

# Seeing is Believing

**How do you tell a real performer from one who is simply getting results because they are part of an effective system?**

The key to this conundrum lies in the performer's ability to **know why the results are occurring.**

## The "Blind" Performer

Many people do not take a broad enough viewpoint of what is happening with the work they do. They are effectively blind to the reasons they are getting results.

All they know is that they perform certain actions, and they get certain results. But if the results are not as good in November as they were in October, they have no concept of how to correct this. In fact, they might not even notice that the results were worse!

**Such people do produce results, but they are not top performers.**

The trap is that if you ask these people about the results they have achieved, they **can** give you what appears to be a valid answer. They can **appear** to be a performer because they can tell you their results.

This is not to invalidate people who can perform efficiently within an established and well-run system. Such people are valuable parts of the whole, and make up a significant proportion of the staff in any organisation.

Such people are not, however, what you could call "top performers". They will not set the world on fire with any brilliant ability to produce results which far exceed your expectations.

They get the job done because the **structure around them** has been set up to run as an efficient machine. They simply perform their part in producing the results which that machine was originally designed to accomplish. **It is the machine** – the system – which is the **main performance factor.**



**But what happens when you hire someone who only got results because the system propped them up?**

They can sure quote results which were achieved, but can they continue to get results of that calibre when away from the elaborate support system?

The top performer, on the other hand, is the one who can make it all happen **despite** the lack of an established system. They know **why** the results are occurring (or not), and can therefore find a way through.

## The Basic Principle

For any **RESULTS** to be produced there must be some **ACTION**.

For any **ACTION** to occur, there must have been some **IDEAS** which preceded. The sequence is:-

**IDEAS — ACTION — RESULTS**

But, **whose** ideas are they? And **who** performs the action? And **who** can claim the results?

In general, the "blind performer" is performing the actions based on someone else's ideas, and the results they produce when they perform the actions **also** belong to someone else (or the system).

## Seeing is Believing

Now this is not to say that everyone who performs actions based on another's ideas is a "blind performer". On the contrary, the **ownership** taken by the employee for the job they do is a clear indicator of their performance value.



### The "Seeing" Performer

Most jobs have been in place for some time (even if the employee hasn't). The ideas which created the job in the first place were undoubtedly there long before a specific employee came along.

But how well can they see the ideas which drive the actions? Do they look at the results they are producing and go back to the ideas to see how their results might be improved? This is the difference between a "blind performer" and a top performer.

### A Top Performer Looks, and Sees

One of the attributes of a top performer is that they will always want to improve what they are doing. They are therefore very interested in the results they produce.



- They will know if those results are **improving**, and what made them improve.
- They will know if their results are worse, and why **that** is occurring.

In other words, a top performer will **take ownership** for the whole job, from start to finish. They will constantly ask themselves:

- What are the basic **IDEAS** and considerations which drive this job?
- What **ACTIONS** must be performed in order to get things moving on this job?
- What **RESULTS** are being produced, and how do they compare with past performance, industry standards, highest possibles, etc?
- How should the **IDEAS** be modified (or better understood) in order to drive better **RESULTS**?
- How should the **ACTIONS** be varied in order to get better **RESULTS**?
- How do the **RESULTS** look now?



And so on... It is a cyclic thing. The top performer, being interested in results, looks at the whole picture.

It doesn't matter that someone else might have set up the basic ideas for the job in the first place.

## Seeing is Believing

They take ownership of their area and are prepared to do what is necessary to make it work.

The “blind performer”, by comparison, merely looks at the actions they are to perform. They don't much care about the results, and are probably not even aware of the ideas upon which the job depends.

## Sorting Them Out

This one can be tricky. You can be looking at a candidate who has come from a well organised corporate structure. Because of the size of the operation, their effectiveness has been masked.

**They were hidden within a well run operation.**

They can quote the statistics of their area, which may have been very good indeed. But the question remains: how much did **they** really contribute to those results?

Some smaller companies often tend to shy away from candidates who have been working in very large organisations. They are aware of this trap.

But **there is a sure fire way** of sorting out the sheep from the goats in this context.

The Performance Analysis which U-MAN puts candidates through is dynamite in this area. **We measure their real performance!**

