

Efficient Customer Service Delivery: The Perspective of Organizational Leadership

Anthony Agyemang

Cape Coast Polytechnic, P. O. Box AD 50, Cape Coast, Ghana

ABSTRACT: Organizations leaderships require the best of many minds. Intellects must be well organized for the organization to arrive to their desired ends. Organizations have visions to fulfil, and the vision must be well fulfilled. It is leaderships that have the mandate of setting the objectives with the time frames and lags. Leaderships' innovativity, inventivity, adaptability, versatility, flexibility, entrepreneurial acumen, their thirst for success, service to achieve set goals, impeccability, originality, and their courage to surmount all odds and damn the consequences are all crucial for the success or otherwise of organizations. This requires deep thinking on the part of leadership. If customer services provided by the organization are poor or below standard, it is a reflection of poor leadership style. On the shoulders of management rests total organizational success. This is not to say, everything is on their shoulders, the other stakeholders, have their parts to play; employees, shareholders, governments, the industry, suppliers, organizations; environment, technology, resources, the competition, etc. are all crucial.

Keywords: Customer Service, Organizational Leadership, Ghana

I. INTRODUCTION

The Conceptual Framework

Leadership has been psyched to the fact that the organization's success or failure lies in their bosom. Their mandate is to optimize production and for the needed results. Leadership is not to sub-optimize when they can optimize. Their design and engineering capacity is at stake. They are to stand for the models that will enable them to operate. The mathematical, statistical, cybernetic, logistical, logical, operational, computational aids must be sought and utilized. Leadership encompasses every discipline: from anthropology to zoology.

Organizations' leadership make organizations manageable or unmanageable. Leadership creates organizations and the creation is from their intuition and experience. Hardly is there any chart for leaders to follow. They are to consistently task their imagination and creativity. Dictatorship is the most effective way of administration, provided the dictator knows the complete answers to all questions; but this is well impossible. For leaders are to lead with leaders. Leaders cannot lead alone (Crainer, 2000).

Critical to leadership is the issue of organization. How are organizations to be organized. This brings on board the issue of organization design. Do leaders organize for productivity, efficiency, effectivity, profitability, or for manageability? At least, an organization must be manageable to elicit organization success. Building a colossus is not bad in itself, but the issues of manageability and adaptability cannot be waved away. A lean organization is good, provided there is no sub-optimization on the part of the organization. If an organization can be in 100 markets comfortably and profitably why remain in 90. That is obviously sub-optimization. Examples abound in corporate American history (Durant, Sloan, Du Pont, Edison, Watson) (ibid).

Organizational Design Factors: Tall or Flat Organization

The size and structure of an organization have a bearing on organizational effectiveness and the effectiveness of an organization impacts the efficiency and effectivity of its production processes and procedures. If an organization is tall, decision making is largely in the hands of the top hierarchy. Those on the shop floor do not partake in decision making. And if those on the shop floor do not partake in decision making, how do they aspire to own those decisions? According to Crainer (2000), Alfred Sloan replaced Durant's erratic, one-man leadership with clearly formulated policies and talented executives. Over five decades, he reshaped General Motors and reinvented how it was managed. His major achievements were two fold. First, Sloan created a new cadre of highly professional, dispassionate, intelligent managers who made decisions on the basis of the information available rather than always following their intuition. Decision making was the heart of management. Per Stuart Crainer, Alfred Sloan was the first professional manager. As exemplified by Sloan, the executive is first and foremost: objective, dispassionate, open-minded. His insistence on facts, is ample demonstration, in considering all sides of a question, prevent his being opinionated. More damningly, Fortune later observed: "Alfred Sloan Jr. was himself a man of limited interest who increased immersed himself totally in the construction of the company (H.B.R., 2013). Alfred Sloan did for the upper layer of management what Henry Ford did for the shop floor: he turned it into a reliable, efficient, machine-like process (The Economist,

1995). Sloan, trained as an engineer, was driven by a love of systematic reasoning, by weighing the pros and cons and then making a decision. He turned managerial decision making from a tumultuous, spontaneous art into an informed, commercially driven process. He took the amateurism out of business and replaced it with sober, respectable professionalism. Sloan created a new organizational form, a means of managing Durant's meandering colossus. The fruits of Sloan's organization study was an organizational model that combined decentralized operations with coordinated, centralized policy control (Waters, 1999).

As a result of his organization study, Sloan organized the company into eight divisions – five car divisions and three component divisions. In the jargon (invented fifty years later) they were strategic business units. Once responsibilities were decided in at General Motors. Sloan believed that it was inappropriate as well as unnecessary for top managers of the corporate level to know much about the details of division operations. Poor performance led to changes in management or divisional level. Simple as that, for this reason, Sloan invested a great deal of time in personal reflection. If GM got it right in the first place, the divisional chiefs should be up to standard. Good performers were promoted and, eventually, found themselves based at GM HQ.

Sloan's multi-divisional form meant that executives had more time to concentrate on strategic issues and that operational decisions were made by people in the front line rather than of distant headquarters. It required a continuous balancing act. But it worked. In effect, Sloan took advantage of the company's size without making it cumbersome. Companies like Buick, Pontiac, and Cadillac retained their powerful feeling of independence and their individual brand identity. At the same time, GM as a whole offered a coherent superstructure. The multi-divisional form created a trend among large organisations that helped companies grow in size and diversity far beyond the limits of the functional organization it replaced (Financial Times, 1997). The multi-divisional form created a trend among large organizations for decentralization. In 1950 around 20 percent of Fortune 500 corporations were decentralized; this has increased to 80 percent by 1970. Among those taking the plunge was IBM – in 1956, IBM chief Thomas Watson Jr. announced his plans to decentralize the company into six autonomous divisions, each forming a product line. Later in the 1980s AT&T joined in when it attempted to make the shift from being a production-based bureaucracy to a marketing organization. Alfred Chandler lauded Alfred Sloan's work of General Motors. Chandler argued that the chief advantage of the multi-divisional organization was that it clearly removed the executives responsible for the destiny of the entire enterprise from the more routine operational responsibilities and so gave them the time, information and even psychological commitment for long-term planning and appraisal. But Sloan's organizational model had its disadvantages and flaws. As recently as 1998, an article in Fortune noted: "As we executive explained: 'The die was cast 70 years when everything was bought, rather than built from within'".

Organizational Design Factors: Framework for Organization-Wide Communications

Organizational communications framework can be in the form of centralization or decentralization. Units within the larger whole can be given the authority to prepare their own communication and then communicate to other units in the larger whole. Giving the units the authority to communicate when necessary forces them from taking clearance with whatever they want to communicate. This in a way gives them the motivation to always communicate very well to enhance unit productivity. Organizational communication departments and the spokespeople are then in control of affairs when it comes to unit, sectional, departmental, divisional communication. Organizational communications set the organization going, for without overall or over making communication, the organization comes to a halt, a situation which must not be allowed in any way. Who communicates in the organization and what does he or she communicate? Who does he communicate to, and how does he communicate, and what medium or channel does he use to communicate and who evaluates the communication and what criteria does he use to ascertain the effectiveness and the efficiency of the communication.

The Public Relations section or department is responsible for communications management and the actual engineering and the proper 'mix and wash' of the organizational communication. The section has all the arsenals and the armoury to carry out effective communication and they do this with the assistance of liaison officers who also act as conduits or conveyor belts of the communication. They ensure the communications get to their intended targets or segments of the organization. There are very many reasons for corporate communications. At least, to keep all internal and external stakeholders of the organization informed on current events and what the organization aspires to achieve. The organization has a vision and an agenda and these must be clearly conveyed to all stakeholders, even those remotely away and who in one way or the other have a bearing on organizational productivity. Organizational communication can be 'top-down' or 'bottom-up'. To prevent corporate internal gatekeeping, matters of concern to all which the organization wants to take decisions on, can be thrown to the shop floor for their inputs. They then meet to brainstorm and convey their decision to the top hierarchy, and that is decentralized decision-making. Communication processes are many. Setting the agenda, who the agenda will benefit, the cost of the agenda, for how long will the agenda affect the

organizational elements, who stands to lose, the least cost channel to be used, the support the agenda will receive, when finally implemented and future fallouts (H.B.R., 2014).

Meetings, conferences, durbars, exhibitions, seminars, colloquiums, newsletters, journals, magazines, end of year parties, which are channels which organizations use to communicate. The organization as a system has many parts and these parts always glued together by overall communicators which aims at every element of the larger whole without any element falling outside of the organization. Communicating effectively therefore has a lot of windfalls when it comes to enhancing efficient customer service delivery. Evaluating the effectiveness of corporate communication is by considering the feedback of the entire communication value chain. Wherein the response of the recipients of the communication are they doing what the communication chain asked them to do or not? If the communication is to redress a wrong and the wrong persists after the communication, then there is something surely wrong with the entire communication. And since communication has accompaniments, the accompaniments must be examined in their totality. The medium, time, occasion, the person, the object, the context, the content, the culture, the demeanour, might be all wrong. A re-examination is then called for to ascertain what really is amiss.

Work Allocation and Work Flow: The Operational Perspective

To avoid losses in work, work allocation must be done with a lot of perspectives in mind. The resource perspective, the technology perspective, the worker or employee orientation, psyche perspective, the situation perspective, the plant, machine, equipment perspective, the work culture perspective, organizational mission or ethos perspective, management perspective, worker socialization or indoctrination perspective and worker productivity perspective. It is not first a question of allocating work, what should be borne in mind is whether the worker is properly attuned for the work and the environment and all are right. It is a question of considering a lot of 'fits' before moving in to allocate and the quality imperative cannot be thrown overboard. The technology available for the work must be right and proportionate, the employee must also have the mindset of delivering results as and when needed. How does one avoid work stoppages in the shop floor? It calls for ingenuity on the part of the work management or staff. Work should be designed such that there is a 'connect' between pieces of work to avoid blockages and stoppages which hinder production and productivity. Operations research and production operations come in largely over here. Work speed, complexity, interconnectivity, work smoothness, the flow of work, plant layout, plant efficiency and productivity, plant maintenance, plant capacity must all be considered in the place of employee work allocation. Close and proper supervision on the part of management is very crucial. There is no one best form of operation when it comes to work sequencing and programming, but what is reliable, accurate, economical, speedy, effective, efficient, and profitable must be embarked upon and used. A pre-engineering before the allocation of work is therefore proper (H.B.R., 2012).

Management is always after optimization and the elimination of work losses and defects, but these do not come on a silver platter, they must be worked for and obtained. Synchronizing work flow calls for a good combination of the work processes and mechanisms, raw material availability, state of work readiness of plant and machinery, the proper orientation of employees and employee work ethics. The synergistic combination of the three is therefore in order to ensure large scale productivity and judicious use of raw materials, work processes, and machinery.

Delegable and Non-Delegable Work: The Efficiency Factor: Employee Autonomy

Managers need to get to grips with delegation. It is a key skill managers need to develop. Delegation is about getting a particular job done, clearly, but it is also about getting people to learn new skills and reach their potential, all of which helps a business to grow. Many managers like being in control of everything and find it hard to let go of things we know we can do well ourselves. There are many reasons why managers find it difficult to delegate. Often, it seems quicker to do the task yourself than bother to explain it to somebody else and then correct his mistakes. Managers must not feel threatened by the competence of a person who is quick on the uptake and does well (Peters et al; 1995).

Delegation offers many benefits. Done well, it allows corporate management to concentrate on the things they do best and also give them the time and space to tackle more interesting and challenging tasks in the future. They will be less likely to pair off making key decisions and they will be much more effective. The staff will benefit too; everyone needs new challenges, and by delegating to them, management will be able to test their ability on a wide range of areas and increase their contribution to the business. Staff can make quick decisions themselves, and they will develop a better understanding of the details concerned. Done well, delegation should improve the overall productivity of employees. Passing tasks down the line is essential if other people are to develop. Not knowing how to do this is recognized as one of the biggest obstacles to small scale business growth. By developing, you will have much more time to do your own job properly. Delegation does not make things easier, but it does make things more efficient and effective. Essentially, it represents a

more interactive way of working with a team of people, and it involves instruction, training, and development. The results will be well worth the effort you invest in doing it properly (Waters, 1999).

Delegation is fundamental to successful management. When it is clear that certain staff, particularly new employees, need to develop, or when an employee clearly has the skills needed to perform a specific task, delegate. What are delegable tasks? Managers must begin with any routine administrative tasks that take up too much of their time. These are likely to be many small everyday jobs which managers have always done and may enjoy doing them, but they are not a good use of their time. These small jobs must be reviewed and many as can be delegated, delegated. Being your own company's point of contact for a particular person or organization, which is important but time consuming, is also an excellent task to delegate.

On a larger scale, projects that it makes good sense for one person, must be delegated; that these make good tests of people's ability to manage and coordinate tasks. Give the person you delegate to something he has every of completing successfully and, if possible, something for which he has a special aptitude. Do not delegate an impossible task at which others have failed and which may well prove a negative experience for the delegatee (H.B.R, 2012).

Manager must make sure they understand the person they are delegating to. He must have the ability and the skills or at least the potential to develop into the role and must be someone you can trust. It is a good idea to test out the employee with small tasks that will help show what he can do. Also make sure that the employee is available for the assignment, don't put too much pressure on your most effective workers. Spread out the tasks you delegate among as many people as possible: two or more people could even share a task if it is particularly complicated (Drucker, 1973).

Leadership must organize themselves first. If there is no plan of what is going on, it will be hard to identify, schedule, and evaluate the work being delegated. They are to prepare the ground before seeing the person. Assess the task and decide how much responsibility the person will have. Assess the person's progress regularly and make notes. Roberts (2009) states that top management must not delegate an assignment and then attempt to manage it, this will make them enemies of the overruled subordinate. When the person you are delegating to is not, the problem and the tasks must be discussed in depth, and explain fully what is expected of them. It is crucial to give people precise objectives, but must be encouraged to seek out these themselves by letting them ask questions and participate in setting the parameters. They need to understand why they are doing the task, and where it fits into the scheme of things. They are to ask them how they will go about the task; discuss their plan and the support they might need.

Targets should be set and deadlines scheduled into diaries. Summarise what has been agreed, and take notes about what the person is required to do so everyone is clear. If he or she is given a lot of creative scope and is being tested out, management may decide to be diligently vague, but if the task is urgent and critical, management must be specific. How much support management must offer will very much depend on the person and the relationship with him or her. In the early stages management might want to work with the person and to share certain tasks, but management will be able to back off more as the understanding of the person's abilities increases. Encourage people to come back to you if they have any problem. If someone needs to check something with you, try to get back to him or her quickly. Don't interfere or criticize if things are going according to plan. Monitoring progress is vital, it is very easy to forget all about the completion date, but, in the meantime, all subtle things could have gone wrong. When planning, time should be built in to review progress. If more problems were expected to arise and nothing has been heard, check with the employee that all is well. Schedule nature head's with the person and be flexible enough to change deadlines and objectives as the situation changes. When a task is complete, give praise and review how things went. If an employee's responsibilities are increased, management must make sure he or she receives fair rewards for it. On the other hand, there may be limits on what can be offered, so don't offer rewards you can't deliver. Also bear in mind that development can carry its own rewards. Such career development issues can be discussed with the employee in appraisals, and the results of delegated tasks noted for this purpose. If the person has failed to deliver, discuss it with him or her, find out what went wrong, and aim to resolve problems in the future (Ultimate Resource, 2006).

Worker Empowerment by Organizational Leadership

Kotler, (1999) states empowerment is more than delegation, it is a genuine opening up of the creative power of an organization's staff. It is based on the belief that employees' abilities are frequently underutilized and that given the chance and the responsibility, people want to make a positive contribution. Empowerment is about:

- letting staff get on with the job
- allowing staff to take responsibility for customers' experience
- letting those closest to customers take decisions
- stripping away unnecessary bureaucracy
- encouraging and helping staff to put their ideas for improvements at work into practice.

Managed properly and effectively, empowerment can:

- strengthen the commitment of staff as they take ownership of problems and share their own solutions
- generate ideas for improving services – staff feel their ideas count
- help unearth staff talent that has previously lain dormant
- reduce the amount of time managers spend sorting out other people's problems
- improve customer service and organization performance.

Redmond and Ron (1998) provide the action checklist to be used by top leadership in the process of empowerment. They give a 12–pair checklist as follows:

1. Check your own opinions, assumptions and attitudes.
2. Recognize the barriers to empowerment.
3. Recognize the need for a conducive culture.
4. Set boundaries.
5. Raise awareness.
6. Let staff on your side.
7. Find out what your employees actually do.
8. Audit staff skills.
9. Ensure staff have resources.
10. Agree performance objectives and resources.
11. Launch the initiative.
12. Monitor developments.

Rosabeth Kanter (1997) completes her trilogy on the need for change for US corporations. The global economy is likened to a 'corporate Olympics' of competing businesses, with results determining which nations, as well as organizations, are winners. The games differ, but successful teams share some characteristics such as strength, skill, discipline, good organization, and focus on individual excellence. To win, US companies would have to become progressively more entrepreneurial and less bureaucratic. Kanter suggested a model for the 1990s the 'post entrepreneurial' corporation in which three shaping forces would play the key roles:

- the context set at the top
- top management values
- project ideas and approaches coming up through the organization

An athletic organization of this kind would be lean and flexible, and would seek to create synergies through the use of team and partnership approaches. The organization would be built on empowerment, and employees would be highly valued within team-based or partnership relationships.

Reengineering For Organizational Efficiency – Corporate Factors

Do organizations contribute toward their state of inefficiency? As entities are they to reengineer themselves? Are they self-propelling or perpetuating? Are they to be efficient from within or without? Answers must be found to the above questions. In their search for efficiency and excellence, they reinvent, recreate, realign, readjust, readapt and renew themselves. The quest for improvement and maximum productivity is in a state of continuum... until it is reached, corporate leadership is restless (Hammer, 2004). Environmental turbulence and volatility may contribute towards organizational inefficiency and lack of productivity or even inertia. A meticulous scanning and probing of the environment may lead to an answer or a set of solutions which must be meticulously followed to get to a preferred state by management or leadership. Organizational efficiency can be got from within but not without comprehensive planning.

Champy and Hammer (2004) opine reengineering must focus on the fundamental rethinking and radical redesign of key business processes. Dramatic improvements in cost, quality, service, and speed are the objectives, and organization must make key processes as lean and profitable as possible, discarding peripheral processes and people if necessary (Hammer & Champy, 2004).

Reengineering should go far beyond altering and refining processes: the aim is to reverse the Industrial Revolution. Organizations should start with a blank piece of paper and map out processes to identify how their business should operate. They should then attempt to translate the paper into concrete reality.

Reengineering puts a premium on the skills and the potential of the people at the centre of the organization, and should also tackle three key areas of management – managerial roles, styles and systems. Reengineering fosters on improving the processes, and a lean organization, achieves a complete corporate revolution, transform the future, reengineers management as well and should be built on trust, respect and people.

Adaptability, Flexibility, Innovativity and Inventivity Of Corporate Leadership

Organizational leadership is primarily responsible for the progress and development of the organizations they are entrusted with. They are to oil the organization to be on the pedestal of growth. Leadership still needs leaders to assist in the growth and development processes. They are to oversee and superintend the development and expansion agenda of the organization. Examples abound in corporate development history of particular individuals who masterminded the phenomenal development of organizations they were charged to handle. Jack Welch comes out. He may not be the foremost entrepreneur, but he is a colossus. Lee Iacocca also comes out. What particular traits are expected to be displayed by leadership. They are mandated to be dreamers and look for partly what will take the organization to its destined or envisaged end. The paths are many but they are to take the reasonable and feasible path that will engender corporate growth and leverage the competitive armada of the organization.

The traits of innovativity, inventivity, flexibility, versatility, should be displayed or should be sought for to be used to man the organizations they are in charge. They are to take upon themselves the arduous task of seeing to the continuous progress of the organization. Stakeholders want to see the perennial expansion of the organization and the ability to outmanoeuvre the competition and stay on top of the industry, the market, or the competition always. Governments and society want to see ample display of corporate social responsibility and environmental accounting. Customers want to have quality products or services and organizational leadership cannot fail in the endeavour. Transforming an entire organization with ingenuity and dexterity is not something leaders must be told. They are to be proactive, the ability to spot the problem before the problem arises is the hallmark of a leader. But leadership needs leaders to be able to succeed. There are no paths to be followed; traveller there are no roads or paths, paths are made by travelling (Kissinger, *White House Years*, 1985). Quick thinking leaders and dreamers are going to rule the business world for years to come. Wind and Main (1999) cite leaders who are fine leaders. Among the entrepreneurs there are visionaries, sometimes greatly flawed but nevertheless people who substantially changed the world: John D. Rockefeller, Henry Ford, Thomas Watson, David Packard and William Hewlett, Sam Watson, and Bill Gates, to name a few. Good leaders are good with people and not only information and numbers. They exhibit, according to O' Toole (1995): courage, authenticity, integrity, vision, passion, conviction, and persistence.

Customer-Centricity by Organizational Leadership

Per Peter Drucker (1973), there is one valid definition of business purpose: to create a customer. The idea of serving the customer well is hardly new. To write a favorite legend, L.L. Beam, Waid and Main (1999) founded his outdoor outfitting company in 1912 on this principle: "Sell good merchandise at reasonable profit, treat your customers like human beings, and they'll always come back for more." Thomas J. Watson Sr. believed that IBM should excel in everything it did, especially in how it treated the customer. Some of the three simple precepts he laid down for IBM during his three decades at the helm was: spend a lot of time making customers happy. IBM was good to its customers. Not only did it sell or lease them excellent products, but it provided good service, listened to what they had to say, and helped them solve their problems. But then, like so many other companies, IBM became so big and rich and successful that it began to forget the customer. But just when the callous treatment of the customer began to hurt, the customer started to have more choices and became more demanding. Businesses had to make a huge adjustment. The whole relationship between customer and company became far more complex. First came improvements in the quality of r[products and services, which whetted the appetites of customers for more improvements. Then came an effort to find out what satisfied the customer, which drew corporations into a deeper understanding of what the customer wanted. That resulted in a different approach to the customer; "relationship marketing" which moved well beyond the old "transaction marketing," with its shotgun technologies of mass-media advertising, coupons and point-of-sale promotions. Instead of mailing down the one-time sale the goal became to capture the long-term loyalty of the customer. Information technology helps enormously because the corporation can capture useable information about preferences and behavior not only of segments of the market but of individual customers – by the millions. New manufacturing technology helps too because production can be made to fit the quality and schedule demanded by the customer, to the point of reducing a production run to one item – for delivery tomorrow if necessary.

Fundamental changes in the way customers are treated can't be accomplished by some rework in the sales and marketing departments. They involve the whole company, the way it is organized, the way it is managed, the way people are trained, evaluated, and compensated. Deeds of heroism to serve the customer are all very well, but the market today demands a more systematic, sophisticated, long-range approach to the customer. As Jack Welch said, a corporation has to stand facing the customer, and not with its face to the CEO and its rear to the customer. Putting the customer at the centre piece of all marketing programming should be the objective of the corporate leadership. For without customers, the corporation withers and that is not the objective of any corporate leadership (Warner, 1999).

Setting the Benchmarks to Engender Efficient Customer Service Delivery

Corporate leadership must endeavour to put in place the benchmarks which employees must aspire to meet. Deadlines must be conformed to by employees and those violate or flout deadlines, sanctioned. This induces total organizational discipline. The competition is also watching, and so corporate leadership cannot afford to allow the system to be on the loose. It will definitely compromise organizational productivity. Benchmarks set must be reasonable, doable, achievable, practicable, workable, implementable, economically prudent, costs-cutting in demeanour, development-oriented, doused with touches of progress and seeking the organizational agenda for growth. It is not out of place for top leadership to engage employees in the setting of benchmarks for the organization.

Benchmarks can be all-pervasive, they must span the entire organization. Benchmarks can be set for operations, productions, processes, procedures, markets, quality, products, employees, etc. The objective is to be able to withstand the strains and stresses of the competition and also not to be found wanting in terms of total organizational efficiency (Woodward, 1970, Behaviour in Organizations).

Setting the Agenda and The Vision For Corporate Survival

The founding fathers of organizations or companies always have one aim: to wish the organization to exist in perpetuity. They don't want to hear anything like the organization is out of business when people are put in charge to engineer the perennial existence of the organization. It will be anathema. Organizations are to grow from strength to strength when people are in charge to ensure that. This compels organizations to have in place very fine visions which the organization should try to attain. It demands astuteness and very good foresight on the part of leadership to have in place excellent vision. It tasks the creativity and ingenuity on the part of leadership. A lot of brainstorming and debating go on in their minds before eventually settling on one vision or the other. Leadership needs to continuously contact some employees and even past employees who are available and have the experience to share with the current leadership. It is a collective activity and it is not something leadership should arrogate to themselves. As Aristotle once said, if two fools sit on a case and determine it, their decision will be better than one wise judge who sits on the same case to adjudicate it. Leaders are to cooperate with the collectivity when it comes to agenda setting and putting in place a vision.

Ensuring the Organization Arrives

Organizations in business to make good business have the objective of succeeding in everything they do. They want business or market success to beckon them. But these are not got on a silver platter. They must be worked for. Working for it calls for entire organizational overhauling and reengineering which must involve all functional and operational leaders of the organization. Every hand (managerial) must be on deck to contribute to the eventual success. The questions that must be on the mind of leadership is: (1) Are we doing everything right which will engender success at the end of the day? (2) If we are not doing everything right, what are we to do to right them? (3) If they are beyond us, who must we consult or where do we outsource from? These are crucial and herculean. It takes more than organizational leadership to run organizations successfully. The inward searching by leadership and other stakeholders who contribute to organizational success must not be downplayed. This is the reason why organizations employ or engage the services of external consultants, but these organizations must know at first hand the major problem inhibiting the organization and preventing the forward march of the organization.

It takes deeper thinking and reflection to unravel the problem and also suggest possible solutions to the problem organizations must not be allowed to die with their maladies or diseases are known, it then becomes a matter of treatment.

Periodic Organizational Effectiveness Audit

Top leadership is always enthused about high performance of their organizations. High performance on the part of any organization is always worked at. The necessary 'work space infrastructure' and the materials to be used to achieve this high level of productivity must be got and put in place or at the disposal of organizational workers. The dexterity of top leadership is mandatory and workers/employees must be psyched up or orientated to the organizational objective of high performance. It is imperative top leadership arrange for periodic organizational effectiveness audit to find out whether the organization is doing very well in all what it does. The following audits are mandatory. Top management effectiveness audit must not be played down. Marketing effectiveness audit whether marketing is on track to attain high productivity when it comes to all areas in marketing performance. The conduct of these audits must be done professionally and outside consultants must be brought from outside to conduct the audit and the report of the audit must be fully followed, especially the recommendations. Production audit purchasing/procurement audits, financial audits, operational audits, product audits, sectional or divisional audits, and management information system audits to ascertain whether information systems are being used for what they are meant for.

Giving Employees the Opportunity To Develop And Exploit Opportunities

In their book *In Search of Excellence* published in 1982, Peters and Waterman designated certain companies as excellent because those companies over a 20-year period have given an above average return on investment and had a reputation for innovation. They harp on authority and entrepreneurship and productivity through people. Employees must be given the opportunity and the space to experiment and test ideas that will help the organization to move forward. Management must not be intimidating and assume they know all, employees too have ideas and plans which when they are allowed to bring out will help the organization. Employees are a source of quality and product and process improvement. Employees are to be given the opportunity to self-reflect and go on internal retreats and other development programmes that will sharpen the skills of workers. Employees have a 'stake' in what the organization does. From their various perspectives they have different objectives which they would like to see the organization fulfil. Managers and employees have individual interests and goals which, it is hoped, can be harnessed, in part at least, to the goals of the organization (Fitzsimmons, 1997).

Managing Change Properly To Benefit the Organization

Transitional periods are always challenging periods. It is when the adaptability of leadership is put to test. Leadership cannot afford to disappoint. They are to be up to the task. Some organizations elsewhere have been able to sail through the storms. It is a period of selves introspection and meditation by corporate leadership. Collaborations with which leadership and pressure adfays for a way out of the storm is in place. But, top leadership must do their homework very well before consorting with employees and union leadership and other stakeholders (H.B.R., 2014).

Information Value Chain Management for Effective Decision Making In The Organization

Accurate and reliable information is the lynchpin of effective organizational decision making. According to Vladimir Zwass (1985) pertinent, timely, complete, concise, precise, valid management information is the life blood of effective and efficient organizations. Management cannot lead the organization without the relevant and timely information. Information must be collected either within house or outside the house. Information is needed for good decisions to be made to push the organization forward. The Management Information Systems infrastructure must be in place for the information to be gathered and IT staff must be well resourced for effective information collection. When collected, they must be disseminated and this is where the information value chain is important. Functional departments need information and top leadership also need information. Information collection networking is very crucial.

Information outsourcing is nothing new, "farming out the farm", *The Economist* (1989) called it began in 1989 when Eastman Kodak turned the bulk of its information services over to three companies, IBM, Digital Equipment Corporation, and Businessland (Wind and Main, 1999).

Equipping Your Internal Customers to Deliver Exceptional Customer Service

Leadership must have the full grasp of employees attitudes to work. They must have the basics of employees attitude to outside customers who call to transact business. Are internal customers very receptive and accommodating to outside customers? It is imperative internal customers display a positive attitude to all external customers. Internal employees/customers are to exceed external customers' expectations and their needs. Internal employees are to be well grounded in customers' expectations so that they meet them adequately. They are to effectively listen and speak to the external customers. Customer care on the telephone must be possible and house-to-house service made practicable. Internal customers are to build delightful interpersonal behaviour, management must set and measure standards when it comes to internal customers performance. Leadership must find ingenious ways to profit from complaints from both internal and external customers (Schonberger et al; 1997).

Setting and measuring standards for employees so as to be on safe pedestal to render services to customers efficiently is a crucial function of top leadership of the organization. Organizations are in business to compete and also to out-compete and must therefore conform to set standards or benchmarks. Performing below standard (Waters, 1999) is the surest route to organization extinction.

If customers complain about your services or products, top leadership must profit from complaints (Peters and Waterman, 1995). Complaints from customers must enable organizations to soberly reflect on their products, services operations, and processes and thereby improve upon their performance. Boeing and Airbus (USA and France) are always testing their products in terms of safety and reliability, if they should crash hand, at least damages to the aircraft will be minimal. It is not appropriate an organization waits for inspection of regulation to pin point their faults to them. They are to be eternally vigilant in all their operations, with new defects at the end of the day.

Challenging situations in business must encourage top leadership to be astute in all what they do (Business, 2006). Dealing with challenging situations is going to test your creativity and innovativeness when it comes to finding solutions to problems. Such challenging situations must not give way to guesses, problems must be broken down and then solved to optimize whatever leadership is doing.

Organizations which are in business must place their customers at a centre piece and make them the objects of all what they do in business. They are to be market-oriented (Wilson and Gilligan, 1997). Customers are to be retained and not to be maintained for business profit at the end of the day.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Champy, J., & Hammer, M. (1993). *Reengineering: The Corporation*. Massachusetts, U.S.A: Irwin.
- [2]. Drucker, P. F. (1993). *Concept of the Corporation*. New Brunswick, Canada: Transaction Publishers.
- [3]. Drucker, P. (1973). *Management: Tasks, Responsibilities, Practices*. New York: Harper and Row
- [4]. Crainer, S. (2000). *The Management Century, Booz*. New York, N.Y: Allen and Hamilton.
- [5]. Business & Economics (1997c) 'Dial M for merger', *Financial Times*, 15/16 November. Kassim and A. Menon (eds), *The European Union and National Policy*, London: Routledge
- [6]. Groysberg, B., & Michael, S. (2012). Leadership Is a Conversation. *Harvard Business Review*, 90(6), XX.
- [7]. Groysberg, B., & Abrahams, R. (2014). Manage your work, manage your life. Retrieved from www.wbsociety.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Harvard-Business-Review_Manage-your-work-Manage-your-life.pdf.
- [8]. Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*. London: Harper Collins Publishers.
- [9]. O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading Change*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- [10]. Nadler, D. A. (1997). *Competing by Design*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- [11]. Warner, M. (2001). *Management Thinking*. U.S.A: Thomson Learning.
- [12]. Gilligan, C., & Wilson, R. M. S. (1997). *Strategic marketing planning*, Jordan Hill, Oxford, Butterworth-Heinemann