THE 10 DON'TS TO MANAGER'S EFFICIENCY

Prof. Kamen KAMENOV, D.Sc. (Econ.)[*]

Abstract: *The study of human history reveals that all authorities share a common attribute (feature) – the pursuit to consolidate, preserve and reproduce their power. This principle applies to the behavior of managers, too, since they need to ensure the efficient performance of the organisations they are in charge of and survive as the heads of those organisations. When approached from a broader perspective, issues are further complicated by the intervention of the ego. Managers' behavior is still rational and acceptable when the influence of their ego is within reasonable limits. Going beyond those limits may result in dictatorship and bureaucracy in the effort to retain their power. There are some fundamental rules which, if observed during the management process, could help managers and their teams avoid serious trouble.*

JEL: *D91.*

The research paper reviews 10 guidelines for reconsidering the behavior of managers and their teams. Those principles emphasise that we should not consider people with high moral values to be harmful or reprehensible, and that power should not be approached as 'granted from above' but as a means for ensuring common success and efficient performance. Power relates directly to the responsibility of all people along the management process chain, yet it is ultimately borne by managers. This is the underlying idea of the 10 Don'ts for manager's efficiency that are formulated in the paper. The principles are based on observations of management practice as well as on theoretical ideas about the behavior of managers and their teams. Issues such as distorting self-actualization into self-aggrandizement; allowing excessive indebtedness in the relations between team members; underestimating competitors and overestimating oneself; going to extremes in rejecting different behavior; ignoring personal responsibility as a factor of managerial sustainability, etc. may have a dramatic impact on the behavior and performance of management teams. Finding the appropriate solutions to such issues are of crucial importance to improving manager's performance.

[*]This is Prof. Kamenov's last paper, which was kindly submitted to the editorial board of Economics 21, the journal set up by the professor.

Introduction

Things that are happening at present and are taken for granted or considered to be a matter of chance, often have their origin much earlier in time. Therefore, only managers who are well grounded in the lessons of the past are able to respond adequately to current situations and develop a clear of the future. A good judgement when or in what circumstances to say ‘No’ frequently helps organisations avoid future conflicts and prevent the waste of resources. In this case a ‘No’ is not used as a straightforward negation but implies careful observation of the manner in which managers and their teams behave when solving major problems that their organizations are facing.

Compliance with those ‘Don’ts’ when dealing a specific problem requires to do so indicates that a manager does not dwell an imaginary world where power is used as a décor but have their feet on the ground. It also implies that such a manages appreciates people with professional skills and moral and finds intolerable people who violate professional ethics or work discipline.

The ten ***Don’ts*** we have summarized in this study paper relate to different modes of behavior and scientific findings which managers need to take into account during the implementation of the management process. Therefore, these ‘***Don’ts***’are an attempt to give managers a reason to reconsider their behavior in different situations so that they could find adequate solutions to arising problems. Prescribing rules or technological solutions about a specific mode of behavior is not only difficult but can hardly be accomplished even by teams of specialists in the subject matter. This is due to the fact that people tend to act differently at different points of time. One and the same personal attributes may be regarded as opposite extremes in different situations. Hence the need to design a framework with some of the basic elements of manager’s behavior that would help them avoid certain human weaknesses in terms of power and thus ensure their improved performance as managers. At the same time, we should always bear in mind that managers rely mainly on the members of their teams during the implementation of the management process. Therefore, any compromise when selecting the members of management teams will affect negatively the pursuit of sustainable management.

1. Do Not Approach Power as ‘Being Granted from Above’. Exercising Power Beyond the Potential of the Managed Object Is a Delusion of Grandeur

Managers often fail to understand that power is limited by the potential of the managed object. Hence coinages like ‘insufficient power’, ‘limited power’, ‘enormous power’, ‘little power’, etc., which, instead of being interpreted, tend to focus on managers or management teams. In other words, power is identified with those who exercise it. Failure to realistically assess the condition of the managed object, i.e. the potential of that object, may easily prompt managers a wrong approach to exercising power. Not infrequently, when managers approach their power as ‘being granted from above’ (even though it is delegated to them), they tend to make decisions and take actions which in most cases result in inefficient management.

It is essential to avoid any inconsistency between the use of power and the nature and contents of a specific situation, i.e. to avoid inappropriate management styles. Finding the right solution to each situation in terms of organizational management requires that that situation be approached separately. Thus, the approach to be employed in an emergency will differ from the one that is appropriate for a stressful or an extreme situation. Managers’ training, experience, and even intuition should prompt them the best manner in which to exercise their power. The results of dealing with each specific management situation may then be used as evidence about the efficiency of the exercised power.

Under no circumstances should a manager exercise their power under external influence since that will corrupt the management process and achieved results will be marked by the outside pressure that has been exerted. A manager’s determination not to tolerate outside influence may cause serious problems, and in some cases, even result in having their power taken away from them, especially if that power has been ‘granted from above’. This is usually the fate of managers who have attained their position in result of strictly calculated outside interests, rather than due to their personal skills and qualities. In most cases, this exposes managers to significant stress further increased by the fact that they are oftentimes forced to act against their own will or sense of justice.

People have taken much effort to identify those weaknesses of Roman emperors that may explain their indulgency in debauchery. The reasons behind the crimes they committed are obvious – they stem from the unlimited supreme power which those emperors had. ‘Take an ordinary person of average virtue and judgement and give him enormous power and he will soon start to act insane. If Neron had been deprived from power at the very beginning, he would probably have lived the pitiful life of a bourgeois with no infamous virtues.’(Toulouse, 1909, p. 69)

The pursuit of power is genetically determined in people. It relates to the urge of aggression as an element of human mentality. The objective of aggressive behavior is to change certain elements of the environment and of human behavior. In order to ensure the efficiency of managers in the management process, adequate mechanisms should be employed to exercise control over the manner in which power is assumed and wielded. The goals which managers set to the managed object are of crucial importance. In the pursuit of greater accomplishments and keeping ahead of competitors those goals are often inconsistent with the potential of the managed entities. Hence, the efforts that managers take are put to the test and frequently fail to produce the expected results. Therefore, in order to allocate responsibilities correctly and ensure the efficient performance of their teams, managers need to be aware of the professional, psychological and physical qualities of their subordinates. At the same time, there will be situations in which managers will have to discontinue or say NO to certain projects since taking any further effort in the wrong direction may result in huge losses or even pose a threat to the viability of their organisation. The ability of managers to share power and to act as coordinators, rather than supervisors, may produce much better results and ensure the sustainability of the organization. This is a matter of personal judgement as well, since having all the power concentrated in the hands of a manager is just as dangerous as having that power shared with the wrong members of the team.

2. Do Not Underestimate Your Rivals, Neither Overestimate Yourself

The management process takes place in an environment of varying uncertainty. In order to behave adequately, managers need to be aware of the different situations which occur both within the organization and outside it. Although managers usually rely on their teams as well, moral and real responsibility is ultimately theirs. In other words, everything depends on the personal and professional qualities of managers.

A manager's success is determined by the professionalism and the behavioral adequacy with which they approach different situations. An essential requirement for achieving positive results is the awareness of a manager of their personal and professional skills. Susceptibility to external assessments may lead to managers abandoning level-headed behavior and making inefficient decisions or taking ineffective actions. The pursuit of small immediate gains is frequently at the expense of major long-term benefits, that is, an organization may thus lose the opportunity to gain strategic advantages. Therefore, managers whose behavior is guided by the pursuit of small and trivial achievements may easily develop the infallible manager syndrome which then breeds a sense of superiority, that is, managers begin to overestimate their skills and abilities.

Managers need to be aware that each person may approach a specific situation differently due to a number of reasons. One and the same person may act in a totally different manner in similar situations because of the people who have provoked those situations. The opposite is also possible – different situations may provoke similar behavior. Things will depend on deliberation and specific implications. A sober judgement of the qualities of the people around them enables managers to respond appropriately to each person and to specific situations. Managers need to be fully aware that those who are currently supporting and praising them, may, in different circumstances, join their adversaries. While it is clearly upsetting to see people around as potential enemies, good managers must be under no illusions in this respect and accept that people and their motives change in the course of time. Managers should therefore always take instances of obsequious behavior and praise from their coworkers with a grain of salt.

Thoughts provoke actions, therefore the thinking patterns which managers develop are of crucial importance. Those thinking patterns basically relate to two aspects – thoughts about and consideration of one's own behavior and the people around. Appropriate actions on behalf of managers depend on the extent to which these thoughts and considerations match external assessments. Failure to seek that balance soberly and impartially is very likely to result in making the wrong decisions and taking inappropriate actions.

The emotional state of managers is also decisive for their ability to objectively assess competitors and behave sustainably. The lower the consumption of emotional energy, the higher the relative share of the useful input for resolving a particular problem. Feelings such as love or friendliness are hardly present in competition. Similarly, your hatred for your rivals is none of their concern. Yet, transforming such feelings into actions under the influence of emotions can prove to be useless and prevent managers from objectively assessing the position of their organization in comparison to their competitors. An emotional approach to a given a situation is detrimental to rational thinking and unbiased relations since emotions tend to distort our perception of what a situation really is like. This clearly affects the decisions we make or the actions we take in response to a situation. In such cases, the inconsistency in the assessment of the personal qualities of a manager and those of the rivals may be materialized in two aspects, i.e. managers may overestimate their own skills and underestimate those of their competitors. In this case, the lack of behavioral adequacy may result in inefficient management even if managers have high potential as professionals.

Approaching a specific situation emotionally is also dangerous since managers may thus become more susceptible to various external insinuations. One of them is having a certain attitude to third parties transferred. In such cases, the inadequate behavior of a manager may significantly complicate interpersonal relations.

A competent manager must be aware that each situation within the organization may involve people with different professional competence, professional potential and sense of commitment. The reaction of the manager to each situation is externally assessed and assessments may totally differ. Applying flexible approaches to different problems is an element of the behavioral strategy of managers who are capable to adequately assess situations and are aware of their own potential. This implies readiness to hear and take into account opinions and statements which complement and help elaborate the attitude of the manager towards a situation. Managers who overestimate their personal skills and professional abilities may ignore external points of view and thus err significantly in their decision-making and further actions.

Managers also need to be aware that the complexity of a situation may be beyond the comprehension of some of the people involved in that situation. Those people will then interpret the situation differently, each of them will focus their attention on different aspects, which may lead to shifting the general focus from the one that is most significant in that particular case. This poses a danger of trying to deal with the symptoms, rather than the problems themselves.

We may conclude that the behavioral adequacy of managers, which is based on their ability to realistically assess their personal skills and not to underestimate those of their rivals, is a major requirement to management sustainability. Yet, this is a complex and continuous process that starts with the inculcation of core values in childhood to continue later with the development of professionalism and a sound sense of ethics in interpersonal relations. Corporate culture and traditions are extremely important, and so is the establishment of clear and accurate principles that will govern both interpersonal and institutional relations. Any failures or omissions in this respect result in creating an environment which affects individuals differently and does not contribute to developing unbiased relations. This makes it difficult for both team members and managers to assess their own skills correctly. In other words, they will be likely to overestimate their own skills and abilities and underestimate those of their rivals, which will then lead to making the wrong decisions and taking the wrong actions.

3. Do Not Boast as Personal Success Situations or Accomplishments to Which Others Have Contributed, Too

For an organization to perform well, it is essential that all its members should feel committed to the ultimate accomplishment which is pursued. This has a positive impact on individuals' motivation on the responsibility they assume in the process of pursuing that goal. Any result – be it positive or negative – is achieved with the active involvement of teams where structures of employees, specialists and managers vary. One of the basic responsibilities of managers is to coordinate and guide the activity of the participants in the process in order to accomplish the goals that have been set. Clearly, even the best manager cannot be certain as to what is going on in the consciousness of their vice-managers, the heads of units or employees. When doing their work, people are still occupied with the ups and downs in their private life, their relations with friends and neighbours and issues of their community in general. While in some cases this may contribute to the overall positive attitude of employees, there are also cases in which employees are constantly under the pressure of the problems they are facing outside the organization. The psychological background is further complicated by the acknowledgement (or the lack of acknowledgement) of achieved results. Employees' performance can frequently be enhanced even by merely paying attention to them. Emphasizing their commitment to the achievement of organizational goals is a major incentive which fosters positive attitude to work. Individuals thus perceive the organization as an entity that values and protects them and not as a place of exploitation and conflicts.

One of the issues related to the implementation of the decisions made by the management is that of the possible inconsistency between the passive and the active behavior of managers. This has a direct impact on managerial sustainability. Even if we assume that it is within the nature of people to be a little too confident, so that they could face new challenges and cope with different tasks, overconfidence may cause serious trouble. In management, overconfidence is especially dangerous when assessing the strategic potential of a situation. In such cases, excessive confidence in a manager's judgement may result in making the wrong decisions. Emphasizing the importance of your personal input in situations in which other people are professionally involved indicates lack of appreciation for their contribution to the implementation of the process. Attributing accomplishments to the active behavior of managers is even less acceptable as it creates an even less favourable behavioral environment. This may be detrimental to the management of an organization when the strategic potential of a situation needs to be assessed. Managers who are extremely confident in their points of view are likely to take inadequate decisions. A classic mistake which managers make is to transform their passive behavior into an active one at the wrong time, which is a conscious or subconscious attempt to focus the attention on their 'SELF. This has a direct impact on the sustainability of the management process, in other words, the lack of behavioural sustainability on behalf of managers results in deteriorated management sustainability. This often lowers the motivation and activity of the other people who have contributed to the achievement of end results. To avoid this, managers must be able to exercise self-control and only transform their passive behaviour into active one at the right time. When emotions get out of control, negative results are more likely than positive ones, unless the manager is able to behave level-headedly. In addition, managers who think and behave rationally would not allow having relations with or attitudes to third parties transferred in result of internal or external insinuations, either. Unless there is a good reason to involve or respond to a third party, this would render the actions of the manager ill-advised and inefficient. Not infrequently, managers try to compensate weaknesses and shortcomings that are due to premeditated speculations by emphasizing the significance of their 'SELF' for an accomplishment to which others have contributed as well. Similar behavior is even more absurd, when the end results are different from the expected ones due to the lack of vision and insight on behalf of managers.

Managers tend to emphasise the importance of often their 'SELF' due to their sense of unlimited power. Assuming the right to give orders to or subjectively assess the performance of partners, specialists and employees is an example of uncontrolled actions on behalf of managers. These might result in the accumulation of negative attitudes that could later transform into conflicts.

Any situation in companies and organisations involves people with varying professional competence and potential whose commitment to the final results will also vary. Creating the right sense of commitment in all of them is therefore even more difficult, which adds to behavioral unsustainability. When a situation involves persons who are not able to adequately assess or respond to it, they tend to focus on different aspects and may ignore the one that is really essential for the implementation of the management process in that particular case. As a result, the focus of attention may be shifted from major to insignificant issues. In such cases, it is the role of the manager to actively 'step in' in order to assign tasks and coordinate activities. When this is done professionally and competently, an act of emphasizing the 'SELF' of the manager could be approached more favourably by the other individuals who have participated in the implementation of the management process.

4. Do Not Distort Self-Actualisation into Self-Aggrandisement

People perform various social functions in their lives. Some of these functions are dictated by the social structures in which they live and work, others are consciously made personal choices, a third group of functions are influenced by both. Whatever the origin of these functions, an individual actualizes his or her self in the process of their implementation, i.e. individuals consider their own behavior in the process and arrive at certain conclusions about other people's attitudes towards them. Self-actualization relates to the accomplishment of specific objectives. The manner in which a person wants and expects to be perceived by others, the image he or she will create in people's consciousness is an issue which individuals consider in advance. Self-actualisation is therefore based on achieved goals and specific behavior. Setting the wrong goals and inadequate behavior may frequently distort self-actualisation into self-aggrandizement, which is the easier way to make an impression on other people. In any group activity, people deal with the behavior of each individual in the group and with different established behavioural patterns. Hence this is another perspective from which the behavior of individuals can be assessed as either self-actualisation or self-aggrandizement. Another example of self- aggrandizement is emphasizing one's own contribution to situations and results which involve other people, too – an issue that was considered in part three of this paper. This part will therefore focus on managers' self-actualisation in the management process.

Managers can only achieve their self-actualisation within the limits of the power they have. Going beyond the limits of that power may be interpreted as self- aggrandizement. Situations in which managers seem to be unwilling to use the power they possess also have a negative impact on the implementation of the management process. Decisions which are made exclusively by managers could indicate that such managers are distorting their self-actualisation into self- aggrandizement. or are acting under the influence of internal or external insinuations.

One of the major conditions for using their power adequately and efficiently is that managers should not be susceptible to its negative aspects. In many cases, it is power that enables managers to act in a manner that is far from natural. Self- aggrandizement is one of the elements of such unnatural behavior. It prevents managers from responding adequately to current situations. What is more, when acting in this manner, managers are guided by ill-advised internal or external influences. In such cases, the process of self-actualisation acquires a negative aspect which managers could hardly deal with, even if they are willing to do so, due to newly-established circumstances. Power, which can be used for positive self-actualisation, may thus begin to generate multiple negative consequences. This is usually the case when managers overrun their power and make single-handed decisions that serve some private or (minority) group interests. Such minorities are frequently the source of various insinuations that distort a manager's perception of a situation or encourage their self- aggrandizement through flattery and excessive (and often insincere) praise. In the best possible scenario, in similar situations, a manager would be able to exercise some self-control, seriously consider their own behavior and try to identify the people they receive excessive praise from. Those people are likely to turn into rivals later, since their benevolence is highly inconsistent and chiefly influenced by their personal interests and potential gains.

Different behavioral patterns are possible in management practice. In addition to using their power within limits and actualizing their selves through their decisions and actions, managers may stay passive when a situation arises. Such behavior renders the management process subject-less, i.e. there are issues that need to be resolved and opportunities for making the right decisions, yet, the manager does not have the will to do so. There could be a number of explanations for similar situations, some of the major ones being: professional incompetence; private or group interests dictated by the status quo; permanent lack of motivation; inconsistency between the values of the manager and the values of the team, etc. As a matter of fact, subject-less-ness relates to waivering from the right to use the power one has been vested in. In such cases, even if there is some management activity in terms of decisions and actions, they do not produce any major results. Managers may still exaggerate any trivial achievements by emphasizing their own contribution. This is typical of political management where any opportunity is seized for self-aggrandizement.

Subject-less-ness in terms of refraining from one's right to exercise possessed power is no less dangerous than taking the wrong decisions or using the decision-making process to pursue one's personal goals. Subject-less-ness is the main reason why organisations miss major opportunities. When combined with self-aggrandisement on behalf of managers for any insignificant success which has been achieved, subject-less-ness may leave subordinates misled as to what is really happening in the organisation. The trend may further intensify in the course of time if the management process is beaurocratised, a phenomenon known as management implemented by clerks.

Subject-less-ness may also result from the lack of prospects for a social organization. In such cases, the behavior of managers is determined by the lack of the ambition for self-actualisation. The latter could be due to the lack of any significant accomplishments. Organisations then rapidly lose their competitive potential and have fewer chances to be successful.

Without making any sweeping generalisations, we could summarise that self-aggrandisement cannot replace self-actualisation, especially when it is not supported by any real results achieved due to the managers' decisions or actions. Still, there are instances when a manager's team might show passive resistance and remain passive when it is to be active. In case a manager has achieved some real and specific accomplishments, those could be pointed out in an act of moderate self-aggrandisement. As for the reasons for a team's passive behavior, those need to be analysed carefully. Such passive behavior could result from having the interests of the informal leader infringed; from excessive incentives or severe sanctions for team members; third-party attitudes, etc.

5. Do Not Forget That the Problem Your Organisation Is Facing at Present May Have Occurred Earlier

Any problem arising within an organization relates to a specific situation. Different situations affect the implementation of the management process differently and their impact may be positive or negative. Negative effects relate to various problems in terms of management. Problems which managers identify at present may have arisen earlier. A careful analysis may help identify the connection between some problems and certain negative results. Therefore, awareness about the origin of a problem that is currently faced by the organization may help managers find essential solutions or take crucial actions which relate both to the current implementation of the management process and to the reliability of predicted results. If managers focus their attention solely on a specific current problem, they may fail to trace the origin and development of that problem in time. Clearly, those observations refer to major problems which are crucial to the development of an organization and not to any problems in general.

A situation is any deviation from the technology that has been established in advance for the implementation of the management process. Such deviations could be due to internal or external factors, or to a combination of both. What is more, the internal and external environment in which situations develop over time constantly change. Whatever their character or type, situations have an impact on both the management strategy and the administration of the management process. In the first case, this could affect the regulatory framework and the goal setting of an organization, while in the second case, their impact may be in terms of the decision-making process, the management of the implementation of those decisions or the very implementation of decisions.

Any problems arising in terms of a specific situation demand a specific type of behavior on behalf of the manager. These could be summarized as follows:

a) Defining the situation which has arisen – this includes both defining the parameters of the external materialization of the situation and its internal nature. When managers face a problem situation, it is essential to obtain as comprehensive information about the origin and development of that problem as possible. Problems arising in social systems relate to human behavior. The ability to accurately define the nature of current deviations allows managers to review past events and check whether such deviations have occurred previously and what their implications have been to the development of the organization. Another issue is whether the problem situation provokes the interest of the management team. This depends on the behavior of managers as supervisors and coordinators of the actions of their subordinates. In some cases, managers may focus on a problem excessively and thus provoke different responses from their team members. To ensure a consistent attitude and response to a problem, it is essential to thoroughly analyse the situation in order to gain awareness about that problem, its origin and its potential development in future. The transition of our country to market economy is full of examples when the significance of certain problems was underestimated and finding their solution was delayed, which resulted in major economic losses.

b) Analysing the situation **–** in order to analyse a situation related to a problem which an organization is currently facing, it is necessary to establish **what the structure of that situation is**. In some cases, a situation may generally be defined without knowing in detail its internal structure. Problems may then be defined inaccurately if they are related to certain symptoms, rather than to the nature of a situation. The failure to account for the nature of a situation might be due to a number of reasons. Some of them may have their origin much earlier in time and their recognition might require further information. Ignoring those reasons because it is difficult, or because managers are reluctant to examine the past might lead to major problems at present. The lack of awareness about structural elements of the past might make it difficult to accurately perceive the internal structure of a situation. Managers will then have to make decisions without having sufficient information about the origin or the evolution of a problem. At the same time, when a management team has to offer solutions to a specific problem, they need to be able to convincingly justify their refusal to take any actions or the actions they propose in terms of the situation that has arisen.

c) Assessing the situation. This is a crucial moment in the implementation of the management process when the management team, supervised by the manager, make their decision how to respond to the specific situation. When a situation is approached as a problem situation, it is necessary to take actions so that the problem could be resolved. When a situation is approached as an opportunity, it does not usually require immediate active involvement as there is no problem that needs to be solved. In such cases, there is no historical evolution of the situation to be traced, i.e. such situations have usually not occurred earlier.

The problems which organisations face primarily refer to unconventional situations. Within a market economy, such situations arise in result of the specific relations between market entities. This renders the environment in which organisations operate less predictable and therefore requires unconventional behavior from managers and their teams. This includes:

- ***Identifying similar situations, or some of their elements, in the past***. Knowing the background of any problem situation is essential for accurately defining the nature of that situation. In some cases, the origin of a situation might be identified by comparing that situation to similar or even totally different situations, for example, by comparing a situation in medical practice to a situation in the economy. It is the responsibility of managers and their teams to identify a similar situation in the past and arrive at adequate conclusions about the situation which their organization is facing at present;
- ***Showing insight –*** this is the ability of managers and their teams to foresee the future development of those elements of the situation which they have comprehensive information about and to outline possible changes in terms of the elements about which there is not sufficient information available;
- ***Objectively assessing the potential of the organization to respond to the problem situation***, i.e. available financial, tangible and human resources and the overall condition of the organisation;
- ***The manager's readiness to take on a risk***. Actions taken to solve problems in an unpredictable environment are based on the subjective judgement about the reliability of the information that has been gathered about the background of a situation and its current materialization. Since the situation is unconventional, the intuition of the manager that the organization is ready to make the necessary changes to respond to the specific problem is also essential. This is the underlying behavior of managerial risk;
- ***Assessing the which the situation will have on the strategic goals and the performance of the organization.*** The former refers to the strategic implementation of the management process, and the latter – to the administration of that process.

Whatever the results from the actions which managers and their teams take, they become part of the organisational history. Both failures and accomplishments in the management of an organization will one day be used as benchmarks to assess its success and to identify possible solutions to various problems. In this sense, any problem arising at present may have its origin and history earlier in time indeed. It is therefore wise to take into account the lessons learned from the history of both failure and success when seeking solutions to present-day problems.

6. Do Not Allow Excessive Indebtedness in Relations

Different relations occur during the implementation of a management process – interpersonal, intergroup, formal, informal, intra-institutional, interinstitutional, etc. Equality in these relations is essential for ensuring the necessary sustainability and the accomplishment of management goals, in other words, any type of behavior needs to receive an adequate response from counterparts. Such balance is difficult to achieve, which may cause indebtedness in existing relations. Indebtedness relates to inadequate responses and is accumulated in time, thus affecting the implementation of the management process. What is more, indebtedness may develop so far as to cause the appearance of chains of inadequate relations. While this may be approached as a weakness, it also poses a potential threat of arising conflicts. Accumulated indebtedness in relations renders the performance of social structures less efficient and the management process – unsustainable.

Whatever the relations that are being considered, indebtedness is in essence, a behavioral response. It could develop both horizontally, in terms of purely professional and interpersonal relations, and vertically, affecting managerial staff at different levels of management. In either case, indebtedness provokes major compromises and conflicts in social systems. Hence, the significance of the behavioral aspects of management sustainability for governing the relations between the subject that exercises power (i.e. the manager) and the object on which power is exercised (i.e. the manager's subordinates). They are the two parties between which different relations occur when specific problems need to be resolved and developing indebtedness in those relations is a real possibility. The sustainability of the management process relates to the managers' ability to identify the common ground in any situation and thus encourage the active involvement of subordinates. A flexible approach is essential, too, since people are different and equality in relations is not sufficient to guarantee that they will act uniformly as a single entity. In other words, it is extremely important to know when to say 'No' or 'Yes' and whom to.

Managers are surrounded by people with different values and different professional and personal potential. In order to develop the right attitude to each of their subordinates, managers need to know them well. A good example of indebtedness arising in the relations between managers and their subordinates is the tendency to put up with the weaknesses of some employees or provide career growth opportunities to employees who have not really deserved them. Such indebtedness may materialize at different points of time into different conflicts, unless certain expectations are met. As Machiavelli once wrote: 'The first method for estimating the intelligence of a ruler is to look at the men he has around him' (Machiavelli, 1991, p. 80). Good management refers not only to the ability to benefit from the strengths of employees but also to ensure advantages to the organization from their weaknesses, although this might, at first, seem hard or impossible to accomplish. Thus, even a minor confrontation from subordinates might help managers arrive at valuable conclusions as to how long they could rely on a group of subordinates or whether the indebtedness in their relations has reached a critical level.

The underlying cause of indebtedness in relations is the failure of some team members to fulfil their professional obligations and the lack of adequate response to such a failure. Having their duties fulfilled renders employees free, while failures to do so render them dependent. This is the most common type of indebtedness between a manager and their subordinates. Other aspects of indebtedness in relations refer to the trust which managers extend to their subordinates and which subordinates extend to their managers. The act of extending one's trust relates to expectations, the latter being a powerful management tool for boosting the activity of subordinates.

The expectations that people have are usually in terms of some positive change, that is, people expect some changes when they are not satisfied with the current situation. Expectations are usually charged with optimism. In some cases, people may also have pessimistic expectations, yet optimism is a more powerful incentive for activity. Realistic expectations are most adequate, especially when it comes to the relations between managers and their subordinates. Realism, however, is most difficult to develop in human behavior. A sense of realism relates to experience, professionalism, sensibility, a philosophical approach to life, and a number of qualities which are difficult to cultivate in people. Indebtedness in relations usually results from unrealistic expectations, such as the presence of strong personal motivation for career growth in individuals with very low potential or the presence of excellent personal potential in the wrong environment.

Two types of relations can develop in any team or group – interpersonal and functional. Proponents of social engineering believe that the behavior of individuals and groups could generally be regulated as long as goals are justified convincingly and functions are stated clearly. Indebtedness in relations can thus be reduced to a minimum. Replacing interpersonal relations with functional ones, however, is a departure from the system of moral values. Embedding a person into a predesigned scheme of behavior is hardly the best environment in which individuals can fully develop their potential. At the same time, total freedom or spontaneous actions are not an appropriate alternative when seeking to accomplish organizational goals since they could result in chaotic behavior and indebtedness in relations that is difficult to curb. Hence, the essential role of managers who need to be aware of the attitude of their subordinates and apply flexible approaches in their work in order to prevent excessive indebtedness in relations. Relations within a group can be complicated indeed – both those between every member and the rest of the group as well as those between the group as a whole and the manager. They are based on individuals' values, upbringing, general and professional culture, moral principles, etc. that cannot be assessed quantitatively. Having a single opinion voiced or a suggestion made might change the behavior or even the social status of the other party. What is more, even the absence of a response to a situation which affects the other party could be interpreted as some attitude since both action and inaction are a kind of response.

Inconsistent benevolence (Kamenov, 2012, pp. 157-165) is a major driver of indebtedness in human relations. Inconsistent benevolence is predominatly based on other people's opinions. Individuals who are more interested in how their behaviour will be judged by others rather than what the consequences of that behaviour will be tend to be more inconsistent in their attitudes to other people. In addition to being observant, a good manager must also be able to predict the future development of existing relations in the team and what is to be expected from team members. While the indebtedness generated by inconsistent benevolence could initially be positive, it is bound to tranform into negative indebtedness later.

If psychologists and psychoanalysts are right to claim that inconsistent benevolence is a normal human response, then the question remains what casuses negative attitudes to that type of behaviour. The answer is that inconsistent benevolence is in conflict with other people's expectations, i.e. it makes human behavior hard to predict and thus renders it impossible to clearly identify the nature of the relations that are being developed. Such relations can easily transform from positive into negative ones and vice versa, thus causing considerable uncertainty of the indebtedness which exists in the relations between individuals and with reference to third parties that may later become part of those relations, too. 'Wise people have always made a point that nothing is weaker or less solid than the power that does not rely on itself' (Machiavelli, 1991, p. 49).

Inconsistent benevolence is part of human relations and it exists at all levels of the management hierarchy. Managers themselves may be examples of such behaviour. Two skills are therefore essential – self-control and the ability to identify similar behaviour. Symptoms of inconsistent benevolence include:

- ***Obsequious attitude to people in power*** when an individual's attitude towards a person is not influenced by their personal characteristics, but by the power they possess. The object of obsequious attitude changes as soon as the people in power change.
- ***Frequently changing one's point of view on major issues.*** In this case, the aim of inconsistent benevolence is not to identify the opinion that is the most accurate, but the most favourable one in terms of personal benefits. This is accompanied by arising indebtedness in relations;
- ***Focusing on the benefits to be gained by the position which a person occupies, rather than their personal traits***, which, too, results in indebtedness;

- ***Establishing pseudo-friendships with people in power to benefit from them.*** Such friendships only last as long as an objective is accomplished or power changes hands, thus causing negative indebtedness in relations;
- ***Unscrupulous actions in the pursuit of power and wealth.*** The lack of self-control in such behaviour is a crucial sign of inconsistent benevolence. In addition, an aggressive and subsequious attitude and pseudo-friendships may be cultivated, thus leading to chaotic indebtedness in relations.

Self-control and self-analysis are of crucial importance for managers not to become susceptible to indebtedness in relations. Developing human relations is essential for the sustainable performance of management teams and organisations in general. Nevertheless, those relations should only develop within limits enabling managers to control arising situations and exercise their power so as to ensure that the accomplishment of managerial goals will not be jeopardized by the concessions they make. This results in increased manager's efficiency, too.

Institutional indebtedness is a major issue in terms of the sustainability of the management process. While interpersonal and inter-group indebtedness have an impact on individual aspects of organizational performance and could still be governed by the manager of an organization, institutional indebtedness affects the overall management process as it relates to the management policy that is being implemented. In such cases, managers have two available options – they could actively try to change some of the relations or remain passive and try to adjust to the external environment. Implementing the correct management policy is a prerequisite for ensuring the sustainability of the management process.

While societies have designed legal rules and mechanisms to fight financial and material indebtedness, there are no regulations to counteract indebtedness in the relations between individuals or groups. When it comes to moral norms and values, people seem to be unable to identify the person or entity that are responsible for their infringement. This is due to the fact that the personality of an individual is formed under the influence of a number of institutions – their families, different educational establishments, the social environment and even the team in which the personal characteristics of an individual are currently being assessed. Yet, managers will undoubtedly benefit from taking into account the possibility of arising indebtedness in relations as that will make them aware of potential bottlenecks in the implementation of the management process.

7. Do Not Neglect Personal Responsibility as a Factor of Management Sustainability

Each social system is built of hierarchical structures. As long as those structures operate within the parameters that have been set, responsibility is not an issue. Any deviation from those parameters, however, raises the issue of responsibility. In other words, potential responsibility transforms into real one and the specific entities that should bear that responsibility need to be identified.

Responsibility relates to certain powers. Therefore, responsibility is always defined in terms OF and with reference TO specific behavior. In management structures, responsibility is attributed to managers and executors. Furthermore, line managers are responsible for people, while functional managers are responsible for people and activities, and executors – for activities only.

Responsibility for people is part of hierarchical authority, whereas responsibility for activities is part of functional authority. **Self-responsibility** is also crucial for accomplishing the overall objectives of the management process. This is the responsibility to be assumed by each individual in their private, professional and social life. Self-responsibility develops under the influence of a number of factors – the basic human values which individuals share, their social environment, general knowledge, professional skills, etc. What is more, self-responsibility is of crucial importance to both hierarchical and functional managers.

Those three types of responsibility, i.e. hierarchical, functional and self-responsibility are interrelated and interdependent. Together, they build the overall responsibility within a management structure. Overall responsibility is strictly defined and corresponds to:

- The power conferred on the hierarchical authority;
- The power conferred on the functional authority;
- Tasks and activities assigned in compliance with the established normative order.

Self-responsibility relates to the self-awareness and moral of individuals. It also relates to hierarchical and functional responsibility and is a major requirement for the successful implementation of an efficient management process. Self-responsibility on behalf of managers and the members of their teams ensures a better social climate and helps develop the full potential of each team member. Achieved results indicate the extent to which that potential has been developed since any accomplishment results from allocated responsibilities in the implementation of the management process. Sustainability depends on how specific tasks and activities will be executed at each level. Attained results are a consequence of the combined effect of hierarchical, functional and self-responsibility. All three types of responsibility are essential to the implementation of the management process. Hence the significance of managers' self-responsibility in terms of:

- ***How managers use their powers,*** whether they go beyond or under their potential.

Any deviance from appropriate behavior on behalf of the manager would create a prerequisite for disturbing the sustainability of the management process. Practice abounds in both types of deviances, yet instances of managers who exceed their powers seem to outweigh examples of managers who do not fully utilize the potential of their power. Obviously, such cases do not remain unnoticed by management teams and their response may range from depleted motivation to adopting similar attitude to their subordinates;

- ***Managers' involvement in managerial decision-making.*** Different scenarios are possible: decisions may be designed by the team, yet made single-handedly; they may be designed by the team and made with the consensus of the team; decisions may be designed and made single-handedly by managers; or less frequently, decisions may be designed single-handedly by managers and made with the consensus of the whole team. Clearly, any of these scenarios is an option and which one should be employed depends on factors such as the complexity of the problem that needs to be solved; the time available for decision-making; stakeholders, etc. Whichever scenario is preferred, managers need to take their self-responsibility seriously since they are in charge of the overall performance of the organization. A situation in which a manager seeks to place the responsibility to the team, or to some of the team members, is, in fact, an attempt to evade responsibility and indicates lack of self-responsibility;

- ***How managers assign and supervise the implementation of managerial decisions.***

In this case, self-responsibility should help managers reconcile their functions and activities as managers with those of the executors. Task should not be assigned randomly. A manager's self-responsibility is essential here since managers need to match the nature and difficulty of assigned tasks to the professional skills and motivation of the employees who will execute them (i.e. the executors). As for the supervision of task execution, managers' self-responsibility relates to their ability to be flexible and to create a sense of motivated responsibility in the people whom the tasks have been assigned to. Managers with high self-responsibility could still make certain concessions while managing the implementation process. Such concessions should not be at the expense of final results, though, but must be an element of the flexible approach employed to attain those results.

Both the responsibility of the team and the self-responsibility of manages might be assessed in terms of achieved results, since the latter are directly influenced by motivated responsibility and motivated irresponsibility. Motivated responsibility may be materialized actively or passively. Active motivated responsibility relates to active behavior in terms of various initiatives, proposals, and risk-taking by managers and executors, combined with strong self-responsibility.

Motivated irresponsibility has an extremely negative impact on management sustainability. It relates to any instances of active conscious behavior, overt or covert, that impede the normal implementation of the management process. Such behavior might be due to dissatisfaction with incentives or an occupied position; a feeling in lower level managers that their personal and professional qualities are not appreciated by the manager or his team; informal circumstances that create different attitudes to colleagues and supervisors, etc.

While it is possible to seek solutions for dealing with overt motivated irresponsibility, as both its symptoms and the reasons for such behavior could be identified, covert motivated irresponsibility poses serious threats to management sustainability. Quite frequently, such behavior could only be recognized when there are some negative results. A common example of covert motivated irresponsibility is the lack of any activity in situations requiring serious involvement and prompt actions. It is hard to identify the reasons for similar behavior. In such situations, psychologists and sociologists could help managers by analyzing and providing insight about different aspects of the formal and informal life of the person whose behavior is an instance of covert motivated irresponsibility. Needless to say, a manager’s self-responsibility is extremely important, too.

One of the requirements to efficient management is the manager’s ability to best allocate tasks and responsibilities. Since any organization functions within a specific environment, it is subject to the influence of that environment. That influence may be positive, as well as negative. The former is in most cases felt within the organization itself in terms of improving its performance. The negative influence of the environment is predominantly felt as the external pressure exerted by competitors, markets, government institutions, etc. The behavior that serves the interests of external negative pressure may be passive or active. The former relates to an attitude encouraging inactivity and thus making the organization more vulnerable to outside negative influence, while active behavior that caters external negative pressure relates to opinions, insinuations and specific actions. It is the responsibility of the manager to prevent the boundaries of responsibilities from being blurred. It is also essential to account for the circumstances in which a responsibility is assumed. Assigning specific responsibilities to team members without taking into account the circumstances in which that responsibility is assumed exposes managers to the risk of failing in their attempt to effectively influence the further behavior of their subordinates and indicates low self-responsibility of such managers. Psychology defines this phenomenon as fundamental distribution error. When managers or their teams make such an error, this might shift the focus of attention from major issues that need to be resolved. Achieved results will then be negative even if some personal and organizational changes are introduced. Ignoring the circumstances that have provoked such behavior in staff (i.e. to serve the interests of external negative pressure) may prove to be a major obstacle to preserving the sustainability of the management process in future. Therefore, when holding an employee responsible, it would be wrong to assess their personality only and ignore related circumstances. As long as circumstances are promptly and accurately assessed and the necessary changes in the environment are made, managers will be able to significantly influence staff behavior and improve their responsibility and self-responsibility, thus avoiding useless changes in staff.

The self-responsibility of managers and their teams is strongly influenced by a number of factors that have formed their personalities and relate to their upbringing, culture, motivation, pursuit of self-actualisation through their personal accomplishments and those of the organization, their persistent and positive will to act, etc. (Kamenov, 2008). Self-responsibility relates to a set of moral values. Hence, it is materialized as an internal motivation to behave in a specific manner not only in terms of formal (required) responsibility but often beyond its limits, too. Hence, managers' self-responsibility and the responsibility they assume for others are a crucial factor for materializing formal responsibility and ensuring management sustainability.

8. Do Not Ignore the Benefits of Controled Reversion

When both individuals and groups within an organisation are pursuing success, the idea of reversion as part of the management strategies would sound unnatural, to say the least. In order to justify such unusual behaviour we need to define the philosophy of success. In a broader sense, success is a subjective perception of the specific condition of a person. It also relates to the emotional attitude and the perception of others. Hence, success is related to self-consciousness. Not infrequently, the way individuals perceive their own SELF is not the same as the way in which their personality is perceived by the others, i.e. the internal and external perception of an individual may differ. Therefore, when considering success as a personal accomplishment, it would be logical to define it in terms of personal self-assessment and its consistency with external assessment. Hence, managers might be seriously misled if their self-assessment is high, yet unrealistic, but is readily supported by team members and other external parties due to some gains they are seeking.

The perception of success may be subjective since in some cases, the subject who has achieved it may contribute to the accomplishments of the organization in general and its strategic development, yet some individuals or groups within the organization may not be satisfied at a certain point or for a specific period of time. Shrewd managers must be able to identify and prevent such situations in their organisations since they might lower the morale of some employees.

Managers may also find themselves in a situation in which they are unable to identify any clear prospects about the organisation or define its strategic goals, yet such short-sighted management might serve the interests of certain individuals and groups and therefore be positively assessed by them. Satisfaction with similar pseudo-success indicates either temporary delusion or interestedness on behalf of certain groups, yet in both cases it also signals an imminent crisis.

In general, failure must be distinguished from a specific negative result, although the latter is part of failure. For example, the performance of an organization depends on available financial resources, the quality of labour, equipment, etc. They also affect profit as an economic indicator. The fact that a company is making short-term profit must not mislead the manager that the mid-term and long-term success of the company is guaranteed and vice versa, a temporarily poor performance does not indicate that the company will not be able to perform better in future. The value of success is therefore measured in time and relates to a number of changes (in the condition and trends), whereas results are more specific and refer to a certain period of time.

The distinction between success as a trend and specific current results relates to the theory of controlled reversion. The underlying principle of that theory is that success may entail controlled reversion, in other words, not all instances of reversion should be approached as failures. Managers who are aware of that can employ more flexible approaches and take calculated risks in their work. If success is approached as a system of specific results, then it will be logical that some of these results will differ from those which are expected. Since success is perceived to be a continuous process over time, rather than a specific condition, it cannot be pegged to a certain point of time. Once this is done, success becomes a strategic (short-term, mid-term or long-term) result and such results are present as goals in the management strategies of organisations. Hence, a successful period in the development of an organization is reported in terms of specific results, too.

Managers who want to employ controlled reversion need to clearly answer the following questions:

- What is the current position of their organization when compared to competitors?

This means that they need to define accurately the situation at present.

- Are the manager and his/her team able to produce an impact on the current situation?
- What are the benchmarks for the strategic behavior of the organization?

If we assume that any result from a specific organizational activity is a function of time and expenditure, then managers and their teams need to be aware what their strategic behavior will be. The major features of strategic behavior are:

- ***C h a n g e*** – there are two available options – to manage or to adjust the process of implementation of strategic goals (i.e. expected results);
- ***I m p r o v i s a t i o n*** – a change may imply implementing some of the activities and totally abandoning others. It may also imply implementing new activities that have not been planned earlier.

In terms of these two options, controlled reversion may be approached as a component of strategic behavior. Controlled reversion may be employed by organisations when it is impossible to change the impact of external forces or internal factors, or when a group of specific activities are considered to be irrelevant to the implementation of strategic goals and should therefore be replaced with new activities. It is exactly at this point that managers need to consider and employ controlled reversion. It includes discontinuing certain activities and reversing the development of others. Such behavior will be more beneficial to the organization than going ahead without having any rational reasons to continue further.

A manager's decision to employ controlled reversion may be based on various motives. They refer to situations in which:

- The assessment made by the management team and professional consultancy experts indicates that the organization lacks the strategic potential which the current situation requires;

- External and internal changes require that the development strategy which is currently being implemented should be reconsidered since the current potential of the organization is incongruent with the goals which have been set;

- Fierce competition renders it necessary to reconsider organisational activities;

- The course of development is going in the wrong direction and indicates a wrong strategy and wrong goals.

The decision to temporarily suspend or reverse some of the organizational activities is a responsibility which managers and their teams must take. Before making the decision itself, a number of signals may be identified to facilitate the decision-making process. Some of the major signals are:

- A slower pace of development;

- Discontinuing the core activity of the organization and looking for possible alternatives;

- Employing elements of strategic deception in order to deceive competitors, etc.

Organisational behavior during reversion must be controlled. If a manager fails to ensure such control, their organisation might go out of business.

Bankruptcy is not part of the theory of controlled reversion since the reasons for a similar outcome might be totally different. In this case, the focus is on the strategic behavior of managers and their teams in order to ensure better conditions for the sustainable development of the organization. More specifically, this is an approach for reviewing and boosting organizational potential.

In a competitive market economy, organisations need to employ controlled reversion as an element of their strategic development whenever they find it appropriate or when such reversion is required by some factors that are beyond their control. As long as managers are aware of that necessity, they will be able to plan an adequate course of behavior that must also include an alternative course of action. Managers who are not prepared for such behavior may fall victim to the ambition to maintain the status quo at all costs, which will further deplete the potential of the organization. Controlled reversion is therefore useful for maintaining, restoring and developing organizational potential as long as this is considered necessary at a certain point of organizational development and reversion is subject to strict control. Otherwise, reversion will be associated with a failure of the organization and could, unless efficiently controlled, result in the company's going out of business. Well prepared managers are able to face any surprises on the market and adequately respond to specific situations. Those who are not, are likely to suffer losses since they have failed to understand that controlled reversion is a prerequisite for succeeding in future.

9. Do Not Go to Extremes in Rejecting Different Behaviour

Individuals fulfil their potential in different spheres of public life. In some cases, these spheres relate to the professional potential of individuals and its development at the workplace; others relate to individuals' private life, and a third group relate to the circumstances established by the external environment. Any interaction between an individual and the environment is marked by common as well as by different interests. A major feature of the behavior of individuals is their pursuit of self-actualisation based on their personal qualities and an inclination to reject different behavior. That inclination is largely influenced by the Ego. 'Those are a group of mental processes which consist of functions that are more or less related to the interaction between individuals and their environment … in adults, this general definition includes the pursuit of pleasure; habits; compliance with social rules; intellectual, aesthetic, artistic interests, etc.' (Brenner, 1993). Hence, a manager's environment consists of people who share different interests and would act differently in different situations. A manager must be able to judge which personality traits in the behavior of each team member need to be developed further and which need to be gradually adjusted, i.e. reject any behavior that differs from what is expected. The rejection of different behavior is also part of managers' behavior. What managers should be aware of is that rejecting different behavior is a form of self-actualisation and self-assertion. The former refers to establishing an internally motivated type of behavior in an environment, while the latter – to having that behavior accepted by others as appropriate, purposeful and strategically congruent. This relates to what is known as constructive rejection of different behavior, i.e. when rejection is based on objective facts and accompanied by constructive proposals made by the manager. Rejection of different behavior may also be destructive. This is the case when the pursuit of self-actualisation and self-assertion is not supported by significant personal potential but is an attempt to override any different forms of behavior in order to assert one's SELF. Instances of such behavior on behalf of managers and their teams indicates a serious crisis in the management of an organization.

Whether different behavior will be rejected by team members or managers themselves, it is the motives behind such behavior that matter. Two major types of motives may be identified. In the first case, rejection is motivated by a purely subjective attitude to a specific person, while in the second case, rejection may result from a negative attitude to the environment in which the object of rejection is pursuing their personal or professional fulfilment. Clearly, there might be instances in which the behavior of both individuals and their environment is rejected. This is an extreme situation in which it would be difficult to identify an acceptable approach so as to ensure effective communication.

Identifying the subject and the object of different behavior rejection is a major requirement for accurately classifying a situation as different behavior rejection. Since the nature and type of changes which an organization is undergoing may result in role reversal, i.e. the object of different behavior rejection may become its subject and vice versa, such processes need to be clearly defined by thoroughly analyzing the environment and the behavior of individuals. This will help understand why the persons who have earlier criticized and rejected the manager's behavior have started to share his/her opinions and attitudes, while others who have been loyal to the manager are now passively or actively opposing him/her.

A situation in which different behavior is rejected directly relates to conflicts. It precedes them and, as a matter fact, any conflict arising during the implementation of the management process is due to different behavior rejection. Conflicts usually result from instances of rejecting different behavior actively by expressing opinions, making insinuations or making attempts to manipulate others and, finally, by taking specific actions. As for the passive rejection of different behavior, it exists in the consciousness of a person only. Such rejection is transformed into active under the right circumstances and when both personal and group interests are threatened.

In management, a situation related to the rejection of different behavior may be approached from different perspectives. Such attitude is constructive when it results in groundbreaking decisions and promotes development. It is destructive when it hinders positive developments.

Situations related to the rejection of different behavior may arise along the entire chain of the management process – from the point at which managerial decisions are assigned to be implemented, through the process of managing that implementation, to the implementation itself. Managers may prevent or deal with conflicts between persons or groups in the organization if they consult good specialists on situations of different behavior rejection. This will reduce the relative share of unjustified rejection of different behavior and substantially raise the sustainability of the management process. Managers need to be aware that rejection of different behavior is based on man-to-man relations and attitudes. Hence, any hasty decision made by the manager is a serious mistake. They need to know the mentality of their team members since that will be helpful in dealing with situations in which different behavior is rejected. A person may sincerely believe in ideas that are totally wrong and even absurd. This is often the case when a situation is emotionally overcharged. Whether emotions are positive or negative, they might prompt a type of behavior that is incompatible with the specific environment. Managers should focus on any instances of such behavior and seek the advice of social psychologists and sociologists so as to reduce destructive models of different behavior rejection and increase constructive ones to preserve the sustainability of the management process.

In management practice, rejection of different behavior may also be attributed to the phenomenon known as 'leader-ism'. Although not very common, such model of behavior does exist. It relates to having subordinates blindly obey the decisions and actions of the 'leader'. Any instance of different behavior is unwelcome and unacceptable. The behavior model may metaphorically be illustrated by the following situation: 'The leader enters. All members of the tribe 'switch off' their brains and continue to use their eyes and ears only.' Clearly, subordinates whose ability to think rationally has been smothered will act as instructed by the 'leader' (i.e. the 'vozhd'). Any bottom-up initiatives are out of the question, while any attempt to behave differently is reprimanded and sanctioned. Such models of behavior are both unsustainable and short-lived, yet they could cause long-term damages to an organization.

It would be hard to make any recommendations as to when or to what extent managers should reject any behavior that differs from what they currently consider to be appropriate. It all depends on approaching each situation professionally, knowing the mentality of each member team and, above all, eliminating emotions as a possible response to both situations and team members.

10. Do Not Understimate Team Behaviour as a Factor of Achieving Positive Results, Neither Rely on Team-Shared Responsibility When Trying to Identify Weaknesses or Reasons for Poor Performance

Collective effort is increasingly becoming more important than individual professional excellence for having different problems resolved by organisations. Communication between managers and their teams is an essential element of successful team performance that also depends on issues related to individual and group motivation, interpersonal relations, the overall qualifications of staff, etc. An effective administrative process can only be implemented when managers and their teams identify adequate solutions to those issues since even the best managerial decisions will not be materialized unless properly allocated and executed. To accomplish all this, the organization and administration of management decisions are of crucial importance. This is also one of the areas in which the potential of having efficient teams built and improved has not been fully exploited yet. People think and act differently at different points of time, which implies that existing relations between team members also change over time. Achieved group results largely depend on the congruent behavior of the members of a group. The higher that congruence, the better the accomplishments and vice versa – deteriorating social climate affects the behaviour of teams and results in less satisfactory organizational performance and may even result in an organization going out of business. Hence, the question who is to be held responsible in such cases?

Team work skills have been identified as one of the major requirements for people engaged in management as managers or executors as the management process is becoming increasingly complicated due to the high unpredictability of the market environment. As Lee Iacocca observes: 'I have seen many people who are very clever and talented but are unable to perform in a team. Those are the managers that make people wonder why they have failed to achieve more. The main reason why gifted people cannot advance in their career is their poor interaction with colleagues' (Iacocca, 1991, pp. 82-83).

One of the essential attributes of a good manager is the ability to motivate executors of management policies to accomplish the ultimate goals of those policies. Hence, the importance of the ability to communicate with executors and encourage their activity. A positive attitude thus implies creating a favourable environment for developing and fully exploiting the benefits of team spirit. Furthermore, professional communication needs to be distinguished from communication in general. The behavior of a team is based on professional communication. Not infrequently, though, managers tend to replace professional communication with giving directions and recommendations about the behavior of the team.

It is essential to distinguish professional interaction from professional communication. Professional interaction relates to the implementation of a specific range of assignments, whereas professional communication relates to the information exchange at different levels. In terms of professional interaction, the role of management is to manage the activity of the people within an organization. This implies adjusting their actions so as to achieve planned results. Managers can thus use the potential of teams and accomplish management goals by having the performance of teams adequately organized.

Managers use professional interaction to:

- Give instructions, recommendations and advice;
- Obtain feedback from team members about the implementation of assignments;
- Assess the performance of executors.

Team members interact professionally with reference to:

- The technology of assignment execution;
- Different problems arising during the execution of assignments;
- Failure to keep the deadlines for the implementation of specific tasks;
- Changes in the pace at which tasks are executed.

Both management interaction between managers and their subordinates and professional interaction between team members are essential for implementing an effective management process and enjoying the benefits of teamwork. The sustainability of the management process is affected by any imbalances in both aspects of interaction.

What distinguishes a team from a group is the interaction between their members. Within a team, personal interests and behavior are governed by the objectives of the team. True professionals find it necessary and natural to be part of a team and easily adjust to team requirements. Therefore, teamwork skills are increasingly becoming a major requirement for both managers and executors who need to perform in a highly unpredictable environment.

Team responsibility is a complex issue. Any attempt to impose responsibility may not only prove unsuccessful but could also dramatically affect the accomplishment of management goals. Within teams, the achievement of these goals should be approached as a philosophy rather than a technology that is to be materialized in practice. Team members need to be aware of the significance of each position within the organization. Each activity needs to be carried out with high professionalism therefore team members need to assume maximum responsibility about the results achieved by the team. There are different approaches as to how to achieve team perfection, and in some cases, even unconventional ideas may be employed. Major principles of team behavior and efficient interaction which seem appropriate at present may prove to be less appropriate or applicable in future. Hence the conclusion that when it comes to negative outcomes, managers should not rely on team responsibility. There is no universal technology that could be employed to govern team behavior or management interaction. Rather, a philosophical framework needs to be designed that will make it possible to focus on different values and priorities during different periods of time. This will prevent teams from being the product of a uniform design process and management interaction from becoming a technology prescribing the professional and interpersonal relations that should exist between managers and their teams. Clearly, such freedom in team relations involves certain risks in terms of the responsibility to be assumed about the implementation of assignments. Practice has confirmed that the performance of teams with such behavior is much better than that of teams where the behavior and activity of team members is subject to strict rules and where ideas proposed by team members are rarely considered. Clearly, managers need to be able to accurately assess different situations and choose the most appropriate actions in each case, since the overall responsibility about the results achieved by an organization is ultimately theirs.

***

Manager’s efficiency relates to a number of issues of different nature. Those issues are subject to assessment and analysis by specialists and scientists in different areas - philosophers, sociologists, economists, law specialists, psychologists, etc. In terms of the issues related to the 10 Don’ts to manager’s efficiency that have been reviewed in this paper, two major conclusions can be made:

Firstly, an effective management process depends on the manner in which it is structured. Managers need to identify and resolve any conflicts with the existing regulatory framework and with the subject or the object of management promptly by employing adequate efficient management behaviour.

Secondly, the behavior of managers and their teams are a major factor that enables them to benefit from the advantages of a well-structured management process. The human factor produces an impact on the end results achieved by an organization through its behavior. The ability to encourage such activity depends on the skills and behavior of the manager.

References

Brenner, Ch., Psihoanaliza (osnoven kurs), Fondatsiya Otvoreno obshtestvo, S., 1993, p.43

Iacocca, Lee. Kar'yera menidzhara, Moscow, Progress, 1991, pp. 82-83

Kamenov, K., Povedenie v upravlenieto, izd. Faber, V.Tarnovo, (second edition), 2012, pp.157-165

Kamenov, K., Ikonomicheska misal, ‘Za sindroma na hronichnata upravlenska nedostatachnost’, kn.2, 2008.

Machiavelli, Vladetelyat, izd. Espas, S.1991, p.80

Op. cit., Vladetelyat, izd. Espas, S.1991, p. 49

Toulouse, Ed., Izkustvo da se zhivee, S. 1909, p.69

D. A. Tsenov Academy of Economics, Svishtov
University of National and World Economy, Sofia
University of Economics, Varna
Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski
New Bulgarian University, Sofia

ECONOMICS 21

An inter-university scientific journal
Volume IX, Issue 1, 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ECONOMICS 21

AN INTER-UNIVERSITY SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL

Submitted to publisher 19.04.2019, Printed in 11.06.2019, Print format 70x100/16, Printed copies 70.

ISSN 1314-3123 (Print)
ISSN 2534-9457 (Online)

ISSN 2534-9457 (Online)
ISSN 1314-3123 (Print)

ECONOMICS 21

Year IX, Book 1, 2019

- The 10 Don'ts to Manager's Efficiency
- Infrastructure Charges Levied in Air Transportation – Current Issues and Perspectives
- Protection against Fraud in Electronic Trade Payments

INTERUNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Икономика 21
Година IX, книга 1 2019
Year IX, Book 1, 2019
Economics 21

TO THE READERS AND AUTHORS OF ECONOMICS 21

Economics 21 publishes **research studies, articles and methodological papers**.

1. Volume

Studies: min. - 26 pages; max. - 40 pages;
Articles: min. - 12 pages; max. - 25 pages;
Methodological papers - up to 40 pages.

2. Submission of materials

- On paper and electronically (on CD and/or by e-mail).

3. Technical characteristics

- Written in Word 2003 (at least);
- Page size - A4, 29-31 lines / 60-65 characters per line;
- Line spacing - Single;
- Font - Times New Roman 12 pt;
- Margins - Top - 2.54 cm; Bottom - 2.54 cm; Left - 3.17 cm; Right - 3.17 cm;
- Page numbers - bottom right;
- Footnotes - size 10 pt;
- Charts and graphs - Word 2003 or Power Point.

4. Layout

- Name of article, name of author, scientific degree, scientific title - font Times New Roman, 12 pt, capital letters Bold - justified;
- Employer and address of the place of employment; contact telephones and E-mail;
- Abstract in Bulgarian - up to 15 lines; keywords - from 3 to 5;
- **JEL** classification code for research papers in economics (http://ideas.repec.org/j/index.html);
- The main body of the paper;
- Tables, charts and graphs must be embedded in the text (allowing for language correction and translation);
- Formulae must be created with Equation Editor;
- References in alphabetical order – in Cyrillic and Latin script;
- Technical characteristics and layout:

Template: https://www.uni-svishtov.bg/samagazine/upload/Economics-21-Template_bg.doc

5. Citation guidelines

When citing sources authors should observe the requirements of **APA Style** at: http://www.apastyle.org/ or at http://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/ or at http://www.calstatela.edu/library/guides/3apa.pdf.

Each author bears responsibility for the ideas presented, the content and layout of his/her text.

6. Contacts

Editor-in-chief: tel.: (++359)631-66-338
Stylistic editor: tel.: (++359)631-66-335
E-mail: i.varbanov@uni-svishtov.bg, economics21@uni-svishtov.bg
Address: D. A. Tsenov Academy of Economics, 2 Em. Chakarov str., Svishtov, Bulgaria