

Framework for Establishing an Effective Management Team within Organizations

Ana Tomova

Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, Skopje, North Macedonia

Beti Andonovic

Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, Skopje, North Macedonia

Aleksandar T. Dimitrov

Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, Skopje, North Macedonia

Abstract

This paper presents contemporary concepts, characteristics, and managerial strategies tailored for the demands of the new century. It delves into the significance of competitiveness and the implementation of effective management practices, emphasizing the pivotal role of knowledge management, organizational culture, and environmental analysis. The central focus lies in explaining the fundamental traits of a modern manager, highlighting the imperative for proactive improvement within the company. The subject of this paper is to evaluate the adoption of contemporary management principles by corporate management teams. The study examines the merits, drawbacks, and obstacles faced by these teams through surveys, aiming to optimize management teams. The research employs the Julie Hay's Working styles Questionnaire to predict Role distribution within working teams, offering a strategic advantage over empirical allocation. Furthermore, it utilizes the Adizes' Questionnaire to assess the development of key characteristics essential for effective decision-making within organizations. Surveys were conducted in two Macedonian companies following international research standards. Statistical analysis was conducted on the Questionnaire responses, offering not only a comprehensive evaluation and comparison of management team success across the surveyed companies, but also recommendations for improvements within the companies.

Keywords: Julie Hay's Questionnaire, Adizes' Questionnaire, team work, success criteria, management team.

JEL classification: M53, L22, L25

Paper type: Research article

Received: 9 February 2024

Accepted: 28 May 2024

DOI: 10.54820/entrenova-2024-0031

Introduction

Utilizing specific communication and system concepts allows team members to evaluate their knowledge and expertise within a defined scientific framework. This framework facilitates introspection and a novel perspective on interpersonal relationships and team dynamics. In this context, a team refers to a group of individuals possessing complementary skills essential for completing tasks or projects. While teams exist across various domains, in this discussion, a team refers specifically to a professional group within an organization.

A successful team isn't solely comprised of the most skilled individuals; rather, it consists of compatible members who work interdependently, share responsibilities, and strive towards common goals. Team dynamics, structure, and evolution are emphasized in this discussion. The team's structure is inherently organized, with established schedules and durations. Analysing positions, Roles, interpersonal dynamics, and hierarchical structures among team members enhances understanding of the team's structure.

This paper integrates two concepts for Role distribution within a team, the Roles concept of Adizes (Adizes, 1991; 2004) and Working styles concept of Julie Hay (Hay, 2009) based on drivers' concept of Taibi Kahler (Kahler, 1975, 2008), specifically within two Macedonian companies. The essential Roles crucial for effective and efficient decision-making within any organization, system, or team include: the Role (P) - focused on production, the Role (A) - responsible for administration, the Role (E) - embodying entrepreneurial functions, and the Role (I) - dedicated to organizational integration. These Roles are fundamental for achieving both short-term and long-term effectiveness. Julie Hay's definition of Working styles describes five specific styles, which manifest in how individuals organize their work and personal lives, as well as how they communicate within teams or with family and friends (Hay, 2009).

The Isaac Adizes' Roles

According to the Adizes' framework, Producing (P) involves achieving immediate results, Administrating (A) entails minimizing waste in ongoing activities, Entrepreneuring (E) revolves around identifying and pursuing new opportunities or directions, and Integrating (I) focuses on coordinating and maintaining the social and functional coherence of organizations to prevent them from becoming disjointed collections of isolated individuals. When functioning effectively, an organization becomes an organic entity capable of resilience even in the absence of key personnel. Adizes simplifies these four categories into the acronym PAEI.

Teams excel in decision-making compared to individuals due to the inherent personal biases and preferences individuals possess. Adizes illustrates these biases through four archetypal personality profiles: the Producer, the Administrator, the Entrepreneur, and the Integrator. To allocate Roles within a working team according to the Adizes' method, professionals would observe members' activities over a period to ensure a balanced distribution of responsibilities.

The Julie Hay's Working Styles

Working styles encompass ingrained patterns of behaviour that often occur unconsciously and influence all aspects of our lives, whether we're alone, with family, socializing, at work, or at home. There are five overarching styles, each with its own set of advantages and disadvantages, identified simply by the characteristic behaviour that typifies it: Be Perfect (BP), Be Strong (BS), Hurry Up (HU), Please Others (PO), and Try Hard (TH). Individuals may identify with one or more of these patterns, and

becoming more aware of one's own working style(s) can enhance the positive aspects associated with them.

Integration of the two concepts

The combination of these two concepts "(Andonovic et al, 2014)", each of which is highly applicable on its own, expands the scope of their utility through in-depth examination, leading to the development of an original approach to distributing Roles within a working team or organization. This is achieved by establishing a correlation between the two concepts to form a unified new model.

In conducting detailed analyses that incorporate characteristics from both theories, particular attention is given to scenarios where reliance is placed solely on one of the four Roles. Adizes has coined specific management styles for such instances: The Lone Ranger (P), The Bureaucrat (A), The Arsonist (E), and The Super Follower (I).

Methodology

The study utilized both the Adizes' Questionnaire, which assesses the level of development of (P), (A), (E) and (I) characteristics/Roles within companies—functions essential in any organization, system, or team for ensuring effective and efficient decision-making, and Julie Hay's Questionnaire for identifying Working styles. Hay's Questionnaire provides insights into Role distribution within Working teams, offering a valuable advantage in terms of practical experience-based allocation.

A survey was conducted in two Macedonian companies, with the Questionnaire responses being subjected to statistical analysis. This facilitated a thorough examination and comparison of the management teams' performance across the companies under review. The Adizes' and Julie Hay's Questionnaires were distributed to multiple respondents within the following companies: Company A, located in Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia, with 3 respondents, and Company B, also in Skopje, Republic of North Macedonia, with 6 respondents.

The completion of the Questionnaires took into consideration the respondent's position within the company, with each respondent being identified by a combination of letters and numbers. This method facilitated a systematic organization and tracking of the completed Questionnaires.

Through completing the Adizes' Questionnaire, respondents can assess the level of development of specific characteristics/Roles: P for Producer, A for Administrator, E for Entrepreneur, and I for Integrator. The Questionnaire comprises 33 questions designed for this purpose.

Completing Julie Hay's Questionnaire allows respondents to identify their Working styles: Be Perfect (BP), Be Strong (BS), Hurry Up (HU), Please Others (PO), and Try Hard (TH). This Questionnaire comprises 25 questions, divided into five groups, with respondents unaware of the groupings.

The responses from the Adizes' and Julie Hay's Questionnaire are analysed separately for each respondent, focusing on working characteristics/Roles and Working styles, respectively, categorized by company and for each individual company. Recommendations are provided for each respondent, company, and leader/team within each company.

Results

The results are summarized and examined for each respondent individually. The filled-out Questionnaires are evaluated on a per-employee basis, and subsequently for the entire company, with points allocated accordingly in tables. Following this, an interpretation and discussion are conducted based on the Working style and the interpretation derived from the combinations of Roles obtained. Based on the responses to the Adizes' Questionnaire, the analyses indicate that a maximum of 20 points can be attained for Roles P, A, and I, whereas role E allows for a maximum of 22 points. Based on the information provided, if a respondent achieves over 80% of the maximum points for a particular Role, they are considered to possess that Role significantly (high expressiveness, i.e., performing the function exceptionally well), denoted by the capital letter corresponding to the Role (P, A, E, I). If they achieve between 50% and 80% of the maximum points, they are characterized as possessing the Role moderately (performing the function satisfactorily), indicated by the lowercase letter corresponding to the Role (p, a, e, i). If they score below 50% of the maximum points, they are not characterized by that Role (indicating poor performance or absence of the function), represented by a dash in the code (-, -, -, -). Nonetheless, in accordance with I. Adizes, an individual can be deemed a leader only if they proficiently execute two or more functions, with one of them being integration (I), signifying the capacity to bring people together. Simultaneously, satisfactory performance across other functions is also essential, including combinations such as PAeI, PaEI, pAEI, PaeI, pAeI, and paEI.

Table 1
Characteristics of Roles according to I. Adizes

Input Roles	Process	be	Output on
Producing (P)	functional	effective	short-term
Administrating (A)	systematized	efficient	short-term
Entrepreneuring (E)	proactive	effective	long-term
Integrating (I)	organic	efficient	long-term

Source: Adize, 1994.

Based on the responses to the questions in the Hay's Questionnaire, the analyses reveal that regardless of variations in the scores obtained, the prominence of styles is indicated by the highest score values. Based on the combinations of Roles obtained for each respondent within each company, various types of respondents emerge, categorized according to their predominant Roles. Some types exhibit a lack of certain Roles, while others have a limited representation of specific Roles, and some show a strong representation of particular Roles. For those with a low representation of a Role (which is common across all three companies), the Roles (either P, A, E, or I) with the highest values in the analysis are highlighted. This doesn't necessarily imply a dominant presence of that Role; rather, among the limited representation of Roles, it is the most pronounced.

Presented below is the distribution of Roles and Working styles among respondents categorized by company.

Table 2

Company A (3 respondents) – Results according to I. Adizes

	P	A	E	I
A1	14	13	15	13
A2	15	14	13	11
A3	17	17	16	15

Source: Adize, 2004.

Table 3

Company A (3 respondents) – Results according to J. Hay

	Hurry Up	Be Perfect	Please Others	Try Hard	Be Strong
A1	18	34	39	37	38
A2	19	28	30	20	24
A3	25	31	34	24	22

Source: Hay, 2009.

Table 4

Company B (6 respondents) – Results according to I. Adizes

	P	A	E	I
B1	13	10	8	10
B2	16	13	16	13
B3	17	13	17	15
B4	15	13	14	14
B5	14	14	10	15
B6	14	11	14	13

Source: Adize, 2004.

Table 5

Company B (6 respondents) – Results according to J. Hay

	Hurry Up	Be Perfect	Please Others	Try Hard	Be Strong
B1	19	20	25	23	22
B2	19	30	26	24	19
B3	28	27	33	31	25
B4	21	27	24	21	23
B5	20	31	26	21	27
B6	25	27	32	22	27

Source: Hay, 2009.

Discussion

Based on the obtained results, a general review of the two companies was made.

Company A

Based on the dominance of the Working style "Please Others," it can be concluded that this organization fosters a supportive environment, characterized by empathy and cooperation.

Team Motto: Cultivating unity within the company and striving to foster stronger bonds among employees.

Team Need: Ensuring the satisfaction of all team members.

Team Challenge: Avoiding any potential risks to prevent harm, no matter how minor. Based on the combination of Roles, we observe an organization type (paei) characterized by balanced allocations across the Roles of producer, administrator, entrepreneur, and integrator. It moderately generates outcomes through products and services, implements policies and procedures with moderation to ensure effective system functionality, moderately generates new ideas and initiatives, thereby initiating changes, and also moderately attends to fostering teamwork and interpersonal relationships among employees.

Recommendation: To enhance dedication to personal ideas and assertiveness in correcting others when necessary. Additionally, to delegate a larger portion of tasks to subordinates, while considering both the outcomes and processes, as well as engaging in strategic planning and thorough risk analysis.

Suggestion for an Ideal Management Team: Based on comprehensive preliminary assessments and individual analyses, the suggested team composition for this company would include the following personnel:

- Respondent A3 (PAei) – team leader, autocratic management style
- Respondent A1 (paei) – team member
- Respondent A2 (paei) – team member

Examining the Role distributions, it's evident that there is a relatively higher presence of the minor Role p in respondent A2, a more pronounced presence of the minor Role i in respondent A1, and a substantial presence of the major Roles PA in respondent A3. Based on the information provided, it can be inferred that there is a suitable harmony within the team, as evidenced by the varying degrees of representation of corresponding minor Roles among different respondents. This implies that team compatibility is achieved when members and leaders possess diverse skill sets, allowing them to complement each other in task execution. However, a notable absence in this context is the limited representation of Role I, which is crucial for effectively integrating the team itself.

Company B

Based on the prevalence of the Working style "Satisfy Others," it can be deduced that this organization fosters a supportive environment characterized by empathy.

Team Motto: Fostering unity within the company and striving to cultivate closer relationships among employees.

Team Need: Ensuring the satisfaction of all team members.

Team Challenge: Steering clear of any potential risks, no matter how minor, to prevent harm.

Based on the combination of Roles, we identify a type of organization (paei) characterized by balanced organization and similarly minor Roles of producer, administrator, entrepreneur, and integrator. It demonstrates moderate efficacy in delivering results through products and services, implementing policies and

procedures to ensure effective and efficient system operation. Additionally, it moderately fosters the development of new ideas and initiatives, facilitating changes, and moderately attends to fostering teamwork and interpersonal relations among employees.

Recommendation: To enhance dedication to personal ideas and address discrepancies in others' actions, while also delegating the majority of tasks to subordinates. Additionally, prioritize considerations such as outcomes, processes, organizational structure, strategic planning, and thorough risk assessment.

Suggestion for an Ideal Management Team: Based on the comprehensive initial assessment and individual analyses, the team composition for this company would be determined and comprised of the following employees:

- Respondent B3 (Paei) – team leader, producer
- Respondent B2 (paei) – team member
- Respondent B4 (paei) – team member
- Respondent B6 (paei) – team member

Examining the Role distributions, we can observe a notably higher presence of the minor Role p in respondent B4, an increased representation of both minor Roles p and e in respondents B2 and B6, and a substantial presence of the major Role P in respondent B3. Conversely, respondents B1 and B5 exhibited a deficiency in Roles, suggesting that they may not be suitable candidates for team leadership roles. Moreover, their likelihood of being team members is also minimal. Based on the information provided, it can be inferred that among various respondents, there is a diverse distribution of minor Roles, with each exhibiting a greater representation of its corresponding minor Role. This suggests that team compatibility is achieved when team members and leaders possess varied abilities, enabling them to complement each other's skills during task execution.

Several team configuration possibilities can be outlined. The initial option might resemble the aforementioned setup; however, this arrangement would result in two team members possessing identical Roles and representations. Specifically, two members would have a greater representation of the minor Roles p and e, which does not contribute to diversifying task execution within the team. Therefore, it can be deduced that the most suitable team arrangement for this company would be as follows:

Option 1:

- Respondent B3 (Paei) – team leader
- Respondent B4 (paei) – team member
- Respondent B6 (paei) – team member

or Option 2:

- Respondent B3 (Paei) – team leader
- Respondent B2 (paei) – team member
- Respondent B4 (paei) – team member

A common deficiency across all options is the limited presence of Role I, which is crucial for effectively integrating the team as a whole.

Conclusion

Based on the study, the findings from the responses provided by potential managers of two companies were examined using two questionnaires: the Adizes' Questionnaire on Roles/working characteristics and the Julie Hay's Questionnaire on Working styles. The analysis of these two questionnaires was conducted independently, and the results from each were evaluated separately, leading to the following conclusions:

- The findings derived from the examination of the responses to the Hay's Questionnaire primarily provide informative insights into the attributes of each respondent, considering both Working styles and functional Roles. Conversely, the outcomes resulting from the analysis of the responses to the Adizes' Questionnaire effectively differentiate between suitable candidates for managerial positions and those who may not align well with the responsibilities of a team member.
- From the results obtained from the Questionnaires, it is evident that there exist groups comprising three or four candidates who are potentially suited to fulfil the Roles of managers and members within an optimal management team for companies. These groups are designated accordingly in the Results and Discussion section above.
- It can be asserted that further investigation via surveys, studies, or research would undoubtedly contribute positively to gaining deeper insights and more accurately identifying the specific skills that candidates need to enhance. It is presumed that the aforementioned analysis could serve as a complementary component or a valuable input for subsequent methodologies concerning the establishment of an optimal management team within companies.

The importance and impact of the research lie in the recognition that senior management teams are profoundly affected by global shifts and trends. They bear the responsibility of avoiding the significant repercussions of market volatility, enabling companies to adjust to environmental opportunities and enhance their positioning for greater profitability. Given the significance of exploring the challenges and transformations within the management teams of contemporary companies, along with the potential, constraints, and prospects they face, this subject holds exceptional significance and relevance.

The findings of the research will serve as a foundational resource for future studies, particularly in highlighting and determining the correlation between global trends and shifts within management teams in contemporary companies.

References

1. Adizes, I. (1991). *Mastering Change: The Power of Mutual Trust and Respect in Personal Life, Family Life, Business and Society*. Santa Monica, California: Adizes Institute Publications.
2. Adizes, I. (2004). *Management/Mismanagement Styles: How to Identify a Style and What To Do About It*. Santa Barbara, California: Adizes Institute Publishing.
3. Andonovic, B., Spasovska, M., Temkov, M., & Dimitrov, A. (2014). Integral Model for Distributing Functional Roles Within a Working Team, *Quality of Life*, 5(1-2):5-18.
4. Hay, J. (2009). *Working it Out at Work: Understanding Attitudes and Building Relationships*. Sherwood Publishing: August.
5. Kahler, T. (1975). Drivers —The Key to the Process Script. *Transactional Analysis Journal*, 5:3
6. Kahler, T. (2008). *The Process Therapy Model: The Six Personality Types with Adaptations*, USA: Taibi Kahler Associates

About the authors

Prof. Ana Tomova, PhD, is Associate Professor at the Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, Skopje, North Macedonia. She obtained her PhD in nanomaterials and nanotechnology at the Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, Skopje. She is author of scientific articles in the area of nano sensors, nanomaterials and metallurgy i.e., production of nonferrous metals. Her field of interest includes metals/nanometals, nanomaterials and their application. The author can be contacted at: anatomova@tmf.ukim.edu.mk

Prof. Beti Andonovic, PhD, is a Full Professor at the Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, North Macedonia. She obtained her PhD in mathematics at the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences in Skopje. She is author of many scientific articles in the area of mathematics and mathematical modeling and its applications, as well as in management and communication skills. She has participated in many international and national projects. Currently, prof. Andonovic is an MC member in the completed or ongoing EU projects COST Actions CA16227, CA17139, and CA17140. The author can be contacted at: beti@tmf.ukim.edu.mk

Prof. Aleksandar Dimitrov, PhD is Full Professor at the Faculty of Technology and Metallurgy, North Macedonia, and Head of Department of Extractive Metallurgy. He completed postdoctoral studies at the Department of Material Science and Metallurgy, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK. Prof. Dimitrov is an author of more than 100 international scientific articles. He had numerous research and scientific missions such as University of Cambridge, University of Leeds, University of Oxford. His current research is focused on nanomaterials and nanostructures, synthesis of graphene, MWCNTs, and other carbon nanomaterials, as well as on quality management. The author can be contacted at: aco2501@gmail.com