

LEADING THE LEADERS

HOW TO ENRICH YOUR STYLE OF MANAGEMENT
AND HANDLE PEOPLE WHOSE STYLE IS
DIFFERENT FROM YOURS

by

Ichak Kalderon Adizes, Ph.D.
Director of Professional Services and CEO of
the Adizes Institute

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Adizes, Ichak.

Leading the Leaders: how to enrich your style of management and handle people whose style is different from yours

© 2004 by Dr. Ichak Adizes.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by any means (including electronic, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without permission of the author and the publisher.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2004092672

ISBN: 0-937120-04-9

Published by:

The Adizes Institute Publishing
2815 East Valley Road
Santa Barbara, CA, 93108
805-565-2901
www.adizes.com

Printed in China

For Nurit, who does not need this book to read people.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Nan Goldberg who has diligently edited this book into a readable form and put up with my endless rewritings. Without her this book would not see the light of the day.

Zvonko Kuzmanovski labored on publishing this book and organized all that is needed for making it happen.

Martha Bright checked the spelling and did the copy editing.

Thank you all.

Contents

Preface.....	13
Why This Book?.....	13
Goals of This Book.....	14
The Premise.....	15
Methodology and source of data.....	16
Organization and Presentation.....	17
How to Read This Book.....	18
A Note on Style.....	19
A Request.....	20
Chapter 1: What Is Management?.....	21
The Functionalist View	23
Why the Roles Are Incompatible.....	25
The Myth of the Perfect Manager.....	28
Management vs. Mismanagement vs. Leadership.....	31
Management Training: The Big Fallacy.....	32
The Workable Solution: A Complementary Team.....	33
The Inevitability of Conflict.....	34
Recognizing and Hiring a Good Manager.....	35
Chapter 2: Management Styles.....	39
A Raison D’Etre.....	40
The (P)roducer (Paei).....	42
Running the Railroad.....	43
The (A)dministrator (pAei).....	44
Seeing through the Fog.....	46
The Creative Contributor (paEi).....	47
The (E)ntrepreneur (PaEi).....	48
Getting Religion.....	49
The (I)ntegrator (paeI).....	52
The (I) Role in Leadership.....	54
Chapter 3: Mismanagement Styles.....	57
The Lone Ranger (P--)......	58
The Bureaucrat (-A--)......	63

The Arsonist (--E-)	70
The SuperFollower (---I)	76
The Common Denominator	79
The Deadwood (----)	80
Chapter 4: Prescriptions for the (P) Style	85
Behavior	85
Communication	90
Decision-making	97
Implementing	110
Team-building	112
Managing staff	114
Managing Change	118
Top Ten Prescriptions for a Predominantly (P) Style	123
Chapter 5: (pAei) Prescriptions	125
Behavior	125
Communication	128
Decision-making	134
Implementing	143
Team-building	147
Managing Staff	150
Managing Change	156
Top 10 Prescriptions for a (pAei)	159
Chapter 6: (paEi) and (PaEi) Prescriptions	161
Behavior	161
Communication	168
Decision-making	173
Implementation	182
Team-building	185
Managing Staff	191
Managing Change	200
Top Ten Prescriptions for the Predominantly (E) Type	203
Chapter 7: (paeI) Prescriptions	205
Behavior	205
Communication	208

Decision-making.....	211
Implementing.....	214
Team-building.....	215
Managing Staff.....	217
Managing Change.....	220
Top Prescriptions for an (I) Style.....	222
Chapter 8: Management Style Comparisons.....	223
Behavior Comparisons.....	223
Communication Comparisons.....	226
Decision-making Comparisons.....	229
Implementation Comparisons.....	237
Team-building Comparisons.....	241
Managing Staff Comparisons.....	246
Change Comparisons.....	250
Chapter 9: Dealing with Other People.....	255
Communicating.....	257
Dealing with a (P) – a (P)roducer or Lone Ranger.....	259
Dealing with an (A) – an (A)dministrator or Bureaucrat...	262
Dealing with an (E) – an (E)ntrepreneur or Arsonist.....	267
Dealing with an (I) - an (I)ntegrator or SuperFollower.....	273
Summing It Up.....	274
Chapter 10: Prescriptions for Dealing with Others.....	277
Dealing with a (P).....	277
Dealing with an (A).....	281
Dealing with an (E).....	284
Dealing with an (I).....	295
Summary.....	298
Afterword.....	301
Bibliography.....	302
Additional works by the author.....	305
About the Adizes Institute.....	311

Preface

WHY THIS BOOK?

I introduced my theory of management in one of my early books – *How to Solve the Mismanagement Crisis* (first published by Dow Jones Irwin in 1979 and subsequently reprinted several times by the Adizes Institute). The book was translated into 22 languages and became a bestseller in several countries. As I continued to work with hundreds of companies in 48 countries, my knowledge of the subject increased and I was able to expand each chapter of the original book into a book of its own. The chapter on corporate lifecycles became: *Corporate Lifecycles: Why Organizations Grow and Die and What to Do about It* (Paramus, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1989), with subsequent enlarged and revised editions published by the Adizes Institute).

The chapter on how to keep an organization in its Prime condition of vitality became *The Pursuit of Prime* (Santa Monica, Calif.: Knowledge Exchange, 1997), and the chapter on how to manage change became *Mastering Change* (Santa Monica, Calif.: Adizes Institute, 1992).

More parts of that introductory book are being presented now in a series of three books. The first is: *The Ideal Executive: Why You Cannot Be One and What to Do about It*, in which I discuss why you can never become the perfect textbook executive that management development programs are attempting to produce.

The subject of management and mismanagement styles – and by this I am speaking of the styles of normal people, rather than a collage of perfect traits that no one actually possesses – I cover in the second book, *Management and Mismanagement Styles*.

This book, the third in the series, *Leading the Leaders – How Improve Your Style of Management and Handle Styles That Are Different from Your Own* – is meant to help you compensate for your own flaws and weaknesses, once you have discovered what your basic

management style is; and also to help you handle other managers – your subordinates, peers, and those you report to – whose styles are different from yours. It is written in the form of “prescriptions” to follow – different prescriptions for each style. It is also directed to the emerging profession of corporate coaches, as it provides additional tools for coaching executives.

GOALS OF THIS BOOK

This book is not a survey of the literature, although I do include some references to illustrate that my experiences are not unique to me. Rather, these prescriptions are notes from the battleground, based on my experiences in coaching executives around the world. You might say that this book has been in the process of being written for more than thirty years.

It is important to note, however, that my prescriptions are not intended to change anyone, but rather, to enrich a manager’s style. The word “change” is usually taken to mean a total transformation, such as a change of seasons from winter to summer. That kind of personality change is impossible to accomplish.

What can be done is to make the summer not so hot and the winter more bearable. Enriching a style does not mean a total change of personality and behavior. The purpose of coaching is to make managers, whatever their personal style, become more flexible, so that they can work with others whose styles are different.

Granted, it is more of a small, incremental, continuous improvement than a revolutionary change, a paradigm shift or a breakthrough. But that’s life. I do not believe that people can change their innate character. That has been one of my continuing struggles with executives in many companies: “Why doesn’t he change?” they ask me. “Can’t you help us change him?”

My answer is: “People do not change, but since they can get worse they can also get better, and that might be all we need to be able to work with them.”

In clarifying these definitions I am merely attempting to set appropriate expectations. Sometimes when companies hire a coach, there is the expectation that those who are being coached can become someone else entirely. We expect that in a marriage too, don't we? – until we realize that it does not and cannot happen. Making a fish into a bird is not something we should aim for – not in the time frame of one lifetime, anyway. But we can work on making people whose styles are different work better together nevertheless.

THE PREMISE

My premise, which I fully develop in *The Ideal Executive* and reiterate in Chapter 1 of this book, is that the ideal leader, manager, or executive does not and cannot exist. All the books and textbooks that try to teach us to be perfect managers, leaders, or executives are based on the erroneous assumption that such a goal is possible. No one can excel at all of the roles expected of leaders or managers. Every human being may excel in one or more roles, but never in all of them, forever and under all circumstances. We are all human and thus have strengths and weaknesses. The managerial task requires a perfection no one is able to provide since no one is perfect.

Thus, classic management theorists, including Howard Koontz, William H. Newman, and even Peter Drucker, present what the manager or executive should do – as if all managers have the same style and can be trained to manage the same way, ignoring the fact that different people organize, plan, motivate – in other words, manage – differently.

Since the “perfect,” “ideal” executive, who excels in all roles, does not and cannot exist, does that mean that all organizations, by definition, will be mismanaged? The answer is: “Absolutely not!” What we need is a complementary team. But how can such different styles complement each other? How can they work together when they are so unlike each other?

The first step is to understand that the different styles speak different “languages” – in other words, they infer different meanings from different communication cues in word and in gesture. Conflict between the different styles is unavoidable; but by learning to speak the “language” of the people we are working with, we can build a complementary team and nourish it, thus preventing that conflict from becoming destructive.

You need to pay attention to how your behavior affects others. If you know your style, then you also know that your style of communicating is apt to be problematic for the other styles. If you know in what ways it is problematic, then you can compensate. And here is where we come to the purpose of this book: How to compensate for your style so you can work with others; and how to coach others so that they can work with each other.

METHODOLOGY AND SOURCE OF DATA

This book summarizes for the reader my insights based on thirty years of work in the field of organizational transformation (“consulting”). Since my work as an organizational transformationist and lecturer frequently takes me all over the globe, I have been able to compare notes and share my observations with executives around the world.

I have treated companies in 48 countries that range from \$1 million to \$15 billion in sales or \$120 billion in assets, and employ from 80 to hundreds of thousands of people. They are involved in numerous technologies, including aircraft, insurance, banking, the performing arts, museums, and government agencies, in both the profit and not-for-profit sectors. I have also used my insights about leadership style to counsel several heads of state.

I’ve found that my insights on managerial styles are valid for all the countries in which I’ve lectured, including cultures as different from each other as those of Taiwan, Japan, Sweden, Mexico, Greece, Israel, England, and the United States. Managerial styles and behavior are independent of culture – although social culture, I have noted, tends to reinforce managerial behavior.

ORGANIZATION AND PRESENTATION

In Chapter 1, I sum up the first book in this series, *The Ideal Executive: Why You Cannot Be One and What to Do about It*. I define the concept of management, discuss the myth of the perfect manager, and briefly present my functional theory of management: the four roles – (P), (A), (E), and (I) – necessary to perform good management. Next, I explain why these four roles are incompatible and why they inevitably lead to conflict – and what you can do about it. Finally, I discuss the attributes of a good manager – in contrast to that mythical perfect manager who appears about as frequently as a unicorn.

Chapters 2 and 3 briefly review the contents of the second book in this series, *Management and Mismanagement Styles*, because it is impossible to understand this book without the information contained in the preceding book of the series. In Chapter 2, I describe the management style that results when one of the necessary (PAEI) management roles is performed with excellence and the others only adequately, creating archetypes that I have dubbed the (P)roducer, for a (Paei); the (A)dministrator, for a (pAei); the (E)ntrepreneur, for a (PaEi); and the (I)ntegrator, for a (paeI).

Chapter 3 contrasts the above management styles with the mismanagement style that results when all emphasis is placed on one role to the exclusion of the other three: the Lone Ranger, (P---); the Bureaucrat, (-A--); the Arsonist, (--E-); the SuperFollower, (---I); and finally the Deadwood, (----) who does not perform any of the four (PAEI) roles.

(If you have already read *The Ideal Executive* and *Management/Mismanagement Styles*, you can skip those chapters.)

Chapters 4 through 7 contain my prescriptions for each of the four basic managerial styles. These are quick, easily grasped reminders that, once you have discovered your own style, will help you compensate for your weaknesses and communicate effectively with other management types.

Each style has its own chapter, and each chapter contains custom-made prescriptions divided into categories that reflect the five basic

functions of every manager – decision-making, implementing, team-building, managing staff, and managing change – as well as behavior and communication. Within each category, there is no particular order or sequence to the pages. Each statement, each page stands on its own. Each prescription is followed by a brief discussion.

Chapter 8 contrasts the different styles' common managerial problems by placing the prescriptions in a comparative context, so that the characteristic failures of each style are juxtaposed. Reading these comparisons can make you wonder how any organization manages to function at all without imploding.

Chapters 9 and 10 focus on how to deal with a boss, employee, or colleague whose style is different from yours. (Theoretically, it should not matter what style you are, since how you communicate should depend on whom you are speaking to, not who is speaking.) The way to achieve influence over others is to master the style of communication that others respond to. And the more influence each manager has on the others, the better the quality of decision-making will become.

In Chapter 9, I offer clues to diagnosing another person's basic style (as opposed to your own), as well as some general tips on how to communicate with each style: What works and what doesn't work. Chapter 10 offers specific prescriptions for dealing with other people of each style in the areas of decision-making, implementation, team-building, managing staff, and managing change.

HOW TO READ THIS BOOK

To get the full benefit from this book – particularly if you are still convinced that you can do the job all by yourself and don't need people who complement you – please read the first two books in this series before you start reading this one.

These prescriptions are meant for those who have an inclination to enrich themselves and are looking for encouragement, reminders, and direction. To get maximum benefit, you must be relaxed and open. Above all, do not be defensive about your own style or

judgmental about someone else's. Remember that the prescriptions will not all be relevant – at least not all at the same moment in your career. Choose those that apply to you, based on your assessment of your own basic style.

When you get to the prescriptions, I suggest that you read no more than five or six at any one time. Each statement takes a page or more to explain and could take a whole book to elaborate. Reading too much too soon would overtax you, like reading a book of jokes: overexposure causes you to become bored and unappreciative.

On the other hand, I strongly suggest re-reading this book at intervals throughout your professional life – both to remind yourself of these tips and because as time passes and you have new experiences, statements that once had little or no relevance might become powerful and exciting. I personally re-read my own statements often, and even though they are my own I can find them banal or very illuminating, depending on when I read them and what my recent experience has been.

Everyone needs reminders. I, too, sometimes violate my own principles in communicating with people. I have found that the more tired or emotional I am, the more likely I am to forget to focus on the style of the person I am talking to, and to speak to him instead as if his style were identical to mine. When that happens, there is a good chance that I will start, or reinforce, a dysfunctional conflict.

I must make one important disclaimer: The prescriptions will not work for managers who have zeros, or dashes, in their code. I have found that when someone totally lacks the capability to perform a certain role, no prescription will help; it is beyond my capability to enrich his style. Thus, when I refer to someone as having the (P) style, assume that I am speaking about a (Paei) manager, not (P---) ; when I say (A), I mean a (pAei), not (-A--).

A NOTE ON STYLE

Throughout this book I have most often used the masculine gender, because I found it cumbersome to switch back and forth and

inaccurate to assign one gender to any specific managerial style. My insights apply equally to female managers. When, occasionally, I use the female gender to refer to a managerial style, again I intend my comments to refer to both genders equally.

A REQUEST

I am extremely interested in your feedback. Do you have any disagreements? Do you have some experiences that confirm what I am saying or reject what I am saying? Let me hear from you.

I have learned from everyone who has cared to share their thoughts with me. If any reader wishes to communicate agreement, disagreement, experience or anecdotes, jokes or cartoons that illustrate my points, I would appreciate the feedback. Use the chat room at the Adizes Institute's website for that purpose (www.adizes.com), or write to me at the Adizes Institute, 2815 East Valley Road, Santa Barbara, CA 93108.

Better yet, send me an e-mail: Ichak@Adizes.com.

Thank you.

Ichak Kalderon Adizes
Santa Barbara, 2004

Chapter 1

What Is Management?

First, let's define our terms. What, exactly, do we mean by the word "manager," and what roles does the word "management" encompass?

From textbooks we learn that managers (also called administrators, executives, and leaders) plan, decide, lead, organize, control, and motivate.

However, there are organizations in which management does not perform some of those functions. Some years ago I studied the management of artistic organizations – opera, dance, theater, etc. – and I became aware that managers cannot manage artists as, let us say, one can manage workers.¹ They cannot plan, organize, and control as the textbooks prescribe. I noted the same phenomenon in the health and educational systems:² Administrators do not perform all the functions of management. They do not decide policy matters, for example, since physicians and educators usually have this as their prerogative.

Nor do all countries around the world practice the managerial process exactly as we define it. In fact, in some countries our form of management is prohibited by law. In Yugoslavia, for instance, during the Communist era of self-management, it was constitutionally prohibited to make decisions the way we do, *for* the organization. The manager's role was to suggest, present to, and convince the workers, who had the ultimate responsibility for deciding salaries, quotas of production, investments, etc.³

In other countries, management is socially discouraged. In the heyday of the Israeli kibbutzim, for instance, management was deliberately rotated every two or three years, so that nobody became what in the United States is called a professional manager: A person whose profession it is to tell other people what to do.

In certain languages, such as Swedish, French, Serbian, and Croatian, the word “manage” does not even have a literal translation. In those languages, words like “direct,” “lead,” or “administer” are often used instead. When they mean to say “manage” the way we use it in the United States, they usually use the English word.

In Spanish, the word *manejar*, the literal translation for “manage,” means “to handle” and is used only when referring to horses or cars. When they want to say “to manage” in the American sense of the word, they use “direct” or “administer.”

In an English thesaurus, synonyms for “manage” include: “decide,” “operate,” “plan,” “control,” “organize,” “rule,” “achieve goals,” “lead,” “motivate,” “accomplish,” “dominate,” “govern,” even “manipulate.”

What is the common denominator shared by all these synonyms? They are all a one-way process. The managing person is telling the managed person what to do. Even the word “motivating” makes an assumption: that the motivator has decided already what to do, and in motivating is trying to convince a subordinate to do it.

Now let’s look at the word “subordinate” – the one who is managed, who is supposed to carry out the manager’s decisions. What does that word really mean? Listen to it: *Subordinate* – like *sub*-ordinary. Now listen to the word *supervisor* – it connotes superior vision. It connotes a fixed hierarchy of capabilities as well.

So the managerial process, as it is taught and practiced, is not a value-free process. It is not only a science and an art, but also an expression of sociopolitical values. All of the synonyms for “managing,” to a greater or lesser degree, are a kind of manipulation.

So, then, what *is* management, if in some countries it’s prohibited, in others it’s socially discouraged, and in still others it doesn’t even exist?

THE FUNCTIONALIST VIEW

Let us try to understand the meaning of management by understanding the function it performs: Why do we need it? What would happen if it did not exist?

The function should be value-free, without any sociopolitical or cultural biases. It should be the same whether we are managing ourselves, our families, a business, a not-for-profit organization, or even an entire nation. Whether we are speaking about managing, parenting, or governing, it should be one and the same process conceptually, differing only in the size and nature of the unit being managed.

What is the function of management? What is it supposed to do? Would you agree with me that it is to ensure a well-managed organization?

Now, what does “well-managed organization” mean? Would you agree with me that an organization is well managed if it is effective and efficient in the short and long run? Effective in the short run means that it satisfies the present needs of its present clients. Efficient in the short run means that it is operating with the minimum necessary resources. There is no unnecessary waste.

Effective in the long run means that it will satisfy the needs of its future clients. It means that the organization proacts to change. And efficient in the long run means that no one is indispensable in this organization. It can survive and adapt organically to internal changes as well.

The purpose of management, then, is to see to it that the organization is effective and efficient in the short and long run.

Please note that this definition is value-free. It applies to any organization of any size in any technology with any purpose in any country. It equally applies to running an organization of saints and, sorry to say it, to running a Nazi extermination camp. It applies to running a family, a business, a not-for-profit organization, or a country.

Thus it is a universal, functionalist theory of management.

How does management (parenting, leading or governing) accomplish this task?

Over more than 40 years of continuous research and testing, I've discovered that there are four roles that management must perform if an organization is going to be well managed in the short and in the long run. Management can be defined by these four roles, because each one of them is necessary and together they are sufficient for good management: In other words, if all four roles are performed, the organization will be effective and efficient in the short and long run.

What are those roles? Let me briefly define each.⁴

The first role that management must perform in any organization is to **(P)**roduce the desired results, making the organization effective in the short run. What are those results?

It is to satisfy the needs of the clients for which the organization exists. Why are people coming to you? Why do they need you? What is the service they want? The **(P)**roducer's job is to satisfy this need. One way of measuring client satisfaction is by how many people *come back* to buy your competitive products or services.

The second role, to **(A)**dminister, means to see to it that the organizational processes are systematized: that there are procedures and that events happen in the right sequence with the right intensity. It is the role of **(A)**dministration to ensure efficiency in the short run.

If you satisfy your clients' needs at a price that is higher than the cost of satisfying them (**P**>**A**), the organization will be profitable in the short run.

What about the long run?

For the long run, management must perform a visionary role, ensuring that the organization takes the direction it needs to take. This role requires the organization to proact to constant change and thus renders the company effective over the long run. This is the **(E)**ntrepreneur's role, which combines creativity with the willingness to take risks. If the organization performs this role well, it will have the future services and/or products that its future clients will want and seek.

Finally, management must **(I)**ntegrate, which means to build a climate and a system of values that motivates the individuals in the

organization to work together so that no one is indispensable, rendering the company efficient in the long run.

In any organization of any size, in any technology, in any culture, these four roles are necessary for good management. Any time one or more of these roles is not being performed, there will be mismanagement. If the **(P)** role is not performed well, clients will not be satisfied and sales will decline. If the **(A)** role is not performed well, the organization will have unnecessary waste. If the **(E)** role is not performed well, the organization will be late to market with its products or have new products that fail; and if the organization is badly **(I)**ntegrated, then when a leader leaves the company, it will experience a seizure. And the pattern of mismanagement that will appear is a predictable, repetitive pattern all over the world, regardless of culture, regardless of technology, regardless of the size of the organization.

It is as if for organizational health, in the short and long run, we need four “vitamins”: **(P)**, **(A)**, **(E)**, and **(I)**. Any time one of them is missing, a predictable and identifiable organizational “disease” will become evident. However, if one knows how to “inject” the missing “vitamin,” the organization’s performance can be improved and brought back to short- and long-term health.

For thirty years, I have used the **(PAEI)**⁵ principles, among other tools that are covered in my other books, in my consulting work in companies around the globe – as have my associates, who are trained and certified in this methodology. It is a tested methodology for analyzing and solving problems and predicting behavior.

WHY THE ROLES ARE INCOMPATIBLE

Peter Drucker has recognized the complexity of the managerial task. “The top management tasks,” Drucker writes, “require at least four different kinds of human being.” Drucker identifies them as “the thought man,” “the action man,” “the people man,” and “the front man.” And Drucker also acknowledges, “Those four temperaments are almost never found in the same person.”⁶ But he does not go

beyond saying that more than one style is necessary to manage any organization. Why those styles and not others? He neglects to say what those styles are and how they should interact in order to work together in spite of being so different. That is the gap I am trying to fill with my books.

Why is it that the perfect, all-encompassing (**PAEI**) manager does not exist?

The reason why no manager can be the perfect (**PAEI**) executive every organization needs is that the managerial (**PAEI**) roles are incompatible in the short run; in other words, they cannot be performed simultaneously. For example, (**P**) and (**I**) are incompatible. Have you ever attended a course or workshop where you were taught how to be a better (**I**): how to relate better to people and be a good communicator and a sensitive human being? Then there was a crisis, and time pressure, and you had to have a meeting in which you had to (**P**), then and there. There was no time to convince, explain, or motivate. What happened to your team orientation and ability to listen patiently?

When there is time pressure to (**P**)roduce results, it is normal to become rather “dictatorial” and assign a lower priority to (**I**)ntegration and teamwork. The (**P**) squeezes the (**I**) out.

Let us look more closely at the incompatibility of roles. We all know managers who are brilliant at conceptualizing plans and ideas but not very good at monitoring the details of implementation; or who are sensitive, empathic, and good at (**I**)ntegration, but just can't seem to make hard decisions.

The explanation is simple: The four roles are not mutually exclusive, but they are incompatible in the short run and thus mutually *inhibitive*. In other words, the ability to excel at one of the (**PAEI**) roles is likely to impede one's ability to perform another.

Any combination of the four roles is incompatible, not just (**P**) and (**I**). (**P**)roducing and (**E**)ntrepreneuring are incompatible too. How many times have you said, “I'm working so hard, I have no time to think”? In other words, the energy dedicated to satisfying present

demands is so overwhelming that you have no time or energy to think about future opportunities. **(P)** actually endangers **(E)**, because if you work very hard, day and night, focusing on short-run results, it is difficult if not impossible to also notice the changes that are coming your way. Your mind is like a camera: you can either focus on the close-up view, rendering the long view out of focus, or the opposite.

Conversely, **(E)** threatens **(P)**: **(E)**ntrepreneurship means change, and that threatens the **(P)** role. People in Production often complain to the Engineering department, “If you guys don’t stop changing things, we’ll never get anything done!” At some point, you have to freeze the planning so you can proceed with the doing.

Now let’s look at another combination: **(P)** and **(A)**. They are also incompatible. When you want to be very effective, you have difficulty being efficient. That’s why start-up companies, which are constantly putting out fires and dealing with unanticipated problems, are disorganized and inefficient. They accept the fact that organization and order – **(A)** – will have to wait.

The opposite is also true: If you are very efficient, you end up being less effective. That is the case with bureaucracies, in which every detail is planned and no variable is left uncontrolled. But the more control you insist upon, the more inflexible and non-responsive the system becomes, until it can no longer adapt to the changing needs of its clients.

Think of a tennis player who trains and trains until his hand and body movements are perfect. Then he announces to his opponent: “Send the ball *here!*” – to the spot on the court from which he knows he can return the ball in perfect form.

I call that being precisely wrong rather than approximately right. That is how bureaucracies work. The fact that the clients’ needs have changed does not concern them. They just go through the motions as developed for maximum efficiency and control. It is efficient in the extreme, and extremely ineffective.

How are **(A)**dministration and **(E)**ntrepreneurship incompatible? As you freeze new ideas for the sake of efficiency, your ability to be

proactive and effective in the long run will become limited. Policies, rules, and institutionalized behavior inhibit change. Thus (A) endangers (E). And vice versa: too much change hinders systematization, routinization, and order.

Let's look at (A)dmistration/(I)ntegration incompatibility. Which country has the fewest lawyers per capita? Japan. Their need for (A)dmistration, with its strict rules and policies, is low, and that is because their (I)ntegration is high. In Japan there is a great deal of loyalty and interdependence in business. Corporations offer lifetime employment and a family environment. They take care of each other; they are guided more by their culture than by their legal institutions.

Now, which country has the *most* lawyers per capita? The United States. (A) is very high and growing; our court system is overloaded. We rely on external intervention to solve our interdependency problems. Our (I) is low.

As a result of these compatibility issues, all managers have strengths and weaknesses in their ability to perform the four key roles. While a (paEi) manager may excel at activating change, he or she will be weak in (A)dmistration. Another manager, a (pAei), may excel at organizing, but will show weakness at (E)ntrepreneurship. A (paeI) will excel at understanding people – but don't expect a high level of (P)roductivity, (E)ntrepreneurship, or (A)dmistration from him.

And so on. Unfortunately, in any manager, a role can be completely missing, squeezed out, threatened into extinction, or never fully developed. When that happens we get mismanagers, which we will expand upon in the next chapter.

THE MYTH OF THE PERFECT MANAGER

The New York Times once ran an article about me in which I was labeled “the corporate exorcist.”⁷ I go from company to company trying to purge management of its belief that it can do the impossible.

What is it they cannot do? They cannot find, or even train, the perfect manager, executive, or leader: one who can single-handedly

create and maintain a well-managed organization by causing it to become effective and efficient in the short and long run.

Try the following exercise. Call all of your top managers into a room. Ask each of them to write down the company's top five problems. The rules are that, first, no names be mentioned; and second, that they not use the word "because" – no explanations for the problem are necessary.

Just ask them to note on a piece of paper, which they do not have to show to anyone, the company's top five most critical, significant problems, as manifested in undesired results or processes.

All of these problems must be *controllable* by the people in the room; it is not acceptable to define a problem as something "they" are not doing. Focus on what "you" – those in the room – are not doing. In other words, instead of saying: "Unpredictable interest rates" (this was a problem raised in a bank), they could write: "We do not have a plan for how to handle unpredictable interest rates," or, "Our strategy for handling unpredictable interest rates does not work," etc.

Now ask them: "How many of these problems did the company have last year?"

Do not look at what they have written. Do not let them share what they have written. Just ask them: "How many of the problems on your list did we also have last year?" The answer is usually: 90 to 100 percent.

What about two years ago?

Most of them, right?

How about three years ago?

Again, most of them!

Now, if this is true, then how many of these same problems are we likely to have three years from now?

Most, right?

But why?

Because look at your list of problems again. How many of them can *any individual* in the room *solve by himself*?

None!! Right? If they *could* have, they probably *would* have.

Now ask them: “How many of these problems would disappear if I gave you a magic pill that would permit you as a team to agree on the solution?”

All of them, right? If you followed my instructions correctly and only wrote down problems that can be solved by the people in the room, then it is true by definition that a solution is possible – if only the people in the room would agree to it.

So what is our problem?

The problem is that we usually have one executive or manager chasing ten problems, rather than ten managers chasing one problem at a time.

“The problem is not what you have on your list,” I tell them. “What you have are *manifestations*. The problem is YOU!!! You do not know how to work together. *That* is the problem!!!!”

The business world is trapped by its misguided principles of individualistic management, which personify the whole management process in one individual who excels at all tasks – planning, organizing, training, developing, motivating, leading, organizing, disciplining, communicating, building a team, and making him- or herself dispensable – under all conditions in all organizations in the same way: in other words, a **(PAEI)** manager, executive, leader, tsar, sultan – or whatever else you want to call him.

But where on earth would you find this perfect animal? Forget it; you wouldn't! That's why I call this theoretical **(PAEI)** person “the textbook executive” – because he or she exists only in textbooks. In reality, such a manager does not and cannot exist – because what is expected cannot be achieved by a single individual.

How come?

The reason is that although all four **(PAEI)** roles are necessary, they can rarely if ever be performed by a single individual for each decision that that individual has to make. The total managerial process is far too complicated for one person to perform.

And why is that?

Because, as I demonstrated above, the **(P)**, **(A)**, **(E)**, and **(I)** roles are incompatible. You cannot perform them simultaneously. No one can – not for every problem an organization might have.

MANAGEMENT VS. MISMANAGEMENT VS. LEADERSHIP

If the individual **(PAEI)** manager is nonexistent, is every manager necessarily a mismanager? Of course not. We have argued that each of four managerial roles is a necessary but not a sufficient part of a good managerial style; that managers should excel in one or more roles but not to the exclusion of the others. Thus, the **(P)**roducing manager should be a **(Paei)** rather than a **(P---**), the **(A)**dministrating manager should be a **(pAei)** rather than an **(-A--)**, and so on. An **(-A--)** style is dysfunctional – not because it emphasizes only one role but because the other roles are totally absent.

Mismanagers lack the ability to perform certain roles. Managers must perform all the roles – to the degree of meeting the threshold needs of the task – and they must excel in one or more roles depending on the task – but they should not be expected to excel in all four. Not even the best corporate leaders excel in all four roles; as a rule, they excel in **(I)** plus one or two other roles. Whether their leadership is functional to the needs of the organization depends on their task at that stage of the organization's lifecycle.⁸

Thus the difference between managers, mismanagers, and leaders is one of degree and circumstance. A person with no dashes in his code – that is, a person who is capable of performing all four managerial roles even if he excels only in one of them – is a potentially good and useful manager without being perfect, as long as what is expected of him conforms to his ability to get the job done.

The purpose of managerial education, then, whether it is at programs for top executives or at schools that grant MBAs, should not be to create an ideal, perfect **(PAEI)** executive, manager, or leader, but to train normal human beings to accept their deficiencies and

learn how to work with others who complement their strengths and weaknesses. Education should make each student aware of the roles he will need to perform and teach him how one can and should benefit from others' differences, instead of being threatened by them.

MANAGEMENT TRAINING: THE BIG FALLACY

Unfortunately, management schools continue to focus on training the perfect individual manager. They make the same assumption that drives economic theory, which attempts to predict how a firm will behave: If you have one set of conditions, the firm will raise prices; if you have another, it will reduce prices. This theory personifies the group process of making a decision into an abstract entity called "the firm." It tries to analyze *why* decisions were made but neglects to explain *how* they were made.

Management theory, and management schools, suffer from the same type of perceptual limitation – nor do they differentiate among the different styles and the various ways each style thinks, acts, and communicates. Management theory, as a profession and a "science," is a 20th-century phenomenon that has resulted in a burgeoning of management training schools that attempt to equip the newcomer with the knowledge and skills necessary for good management, and assist the veteran in improving his managerial performance. These efforts are documented in textbooks, which are written by taking the best traits of the best managers and personifying this collage of characteristics in an individual who doesn't exist. (Books in which leaders of industry share their experiences do not meet the need either, because they tend to show you only their best practices. Where do they reveal their deficiencies, which all humans have, and how they were overcome?)

But how many people have you known who went to the best MBA schools in the country, the best programs, who know the textbooks by heart, and still go back and mismanage? Quite a few, right? Why? *Because no one can excel in everything.*

This is where I depart from traditional management theory. Traditional management theory talks about what managers *should* do, *although in reality they cannot do it.*

Thus, this kind of training is an exercise in futility, because by my definition we are *all* mismanagers, all of us. Even the management gurus.

I think it is very dangerous to believe in genius. I think it exists very, very seldom. When it does exist, it exists in terms of a man's personal or individual output, whether it be painting or music or whatever. It certainly does not exist in a corporation. Any corporation will be extraordinarily limited if it depends upon what any individual can do, even if you assume he is an outstandingly competent individual."

RALPH ABLON

THE WORKABLE SOLUTION: A COMPLEMENTARY TEAM

My belief is that for good management to occur, the four roles must be performed by several people. Managers who act and think differently need to be brought together. Instead of talking about a manager who plans, organizes, etc., we should be talking about the managerial *team* that performs these functions. The roles of **(P)**roducer, **(A)**dministrator, **(E)**ntrepreneur, and **(I)**ntegrator must be fulfilled by a *complementary* team, because no one person can perform them all.

"I have never met a person who was not my superior in some particular."

RALPH WALDO EMERSON

I want to emphasize the word *complementary*, because normally when I say to a manager, "We need a team," he replies, "Yes, you are right. I am going to hire several more people who are like me."

That is not a team. That is cloning.

Look at your hand. What makes a hand a hand is that every finger is different and that they cooperate.

In the same way, we need a complementary team – a team in which the members of the team are different from each other, not similar to each other. That means acknowledging the differences in style and opinion. Each person's style should complement the others' by balancing their naturally biased judgments. *That* is a team.

Please note that I am not talking about the need for different kinds of know-how, such as having both an accountant and a marketing expert, for example. I am talking about having people on your team whose temperament, style, and behavior are different from the other members'. I am talking about diversity of styles.

Think of this as a kind of organizational ecology, in which diversity is acknowledged to be necessary for the organization's health in the short and the long run.

If it is so obvious, then why hasn't this theory been universally embraced? Because differences of style cause conflicts – and we do not know how to handle those conflicts well.

THE INEVITABILITY OF CONFLICT

Since the (PAEI) roles are incompatible, then it follows that those who perform the different roles will be in conflict.

For example, the (A) style and (E) style are in conflict, because (A) is conservative and wants control, whereas (E) wants change. (P)

and (E) are also in conflict, because (P) requires short-term feedback, whereas (E) needs time to develop his thoughts and looks to the long-term for feedback.

(E) and (I) are in conflict, because (E) prefers to discuss, whereas (I) wants only to listen. (And in any case, very few people can both talk and listen effectively – that is, communicate well.)

All styles are in conflict with each other because of misunderstandings, each style communicates differently, sometimes even speaking the same words but with opposite meanings.

One example is how the different styles express agreement and disagreement. If (E)ntrepreneurs disagree with an idea, they will usually be very expressive about it. They're expressive even when they *agree*. (A)ministrators, on the other hand, express disagreement by being silent. That discrepancy alone can cause tremendous misunderstanding and conflict.⁹

So how do we build managerial teams in which the team members are different from each other and yet can work together?

One essential goal is to recognize and accept conflict as an inevitable and even desirable facet of managing. To do that, one must learn how to deal with styles which are different from your own – a matter I start to cover in this book.

RECOGNIZING AND HIRING A GOOD MANAGER

If the ideal (PAEI) executive does not exist, then what kind of manager can be an effective leader of a complementary team?

There are nine important characteristics to look for:

Self-awareness: A good manager must be aware of what he is doing, aware of his style, his code.

Consciousness: He must understand the consequences and meaning of his actions, including the impact his behavior has on other people's behavior.

“Make it thy business to know thyself, which is the most difficult lesson in the world.”

MIGUEL DE CERVANTES

Well-rounded: no zeros in his (PAEI) code: Can he perform all four roles? The difference between a manager and a mismanager is that one is flexible, the other inflexible. What makes a mismanager inflexible is his inability to perform (and I did not say excel) – and therefore appreciate and respect – all the tasks required of a manager.

Knows strengths and weaknesses; knows his uniqueness: To be able to put together an effective team, a manager must have a balanced view of himself, so that he can find out what kind of people he’ll need to complement himself.

Accepts strengths, weaknesses, and uniqueness: Accepting one’s weaknesses is a condition for improving. We all have limited energy, and if a manager’s energy is spent on rejecting who he is, there will be little or no energy left for adapting and changing himself into who he wants to be.

Can identify excellence and weaknesses in others: In particular he must be able to identify other people’s strengths in areas in which he is weak. Unfortunately, many managers fear excellence in others. Will he hire and utilize and develop people who are different from him, instead of opting for the security of hiring people who are like himself?

Can accept and appreciate differences in others: Can he see beauty in difference? Can he accept, respect, and nourish it? Is he aware that since he cannot be superior in all four management roles, his subordinates will ideally be superior to him in some respects? Can he experience that without feeling threatened?

“I never learned from a man who agreed with me.”

ROBERT A. HEINLEIN

Knows how to slow down and relax in difficult situations: On a basic level, being a good manager means knowing how to disagree without being disagreeable. I jokingly say that one way to recognize a good manager is by the depth of the scars on his tongue.

Creates a learning environment in which conflicts can be resolved, by both commanding and granting mutual trust and respect: How does one accept conflict, legitimize it, and harness it? A manager who cannot command and grant trust and respect cannot help resolve the conflicts that necessarily arise in a complementary team. We grow through disagreement, because you have points of view that I don't have. I might not like it, I might feel uncomfortable with it, but I'm learning.

This series is a step in the right direction. In *The Ideal Executive: Why You Cannot Be One and What to Do about It*,¹⁰ I cover the material in this chapter in much more depth. In *Management/ Mismanagement Styles*,¹¹ I cover the styles that emerge when one or more roles are performed, and when some roles are completely absent – a subject I also summarize briefly in the next chapter.

In this book, I offer specific advice for how to behave toward people whose styles are different. How do you become more rounded in your style so that you can work with others? In future books we will cover how to manage meetings when various people with various styles participate, how to structure the company correctly so that the different styles can coexist, how to reward people by recognizing their diverse needs.

So this book is just the beginning.

Let us now turn to the different styles that emerge when different roles are performed.

NOTES

1. Adizes, Ichak, with Griffin, Patrick H.: *Managing the Performing Arts Organization: Founding Principles in the Management of the Arts* (Santa Monica, CA: The Adizes Institute, 1999).
2. Adizes, Ichak and Zukin, P.: "A Management Approach to Health Planning in Developing Countries." *Health Care Management Review* 2, 1 (1977).

3. Adizes, Ichak: *Industrial Democracy, Yugoslav Style: The Effect of Decentralization on Organizational Behavior* (New York: Free Press, 1971; reprinted by MDOR Institute, 1977, paper).
4. For a more detailed discussion of this topic, see Book I of this series: Adizes, Ichak: *The Ideal Executive: Why You Cannot Be One and What to Do about It* (Santa Barbara, CA: The Adizes Institute, 2004), Ch. 1.
5. For more details, see: Adizes, Ichak: *Managing Corporate Lifecycles* (Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall Press, 1999), Ch. 12.
6. Drucker, Peter F.: *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), p. 616.
7. Fowler, Elizabeth M.: "The Team Approved at the Top," *The New York Times* (Business section, Sept. 16, 1977).
8. Op. cit., *Managing Corporate Lifecycles*.
9. Another source of conflict in managerial teams is divergent interests, which can lead to a lack of cooperation. That is the subject of *The Ideal Executive*.
10. Op. cit., *The Ideal Executive*.
11. Adizes, Ichak: *Management/Mismanagement Styles, How to Identify a Style and What to Do about It* (Santa Barbara, CA: The Adizes Institute, 2004).

Chapter 2

Management Styles

We've determined that in order to be effective and efficient in the short run and the long run, management has to perform four roles: (P)roducing, (A)dministrating, (E)ntrepreneuring, and (I)ntegrating.

INPUT	THROUGHPUT	OUTPUT	
The Roles	Make the organization	To be	In the
(P)roduce results	Functional	effective	short run
(A)dminister	Systematized	efficient	short run
(E)ntrepreneur	Proactive	effective	long run
(I)ntegrate	Organic	efficient	long run

Each role is *necessary* and the four together are *sufficient* for good management. By “necessary,” I mean that if any one role is not performed, a certain pattern of mismanagement can be identified.

In problem-solving, each role focuses on a different imperative:

(P): what? (A): how? (E): when (I): who?

If all four questions are not answered before a decision is finalized, then that decision will be only “half baked.”

If you both **(P)**roduce results and **(A)**dminister, you'll be effective and efficient in the short run. You will be profitable for the short run only. If you **(E)**ntrepreneur and **(I)**ntegrate only, you'll be effective and efficient in the long run, but you will suffer in the short run.

For a company to be profitable in the short and long run, it needs to perform all four roles well. If you do not happen to be in a for-profit business – if, for example, you manage a government agency, then by capably performing the four roles you will achieve, instead of profit, whatever results you're looking for: service, political survival, etc.

Even parents must perform these roles, because a family is an organization and thus a system that requires all four roles to be performed. In the traditional family, the husband performs the **(E)** and **(P)** roles, building a career and bringing home the bacon. The wife is the **(A)** and the **(I)**, transforming a house into a home and a group of adults and children into a family.

In contrast, look at what we call the modern, extended, two-career family. What do we have? Two **(P)**/**(E)**s – who need a maid to do the **(A)** child care and housework and a family therapist to do the **(I)** work.

This chapter describes the four roles in detail as well as the four basic styles that correspond to those roles. In the next chapter, we will discuss the types of mismanagement that result from an absence of some roles.

A RAISON D'ETRE

The first and most important role that management must perform in any organization is to **(P)**roduce the desired results for which the company or unit exists.

What does this mean? Every organization has its *raison d'être*. It is not put together just to be put together. Some sociologists claim that the purpose of organizations is to survive. To me, that's not normal; that's a pathological phenomenon, like cancer. An organization must have a larger mission than survival, and that is to do something or make something for *someone else* or for a common purpose.

Let's use an analogy:

Five friends get together on a Friday night and have some beers. As they are drinking, someone suggests they go on a hike to the nearby lake the next morning. The rest of the group enthusiastically agrees.

The next day, the five friends follow a mountain path that leads to the lake. It's a very narrow path so they must walk single file. They have been walking on the path for hours. They're singing, whistling, joking, and laughing.

This group can be described as an organization; in other words, it has common goals that continually change and progress: First it was to get together Friday night. Second it was to have some beers. And the latest is to hike to the lake. A social scientist or psychologist would have a field day studying this primary group: their interactions, their style, their leadership, their communication. But there is no management in this organization – *until* this group of five people comes across a big rock that's blocking the path and that none of them *individually* can lift.

Organizational management is born when a task evolves that cannot be performed by one person alone. To lift the rock, they need to plan and organize and control and delegate. They may decide to move the rock, or they may decide to camp out right there instead of trying to reach the lake, or they may go back home and have a barbecue.

There is no management without a task, whether it is in the immediate term, the intermediate term (in which case it is called an "objective"), the long-term (which is called a "goal") or when it is more spiritual and continuous in nature (a "mission"). But no matter which word you use, there must always be a *telos*, which in Greek means "a purpose" and a necessary interdependence to achieve the purpose.

And what is the rock of a business organization? Why does it exist? What result is it supposed to give you?

Profit?

No.

We probably all know organizations that are extremely profitable and yet are going bankrupt – not *in spite of* but *because of*. Let me explain why. Constantly thinking about profit instead of about what the client needs is as futile as saying, “The purpose of my existence is to be happy.” So every morning you get up and ask yourself, “Am I happy?” You can become quite miserable doing that.

You must concentrate first on these questions: Who needs this organization? What for? First, there must be a satisfied client who is willing to pay for the satisfaction of his or her needs. You have to provide that for which people come to you and thus have sales and thus revenues. Without revenues there can be no profits. If you produce that satisfaction efficiently, at a price that is lower than the client is willing to pay to satisfy his need, you are profitable. So the first role that needs to be performed is to provide client satisfaction, to **(P)**roduce.

THE **(P)**RODUCER (**Paeci**)

Let’s describe the style of a manager who excels in **(P)**roducing results while also meeting the threshold needs of **(A)**dministration, **(E)**ntrepreneurship, and **(I)**ntegration. This manager, whose code is **(Paeci)**, I call a **(P)**roducer, or the **(P)** type.

In order to **(P)**roduce, as a manager you must possess two qualities. The first quality is you must know what the heck you’re doing; you must know what people need and why they are coming to you. And that includes all managers in the organization. Your clients could be inside the organization; for example, Accounting has clients: they are all those in the company who need information.

Then – very important – you must know something about the technology of how to provide that for which they come to you.

Thus, it’s not true to say, “To manage is to manage is to manage is to manage – you can manage anything if you are a professional manager.” That is dangerously oversimplified, unless we add three more words: *After some time*. And what do you do during that time?

You try to learn the peculiarities of the organization that you are managing. Because there are no two rocks alike in the world.

Any time you move from one branch to another in a bank – the same bank! – the rock is going to be different. If you move from one department to another, the rock is different. So what does a good manager do before he starts doing anything else? He learns the rock. He learns what it is that people come to him for. If he's managing an accounting department, what is this accounting department supposed to do – because there are no two identical accounting departments in two different organizations, even in the same industry. Organizations are like men and women – everybody is different. You cannot treat them all alike. You have to know the particularities of what you are trying to manage, so that you can **(P)**roduce results.

But that's not enough. Some people, despite being very knowledgeable, do not **(P)**roduce results. They can give you a beautiful report, they know the technology, their judgment is correct – but they lack what the psychologists call “achievement motivation” – the urge to get in there and do it! Don't just talk about it – *do it!* This is the desire to see the finalization of a task, like a salesman who won't stop selling until he has the final signature on the dotted line.

For me, then, a manager, a **(P)**roducer of results, is a knowledgeable achiever.

RUNNING THE RAILROAD

Is **(P)**roducing results sufficient? No. What happens when the manager is an excellent **(P)**roducer of results: a knowledgeable achiever? This person is so good that we reward him with a promotion. But now, he is no longer merely a **(P)**roducer: he has to work with five or six or more people; he must coordinate and delegate and control and oversee; instead of **(P)**roducing by himself, he must make the *system* **(P)**roduce results. That is more difficult. That's why we need another role: To **(A)**dminister.

The **(A)** role is indispensable for good management. It is the role of **(A)**dministration to pay attention to details, to systematize the

(P)roduction process so that a wheel does not have to be reinvented each time a wheel is needed, and to ensure that staff follows those systems and routines. It ensures that the organization does what it was intended to do – efficiently. It moves the organization up the learning curve so it can capitalize on its memory and experience. It analyzes successes and programs so that they can be repeated.

If you (P)roduce results, the organization will be effective. If you also (A)dmister, your organization will be efficient. If you (P) and (A), the organization will be both effective and efficient in the short run.

An American analogy for management is “running the railroad.” How do we run a railroad? First of all, we need the railroad engineer to (P)roduce results: that’s transportation. The engineer takes the train from station A to station B. Then we need someone to manage the engineers, making sure they get the train from station A to station B, correctly and on time. The latter role, in companies, is called Operations.

If the railroad engineer does a bad job or if Operations does not perform, then the organization is going to be mismanaged. The trains will not run or will run ineffectively; thus the need for transportation will not be satisfied.

But “running the railroad” entails more than taking customers in trains from station A to station B. We need supplies and money, collection and payment, and we need universally communicated timetables to get the right train to the right town at the designated time. If the schedules are well coordinated, we are running a tight railroad. That is the role of (A)dmistration.

THE (A)DMINISTRATOR (pAei)

This person is methodical and likes his environment to be well-thought-out and organized. When you have a business idea – especially a crazy one or one you are afraid *might* be crazy – you go to this

manager to help cool your enthusiasm. He will think things through for you. He will ask you questions you had not thought of. He will see all the pitfalls you did not realize existed. Give him a business plan to read and he will tear it apart. And you will be grateful! It costs less and hurts less in the long run if problems are foreseen; either you can find ways to solve them before they become crises, or you can reject the plan as unworkable.

A good (A)dmistrator, or (A) type, can foresee the problems inherent in an idea. People have told me, about such executives, “He can find a hair in an egg while it is still in its shell,” and “He can smell a rat a mile away.”

If you trust him, then if your idea passes his scrutiny, you know you can do it. And *should* do it. And if it does not pass his scrutiny and you decide to do it anyway, at least you know ahead of time what risks you are taking.

A good (A)dmistrator always knows what is going on. He cannot sleep if he doesn't know what is going on. He keeps track of the details. He is well organized and concerned with follow-up and implementation. He has an excellent memory (or is fortified by systems, which means that he does not have to rely only on his memory), and he works to see that the system operates as it was designed to operate.

The (A)dmistrator is good at worrying, but he worries *appropriately*. He worries about precision, about integrity of information. He worries that the organization will lose its memory, its database, or its intellectual property.

A lawyer who has a (pAei) style is the one you want to write up your contract. But do not ask him to be your trial lawyer. He will lose in court. He can write an agreement that is faultless, but if you have to sue, find a (paEi) lawyer who can interpret night as day and turn a liability into an asset.

The same is true for accountants. I need two: one to advise me on my taxes – the (paEi) type – and the other to *file* my taxes – the (pAei) type. If the (E) *files* the taxes, I will get in trouble for creative accounting. If the (A) *plans* my taxes, I will probably pay more than necessary.

A good (A)dmistrator is indispensable to a growing organization. A young organization usually grows too fast and in too many directions, and can easily trip and fall on its face (i.e., go bankrupt) without even realizing that it's been bankrupt for quite a while.

A good (A)dmistrator protects your back. He keeps the gates to the castle closed so that the enemy – chaos – cannot enter.

What he does *not* do is (P)roduce that for which the organization exists.

If you open a thesaurus and look for the word “administration,” you will find that its synonym is “to serve.” (A)dmistration serves those who (P)roduce, or meet the needs of the market. One (A)dmisters *for* someone, *for* something. In public service organizations, the government should (A)dmister for the public.¹

SEEING THROUGH THE FOG

Are (P)roducing and (A)dmistrating enough? No. Beyond these tasks, an organization must also be capable of planning, deciding what direction it should take as it adapts to change. This is the role of (E)ntrepreneuring.

The (E) role analyzes changes in the environment as they affect the organization. Whereas (A) involves systemizing and implementing plans that have already been decided, (E) must generate a plan of action.

A metaphor I find useful for the (E) role is “the capability to see through the fog.” The creative person will look into the fog and see pieces of information appearing and disappearing, and all at once something clicks. He says, “Aha! I think I know what’s out there. I have an idea what it might be and what we might do about it.”

The non-creative person waits until the fog lifts, until the sun is shining and it's totally clear, and then says, “Aha, *this* is what I think it might be!” But that person has not added any information or created anything. The creative person, using his imagination, fills in the blanks in the fog.

Returning to the “railroad” analogy I used above, it is the (E) role to decide which stations to close and which new stations to open, whether to add or subtract the number of cars on each line, and to determine how often the train should stop at each station. It is (E), in other words, that will guide the organization as it deals with changing realities.

(E)ntrepreneurship is not confined to the business world. In addition to business (E)ntrepreneurs, who try to exploit the monetary opportunities of the market, there are social (E)ntrepreneurs, who initiate change in the cultural and political sphere, and educational and artistic (E)ntrepreneurs, who initiate activities that satisfy aesthetic needs and generate new ones. All are of tremendous value to society.

Since change is inevitable and constant, the (E)ntrepreneurial role is also essential to good management. It makes the organization effective in the long run. If there is no one to perform the (E)ntrepreneurial role in an organization, that organization will eventually lag behind its competitors who are more creative and proactive toward change.

THE CREATIVE CONTRIBUTOR (**paEi**)

In my previous book *How to Solve the Mismanagement Crisis*,² where I first presented the (PAEI) model, I named the person who performs the (E) role, whose typical code is (**paEi**), the (E)ntrepreneur. That book was written exactly 30 years ago. Since then, in studying these codes in greater depth, I have changed my mind.

A (**paEi**) is not quite an (E)ntrepreneur. To be an (E)ntrepreneur, who creates organizations and develops them, one must be strong in the (P) role as well. A focus on (E) alone is not enough.

A person who focuses only on (E), whose (P) orientation is weak – (P) – I now call a Creative Contributor. This is the person who has plenty of ideas – some good, some bad. But he has lots of them, sometimes non-stop. He is like the kid in school whose hand goes up even before he hears the end of the question. He is the person in

a meeting who does the most talking. Whatever solution we propose, he has another option.

This person adds energy to the meeting. He is not totally oblivious to what the discussion is about and what the goal is. He is not without some sensitivity to what others are saying (**I**) and he is capable of paying attention to details (**A**). But without a strong (**P**) focus, he is not the person to say: “Let *me* lead, let *me* do it.”

Without a strong (**P**), he will not be able to build an organization. He will be constantly moving from one idea to the next, never finishing anything.

THE (**E**)NTREPRENEUR (**PaEi**)

To be (**E**)ntrepreneurial, a manager must have two major characteristics. He must first of all be creative, able to visualize new directions and devise strategies for adapting the organization to a perpetually changing environment. He has a feel for the organization’s strengths and weaknesses, as well as the imagination and courage to identify strategies in response to such changes.³

Both qualities, creativity and willingness to take risks, are necessary for being an (**E**)ntrepreneur. If a manager is willing to take risks but lacks creativity, he may be more at ease in a Las Vegas casino than in the corporate world. If he is unable to take risks, but is creative, he may end up as a staff person, a consultant, or a business professor – someone who is capable of identifying a course of action but does not undertake it himself.

The (**E**)ntrepreneur knows what he wants and why he wants it. He is creative (**E**) but in the service of a purpose (**P**). He has an idea, a purpose, and he can translate that idea into reachable and achievable outcomes. His creativity is focused on how to make that outcome a reality. He is a no-nonsense person, focused and creative. Ideas without results annoy him, and results that are not born out of BIG ideas are a waste of time.

An even better (**E**)ntrepreneur would be a (**PaEI**), who also excels at the (**I**) role. The (**PaEI**) is a leader of change. He can visualize what

needs to be done and why, *and* he can motivate people, **(I)**ntegrating them as a team in order to make those changes.

GETTING RELIGION

In the example of the five friends, their friendship and sense of belonging expressed itself in a need to do something together. First, that need was satisfied by drinking beer. Then it was satisfied by going on a hike to a lake. Then it was satisfied by working together, either to lift the rock or to come up with another plan.

The process of identifying a new need that satisfied that ultimate purpose – going on a hike rather than drinking beer – was **(E)**ntrepreneuring, the **(E)** role. The organizing of that hike – where to meet, what time, who would bring the picnic basket – belonged to the **(A)** role, or **(A)**dministrating. The actual act of drinking beer, hiking to a lake, or removing the rock that blocked the path, the act of doing whatever satisfied the purpose of the interrelationship at that moment, was **(P)**roducing, the **(P)** role.

What is the fourth role? Let's imagine a scenario. What would happen if your organization were managed by an executive who is an outstanding **(P)**, **(A)**, and **(E)**? This person is a knowledgeable, achievement-oriented, task-oriented, effective, no-nonsense **(P)**roducer; also an outstanding **(A)**dministrator who runs a tight ship: everything is efficient, correctly done at the right time. The organization is effective and efficient. In addition, he is an outstanding **(E)**ntrepreneur – constantly adapting and improving so that the organization is really moving and adjusting to its changing environment.

Now, what happens to this organization when this unique, unbelievably gifted manager dies?

The organization also dies.

Why? Because the **(P)**, **(A)**, and **(E)** roles are necessary, but they are not sufficient if the organization is to be effective and efficient *in the long run*. Organizations should be managed so that they can survive for thousands of years. Look at the Catholic Church, for example. It has existed for two thousand years and it could go for another two

thousand. Why? Because it has a set of values that each individual in the organization can understand and identify with. And to do that, you need **(I)**ntegration.

(I)ntegration means nourishing this need for interdependence, feeding the need by sensing people's aspirations and needs, recognizing them and finding the tasks (**P**), the rituals (**A**), and the missions (**E**), that transform individuals into a community with a shared identity.⁴ If the role of **(I)**ntegration is performed well, people will work as a team and not as individuals, and will be able to achieve or support any task that happens to be missing or deficient.

(I)ntegration builds a climate, a system of ethics and behavior, that encourages everyone to work together so that no one is indispensable. To **(I)**ntegrate means to change the consciousness of the organization from mechanistic to organic.

Mechanistic means: "I care only for my own interests; you care only for yours." Look at a chair. If one of the legs breaks, does the other leg care about it? Does it change position on its own to create a tripod so that the functionality of the chair can continue? Since there is no internal interdependency, where does the repair have to come from? Outside.

Now look at your hand. If one finger breaks, your whole body feels it. There is empathy. And not only that: when one finger breaks, the other four fingers on that hand will try to back it up, to compensate for the loss. That is organic consciousness. There is interdependency, there is cooperation; it's synergetic instead of being individualistic, independent, and frequently adversarial.

(I)ntegration is what you do in your family when the kids are fighting. You don't always give them a solution. You demand that they solve their own problems. You say, "Hey, you are brothers or sisters, you're supposed to be helping each other. I'm not going to be here forever." A family is more than a group of people; a hand is more than five fingers. There is interdependency. **(I)**ntegration involves making yourself dispensable so that the team can continue to function if anything happens to any individual member.

Look at a sports team. If you take a team of stars, each from a different team, and put them together to play against an above-average team without stars that has been together for a long time, who might win the first game? The average team. Why? Because the star team has not yet developed its team consciousness. The team members cannot yet predict: “If he does this, I can back him up by doing that.” That sense of cooperating to reach a common goal is what we mean by teamwork.

(I)ntegration turns individual (E)ntrepreneurship into group (E)ntrepreneurship. If a manager does not (I)ntegrate, does not nourish group (E)ntrepreneurship, then in extreme cases the group will be unable to initiate action or determine goals in his absence. Thus, (I)ntegration is a necessary component to good management. Companies that rely on any one individual for continuous success in their operations inevitably will face a crisis if that individual leaves or dies. Even organizations that have been managed by a (PAE-) have found themselves in trouble if that manager leaves before a team feeling – an *esprit de corps* around an effective course of action – has been developed.

Since an organization’s life span is longer than the life of any individual, effective long-range continuity depends on building a team of people who understand, trust, and respect each other, and who complement each other’s abilities. (I)ntegration creates that effect.

When there is no (I)ntegration taking place, no one is focused primarily on the company’s long-term interests. Instead, everybody is looking out for his own interests, often at the expense of the company. The stockholders are trying to milk the company. Management is trying to get maximum rewards for itself. Labor is trying to get the best salaries and the best security at work. Among such competing interests, it’s possible to arrive at a working consensus in which everyone is working hard but the company is actually going bankrupt.

When I find a situation like this in the organizations I coach, I often dramatize the dilemma by bringing an empty chair to the table. I place the company name on the front of the chair and ask, “If someone were sitting in that chair, what would he say? What does *this*

company want?” When I let the participants play out that scenario, I hear voices that have previously been silent. In this exercise, I am playing the (I)ntegrating role.

Interrelating is the ultimate purpose of our existence. There is nothing in this world that doesn't exist to serve something else by functionally interrelating to it. If it serves only itself, then it is a cancer and serves death.

The pen I write with is useless if it does not leave a mark on paper. Breathing has no meaning unless the oxygen feeds my body. Nothing in itself is functional. The ability of anything to function must be measured and evaluated by how it serves its clients. The final purpose of existence of any system is (I)ntegration, the (I) role. In fact, managers with the ability to perform that role have the potential to go beyond good management and become leaders.

THE (I)NTEGRATOR (pael)

There are two types of (I)ntegration – passive and active – and three directions: upward, lateral, and downward.

A passive (I)ntegrator will (I)ntegrate himself into a group of people. An active (I)ntegrator can (I)ntegrate a group of people among themselves. Because in management (I)ntegration must be active, we will concern ourselves here only with active (I)ntegration.

Upward (I)ntegration is the ability to (I)ntegrate people who are higher in status, authority, rank, and so on. Lateral (I)ntegration is the ability to (I)ntegrate peers into a cohesive group. Downward (I)ntegration provides leadership by establishing cohesion among subordinates.

A very effective lateral (I)ntegrator may function poorly as a downward (I)ntegrator – tending to be arrogant with subordinates. In fact, it is unusual for a person to be an excellent (I)ntegrator in all directions.⁵

Let's talk about the characteristics that a good (I)ntegrator brings to an organization.

Perhaps surprisingly, the **(I)**ntegrator is the most creative of all the management types, since he must make decisions from a more diffused and less structured database. **(I)**ntegrating is even less programmable than **(E)**ntrepreneuring, because **(E)**ntrepreneuring does not necessarily deal with people, whereas **(I)**ntegrating involves uniting individuals with diverse interests and strengths behind a group decision.

In **(I)**ntegrating **(E)**ntrepreneurs, one has the additional burden of forging their individual creativities into a cohesive unity – to develop group risk-taking out of individual risk-taking, to fuse an *individual* sense of responsibility into a *group* sense of responsibility.

The **(I)**ntegrator clarifies issues by finding the common threads of deep – not just superficial – agreement, and by analyzing contrasting values, assumptions, and expectations.

A successful **(I)**ntegrator also must make himself dispensable. His subordinates must be trained to be capable of replacing him. Ideally, in a cohesive group almost any member should be able to initiate action, **(A)**dminister programs, and **(P)**roduce results. To take a military example, if any soldier in a squad can take the squad leader's place and be accepted by the squad when the leader is killed, this demonstrates that the leader was a good **(I)**ntegrator. If the squad scatters when the leader is killed, this shows that the **(I)**ntegration of the unit was insufficient, though the leader may have been a competent commander in other respects.

The **(I)**ntegrator is sensitive to others (i.e., empathetic), and he is capable of deductive thinking (i.e., able to infer what people really want to say from what they do say). He has few ego problems of his own, which enables him to hear and respond to other people's expectations, problems, and needs rather than his own.

The late Juscelino Kubitschek, former president of Brazil and founder of Brasilia, was very **(I)**-oriented. I was told that when asked whether he was for or against a certain political program, he replied: "I am neither for nor against it: I am above it."

THE (I) ROLE IN LEADERSHIP

The (I)ntegrator is unique in that he not only provides for future organizational continuity, but also enables the organization to function smoothly in the present. His role is essential for success, both in the short run and in the long run. Finally, his is the one role that must be present in order for leadership to occur.

Without (I), you can be a good manager. Managers can be strong in two or even three roles – (PAei), (PaEi), (pAEi), (PAEi) – but unless one of them is (I)ntegrating, they will not be leaders. For leadership to occur, the (I) role must enhance whatever other roles a manager excels at performing.

What, exactly, is leadership? What defines a leader?

Many people visualize leadership as a pointing finger: “Do this, do that!” But my definition is that leadership functions as a thumb. Why? The thumb is the only finger that both opposes the other elements of the hand and, by (I)ntegrating them, helps them work together as a hand.

A manager does not have to excel at (I)ntegration, or being a thumb. A leader, however, does. Without that ability to (I)ntegrate, there can be no leadership that makes four fingers perform like a hand.

Along with their other abilities, leaders must motivate, inspire, thus (I)ntegrate. There are three styles of leadership: (PaeI), (pAeI), and (paEI).

Whether the organization needs (PaeI) leadership, (pAeI) leadership, or (paEI) leadership depends on where the organization is in its lifecycle.⁶ The appropriate leadership style must change as the organization grows and ages, just like parenting style has to change depending on the age of the child.

Now let us turn to describing the styles of mismanagement that occur when only one role is performed or even excelled at, but the other roles do not meet the threshold needs of the task.

NOTES

1. In government, the (P) and (A) functions are the same. In other words, the (A) actually (P)roduces what the organization exists for. Take a government agency that issues licenses or monitors the health and safety of food service establishments. Its (P) function is to (A). Of course, this organization will have its traditional (A) roles too: to organize, systematize, and monitor the system.
2. Adizes, Ichak: *How to Solve the Mismanagement Crisis* (Santa Monica, CA: Adizes Institute, 1979).
3. For a definition of entrepreneurship, see Schumpeter, Joseph: *Business Cycles* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1939), pp. 102-109; and Drucker, Peter F.: *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973), Chapter 10.
4. On the role of integration, see Lawrence, P.R., and J. W. Lorsch, "New Managerial Job: The Integrator," *Harvard Business Review*, 45 (November 1967), pp. 142-51.
5. The (I) component, as has been pointed out, is essential to good management at all levels, because the manager must work through others to achieve organizational goals. Where management has succeeded in (I)ntegrating the individual members of an organization into a group, we may expect greater identification with the organization, more job satisfaction, and better performance. The importance of interpersonal relationships for the success of organizations has been repeatedly demonstrated in the literature. Chris Argyris found that the worker's skill and pride in his work were directly related to his on-the-job friendships. See Argyris, "The Fusion of an Individual with the Organization," *American Sociological Review*, 19 (1954), pp. 145-67; and "Personality vs. Organization," *Organizational Dynamics*, 3 (1974) no. 2, pp. 2-17.
 A similar association between level of competence and degree of (I)ntegration with the organization was reported by Peter M. Blau in a study of law enforcement agents. See Blau, "Patterns of Interaction among a Group of Officials in a Government Agency," *Human Relations*, 7 (1954), pp. 337-348.
6. See *Managing Corporate Lifecycles*, op. cit.



Thank you for reading the free sample of Dr. Adizes' book. Visit our blog for Dr. Adizes' latest insights on issues of management, leadership development, business, personal growth and much more: <http://www.ichakadizes.com/blog>

Join our mailing list at: <http://bit.ly/adizesnews>

For more information about Adizes publishing, consulting, events, management training, and more, visit our website at: <http://www.adizes.com>

About Adizes

Adizes is a systematic approach for constructively managing change and the conflict it creates. Adizes consists of a tested and proven framework that is expressed through the programs delivered by Adizes Institute Worldwide and taught in the Adizes Graduate School.

For more than 40 years, the Adizes Methodology has been tested and proven in 52 countries around the world. It has repeatedly been shown effective when applied to organizations, individuals, families, and groups of any size or type—including profit and nonprofit companies, government agencies, and societies as a whole. Visit www.adizes.com for more information.

Contact Us:

Adizes Institute Worldwide
1212 Mark Ave, Carpinteria, CA 93013
United States

Ph. (805) 565-2901

Web: www.adizes.com

E-mail: publishing@adizes.com

Afterword

We are all different. Thanks God. Life would be so boring otherwise. And from whom would we learn ? Who will disagree with us and thus force us to open our minds and learn something new?

In this book I tried to communicate what I have learned from working with thousands of executives all over the world. Forty-eight countries to be exact. Thirty years of note taking. Thirty years with many sleepless nights trying to understand what is going wrong. Where did I go wrong and why.

I hope that my experiences will help you make less mistakes than I did. That you will learn from my mistakes – they were many. As a matter of fact, each prescription I give in this book is based on some mistake I have seen or personally experienced.

I hope that my pain is your gain.

Thank you for taking the time to get to this page. It was a long “trip” to read this book; just imagine how long it was to write it.

Bibliography

- Abravanel, E. and King, E.: *Dr. Abravanel's Body Type Program for Health, Fitness and Nutrition* (New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1985).
- Adizes, Ichak: *How to Solve the Mismanagement Crisis* (Santa Monica, Calif.: Adizes Institute, Inc., 1979).
- Adizes, Ichak: *Industrial Democracy, Yugoslav Style: The Effect of Decentralization on Organizational Behavior* (New York: Free Press, 1971; reprinted by MDOR Institute, 1977, paper).
- Adizes, Ichak: *Managing Corporate Lifecycles* (Paramus, N.J.: Prentice Hall Press, 1999).
- Adizes, Ichak, with Griffin, Patrick H.: *Managing the Performing Arts Organization: Founding Principles in the Management of the Arts* (Santa Monica, Calif.: The Adizes Institute, 1999).
- Adizes, Ichak: *Mastering Change: the Power of Mutual Trust and Respect* (Santa Barbara, Calif.: Adizes Institute Publications, 1992).
- Alessandra, A. and Wexler, P.: *Non-Manipulative Selling* (San Diego: Courseware, Inc., 1979).
- Bell, Gerald: *The Achievers* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: Preston Hill, 1973).
- Bennett, E.: *What Jung Really Said* (New York: Schocken Books, 1967).
- Bennett, J.: *Enneagram Studies* (York Beach: Samuel Weiser, Inc., 1983).
- Berliner, Joseph S.: *Factory and Manager in the USSR* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957).
- Berne, Eric: *Games People Play* (New York: Ballantine, 1996, revised edition).

- Blake, Robert, and Mouton, Jane: *The Managerial Grid* (Houston: Gulf Publishing, 1964).
- Blau, Peter M.: *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956).
- Bolton, R. and Bolton, D.: *People Styles at Work* (New York: American Management Association, 1996).
- Bolton, R. and Bolton, D.: *Social Style/Management Style* (New York: American Management Association, 1984).
- Choiniere, R., and Keirse, D.: *Presidential Temperament* (Del Mar: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company, 1992).
- Drucker, Peter F.: *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices* (New York: Harper & Row, 1973).
- Fieve, Ronald R.: *Moodswing: Dr. Fieve on Depression* (New York: William Morrow and Co., 1989).
- Francis, Roy G., and Stone, Robert C.: *Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy: A Case Study* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956).
- Fraser, J.: *The Chinese Portrait of a People* (Glasgow: William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd., 1981).
- Gordon, Dr. T.: *L.E.T. Leadership Effectiveness Training* (Wyden Books, 1977).
- Halberstam, D.: *The Best and the Brightest* (London: Pan Books Ltd., 1972).
- Hartman, T.: *The Color Code* (Taylor Don Hartman, 1987).
- Herrmann, N.: *The Creative Brain* (Lake Lure: Brain Books, 1990).
- Keirse, D. and Bates, M.: *Please Understand Me* (Del Mar: Prometheus Nemesis Book Company, 1984).
- Lear, F.: *The Second Seduction* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992).
- Lowen, A.: *Depression and the Body* (New York: Penguin Books, 1981).
- Lowen, A.: *The Language of the Body* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1979).

- March, James G., and Herbert Simon: *Organizations* (New York, London: John Wiley & Sons, 1958).
- Mottram, V.: *The Physical Basis of Personality* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1960).
- Parkinson, C. Northcote: *Parkinson's Law: The Pursuit of Progress* (London: John Murray, 1958).
- Peter, Laurence J., and Hull, Raymond Hull: *The Peter Principle: Why Things Always Go Wrong* (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1969).
- Rothchild, J.: *Going for Broke: How Robert Campeau Bankrupted the Retail Industry, Jolted the Junk Bond Market and Brought the Booming Eighties to a Crashing Halt* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991).
- Schumpeter, Joseph: *Business Cycles* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1939).
- Soros, George, Wien, Byron, and Koenen, Krisztina: *Soros on Soros: Staying Ahead of the Curve* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1995).
- George Albert Steiner: *Top Management Planning* (New York: Macmillan, 1969).
- Storm, H.: *Seven Arrows* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).
- Sundberg, N.: *Assessment of Persons* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977).
- Waldo, Dwight, ed.: *Ideas and Issues in Public Administration* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1963).
- Woodward, Joan: *Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).

Additional Works by the Author

(All available from the Adizes Institute at www.adizes.com)

Books

Adizes, I. *Industrial Democracy Yugoslav Style*. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Adizes, I. and Mann-Borgese, Elisabeth, eds. *Self-Management: New Dimensions to Democracy*, Santa Barbara, CA: ABC/CLIO, 1975.

Adizes, I. *How to Solve the Mismanagement Crisis*. 2nd printing. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1980. (First printing, New York: Dow Jones Irwin, 1979.)

Adizes, I. *Corporate Lifecycles: How and Why Corporations Grow and Die and What to Do about It*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1988.

Adizes, I. *Mastering Change: The Power of Mutual Trust and Respect in Personal Life, Family, Business and Society*. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1993.

Adizes, I. *The Pursuit of Prime*. First printing, Santa Monica, CA: Knowledge Exchange, 1996.

Adizes, I. *Managing the Performing Arts Organization*. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1999.

Adizes, I. *Managing Corporate Lifecycles: An Updated and Expanded Look at the Corporate Lifecycles*. First printing, Paramus, NJ: Prentice Hall Press, 1999.

Adizes, I. *Management/Mismanagement Styles: How to Identify a Style and What to Do about It*. Adizes Institute Publications, Santa Barbara, CA, 2004.

Adizes, I. *The Ideal Executive: Why You Cannot be One and What to Do About It*. Adizes Institute Publications, Santa Barbara, CA, 2004.

Articles

- Adizes, I. "The Role of Management in Democratic (Communal) Organizational Structures." *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economy*. Quarterly review of CIRIEC. Brussels: CIRIEC, No. 424 (1971): 399–420.
- Adizes, I. "Administering for the Arts: Introduction and Overview." *California Management Review* 15,2 (1972): 99–103.
- Adizes, I. "Boards of Directors in the Performing Arts: A Managerial Analysis." *California Management Review* 15, 2 (1972): 109–117.
- Adizes, I. "Economic Changes in Yugoslavia." *East Europe* 21, 10 (1972): 8–16.
- Adizes, I. "Management in Der Demokratischen Organisationen." *Annalen der Gemeinwirtschaft* 41 (Januar-Marz, 1972).
- Adizes, I. "Samoupravljanje Kao Drustveni Cilj i Organizacijski Proces - [Self-Management as a Social Goal and an Organizational Process.]" *Socijalizam* 11, 12 (1972): 1324–1333.
- Adizes, I. "Uloga Rukovodjenja u Demokratskim Organizacionim Strukturama." [Serbo-Croatian translation of "The Role of Management in Democratic Organizational Structures"]. *Moderna Organizacija* 6 (1972): 937–951.
- Adizes, I. "Uloga Vodstva v Demokratskih (Skupnostnih) Organizacijskih Strukturah." ["The Role of Management in Democratic Organization"] *Moderna Organizacija* 6 (1972): 437–451.
- Adizes, I. and Weston, F. "Comparative Models of Social Responsibility." *Journal of the Academy of Management* 16, 1 (1973): 112–129. Reprinted in F. Luthans and R.M. Hodgetts, *Social Issues in Business*. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1974.
- Adizes, I. "Gerencia y Estructuras Comunes (I)." "The Role of Management in Democratic Organization" *Gerencia*. Instituto Peruano de Administracion de Empresas (IPAE) Lima, Peru, (Noviembre/Diciembre, 1976): 23–76. Adizes, I. "On Conflict Resolution and an Organizational Definition of Self-Management" in *Participation and Self-Management*, Volume 5 "Social

- System and Participation,” 1–73. First International Sociological Conference on Participation and Self-Management. Zagreb, Yugoslavia (1973).
- Adizes, I. “Le Role de la Direction Dans une Communante Organisée Sûr une Base Democratique.” “The Role of Management in Democratic Organization” *Les Annales De L’Economie Collective* 1 (Jan.-Mars, 1973): 83–109.
- Adizes, I. and McWhinney, W. “Arts, Society and Administration: The Role and Training of Arts Administrators, Arts and Society.” *Arts and Society*, 10, 3 (1974): 40–50.
- Adizes, I. “Gerencia y Estructuras Comunes (II) Management and Communal Structures” *Gerencia*, IPAE (January/February, 1974): 36–43.
- Adizes, I. “Relaciones Organizativas en la Empresa Autogestionaria [The Self-Managed Enterprise].” *Apuntes* 1, 2 (1974): 21–30.
- Blame, M. and Adizes, I. “Parkview Symphony.” In *Business Policy: Strategy Formation and Management Action*, ed. W. Glueck, 366–374. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Adizes, I. “Autogestion y Naciones en Desarrollo [Self-Management in Developing Nations].” *Apuntes* 4 (1975): 106–122.
- Adizes, I. “The Cost of Being an Artist: An Argument for the Public Support of the Arts.” *California Management Review* 17 (Summer, 1975): 80–84.
- Adizes, I. “Mas Alla del ‘Principio de Peter’: una Tipologia de Estilos de Incompetencia Gerencial.” *Instituto de Administracion Cientifica de las Empresas* (IACE). Monterrey, Mexico (1975).
- Adizes, I. “Mismanagement Styles.” *California Management Review* 19, 2 (1976): 5–20.
- Adizes, I. “Seattle Opera Association.” *Business Policy: Strategy Formation and Management Action*, ed. W. Glueck, 610–634. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Adizes, I. and Zukin, P. “A Management Approach to Health Planning in Developing Countries.” *Health Care Management Review* 2, 1 (1977): 19–37.

- Adizes, I. "Industrial Democracy and Codetermination." *Encyclopedia of Professional Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- Zupanov, J. and Adizes, I., "Labor Relations in Yugoslavia." *Handbook of Contemporary Developments in World Industrial Relations*, ed. A. Blum. Westwood, CT: Greenwood Press, 1978.
- Adizes, I. "Mismanagement." *Affarsekonomi Management*. Stockholm, Sweden, 1978.
- Adizes, I. "Organizational Passages: Tools for Diagnosis and Therapy of Organizational Behavior." *Organizational Dynamics* 8, 3 (Summer, 1979): 28–46.
- Adizes, I. and Turban, E., "An Innovative Approach to Group Decision Making." *Personnel*, 62,4 (1985): 45–49.
- Adizes, I. "Back to Basics: Mutual Trust and Respect and Productivity." *Executive Excellence*, 10, 10 (1993): 11–13.
- Adizes, I. "Managing: The Business of Mutual Trust and Respect." *Manage* 45, 1 (1993): 26–28.
- Adizes, I. "Twelve Tips on Keeping Your Growing Business at Prime." *Manage* 44,3 (1993): 14–17.
- Adizes, I. "Corporate Lifecycles: Entrepreneurship and Integration." In *Management and Entrepreneurship*, the English version, ed. I. Vaji, 168–172. Vol. II. Centar za Management i Marketing, University of Zagreb: Zagreb University Press, 1994.
- Adizes, I. "How to Convert a Committee into a Team." *Successful Meetings* 43, 2 (1994): 115–118.
- Adizes, I. "Integrating Innovation." *Executive Excellence*. 11, 11 (1994): 12–13.
- Adizes, I. "Keeping the Fires Burning [about TQM]." *Manage* 46, 1 (1994): 12–16.
- Adizes, I. "Information Superhighway: Overloading Human Potential." *Executive Excellence* 12, 4 (1995): 15.
- Adizes, I. "What Comes First? Strategy or Structure?" *Executive Excellence* 2, 9 (1995): 20.

Adizes, I. "Eight Myths [about management]: Getting Right the People Dimension of Business." *Executive Excellence* 14, 9 (1997): 20.

Adizes, I. "Five Myths about Management in the 1990s." *Manage* 48 (July, 1997): 30-32.

Adizes, I. "Looking for Mr./Ms. Perfect: The Search for the Right Professional Manager in a Growing Company." *Progress* 2, 1 (1998): 14-15.

Adizes, I. "Self-Esteem: Who Cares?" *The Adizes Institute Journal of Organizational Transformation* 1, 1 (1998): 7-16.

Working Papers

Adizes, I. Establishing a Program for Arts Administration: Summary of the UCLA Conference and a Report on Implementation. In the *Management in the Arts Research Program Publication Series*, Publication 1. Division of Research, GSM. Los Angeles: UCLA, 1969.

Adizes, I. "The Roles of Art in Post-Industrial Society." Presented at the *Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions*. Santa Barbara, CA: January, 1973.

Adizes, I. "Administering for the Arts: Problems in Practice." *Management in the Arts Program Research Papers*, #15. GSM. Los Angeles: UCLA, October, 1971.

Adizes, I. "A New Framework for Management Theory." Santa Barbara: The Adizes Institute, June, 1987.

Adizes, I. and Haldeman, H.R. "Why Gorbachev Might Fail." Santa Barbara: The Adizes Institute, January, 1988.

Adizes, I. "The Common Principles of Managing Oneself, a Family, a Corporation or a Society." Santa Barbara: The Adizes Institute, September, 1990.

VIDEO

- Adizes, I. (1984). *The Adizes Program in Video*. Santa Barbara: The Adizes Institute.
- Adizes, I. *Program A: Overview of the Adizes Process of Management*. Set of 3 videotapes. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1993
- The Adizes Process of Management*. 55 min.
 - The Adizes Program. Questions and Answers #1*
 - The Adizes Program. Questions and Answers # 2*
- Adizes I. *Program B: The Management Process*. Set of 4 videotapes. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1993
- The Roles of Management*. 28 min.
 - Mismanagement Styles*. 41 min.
 - The Structural Causes of Deadwood*. 38 min.
 - What is a Good Manager?* 41 min.
- Adizes I. *Program C: Organizational Lifecycles*. Set of 4 videotapes. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1993
- The Growth Phases of Organizational Lifecycles*. 39 min.
 - The Aging Phases of Organizational Lifecycles*. 38 min.
 - Analysis of Lifecycles*. 52 min.
 - Treating the Growing and Aging Problems of Organizations*. 56 min.
- Adizes, I. *Program D: Decision Making and Implementation*. Set of 2 videotapes. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1993.
- CAPI: Predicting Managerial Effectiveness*. 45 min.
 - The Adizes Process of Decision Making*. 49 min.
- Adizes, I. *From Entrepreneurship to Professional Management*. Speech to the Council of Growing Companies. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1993.
- Adizes, I. *The Young Company's Lifecycle: Are You Ready for the Future?* Keynote Address to the Inc. 500 Awards. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1996.

AUDIO

Adizes, I. *Analysis of Management*. 6 audio cassettes. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1988.

Adizes, I. *Analysis of Lifecycles*. 6 audio cassettes. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1989.

CD

Caric, N., Horvat, Z. and Vukic, B. *The Adizes Program: An Interactive Compilation of the Writings of Dr. Ichak Adizes and the Programs of the Adizes Institute*. Santa Barbara: Adizes Institute Publications, 1998.

ABOUT THE ADIZES INSTITUTE

The Adizes Institute provides organizations worldwide with the managerial resources to achieve extraordinary results while developing and nurturing a constructive, cooperative organizational culture.

Since its establishment in 1975, the Adizes Institute has served hundreds of organizations worldwide, from fledging companies to Fortune 100s, not-for-profit organizations, and governments. Through its network of international locations, the Adizes Institute has provided services to organizations in 45 countries.

The Adizes Institute is the research, publishing, licensing, training, and certification arm for the Adizes® methodology. The Adizes® methodology, developed over the past 35 years by Dr. Ichak Adizes, is a highly evolved proprietary, structured, pragmatic system for accelerating organizational change.

The Adizes Institute is closely associated with the Adizes Graduate School that grants master's and doctoral degrees in the study of Leadership and Change.

