of table produced:

Responsibility level by gender

	Male	Female	Row Total
Top Management (observed)	147	6	153
(expected)	137.0	16	53.3%
(row %age)	96.1%	3.9%	
(col'%age)	57.2%	20.0%	
Senior Management	57	9	66
	59.1	6.9	23.0%
	86.4%	13.6%	
	22.2%	30.0%	
Middle Management	40	7	47
	42.1	4.9	16.4%
	85.1%	14.9%	
	15.6%	23.3%	
Professional	6	5	11
	9.9	1.1	3.8%
	54.5%	45.1%	
	2.3%	16.7%	
Junior Management	7	3	10
	9.0	1.0	3.5%
	70.0%	30.0%	
	2.7%	10.0%	
Column Total	257	30	
	89.5%	10.5%	100%

Pearson Chi-square value 27.15676
Significance level .00002

The first column shows the hierarchical level, the second column shows the numbers of male managers affected, the third column shows the numbers of female managers affected. The remaining aspects of the table are as described for the table shown at page 19. The values which are greater than expected are highlighted in **bold** and those which are less than expected are highlighted in *italic*.

This table shows, inter alia, that female managers are least likely to be found at top management level and most likely to be found at professional or junior management levels.

1.4 THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The study, which follows from the earlier studies of Carlson(1951), Stewart(1967/82), Mintzberg(1968/71) and Hales(1986), confirms many characteristics of managerial work identified in those studies. It shows that whilst the fundamental aspects of managerial work, *getting things done through other people*, have not changed radically since those studies the context within which it is taking place has changed radically. The rapidly changing environment within which industry operates, with its competitive pressures, the generalised influx of new technologies, the demands for quality and widespread 'de-manning' which have characterised the late 'eighties and early 'nineties can be seen to have radically affected managers lives and how they do their work.

1.5 THE STUDY'S CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE

Whilst confirming that the underlying characteristics of management endure over time the study shows that management is taking place within an environment of change and that the job of *manager* is likely to be increasingly demanding on its incumbents. The diary element of the study provides a wide range of information

about the manager's work, what he is doing, where he does it and with whom he does it; a very detailed picture of that work is provided through a series of charts. The relative importance of a wide range of skills and knowledge used by managers is identified and these finding provide strong evidence of areas in which education and training would be particularly valuable for new or potential managers. The interview case studies provide many interesting insights into the perceptions of thirty experienced managers who work in widely differing organisations and job functions. Taken together the various elements of the evidence from the study provide a very detailed picture of managerial work and the demands which it places on managers.

The study provides a potentially valuable contribution towards the design of management education and training for the nineteen-nineties. In the words of Thurley and Wirdenius(1989):

> "It can be argued that the quality of the vocational training and education for managers has probably been severely limited by the lack of a body of systematic research on management practice."

The findings from this study have a contribution to make towards improving that quality.

1.6 LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study examines the work of managers but it does not make any attempt to identify or discuss those aspects of management which are technical or specialist in nature. A manager of a finance department may well be a qualified accountant using his or her technical expertise in the management of a functional department. Similarly a marketing or personnel manager will have technical expertise which is applied in his or her work. A manager of a production department may not be technically

qualified, but may be concerned with many tasks and duties which are functionally specific but do not involve other people. General managers are less likely to have specifically technical or functional tasks and duties, but nonetheless may do many things which do not involve other people. Such matters may be central to particular managers jobs but they are not the concerns of this study.

Whilst the study goes some way towards identifying all of the non-technical aspects of managerial work it is particularly concerned with those aspects related to *getting things done through other people*.

The findings contribute to the identification of the educational and training needs of all managers and potential managers; but it is beyond the scope of this study to specify, in detail, what forms that education and training should take.

1.7 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

Part One provides a background to the original research. This chapter introduces the study, sets the aims and objectives and outlines the methodologies employed.

Chapter two provides a background to the subject area through a brief introduction to the subject of organisations and organisation, and then proceeds to trace the history of management through the twentieth century. The history, inter alia, identifies a number of differing approaches to management widely referred to as schools. There are differences of terminology and writers and scholars have sought to classify both themselves and other writers in various ways.

This work then proceeds to identify developing management thought through a number of the better known writers: certain writers of the late nineteenth to early twentieth

century are identified by the study with what it describes as *managerial structure;* a search for universal principles and practices which are concerned with effective and efficient organisation of work but without particular concern for the human implications of those principles and practices. Chapter three looks at the work of a number of these writers who contribute to what the study descibes as a *management structure school.*

Chapter four identifies a number of writers who take a more philosophical approach and who are concerned with the human implications of organisational life and the need to take account of these in the management and development of organisations. These writers contribute to what the study describes as a *management philosophy school.* They are seen as providing a link between the structural theorists and the developing *human relations movement* or *school* identified in chapter five. For the purpose of this work the period covered by the above three *schools* is regarded as the historical development of *modern management.* In order to identify the nature of modern management chapter six looks briefy at the work of a selection of empirical researchers of the post world war two era.

Part Two provides a report and analysis of the original empirical research of this study which confirms many of the findings of the above writers and adds to the knowledge of managerial work. This research identifies both similarities and differences, through strong statistical associations between certain aspects of managerial behaviour, related to both the nature of the job and the organisation within which that job exists. In doing so it confirms earlier findings and adds some new knowledge though the identification of nine major variables. A conclusion is reached, that although there are significant differences between the work of managers, there is a core of activities and related skills and knowledge which is likely to be a major element within

any managerial job, as defined, i.e. *getting things done through other people*.

Chapter seven provides a detailed technical description of the sample. Chapters eight to ten are an analysis of the questionnaire element of the study, providing a wide range of information about the work of managers including how and where they spend their time, how their performance is measured, the requirements to do their job well, major changes which have affected them, and the skills and knowledge which they use. This study confirms finding from earlier studies and at the same time contributes new knowledge, particularly related to the skills and knowledge which managers use. It also shows that whilst there are enduring aspects to mangerial work which may never change entirely, managers work within environments of rapid and regular changes which affect their work and working methods. Particularly changes brought about by new and developing technologies which affect both office and industrial activities.

Chapter eleven provides profiles from the data obtained in the diary survey. The *diary manager* is a composite of all the participants in the survey. Thirty-two of the respondents to the questionnaire survey contibuted diaries and these have been analysed to provide, through a series of charts, a very detailed profile of the work of the managers concerned. In addition to the composite manager there are also profiles of each type of functional manager. This section of the work clearly confirms earlier studies showing that managerial work is highly fragmented and adds new information about the activities which managers undertake. It provides, in some detail, information on where the work takes place, with whom, if anyone, the manager is working, what he is doing and for how long he is doing it.

Derived from the questionnaire data, chapter twelve identifies a number of *managerial types* through a series

of factors relating to how time is spent, requirements to do the job well, measures of performance, major changes which have been encountered and the skills and knowledge used in undertaking managerial work.

Chapter thirteen provides a series of *managerial profiles* or models based on both the data of the questionnaire survey and the subsequent diary survey. Profiles are provided for a *modal* manager, a general manager, each of a series of functional managers and for each level of the managerial hierarchy. This enables the reader to compare and contrast the work and skills of managers in a range of different jobs. These models include the statistically significant associations of the questionnaire and diary data and show the extent to which managerial jobs differ in relation to a series of variables. Although each variable shows a number, never below 30, of significant differences, the remaining data identify similarities.

Chapter fourteen is specifically concerned with the management of people. This is based on both the secondary research and the interview survey, as well as the data derived from the questionnaire and diary surveys. It identifies a range of qualities, abilities, skills and knowledge required of managers in order to achieve their results through the work of others.

Part Three, consisting of chapter fifteen, summarises findings from the secondary and primary research, provides conclusions and a simple managerial model: *Management in the Nineteen-Nineties*, as a basis for the development of managerial education and training. Taken together the findings from the study add an interesting and valuable contribution to knowledge.

Part Four, the appendices and references/bibliography, is bound as a separate volume.

Chapter Two

Management Context & Background

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter provides a background to the study through a brief section which describes various characteristics of 'work' organisations within which management takes place; followed by a short twentieth century managerial history. The study is concerned with the work of managers, who are to be found in all types of 'work' organisations regardless of their size or their objectives. The original research is concerned with managers who work within organisations which are within both the private and public ownership sectors, have either manufacturing or service activities and are located within Great Britain. However, it is appropriate to first consider the work of some earlier writers and scholars and this is not restricted, either to Great Britain or specific sectors.

2.2 ORGANISATIONS AND ORGANISATION

ORGANISATIONS

Organisations arise from a need to accomplish objectives which cannot be achieved by individuals working separately. The work within such organisations needs to be organised and managed. In the words of Mintzberg(1979):

> "Every organised human activity - from the making of pots to the placing of a man on the moon - gives rise to two fundamental and opposing requirements; the division of labour into various tasks to be performed and the co-ordination of these tasks to accomplish the activity."

These requirements can readily be traced back through Adam Smith to Moses, "And Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers

Cha