HIC Model for Effective Management

Senior executives with extensive managerial experience are often met with obscurity regarding new positions: what exactly should they do to succeed? They often find themselves flooded with assignments and challenges and must function in an environment which expects the maximum. The following model clarifies the ways a senior executive can refine leadership skills, and allocate resources, such as time and managerial ability, to achieve goals in the long run. This model offers senior executives a way to ensure that they are focused on effective action, and that they take the proper steps at the right time. In order to do this, executives should follow three steps: 'Holding', 'Improvement' and 'Creating the Future', which I will go into detail below.

Let me begin with the case of David. David has just entered a new organization as vice president of an entire division. He has rich experience in his line of work and has been hired to guarantee that his division meets its goals. He is motivated and eager to supply results quickly. On paper, David is a blessing to his new organization. However, if he does not calculate the choices he makes in the first year carefully, it is very likely that the scope of organizational resources wasted, could prove to be dangerous for the institution. It is well known that managers recruited from outside an organization have the ability to spot defects that require quick mending, but should they immediately act to

correct them? I claim that influence and change should stem from careful calculation.

What is David's first challenge? Many would say that it would be to promote change: If David was recruited externally in order to improve deficiencies and strengthen the division, we may assume that he holds the heavy responsibility of leading its transformation on his shoulders. Many times, this is in fact the case. However, the immediate inclination of mangers acting on the intuition of guaranteeing the most rapid success, is often to allocate abundant resources in this direction.

Indeed, David's main challenge is to promote change, but his immediate course of action should not be concentrated on that. The efficacy of the transformation process will be greater and more established if the manager does not act out the "auto-pilot" inclination to act quickly towards transformation, but veers towards other tactics while suspending judgement. The following model is meant to assist executive managers in a new role – and especially those who were recruited externally – to refine their actions in order to guarantee fruition. A senior executive in a new position is required to direct the system in three channels:

1. Holding

The first managerial channel for action is what we call 'Holding'. Holding is an important concept originally coined by the psychiatrist Donald Winnicott in order

to describe the mother's contribution to her baby. The term was utilized by Winnicott as a way of referring to every aspect – whether physical or psychological – of motherly activity necessary for inducing a secure emotional and physical state in the baby, and to ensure healthy development. Holding satiates complex emotional needs and requires the mother's investment in the baby.

The introduction of this concept into the world of administration expresses managers' investment in "holding" the organization for which they are responsible. For example, senior-executives who take on new positions tend to be strongly motivated to change the policies of their predecessors, or to give expression to ideas they have had beforehand as employees or junior executives. Despite this tendency, it is my contention that they should invest most of their energies in establishing a work environment that feels solid and secure.

Holding is an active practice. It includes studying the environment, making acquaintances, searching for strengths and weaknesses, and understanding the system the executive is to be responsible for, including who and what it is made out of. It is performed through proximity and a willingness to work hands-on, getting to know the environment and being fully present in it. It is an action based on a process of learning the surroundings (even if the executive feels he is fully informed) and on the manager's ability to study the details of the work place; including its mindset, way of thinking, administrative or other processes, and the considerations effecting decision-making. In short, to lead an organization, we must first learn to hold it.

It is difficult to assess the "holding" abilities of a manager. Successful holding generates in employees the feeling that they have someone or something to lean on, and in executives the feeling that they can trust their staff to perform satisfactorily.

Just like the experience of a baby being held by his mother, people in business need to feel that they have someone to lean on. When they sense that they can rely on their manager they are calm and secure. However, there are some erroneous interpretations of this support system – for instance, in cases where a manager relies too heavily on employees, resulting in trying to fulfil their wants, or expecting them to do his or her work for them, etc. Conversely, it

could also occur that a manager would micro-manage his staff in order to guarantee command of the situation, applying too much pressure in areas that don't necessarily yield improved efficiency.

"Holding" is relevant for many work relationships: between managers and employees, senior executives and their administrative staff, division managers and their teams, etc. The connection fostered by holding is not a technical one, but a cohesive one, that gets everyone to feel that they are "in the same boat". Workers could work in the same position for years under different managers but might not get "in the same boat" with all of them. The holding process is conducive in creating this relation.

It seems natural that in order to lead a stable change, executives must function outside their organization to establish a place for the services and products their company offers in the surrounding business environment. The concept of "holding" reminds us that any progress relies first and foremost on executives' ability to ensure the stability of the internal affairs of the organization.

Holding is based on leadership skills and managerial backbone. An executive must see him or herself as a leader: inspiring members of the organization to rely on them on the one hand, and to adjust and meet their expectations on the other.

The Components of Holding:

1. **Presence** – Now a days presence is a complex word. How can the executive be present in one single location when constantly being approached via cellular phone and various social networks? Holding invites the executive to set limits for him or herself in order to ensure their undivided presence where they chose to be at that moment – meeting an employee, on an excursion, meeting with a client, presenting a report, etc. Full presence is an important skill and a major part of an executive's holding ability. In spite of the pressures, stress and burdens that come with taking on the challenge of management, it is pivotal to construct a system of internal barriers to enable a sense of full presence, which creates the experience of holding in a quick and profound manner.

2. **Research, acquaintance and attention to detail** – this stage highlights observation and meticulous study of the executive's surroundings, acquaintance with the day-to-day happenings, asking questions and drawing insights. This process forms the basis for the decision-making constantly

required of the executive. To perform this stage the executive must research his own organization and pose questions, while avoiding jumping to conclusions. In the modern age, we are always in a hurry and have no time to observe things in detail. The executive must develop awareness and an ability to observe without judging immediately in order to see the situation clearly from all sides. Senior executives are required to oversee many fields, and this creates a somewhat panoramic work method. Despite executives being usually quick-thinking, the multitude of subjects under the executive's supervision should not result in a superficial approach to each; a system should be constructed to allow the executive to review details speedily and to keep in touch with actual occurrences as they happen (and not only through reports), in order to ensure that the executive's relation is substantial and not just a façade.

3. **Quality day-to-day problem solving** – Some of the main trends of the modern age are rising competition, accelerating technological development and the need to be center-stage all the time. This can sometimes result in a situation where the day-today issues are pushed aside, leaving employees or junior executives to deal with them on their own. It is a working supposition in holding processes that problem-solving is pivotal, and that these issues are not outside the scope of executive responsibility. Day-to-day issues are indicative of the state of a business, and if the executive would choose to delve into them (even if just a little), recurring patterns effecting essential macro issues will emerge. This is why day-to-day problems are paramount. For example, these are some expressions emblematic of counter-holding experience: "I sent out an e-mail regarding the issue and have received no reply", "I have raised essential issues at the meeting that were discussed at length but left with the no solution to my problem", "He has absolutely no interest in what the department does, or in its routine. He's only interested in one thing: what's next." Holding invites executive to take it upon themselves to be a part of quotidian challenges in order to help develop the organization.

4. **Managing anxiety, strain, pressure and work related stress** – Part of an executive's job, in the holding infrastructure, is to project tranquility and avoid obliviousness on the one hand, and to avoid disarray on the other. This is achieved by a willingness to address difficulties, complexities and pressures in

order to relieve managerial staff and employees, thus ensuring optimal performance. Emotions are frequently dismissed as irrelevant to the world of management and human resources – "Excuse me", executives have said to me in the past, "I'm no babysitter! They should pull themselves together and push forward, I'm not here to deal with their frustrations and anxieties." True, an executive is not a babysitter and does not come to work to manage the emotions of employees, and the truth is, that they don't even need it. But this does not change the fact that there is a set of emotional terminology that dictates a large part of behavior in a constantly changing system: the sphere of fear and anxiety.

Executives can become anxious because their work involves being constantly scrutinized on their ability to lead the organization to success. Failure, then, becomes personal failure. The entire organization can be experiencing high levels of anxiety on an almost permanent basis: Will it survive change? Will it be able to hold its own against competition? And what about competition with business giants? Employees can be anxious because of fluctuations in the world of business and its potential effect on their future income and well-being. In such a reality, an executive's ability to hold his division or department is vital. Holding processes allow the system to cope with fears and perform properly. This requires that the executive knows the heart of the organization he manages, to discern what's essential and what's not, and to be able to extract and display the prior. Acquaintance with his organization allows the manager to coordinate and lead his staff through guiding it to focus on what's important.

5.   **Professional management** – In a meeting I had with a new CEO she described how she came to realize that her employees' approach was fundamentally flawed, that the value of managers in her company was unclear, and that the market was moving in another direction than the company was going in, mandating a profound change in business approach. She feared that if this were not to happen, the entire company might flounder. During a period of a few months attempting to bring about the required changes, a disturbing thing happened: there was a massive resignation of managers and employees. While trying to halt the process, she castigated managers for having poor managerial skills, for not trying to retain the talented members of their respective staff. When I tried to clarify the reasons for this situation, it came to

light that she had met with the managers under her supervision in order to become acquainted with their work and the details of their position, but it was clear to everyone involved that these meetings were instrumental on her part; examining how she could utilize them for her own needs, and not as a step towards establishing common work protocol or relationships. Moreover, she had failed to inform them of the changes the company was going through and shared only rarely. The result was that most of the employees in the company were already looking for new employment – despite their love of the organization and its function. Eventually, their disappointment with the new CEO won out. This road is a slippery slope. Under these conditions it is likely that the CEO will not have the time to lead the changes she had envisioned since she will have to allocate her resources and time to dealing with replacing personnel and preserving the organization's intellectual property. The CEO in this case might be business savvy, but unprofessional management skills, and a deficiency in allocating resources such as time and energy towards holding the organization, resulted in a fundamental failure and a tremendous fall in performance.

When I suggest to executives that they should promote holding, many reply that they "don't have the time". So I would like to correct a flaw in the idea that "if I run faster, I will go further." In many organizations we can find a dynamic of urgency and haste; everyone is busy and stirring, and managers are motivated to do whatever it takes to lead the company to success. But without taking a moment to convey presence, to understand the current state of affairs and learn about the details, and without refining and rearticulating the vector everyone is to adhere to, entire systems could run in circles, reaching meager results, if any at all. Time is certainly a limited resource, and the clock is forever ticking both for business and society, but this is precisely why it is essential to work accurately, and to make sure that we are running in the right direction. Holding is not maintenance. Maintenance is also important, but it has to do with recurring routine technicalities that are of no great moment for an organization. Holding, however, holds a wider value and refers to organizational, business, psychological and humanistic aspects relevant both in and out of specific organizations.

In contrast, I was happy to meet senior executives who knew how to be fully present in their organizations, to connect employees to processes, and embrace anxiety and fears – both their own and those of the rest of the system – thus promoting giant leaps in their organization's progress towards new goals, novel methods and wonderful results.

2. Improvement – correcting the current state:

Holding requires the executive to observe and produce insights which are then translated into operative action that leads to positive development. **Improvement** is a fundamental element in management, and usually follows the holding process, although the two can sometimes run parallel to one another. Improvement raises three basic questions for the executive: What to improve? How to improve? Have I managed to improve? The working assumption in this channel is to bring about improvements that would ensure better functioning and results in the long run.

Many executives work under high levels of stress, especially when assuming a new position or being promoted. The need to succeed can sometimes lead to precocious judgment and hypercriticism. Executives that fall prey to this tend to act quickly but superficially towards improvement, often leading to such disorganization, that the damage done to functionality outweighs the benefit of the process.

In light of this, before hurrying to bring about improvement, it is advised to delve deeper into the organization's current state. To do this, the executive is encouraged to facilitate longer and more developed discussion with relevant staff in order to guarantee an effective improvement. These "brainstorms" can convince the executive on the right steps to take which would also be those that would most complement the system. This framework requires the executive to be humble and cautious – he must not rush to prove himself, but trust himself. By saying this, I mean to emphasize the executive's ability to withhold judgment; to search, ask, and deliberate; to trust himself by being less confident in his own knowledge. When executives are confident that they can find the deeper, more complex, real, and sometimes even simpler story, and allow themselves not to know exactly what is needed, they enable discovery of what should change and what should stay the same, thus leading to improvement. Hence, it is recommended not to rush to find solutions, but to allocate time to discover them.

To understand how to approach the sphere of "improvement" from the prism of professional management, I suggest a distinction between different kinds of improvement:

Managerial improvement – Amongst other things, professional management means working with standardized routines and clear work processes such as research and data collection, analysis, planning, application and monitoring, and assessing planning versus performance. Implementation and work with these methods, in addition to proper communication between different factors of a business, enable proper and practical management of all fields, while receiving up-to-date information of the situation.

Improvements led through the professional-managerial sphere are the most correct since they are essentially based on personal example and not on external demands. That is, the executive implements his own managerial methods into the organization. However, arranged meetings, managing deliberation practically and effectively, and documented and rationally based problem-solving, are highly recommended methods to be accepted as part of what constitutes a professional conception of managerial work. These kinds of improvements are important and are always correct. We must remember that if changes express managerial norms that are not accepted in a new

environment, it will take a period of adjustment, rearrangement and learning to adopt the new codes of professionalism, and it is advised that executives adopt an educative attitude of explanation, and not a judgmental attitude of disappointment. Leading these improvements in the professional-managerial sphere is a justly preferred process, since it can serve to improve managers' judgment in every attempt at improvement. It is advised to also embed methods that promote input and explication, which allow parts of the system to realize the value and importance of professional management, thus avoiding the feeling that changes are enforced solely by the manager's personal style.

Personal improvement – In order to improve their grasp of professional aspects, executives must pinpoint the subjects in which they are proficient, and those in which they are not. It is perfectly legitimate for an executive not to understand everything about the professional details of every field he is responsible for in a highly professional level. However, it is essential for them to be aware honest with themselves and those around them.

Junior executives are expected to be experts in their field while senior executives are expected to have a professional understanding of their core field, and cultivated didactic abilities enabling them to understand the professional fields under their responsibility to a satisfactory level, in order to perform their managerial task. If a professional field needs to go through changes, the executive is required to go through a thorough process of learning that field. This process is to occur even when there are business, financial, social or other pressures not to do so. The executive is expected to show restraint and be wary of jumping to conclusions, in order to guarantee that the steps taken towards improvement are relevant and appropriate for the specific needs of that field. Executives are required to know the core of the business well enough to tell between what is essential and what is inessential. In this manner they can perform their duty as leaders by giving feedback and guiding their team. Professional improvements are a necessity, and an executive could be requested to handle important decisions that necessitate a deep and thorough understanding, predicated on a meticulous process of consulting with experts within and without the organization.

Organizational improvement – This type of improvement refers to business models, work processes, job allocation and decision-making forums. As such,

it touches on bettering terms of employment, rewarding staff, work environment, etc. It is common for new executives to wish to bring about immediate improvement at the level whole of the organization as soon as they assume their position. I recommend waiting until an executive establishes personal value within the existing system, and only then strive to improve the organization. This is all the true when faced with the need to introduce systematic wide scale change. I once spoke to a new senior executive in a company who boated of how he purchased a coffee machine which he felt was lacking. Despite his good intentions, both his staff and the executives at the main office saw this as a wasteful use of resources, exhibiting an inability to tell the difference between what's essential and what is inessential.

Every level of executive – senior, median or junior – at every stage of their management career – novice, advanced or seasoned – is required to engender improvements in the system. Moreover, executives are expected to be motivated to act according to what would be of actual value to the system, and not in order to create the semblance of improvement, or according to other irrelevant motivations.

These situations highlight differences between seasoned, and sometimes somewhat worn-out executives, and inexperienced ones: The veterans tend to be accustomed to the current state, and sometimes fall in the trap of "normality": what was, is what will be. This can result in a blindness to potential improvements. The beginners, in contrast, tend to fall into the trap of "flooding" – that is, they constantly find things to improve, and no longer knowing where to begin, are tempted to advance quickly with many changes at once.

To avoid both these pitfalls, executives must spot places for improvement, and at the same time filter them so they can tell between primary and secondary issues and base their judgment on a practical and rational basis. Accordingly, seasoned executives are recommended not to manage the same system in the same position for a period longer than approximately ten years. After such a long period it becomes difficult to acquire a fresh view, and things seem repetitive and familiar. In this case, it is to the benefit of the system if executives circulate after a maximal period of ten years. In addition, they should practice methods that will aid them in seeing the possibilities for improvement in their

now familiar organization, such as studying outside the organization and becoming acquainted with other subjects in the intellectual world and in the relevant environment that could inspire them to find new ways in which they could better their organization. Also, they should practice introspection when they feel that they have become prisoners of a certain conception.

New executives are urged to inspect what are the most relevant improvements to be implemented and pursue them instead of pursuing just any improvement possible. It is recommended that the latter stay in their position at least 3-5 years so they could witness the results of the improvements they have led.

The Components of Improvement:

1. **Decision making** – in order to guarantee gradual improvement, we should consider the different considerations before making a decision. Both small and large changes are important. In deciding which path of improvement to pursue, we need to first base the core of the issues at hand – to deal with the essential, and only then with the inessential, with what's important and not what stands-out. Part of this thinking process consists of counsel; sometimes what is perceived by the executive as small and insignificant could seem weighty and important to others in the organization. Improvements pursued without deliberation and transparency could lead to a waste in managers' energies, miscommunication between management and employees and distortion of messages.

   For example, an executive decides to install a card reader on printers to allow printing only with the swipe of a card. He saw this change as merely technical, but it rose a commotion amongst employees when they suddenly discovered that they could no longer print freely as they have before. Another example is of a new executive in a company that had noticed that there were no signs on office doors indicating the name and position of employees. Immediately upon arrival, he decided that it was very important to put signs on the doors. To his surprise, this aroused a tumult of arguments. He was not aware that a long time beforehand, it was decided not to allow putting up signs in the building. He had found himself breaching a prior dictate that was beyond his authority. The point is that we should invest in essential improvements first and only then turn to minor ones, because every change in an organization demands an investment

of thought and energy since there is virtually no such thing as a merely technical improvement.

2. **Managing Change** – improvement is change. And change is a process. Therefore, optimal management of improvements necessitates an ability to manage processes. The executive should construct mechanisms that will guarantee steady, constant and perpetual movement towards the desired improvement. An indispensable part of managing improvements consists of informing employees and other factors within the organization of future changes. Addressing issues correctly ensures the collaboration of staff, liaisons and managers, and minimizes resistance. For this reason, it is important to develop communicational skills. It is recommended to stay humble – there is no place for grandiose messages that create lofty expectations of the results. It is a mistake to explain a future that is not yet manifest. We should explain what we would want to see, what will be the rationale within the process, what are the advantages and the disadvantages, etc. It is risky to be over-talkative during these processes, and especially to fall prey to hubris.

3. **Managing Infrastructure** – Improvement processes direct executives to invest in the infrastructure of the organizational scheme that will enable it to move forward beyond its fundamental flaws. I had once attended a lecture given by a senior executive to a conference hall of executives, where he described the method he chose when he ran a major public institute: "since I could not change much in the institution itself, I picked out 3 important projects and promoted them successfully." He displayed this proudly and went on to give details of the value of these projects. His opening line, however, continued to resonate in me. After all, it seemed that he had skipped the main responsibility of an executive when managing an institution: the very functioning of the institution. Years later, there is now nothing left of the projects he had promoted and the institution remained unchanged: the quality and scope of services has not changed, and so have the critiques. So, what is the managerial worth of this executive? Managerial value is determined by an ability to navigate the entire organization onto the right track, and to guide it step by step. If an executive opts to skip the holding and improvement phases, he is effectively opting not to connect to his own organization, but to manage it in detachment. It is hard to find value in this. This might result in very successful projects but will leave fundamental issues

unaltered. Both quick, short-term success, and wide-scale changes, don't last if they are not built on holding and improvement stages first.

3. Creating the Future

An integral part of good management is thinking ahead: development, management and formation of the future of the organization. The executive's responsibility goes far beyond his or her term in office. The executive is responsible for what will happen to the organization in years to come. Having said that, we should take care not to lose touch with the present while thinking ahead. The present is the basis for the future, and an organization cannot evolve without cultivating it.

Building the future does not necessarily refer to a wide-scale strategical process at the level of the entire organization, but to the ability of every executive in his or her respective field, to embrace the idea of building towards the future as part of his or her conception of the position.

In my work with a new division manager in a large organization, it came to light that all the employees in the important knowledge management division she was running, were over 60 years old. This meant that we needed to "rejuvenate" the division in order to ensure that there will be a conservation of the knowledge accumulated throughout the years. It could be acknowledged that her predecessor should have taken this under consideration. He should have recognized the problem when these employees were in their fifties, which would

have made the "rejuvenation" process natural and gradual. Since he did not, there was a real threat that the division might lose some of the knowledge it has acquired. It might be that her predecessor did spot the problem but was not able to commit to the process of building the future, which requires courage, tenacity and a willingness to take risks – albeit, calculated risks, but risks nonetheless. The current manager handled the situation bravely in a process that was calculated, well-planned and sensitive, managing to maintain the integrity and value of the employees in the division, while guaranteeing the division's future.

The above example illustrates the principle of envisioning the future as a part of the activity in the present, and the courage it takes to form it.

In another case, I worked with the chairman of a socially active organization who told me that he did not feel at home in his position; he was aware that he did not have the skills and abilities required of the chairman of a directory board and was unable to handle day-to-day management. However, he was emotionally attached to the association and found it personally difficult to leave it or the position. An executive's personal reflection on his place in the organization is critical, since it encapsulates the understanding that an executive holds full responsibility for the future of the association. The improper conduct of an association chairman is harmful to its future and does not do it any good in the long run. In this case, despite being aware of the gap between personal needs and actual performance, neither the chairman nor the association managed to overcome personal inclinations, and instead of contributing to the association's future success, he was an obstacle to it.

The ability to build the future is based, first and foremost, on the conception that the self is separate from the organization it manages. The fortitude to acknowledge this is a personal ability that is paramount for any executive and leader.

This example demonstrates the principle that the self should be distinct from the position; the importance of executives being able to inspect how fitting they are for the job and for the future of the organization; and the ability to act and change the current state.

 An executive's ability to think ahead and form the future is a great challenge, both cognitively or mentally, and practically. It often happens that executives

are required to form the future, but anxiety makes them unable to live with uncertainty: Is this the right path? What is the right path anyway?

Uncertainty is a big factor in this process and can lead to a lot of pressure since the desire for certainty, order and security is a prevalent source of anxiety for executives, share-holders, employees and partners. This is why forming the future can become a burden for the executive.

Dealing with this kind of situation consists of the following aspects: a personal ability to dwell in a state of uncertainty without breaking down or losing direction, demonstrated by a willingness to stop and think, to ask questions, to participate openly, to comprehend, learn and go into detail; alongside a willingness to be somewhat solitary and think independently about what will ensure the future of the system the executive is responsible for.

"Create the future" considerations are relevant both when going through transition and when feeling that "it's business as usual". The executive's task when creating the future is locating the factors that will increase the relevance of the system through defining what it can offer; diagnosing trends and threats, whether apparent or concealed, that stem from the system's surrounding environment; and conducting responsible managerial discussions about the former two.

Business organizations can put a lot of pressure on executives, especially when going through changes, since losing revenues, or even just the prospect of it happening, could raise misgivings in the board of directors. In these kinds of situations, the CEO and other executives could create additional pressure both internally and externally. Therefore, executives must find the courage and ability not to be tempted to take the easy road such as giving out "more of the same", but to push hard in one novel direction. We can deduce two principles from this: Primarily, although in moments of high pressure and strain there is a natural inclination to massive maneuvering, it is better to stop, convene, think and expand conversation and erudition. Secondly, executives should allow themselves to dwell in uncertainty, at least for short periods of time.

In a reality riddled with fluctuations, executives sometimes find themselves pushing individuals aside while trying to forge a future for the systems under their supervision. This is not proper conduct while building the future. Usually, this type of behavior stems from executives putting the concern for their

personal future ahead of that of the system (even if executives would claim otherwise). Actions should speak louder than words in these cases.

It is said that when Naomi Shemer would be distraught, her mother would say to her that: "when sailing on a boat in the Sea of Galilee and a storm begins, stick to the hull." I'll use the term "hull" as one of the bases on which to build the future. We can build the future of a system by searching for an answer at its core. There we can find the path that will lead to form the future correctly.

Creating the future requires developing strategic thinking – long term analysis of the coming 3-5 years, while keeping in mind the desired end. After determining the end, we must define the means, for example: recruiting partners, clients or employees.

The components of Creating the Future:

1. **Mark a target** – finding your target can be performed by answering questions such as: Where is the system functioning well? What could it do differently? What are the priorities? This is a process of disclosing and discovering, of construction and formation of a new meaning. In other words, it is a process of re-framing. Our natural inclination as human beings pull us constantly towards the familiar and the known, to what is already at hand. Our ability to imagine, dream, believe and experiment, might be a somewhat childish quality, but it is invaluable in creating the future, and can become manifest in a safe and enabling environment.

2. **Shaping a path** – it isn't enough to set a target, we need to build the path which will lead us to it and recruit those that will enable us to reach it. Even if the executive heads towards a certain objective, it is not obvious that those around him will follow; with no clear path, people find it hard to follow, especially when the direction is one they are not experienced with. The path should be practical and to the point, while still being sensitive to the present and keeping its integrity intact.

3. **Consistency and Persistence –** leading towards a future requires the executive and his leading staff to keep the same line they have agreed upon even in the face of turbulence, opposition and doubt. They should be able to inspect the feedback given by their peers without being overcome by fear in order to ensure that they are not advancing blindly, and to forge on despite

disappointing immediate results and rising pressures. That is the heart of managerial tenacity.

4. **Professionalism** – Every branch, field and profession have patent rules and insights. There is a tendency to copy methods and ideas from one field to another. This supposedly creates the future by introducing a factor from a different field or a fashionable conception in management theory. I recommend avoiding confusion: creating the future should be tailor-made to the specific professional field and stem from it, while incorporating this approach with professional managerial methods. The future does not necessarily lie in replicating methods that the environment has chosen to adopt. As executives we should allow ourselves to think a bit harder, to put in an effort and more time in order to guarantee that we won't make a mistake that will have to be rectified in the future.

<u>Summary</u>

In this article I have shown that in order to ensure meaningful, efficient and effective management a simultaneous threefold movement is required.

In our political and social reality, norms of satiating immediate needs, and a (mainly political) commitment to provide rapid value, are prevalent because of public pressure and the requirements of systems. These trends strengthen a destructive tendency to supply instant, ready-made solutions. These methods have not proven themselves throughout the years. Hence, it is highly recommended for executives not to allow these trends to lead them to faulty manners of conduct that will be harmful to them and the systems under their supervision. Along the years I have worked with executives who have utilized this threefold approach and have accomplished ground breaking and inspirational results. The adoption of the channels that this model suggests can give executives a clearer path to take with which to build and form a system that will be profitable to everyone involved.