

2. Facet Live - - Retailing Differences



Sample:

A major high street retailer used Facet as part of a management training programme. Respondents were 36 department managers in stores from around the UK

Criterion:

Supervisors ratings of managerial effectiveness. 20 were rated as effective, 16 were rated as poor performers.

Results:

Mean scores across the factors were not significantly different between the high and low performing groups. However, the standard deviations were. The organisation has a reputation for enforcing specific modes of conduct and behaviour upon its managers and it was possible that extremes of any sort were not being seen as effective. A metric (Euclidean D^2) was constructed to identify those managers whose profiles were very different from the group average. The correlation between this measure and the supervisors ratings was - 0.54 ($*=0.08$). A t-test of the differences between the group means produced the following result:

	Mean	Std Dev
Good Performers	10.52	6.96
Poor Performers	19.24	17.84
t = 2.00 df=27 prob.= 0.05		

This table confirms that managers who are very different from the "norm" are unlikely to be rated as good performers by their supervisors.

Application

Candidates for these jobs can be questioned regarding their preferred styles of managing. Behaviour based interview techniques can focus on areas of concern and capture real life examples for discussion. Existing managers who are atypical can be given performance counselling regarding the expected managerial behaviours.