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Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine if there were common administrative concepts in important theories of three different eras.

Summary

All major administrative theories, particularly those of Scientific Management and Human Relation theorists, contained common concepts and beliefs. Each major Scientific Management theorist was mainly concerned with productive efficiency or output. Each theorist, however, made certain provisions for the meeting of workers' human needs at work.

All major Human Relations theorists, who reacted against the practices and concepts of Scientific Management theorists, were chiefly concerned with the satisfaction of workers' basic and higher human needs and drives at work. Productive efficiency was regarded as secondary to the proper care of workers at work.

Behavioral or modern administrative theories were mainly a conceptual blending of certain Scientific Management and Human Relations theories. The humane, worker-oriented Human Relations theorists were a greater influence on behavioral theorists than were the more impersonal, mechanical theorists of Scientific Management.

The only administrative concepts employed by selected theorists of all three eras--Scientific Management, Human Relations, and Behavioral--were concern for productive efficiency and concern for workers as humans. The majority of Scientific Management administrative concepts remained intact within that era. However, the majority of Human Relations administrative concepts were adopted and modified by behavioral, modern theorists.

Conclusions

Before the twentieth century, certain aspects of codified administration consisted of the works of European Cameralists and American leader Woodrow Wilson. No relationship was found between the concepts of the Cameralists and Wilson and later administrative theories.
Scientific Management concepts and beliefs were synthesized or altered by Human Relations theorists whose main concern was meeting workers' human needs at work through manipulation of conditions of work. Scientific Management theorists' main interest was manipulation of workers to produce greater efficiency, and the mechanics of the productive process.

In the modern, behavioral era, Human Relations and Scientific Management concepts were combined with the ideas of modern theorists. Current, modern theorists placed greater emphasis on Human Relations concepts than they did those of Scientific Management. In the Behavioral era, productive efficiency was generally regarded as secondary to the meeting of workers' human concerns at work. Naturally, however, each current theorist was concerned with productive efficiency, the major preoccupation of Scientific Managers.
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Chapter 1

EVOLUTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE THEORY

INTRODUCTION

Theory has two basic uses in education. It may serve as a help in organizing knowledge systematically, and it may be used as a guide for research. Thus, theory, a logical thought process, may aid the educator in better understanding and describing reality.¹

General theory may be formed in these ways: by compiling experimenter observations; by synthesizing or blending survey research; by adapting constructs from other disciplines; and by deduction. Theory, a systematic way of organizing experience and knowledge, is the beginning and ending of scientific investigation. When viewed as a set of related principles, its value to administration becomes obvious.²

Efforts to create useful theory in educational administration have been hindered in at least three ways. First, the meaning of theory has not generally been clarified. Second, many administrators have confused theory with taxonomies or orderly classifications.


Finally, there has existed uncertainty among educators as to the exact domain of theory.

Theory construction requires creativity. Theory may be broad and comprehensive or narrow and specific. Theory has various meanings and is not easily standardized or characterized.3

THEORY

Sound theory is necessary if administrators are to be most effective. Useful theory should contain quality observations of many researchers.4 Observations used in the building of theory should be facts, the basis and result of theory. In describing a fact, Guthrie wrote, "A fact is an event so described that any observer will agree to the description."5 People with common frames of reference should agree on descriptions which are to be considered facts.6

Theory Building

Burkett developed a procedure for theory building consisting of the following steps:

1. First, define the specific area for consideration.
2. Identify weaknesses of existing theory.
3. Write a value orientation to gain perspective.


6Campbell and Gregg.
4. Select suitable constructs and models.

5. Select an analogue, something similar in nature and function.

6. State the hypothesis, derived from the Items 1-5 conceptual framework.

7. Formulate the theory, being careful not to infer beyond the known.

8. Translate the theory into practice. This should lead to empirical testing and a search for the basis for more theories.\(^7\)

The steps in the theory building cycle are presented below.

5. FACT (Law)

4. THEORY (Mental plan for action)

3. ASSUMPTION (Something taken for granted)

2. CONCEPT (Mental image or idea)

1. FACT (Law)

FIGURE 1

THEORY BUILDING STEPS, ASCENDING ORDER

Theory building is perpetual and cyclical. Laws or facts give rise to concepts and assumptions. Theory breeds new laws and eventually more theory. The concept of theory building as continuous is further illustrated in the following drawing.

\(^7\)Based on a lecture by Charles W. Burkett, Professor of Education, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, June 26, 1974. Permission to quote granted.
Theory building is an "If \rightarrow \text{Then} \rightarrow \text{Therefore}" syllogism or plan. In the building of theory, if certain things are true, then other things may be true; therefore, even more things might be true.\(^8\)

An important idea in theory building is that when certain things are done, predictable results logically follow. The test or adequacy of theory depends mainly on its predictive power.\(^9\)

**Theory Uses**

Theory may be entirely practical, and it may be used for creating new theory. The greatest benefit of theory to administration is its guidance for action.\(^10\) If theory fails to provide adequate guidance for action, it is of no practical use. Educators should use theory as skilled physicians use research theory in the biological laboratory. School principals should be capable of developing and using specific theory for solving specific problems.\(^11\)

---

\(^8\)Burkett.

\(^9\)Burkett.

\(^10\)Campbell and Gregg, p. 364.

\(^11\)Campbell and Gregg, p. 364.
Theory is useful to administrators in making short-range decisions, each of which contributes to long-range strategies. Theory may be used in this way only if the administrator operates within a theory framework, not his own common experience. According to Bakke, "Strategy has to be based on principles and not solely on immediate advantage."^12

Theory may be used in predicting results of choices, and the administrator's ethical system should enable him to decide a course of action.13 Miller suggested that one measure of the value of theory was the degree to which it pointed out new knowledge.14

Administrative behavior is made consistent by theory because it helps administrators know what to expect in given courses of action. Theories are guides, not necessarily solutions in themselves. Administrators should use the theories of others, while adding and testing their own.15

Three major periods of theory construction took place in the twentieth century. The first was Scientific Management which was dominated by Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber. Industrial efficiency was the primary theme of Scientific Managers.

The second major era of theory creation was Human Relations. Though Mary Parker Follett was the first notable exponent of Human

---

13Bakke, p. ii.
15Burkett.
Relations, the studies of Elton Mayo at the Western Electric Hawthorne Plant in Chicago created the first lasting interest in the subject. Chief concerns of Mayo's researchers were worker morale, group dynamics, personnel relations, and behavioral administrative concepts.

The third and final period of theory creation was the behavioral era. Chester Barnard's writings motivated much current structuralist theory. Since 1950, much attention in theory research has been devoted to these areas: research methods, theoretical concepts of organizational behavior, and specialized behavioral knowledge in specific disciplines. The "new" in administrative theory may consist of a combination of certain Scientific Management and Human Relations ideas.16

THE PROBLEM AND SUBPROBLEMS

The problem was to determine if there were common administrative concepts in important theories of three different eras. The problem was used as a total study unifying theme or thesis.

The subproblems arose from an examination of the problem. Each subproblem was arranged chronologically according to its appearance in the study.

The first subproblem was to determine if theories of the Cameralists and Woodrow Wilson affected later theories. All related writings took place before the twentieth century.

---

16Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, pp. 8-11.
The second subproblem was to determine whether Scientific Management theories were changed in the Human Relations era. Selected writings from about 1910 until 1935 were examined in this investigation.

The third subproblem was to determine if Human Relations theories were altered in the behavioral era. The historical period from about 1950 until 1970 was investigated in answering this question.

The fourth and final subproblem was to determine if the antecedents of behavioral theories were theories of Scientific Management and Human Relations. This question was addressed and answered in Chapter 6.

IMPORTANCE OF THE PROBLEM

A review of the antecedents of administrative theory revealed a need for research into the subject. Lack of information on theory evolvement frustrated those seeking understanding of the origins and growth of theory. Available materials on theory development were fragmentary and unrelated in content and sequence. Little or no attention in current literature was given the antecedents of theory or possible relationships among theories. A study of theory relationships should help fill this historical and educational void.

There exists in educational administration a need for theory. The nature and direction of many administrative decisions clearly show this. Clarification of the antecedents of theory and the provisions of ways it may be used should improve decisionmaking. Generally, theories undergirding educational administration are vaguely understood by administrators. Reporting the antecedents and evolution of theory, and the works of major theorists, should stimulate more frequent,
wiser use of theory. Historical events may have stimulated much
tory. For example, the main impetus for Scientific Management may
have been the accelerating Industrial Revolution. Identifying the
forces giving rise to the most productive theory building should
benefit administrators.

LIST OF TERMS

An understanding of the following terms and definitions should
prove helpful to the reader.

Theory: A set of assumptions from which principles are
derived, a model of reality.  
17
Hypothesis: An unproved conclusion based on facts which is
accepted as a basis for further research.

Assumption: The supposition that a thing is true.

Administration: The overall management of persons and
materials.  

Management: The allocation of human and material resources.  

The terms "administration" and "management" were used interchangeably.

Educational Administration: "Educational administration"
referred mainly to administrative functions of elementary and secondary

17Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory (New York: 

18Owens, p. 35.

19Orin B. Graff and Calvin M. Street, Improving Competence 
in Educational Administration (New York: Harper and Brothers, Inc., 

20William T. Greenwood, Management and Organizational Behavior 
Theories: An Interdisciplinary Approach (Cincinnati, Ohio: South-
school principals. Educational supervisors, superintendents, college and university presidents, department heads, and all other educators who perform administrative duties were included in the designation.

Scientific Management Era: The period (1910-1935) characterized by efficiency studies in industry to increase worker productivity.

Human Relations Era: An administrative era (1935-1950) in which human and interpersonal factors in administration were stressed.

Behavioral or Modern Era: An administrative era (1950 to the present) of the synthesizing or blending of theory from the Scientific Management and Human Relations eras. 21

Structuralist Theory: This term was used interchangeably with the terms "behavioral" and "Post-1950's."

ASSUMPTIONS

The review of the literature relating to the beginnings of administrative theory led to a number of assumptions and possible areas for investigation. This study was based on the following assumptions.

1. Common beliefs and practices were present in all administrative theories.

2. Scientific Management theory was largely unrelated to Cameralist and Wilsonian theory.

3. Classical or Scientific Management theory was modified in the Human Relations era.

4. Classical and Human Relations theories were the basis for behavioral theories.

21Owens, pp. 8-11.
5. An understanding of theories of administration is important to educators.

6. Knowledge of administrative theories should enhance administrative practices.

7. The literature examined accurately reflected the views of theorists.

LIMITATIONS

This study was limited to a consideration of selected administrative theories from approximately 1900 to 1970. However, the administrative theories of the Cameralists, earlier European fiscal administrators, and Woodrow Wilson were also included. The study was further limited by the placing of major emphasis on Scientific Management and Human Relations and their effects on later administrative theorists.

PROCEDURES

A listing of the procedures used in this study follows.

1. A search for related works was conducted in Dissertation Abstracts, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Readers Guide to Periodical Literature, and Education Index.

2. A DATRIX computerized search was conducted for related dissertation materials.

3. A search of the card catalogs of several colleges and universities was completed to find primary and secondary sources. The works discovered were used to determine if there existed beliefs and practices common to all major administrative theories. Major
emphasis was placed on primary sources of industrial and educational theorists.


Primary works were examined to identify theory likenesses and differences. Primary and secondary works were used to determine the extent to which theory of the Scientific Management and Human Relations eras influenced behavior theory.

Primary and secondary sources were essential in finding and relating beliefs, practices, and concepts common to important administrative theories. Primary and secondary writings were necessary to set forth common theoretical threads of major theories to unify the study.

Secondary sources were used to construct the conceptual framework of the study. Major emphasis was placed on primary materials where philosophy, antecedent, and likeness of construct appeared.
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The study was divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 includes the introduction, statement of the problem and subproblems, importance, assumptions, limitations, procedures, and organization.

Chapter 2 contains the review of related literature. The evolution of administrative theory, beginning with the writings of the European Cameralists and United States leader Woodrow Wilson before 1900, was analyzed and set forth. Some of the major theories of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries were noted and described. Certain theoretical concepts of Cameralism, Woodrow Wilson, Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, Max Weber, Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Kurt Lewin, Chester Barnard, Herbert A. Simon, Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick, Daniel E. Griffiths, Douglas McGregor, Paul R. Mort, Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, Andrew W. Halpin, Chris Argyris, Jacob G etzels and Egon Guba, Amitai Etzioni, Talcott Parsons, John K. Hemphill, T. Madison Byar, and Robert G. Owens were examined because of their effect on the evolution and development of theory.

In Chapter 3, the major theories of Scientific Managers Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber received particular emphasis. The theories of the Cameralists, Alexander Hamilton, and Woodrow Wilson were also investigated and set forth.

In Chapter 4, the administrative beliefs of the Human Relations era were identified and narrated. The ideas of some leading persons of that era--Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, and Kurt Lewin--were amplified and recorded.
In Chapter 5, the behavioral modern structuralist theories were presented. Selected works of certain theorists were used which focused on administrative innovations and adoptions since 1950. Some of the works of the following authors were described: (1) Chester Barnard, (2) Herbert A. Simon, (3) Amitai Etzioni, (4) Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick, (5) Daniel E. Griffiths, (6) Douglas M. McGregor, (7) Abraham Maslow, (8) Frederick Herzberg, (9) Paul R. Mort, (10) Andrew W. Halpin, (11) Chris Argyris, (12) Jacob W. Getzels and Egon Guba, (13) John K. Hemphill, (14) Talcott Parsons, (15) T. Madison Byar, and (16) Robert G. Owens. An attempt was made to determine the extent to which Scientific Management and Human Relations influenced behavioral theories.

In Chapter 6, the relationships of beliefs and practices common to selected administrative theories were examined and related. Common theoretical threads or strains of thought from Cameralism to the current era were investigated as a unifying study theme. Study continuity was provided by comparing and contrasting selected theories of different eras.

In Chapter 7, the summary, conclusions, and recommendations were given.
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

According to Campbell and Gregg, Cameralism was a European fiscal management system involving service to the state or ruler. Its purpose was to identify and maintain sources of taxes.¹

Woodrow Wilson's major theory contribution was his call for a scientific study of administration and the creation of a distinct United States administrative science. He hoped this might lead to an American civil service.²

Scientific Management (1910-1935) was characterized by industrial efficiency and ways to increase it. Frederick W. Taylor, a leading theorist, ushered in a "second industrial revolution" with implications as profound as those of the original Industrial Revolution. The theories of Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber most fully characterized Scientific Management.³

² Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration," Political Science Quarterly, II, No. 2 (June, 1887), 201-02.
Human Relations (1935-1950) became popular because of the research of Elton Mayo at the Western Electric Hawthorne Plant in Chicago, though Mary Parker Follett had laid its foundation. Human Relations researchers generally concluded that administrators should become expert at diagnosing worker relations, and management should reflect these observations.

Behavioral theory was mainly a combination of certain concepts of Scientific Management and Human Relations. This "new" structuralist administration was behavioral and concerned with leadership in organizational settings.4

CAMERALISM

The term Kammer denoted administrative theory for which there exists no direct English equivalent. It was a variant and derivative of the Latin camera, a storage place for princely revenue. Cameralism was bureaucratic activity of governmental officials, particularly in Prussia and France, to meet the financial needs of the state and ruler.5

WOODROW WILSON

Woodrow Wilson felt that improved governmental functioning depended on a scholarly, disciplined study of administration as a science. He believed a search for definite principles of

---


administration should be conducted. At the time of his major essay on administration, published in the Political Science Quarterly, II (June, 1887), there had been no important effort by Americans to create an administrative science. Wilson felt, if American government was to function maximally, the development of an American science of administration was a necessity.

**SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT, 1910-1935**

During the Scientific Management or Classical era, great stress was placed on finding ways to increase industrial production. Time and motion studies and formal organizational charts were routinely employed. Strenuous efforts were made to refine administration and eliminate unnecessary worker movements.

**Frederick W. Taylor**

Frederick Winslow Taylor, father of Scientific Management, searched for principles of shop operations in organizations with large numbers of production processes and personnel. Among his special interests were the skills and abilities of ordinary factory foremen at the start of the twentieth century. He originated a production system, "functional foremanship," in which workers owed

---

6Wilson, pp. 201-02.  
7Wilson, pp. 201-02.  
8Wilson, pp. 201-02.  
10Greenwood, p. 675.
responsibilities to foremen dealing with separate productive functions.¹¹

Taylor, by use of Scientific Management, created an orderly world of the factory—a place where actions were expertly planned and coordinated.¹² Under his direction, rigid, administrative principles based on technology accelerated production through increasing efficiency.¹³

Henri Fayol

As Taylor was influencing American administration, the French industrialist, Henri Fayol, was creating important theory in Europe. Fayol, who dealt with top management rather than middle management as had Taylor, tried to separate administrative processes from other essentials of the factory operation. He emphasized administrative elements common to different organizations.¹⁴ He searched for and identified what he called universal principles of administration, the forerunners of much modern theory. Fayol stressed the universality of his administration at all levels and in all types of organizations. The concept of a universal administrative system was significant in establishing the importance of traditional administrative theory.¹⁵


¹⁴Owens, p. 6.

¹⁵Greenwood, p. 5.
Max Weber

The concept of bureaucracy was introduced to political and social science by the German theoretician Max Weber. Weber, eminent sociologist and economist, produced an approach to administration resembling Scientific Management in some ways. Though his basic work, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, was published in 1921 after his death, he conceived much administrative theory before the twentieth century.

Weber's major theoretical concern was bureaucracy which he considered the most efficient and logical of organizations. His bureaucracy was a large, hierarchically-arranged organization with chain of command and division of labor. Fixed worker positions, work specialization, and specific regulations for member conduct and responsibility characterized bureaucracy. Weber felt that efficient workers who conformed to bureaucratic standards would be rewarded by promotions. Bureaucracy was the answer to the irrationality and inefficiency of many large organizations.

HUMAN RELATIONS MOVEMENT, 1935-1950

Before the Human Relations Movement, administration was strictly organization for industrial production. Typical managerial


18 Owens, p. 7.

theory before Human Relations concerned productive efficiency with special attention given to work division and parts coordination.  

Human Relations, beginning in the 1920's, focused on relationships of workers and work. In her book Creative Experience, Mary Parker Follett stated that the most pressing human relations problem was creating an organizational environment that workers would join and remain part of while contributing to organizational goals.

Mary Parker Follett

Mary Parker Follett devoted a great part of her life to creating a well-ordered society where people could more fully enjoy life. Her ideas as given in the book, Creative Experience, anticipated much Human Relations thought.

Follett claimed that the main problem of any business or educational institution was developing and maintaining creative, productive human relationships. Coordination of the human enterprise was the most important factor in creating desirable working climates.

---

20Simon, p. 288.

21Mary Parker Follett, Creative Experience (New York: Longmans, Green, 1924).

22Follett.

Elton Mayo

As a result of his Western Electric Hawthorne Plant Studies, Elton Mayo in 1933 concluded that the change of greatest importance in the experiments had little relation to the actual experimentation. He contended that the change of real importance was one of changed mental attitude. Mayo believed that observation of the experimental group members increased their productivity. These observed group members developed cohesiveness and a sense of belonging with a corresponding increase in productivity. Discovery of the "Hawthorne Effect," that simple observation increased production, was the beginning of the Human Relations Movement.

Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson

Before writing Management and The Worker, Roethlisberger and Dickson conducted an exhaustive study of the work of Elton Mayo and the "Hawthorne Effect." Some of their goals in investigating Mayo's Westinghouse Studies were: to report what actually occurred; to impartially assess the studies; and to record reasons for Mayo's


25Roethlisberger and Dickson, cited by Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, Educational Administration As A Social Process, p. 35.

work.\textsuperscript{27} The book, \textit{Management and The Worker}, became a classic in social science research. For several years after its 1942 publication, most of what was known of relations between workers and managers was contained in it.\textsuperscript{28}

Mayo's Western Electric Studies and the Human Relations Movement paved the way for structuralist behavioral theory which altered relationships between workers and managers. The "new" current theorists proposed organizations as social systems and administrative involvement as necessary to organizational success.\textsuperscript{29}

\textbf{POST-1950'S ADMINISTRATIVE THEORY}

The "new," modern administrative theory was a conceptual blending of theories from the Classical or Scientific Management and Human Relations eras. Behavioral theory was generally humane and concerned with human interactions in organizational settings.\textsuperscript{30}

In the later 1950's, conferences of education professors and public school administrators and foundation grants began influencing administration. Special in-service training, extensive curricular changes, workshops, and other innovations were but a few of many changes brought to education. Some of the more influential of these conferences and foundations were the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), the American Association of

\textsuperscript{27}Roethlisberger and Dickson, pp. 3-5.

\textsuperscript{28}Whyte, p. 8.

\textsuperscript{29}Owens, \textit{Organizational Behavior in Schools}, p. 86.

\textsuperscript{30}Owens, p. 11.
School Administration (AASA), the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA), and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

**National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration**

The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration was created because of the efforts of a small group of professors of educational administration who failed to realize they were initiating an important movement. At NCPEA conferences, much creative, stimulating theory was presented. The NCPEA meetings acquainted professors of educational administration with their colleagues of other disciplines. One continual concern of NCPEA members was administrative leadership, especially the factors in effective leadership.

**American Association of School Administrators**

In 1946 and 1947, American Association of School Administrators spokesmen encouraged members to concern themselves with "professionalization" of the public school superintendency. Efforts were devoted to improving university administration preparation programs. In the later 1940's and the 1950's, members of the American Association

---


32Campbell and Gregg, *Administrative Behavior in Education*, p. 80.

33Griffiths, p. 240.

34Owens, p. 17.
of School Administrators gave effective leadership and important new direction to educational administration.

Cooperative Program in Educational Administration

The Cooperative Program in Educational Administration was started in 1950 and financed by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. As a result of the establishment of CPEA regional centers at eight United States universities, a pioneering era in administrative study was begun. CPEA members were especially interested in improving administration through the study of theory. Near the end of a major period of CPEA activity, study and research in administrative theory became the main focus of the organization.

Members of the board of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan, expressed great interest in public school administration. By 1946, serious efforts were being made by Foundation representatives to improve the effectiveness of public school superintendents. From 1956 until 1959, Foundation grants totaling $9,000,000 were made mainly to universities for studying and upgrading educational administration. Since an early Kellogg grant in 1950, interest in administrative study has grown among educators and theorists.

35 Owens, p. 17.
36 Campbell and Gregg, p. 81.
37 Owens, p. 18.
38 Griffiths, p. 5.
Much current interest in administration may be traced to the Kellogg stimulus. 39

**Chester Barnard**

Though the modern, behavioral administrative era started about 1950, much behavioral administrative theory originated in the 1930's. The administrative ideas of industrial leader Chester Barnard were especially influential in the development of behavioral administrative theory.

Chester Barnard's classic book, *The Functions of The Executive*, 40 published in 1938, provided the stimulus for much current, modern theory. In this important work, Barnard synthesized many theories which had appeared since Woodrow Wilson's 1887 essay on administration. 41

**Kurt Lewin**

Kurt Lewin worked with human behavior in organizations and with group dynamics. Lewin assumed that the major influences on human behavior were individual and group characteristics and cultural norms. He felt this combination created the situations in which human behavior occurred. As a result, if meaningful behavioral

---

39 Griffiths, p. 5.


41 Wilson, *Political Science Quarterly*.

42 Owens, *Organizational Behavior in Schools*, p. 11.
change was to take place, group and cultural norms must support it. To attempt change without gaining peer and cultural support caused conflict, regression, and hindrance to organizational goals. 43

Herbert A. Simon

Herbert A. Simon, a university professor and author, published an important book, Administrative Behavior, 44 in 1945 which furthered the cause of administration. Amitai Etzioni, an administrative theorist, remarked that Simon's book "opened a whole new vista of administrative theory." 45

In a 1955 article, Simon questioned the wisdom of traditional "economic man" motivational theory. 46 He felt developments in economics and business raised serious doubts as to the validity of the "economic man" theory. He believed that motivational views of man should be reassessed in the light of new learnings and insights, particularly in the social sciences. 47

43 Owens, p. 37.
44 Simon, Administrative Behavior.
Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick

Gulick and Urwick borrowed Scientific Management ideas to promote administrative efficiency. Basic to their thesis was the grouping of organizational elements according to function or similar criteria. Their 1937 book, Papers on The Science of Administration, did much to publicize their theory after World War II. Some ideas and concepts associated with Gulick and Urwick were unity of command, line and staff, and span of control.

Talcott Parsons

Talcott Parsons was one of several theorists who worked with social systems theory. He believed all organizations tried to fulfill certain basic needs and--in keeping with this--he developed a social systems organizational model for schools.

There were in all organizations, according to Parsons, three systems levels--the technical, managerial, and the institutional. He was convinced that traditional administrative study had dealt with management while neglecting the technical and institutional levels.

---

48Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 9.
50Gulick and Urwick, p. 3.
Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba

Getzels and Guba developed social systems theory for studying the behaviors of humans in industrial firms. Organizations were described as social systems with roles each of which carried certain behavioral expectations. All persons in the organizational social system observed others and expected certain behaviors of them. Their social systems model included both human and organizational dimensions.

Paul R. Mort

Paul R. Mort and his Columbia Teachers College colleagues tried to create a theory of administration by deduction. He believed that sound theory was a necessity for the effective educator. To Mort, "Action divorced from theory is the random scurrying of a rat in a new maze." He favored use of theory to avoid lost motion and wasted time and energy.

For several years, Mort was widely regarded as the foremost spokesman for educational change in the United States. His guiding thesis was that adequacy of financial support determined whether a school system adopted suitable new and innovative practices. After

---


54 Halpin, p. 156.

55 Owens, p. 44.


57 Mort and Ross, p. 4.
years of energetic work, Mort left a legacy of disciples who considerably influenced administration. 58

Andrew W. Halpin

Andrew W. Halpin analyzed "open" and "closed" school social climates. The organizational climate of a school was "closed" if administration was high in control and low in creativity. He contended that "open" climates were beneficial while "closed" climates were seen as stifling to creativity and innovation. Halpin felt that all school climates could be categorized, with few being entirely "open" or "closed." 59

Daniel E. Griffiths

Daniel E. Griffiths felt that the main theory problem was the scant attention given theory by public school administrators. He said that a leading reason for its lack of use was misunderstanding of its meaning. In stressing the "practical" in administrative training programs, college and university officials had placed little emphasis on the value and practicality of theory. 60

Griffiths realized that theorizing should not be considered the exclusive domain of nuclear physicists or cultural anthropologists.

---

58 Mort and Ross, p. 4.
59 Owens, p. 190.
60 Owens, p. 37.
Theorizing was expressing experiences and observations in general terms and bring them to bear on a problem.61

T. Madison Byar

Before planned change can occur in any organization, those in power must be disposed to change. Authority figures in the organization must be convinced that the proposed change will enhance their status and keep them in power.62 T. Madison Byar, former Chairman, Department of Education, East Tennessee State University, proposed his tripartite power theory to explain institutional development and control. Organizational elements essential to his theory were person, place, and position.63

Robert G. Owens

Robert G. Owens identified certain weaknesses in the traditional treatment of administration as a subject in higher education. According to Owens, administration had been traditionally taught under a system less structured than formal "programs." The teaching of administration was frequently done in a diffuse, haphazard manner by teachers of various university departments. His theory for improved administration included the upgrading of administrative curricula, the teaching of


63Wilson, Byar, Shapiro, and Schell, p. 76.
administration courses as related units, and meaningful contact between administration teachers and their colleagues of other disciplines.64

SUMMARY

Cameralism and Woodrow Wilson's writings were significant administrative theories before Scientific Management. Cameralism concerned efficient service to the state or ruler. Wilson's major contribution was the search for principles of administration suited to governmental service.

Scientific Managers applied scientific principles to factory production chiefly because of the demands of the accelerating Industrial Revolution. Scientific Management theorists Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber tested to find ways to increase industrial efficiency.

Human Relations researchers, led by Mary Parker Follett and Elton Mayo, concluded that attention to workers' feelings and the work environment were essentials of increased production. Human Relations theorists believed that administrators must carefully observe and diagnose worker interaction, and manage accordingly.

Behavioral administration was a combination of Scientific Management and Human Relations. Chester Barnard introduced this changed emphasis by publishing the book, The Functions of The Executive,65 in 1938. The "new" behavioral administration appeared about 1950 and has continued to the present time.

64Owens, pp. 2-3.

65Barnard, The Functions of The Executive.
Chapter 3

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT AND EARLIER THEORIES

INTRODUCTION

Three important administrative theories appearing before the twentieth century were those of the Cameralists, Alexander Hamilton, and Woodrow Wilson. The Cameralists were European administrative bureaucrats who supervised the collecting of princely revenue. Alexander Hamilton, of George Washington's administration, proposed a strong Federalism to replace the Articles of Confederation. Woodrow Wilson wanted a distinctly American administration to promote governmental efficiency.

Though administration developed gradually, management concepts were well-defined before being labeled. Engineers entered industry near the mid-nineteenth century to solve problems such as improper plant design and other difficulties related to accelerating machine speed. ¹ By 1875, engineers had experimented with shop layouts, movement of workers and machinery, and work patterns as shown by time and motion studies. The value of the scientific method to industrial productivity came to be generally accepted.²

²Campbell and Gregg, p. 93.
Frederick W. Taylor tried to solve the main production problem of that time, coordination for greater specialization, by use of "functional foremanship." He was first to conceptualize possible solutions for problems caused by the accelerating and increasingly complex Industrial Revolution.  

In the post-World War II era, new horizons based on Scientific Management and Human Relations were explored in educational administration. Much attention was given by behavioral scientists to human actions in organizations, organizational structure, and "open" and "closed" organizational climates. Behavioral theorists perceived administrators as active participants in organizational settings.  

Cameralism  

In the 1700's, Prussian and Austrian Cameralists developed administrative theory closely tied to governmental service. The main job of Cameralists was finding ways rulers could save and increase revenue. Their concern was the total financial state or condition of countries. Bureaucratic staffs were efficiently trained by Cameralists for governmental service.  

Prussian Cameralists studied the financial affairs of more advanced European countries to adapt certain practices to the needs

---

3Campbell and Gregg, p. 93.


of Prussia. It was partly because of Prussian Cameralists that Germany eventually developed sound financial policies.  

Scientific influences were seen in Prussian Cameralism in the abolition of old, outdated systems of administration and in the creation of new systems. The categorization of knowledge of governmental systems, the introduction of new, different human organizational structures, and the conceptual revision of entire governmental systems were further evidences of the influence of science on Cameralism. 

Alexander Hamilton

Alexander Hamilton's financial plan for the United States was completed before the convening of the first national Congress under President Washington. His major thesis was that the monetary affairs of the United States should be conducted as one would conduct a successful business. His plan for administration of the finances of the United States, though not original, included: an independent chief executive; power delegation to departmental heads; a Federal administrative system separate from the states; standards of integrity for public officials; and the right of public criticism. Hamilton, Federalist leader and Washington's major philosopher, proposed cooperation between the Federal government and the powerful financial

---


interests. His perception of the United States as a large, powerful industrial power was more prophetic than Jefferson's concept of a Federal government with little power and authority. 9

Woodrow Wilson

In the nineteenth-century United States, the word "administration" was used with a governmental context. Concepts suggested by "administration" were basic to the rise of public administration. 10 In "The Study of Administration," an essay published in the Political Science Quarterly in 1887, Wilson wrote that the object of administrative study was to rescue executive methods from confusion and waste and set them on stable principle. 11 He wished to identify principles to create an administrative science, 12 and adapt it to governmental needs. Wilson believed that an American civil service would logically arise from an American administrative science. 13

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT ERA

Near the close of the nineteenth century, American and Western European businessmen made great efforts to raise industrial profits by lowering production costs. The successful uses of the assembly line,
interchangeable parts, and mass production by Henry Ford about 1914 accelerated the drive for technological breakthroughs and productive innovations. Technocrats and engineers were the key personnel in this time of the creation of an industrial efficiency cult.14

Frederick W. Taylor

Frederick Winslow Taylor, pioneer Scientific Manager, discovered and refined industrial management to increase worker efficiency.15 He made an art of task specialization and division of labor while applying both to factory production.16 He was the first to systematically observe the processes of industrial productivity to prove factory production could be scientifically managed and analyzed.17

A few months after joining the Midvale Steel Company of Pennsylvania in 1878, Taylor was promoted to gangboss of the lathe section. In this capacity, he became convinced workers were holding back on production. To gain a fair work day for the company, Taylor lowered the price of piecework and hired new men and taught them himself. Many Midvale workers resisted his supervision by

14Owens, p. 5


17Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 25.
sabotaging machines and blaming Taylor for the breakdowns. During his years as Midvale gangboss, worker-manager conflicts remained at a high level.\textsuperscript{18}

After being with Midvale three years, Taylor was made company foreman. He had realized that, under the piecework system, workers could not increase their earnings even with greater productivity. The workmen, of course, knew this too. Soon after becoming foreman, he changed administrative policy at Midvale to lessen worker-manager hostilities. He was convinced the main reason for antagonisms was the ignorance of management as to what was a proper work day for workmen. Taylor decided on scientific management, rather than a strictly human relations approach, to solve these problems.\textsuperscript{19}

Taylor developed management methods for steel mills, shops, and offices based on the scientific method.\textsuperscript{20} Taylor, an engineer-executive by temperament and training, believed that human performance variability could be used to find better ways of doing work.\textsuperscript{21} He was interested in field testing, experimentation, and measurable results.\textsuperscript{22} Believing management could be learned only by experience, he never attempted preparation of a "comprehensive" management

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19}Fox in \textit{The Encyclopedia of Management}, p. 924.
\item \textsuperscript{20}Bridgwater and Kurtz, p. 2101.
\end{itemize}
treatise. Each of his studies, the paper "Shop Management" for example, resulted from a specific challenge.\(^{23}\)

As Taylor began his efficiency studies, industrial machines were incomplete, and workers were forced to perform tasks machines could not do. This caused workers to be mere extensions of machinery. At this time, in planning machines and designing work, only workers' biological needs were considered.\(^{24}\) In this setting, workers' tastes, aspirations, and abstract human needs were usually ignored. Management believed man would do anything within his physical capabilities if paid enough.\(^{25}\) Taylor's goal was to analyze rationally the administration of human and material resources to attain organizational goals.\(^{26}\)

Taylor determined by experiment a proper work day for workers in all shop operations as a means of refining management. He created in a few years an administration more effective in productivity and good worker relations than earlier management techniques.\(^{27}\)

Taylor's new management system involved two key elements. Discovery by experiment of the best way of performing and the correct time for each productive operation was the first part. The second element was a new labor division between managers and workers.

\(^{23}\)Taylor, p. v.


\(^{26}\)Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 23.

\(^{27}\)Taylor, Scientific Management, p. x.
Managers were expected to find the most efficient ways to perform operational units, and they were to make available to workmen needed materials in the correct amounts. The great gains in production under Taylor came from eliminating waste of worker and machine time. His administrative and managerial principles, though applicable mainly to shop operations, caused managerial and control refinements in large factories.

Taylor's supervisory experiences at Midvale made him aware of the value of harmonious worker-manager relationships. He repeatedly emphasized the need for more enlightened attitudes of foremen toward workers. Authoritarian or "military" administration, traditional in his time and earlier, was to be replaced by mutual helpfulness between workers and managers exemplified by dedicated teachers and willing students. He believed that unless there were improvements in the attitudes of foremen toward workers, as well as more efficient methods of production, "Scientific management cannot be said to exist in any establishment."

Taylor set up definite tasks for workers which called for high efficiency standards. In doing this, he standardized work methods and shop conditions which influenced efficiency. Standardization of management and method of controlling work conditions, centralized

---


29 Greenwood, p. 5.


control in departmental leaders, and high technical training for all factory personnel were recommended as essentials of firm efficiency.32

Taylor, for whom output or worker production was vitally important, intellectualized factory management. Rationality, correct parts arrangement, systematic and logical work regulation, and control were methods of intellectualizing productivity for greater efficiency. His management employed control, according to clear scientific principles, of all methods, materials, and work conditions and its amount, flow, and quality.33

Frederick W. Taylor made the first scientific, systematic attempt to improve industrial efficiency, and "Taylorism" eventually became a permanent feature of shop management.34 Though his administrative views were rather narrow and restrictive, Taylor's work proved administration could be scientifically studied and analyzed.35

Henri Fayol

Henri Fayol (1841-1925) was one of the more distinguished figures Europe gave to supervision and management. He was for thirty years (1888-1918) chief executive of the great French metallurgical


33Copley, p. 246.


35Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 25.
and mining combine, Commentry-Fourchambault-Decazeville
("Comambault"). When he became director of the company, operations were nearing bankruptcy, but when he retired, the financial status of "Comambault" was excellent. Members of the combine had, in fact, contributed significantly to the French effort in World War I, and the administrative staff of the organization was famous over all Europe.

After retiring at age seventy-seven, in 1918, Fayol devoted his remaining seven years to popularizing his administrative theory and advocating its use in areas other than business—the military and government.

Fayol, who initially looked with disfavor on Taylor's studies, eventually viewed Taylor's work as complementary to his own. Taylor had worked with middle management whereas Fayol had studied the top levels of management.

In 1925, a union of the "Centre d'Etudes Administratives" was founded, and the "Conference de l'Organisation Francaise" was concluded. The organization was created to present Fayol's ideas to France. With the establishment of the new organization, France became the first nation to have an institution devoted to the study and application of the scientific method to business and other organization.

Fayol wrote many papers, books, and articles on administration. One of his important books was Administration Industrielle et

---

37 Heyel, p. 242.
38 Heyel, p. 242.
40 Heyel, p. 242.
Generale--Prevoyance, Organisation, Commandement, Coordination, Controle, 1916. 41

This top management thinker, who attributed his success not to his ability, but to his administrative system, worked extensively with principles and techniques compatible with the scientific method. Analyzing and isolating the concepts of administration was his unique managerial contribution. He prepared the way for the functional school of thought and clarified the thinking of top management on administration. 42 Fayol tried to create or discover a universal set of administrative principles, eventually concluding that there existed one administrative science with application to all organizational administration. 43 The six parts of his management plan included forecasting, planning, commanding, organizing, coordinating, and controlling. 44

While Taylor studied workers and Fayol studied managers, the aim of both was increased production. They minimized interpersonal worker relations while stressing administrative processes and productive efficiency. Fayol felt that trained administrators were a necessity for improved efficiency. He believed that useful and

41Heyel, p. 242.
43Dale and Urwick, p. 148.
44Dale and Urwick, p. 107.
worthless administration existed together "with a persistence only to be explained by lack of theory."\(^{45}\)

Fayol was a universalist who contended that his principles would benefit all managers. He failed to realize though that managers might need more than just management principles to manage successfully. He believed that workers would depend more on administrative theory and less on technical knowledge when they reached the top levels of management.\(^{46}\)

Max Weber

Max Weber's major theoretical interest was "bureaucracy." His organizational concept differed greatly from the bungling and inefficiency frequently suggested by "bureaucracy."\(^{47}\) His durable, brilliant administrative theory seemed promising in his day and has since proven invaluable to administrative and organizational theory.\(^{48}\) The reason for the advantage of bureaucracy over other organizational forms was its technical superiority.\(^{49}\) According to Weber, bureaucracy was technically superior to other forms of administration, much as machine


\(^{48}\)Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 7.

production was better than production by hand. The advance of bureaucracy depended on its technical superiority.

In an era of business domination by authoritarian and autocratic method, Weber hoped bureaucracy would be more fair, rational, and less partial than traditional organizations. The decidedly impersonal character would minimize worker interaction and conflicts, freeing workers to conduct business in an atmosphere lacking friction and confusion. In bureaucracy, specialized skills could be best adapted for administrative preciseness, reliability, and efficiency.

Weber's bureaucratic administrative process included the following practices:

1. Systematic distribution of ordinary work activities as official duties.
2. Jobs arranged in a hierarchy with the written authority of each jobholder carefully set forth.
3. Preparation of documents governing organizational conduct.

---


52Owens, p. 7.


The result of correct worker employment and careful definition of worker relationships was bureaucracy, the most efficient organizational form. 55

Bureaucracy involved division of integrated activities seen as official duties of office. Rules of bureaucratic structure clarified different controls, sanctions, and privileges. Role assignment was based on worker qualifications discovered through impartial examinations. Duties and responsibilities of professional bureaucrats were set forth in written guidelines, eliminating the issuing of rules for each case. 56 Weber distinguished among organization members possessing special authority and responsibility. Members were further subdivided into groups with leaders and workers under them who possessed authority over the staff. He concluded that this basic administrative plan was normal and effective for all groups in routine human enterprise. 57 In bureaucracy, a large organizational hierarchy with labor division and specialization of task, people were appointed by member officials to bureaucratic vocations. Workers were not allowed to simply enter and leave bureaucracy at will. When workers performed well, they were rewarded by their bureaucratic superiors with promotions. Workers ascended the organizational structure by conforming to bureaucratic standards. 58

55Dale, p. 158.


58Whyte, p. 6.
Weber was convinced that bureaucracy was best suited to the needs of large, complex organizations serving many clients. His conception included the elimination of the irrationality and frustration of large businesses where worker relationships were organized on a personal basis. He believed well-administered bureaucracy was efficient because of the technical expertise training of all its members.

SUMMARY

The Cameralists, Alexander Hamilton, and Woodrow Wilson developed administrative theories before the twentieth century. Cameralism aimed at identifying, increasing, and conserving taxes for European rulers. Alexander Hamilton tried to establish and administer the finances of the infant United States according to sound business principles. Woodrow Wilson encouraged the search for administrative principles which would lead to improved governmental efficiency.

The acceleration of the Industrial Revolution in Western Europe and the United States about 1900 led to a cult of business or industrial efficiency. Scientific Managers Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber searched for efficiency principles based on the scientific method.

Taylor, founder of Scientific Management, attempted to logically and scientifically analyze each human and material resource in the factory operation. He searched for the most efficient ways of

59Owens, p. 7.
performing productive tasks and a more efficient manager-worker labor division. His productive gains stemmed chiefly from eliminating wasted worker and machine motions.

Henri Fayol, a French top-level manager, searched for a unique set of administrative principles. One of his important contributions was the isolation of administrative precepts which he considered universal. The six parts of Fayol's management plan were: forecasting, planning, commanding, organizing, coordinating, and controlling.

Max Weber, prominent German writer and theoretician, claimed bureaucracy was the most efficient organizational form mainly because of its technical superiority. He believed that the inherent logic and rationality of bureaucracy guaranteed fair treatment for all members. He perceived bureaucratic activity as official duty, arranged jobs in a hierarchy of importance, and prepared written descriptions for each job.

Introduction to Figure 3

A brief overview of the theories of the Cameralists, Alexander Hamilton, Woodrow Wilson, Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber is presented in Figure 3 as they appear in Chapter 3. The major administrative concepts of each group or person is shown in Figure 3. The sequential, historical evolvement of theory--from the view of administration as service to the state to the complex analyses of Scientific Management--was identified and set forth.

Introduction to Figure 4

Figure 4 is a comparison of the administrative theories of Scientific Managers Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber.
Each major Scientific Management figure—Taylor, Fayol, and Weber—developed administrative principles mainly for the promotion of productive efficiency. An examination of Figure 4 shows that each theorist also made some provision for workers as humans. Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber believed that excellence of organizational construct—embodying firm rationality, impartiality, and fairness to workers—guaranteed the meeting of workers' human needs.

Figure 4 shows that Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber utilized many of the same administrative ideas to promote firm efficiency and to satisfy the human concerns of workers. Their techniques of promoting these ends, however, diverged in certain important respects.

Taylor, Fayol, and Weber adhered to the following administrative practices: human engineering, use of the most efficient employment of workers, scientifically chosen and trained foremen, worker-manager cooperation, firm rationality and impartiality, and the meeting of workers' human needs through excellence of firm construct.

Taylor and Fayol—but not Weber—gave special attention to the "economic man" motivational view of workers and the use of scientific administrative principles. Fayol and Weber—but not Taylor—explicitly provided for professionally trained administrators. Taylor and Weber—but not Fayol—made special efforts to employ scientific analyses of the total firm and task arrangement and assignment.

Taylor—but not Fayol or Weber—routinely used scientific job analyses, a near equality of worker-manager work division,
monetary incentives for workers, and the scientific determination of a proper work day for workers. Fayol--but not Taylor or Weber--made frequent use of separate factory administration, the search for a universal set of administrative principles, and planning, coordinating, controlling, forecasting, and commanding. Weber--but not Taylor or Fayol--stressed scientific task specialization, written rules of organizational duty and conduct, the scientific matching of workers and work, and lifetime appointment to the firm.

Though Taylor, Fayol, and Weber used both identical and varied means to firm efficiency and the satisfaction of workers, their primary goal was to upgrade the mechanistic aspects of industrial efficiency. Under Scientific Management, the meeting of workers' human needs in organizational settings was secondary and incidental to the discovery of more efficient means of production.
Max Weber
Developed bureaucracy as a viable organizational concept. Attributed efficiency of bureaucracy to its impersonal nature and its professionally-trained staff.

Henri Fayol
Top-level manager who identified administrative principles compatible with the scientific method. Stressed worker efficiency while minimizing interpersonal relations.

Frederick W. Taylor
Middle-level manager who emphasized worker efficiency. Used time and motion studies to increase efficiency. Minimized Human Relations practices.

Woodrow Wilson
Called for creation of an American administrative science to foster efficiency in government.

Alexander Hamilton
Favored cooperation between Federal government and financial institutions. Management of U.S. finances according to sound business practices.

Cameralism
Administration as concept of service to the state. Administrative system to insure finances for ruler.
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FIGURE 3

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT AND EARLIER THEORIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Taylor</th>
<th>Fayol</th>
<th>Weber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Economic man&quot; motivational view</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most efficient employment of workers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific administrative principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific job analyses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific analysis of the total firm</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientifically chosen and trained foremen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near equality of worker-manager work division</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary incentives for workers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task arrangement and assignment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A scientifically determined day's work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker-manager cooperation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally trained administrative staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate factory administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for universal administrative principles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, Control, Coordinate, Forecast, and Command</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm rationality and impartiality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific task specialization</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written rules of duty and conduct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientifically matched workers and jobs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime appointment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers' needs met through firm quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X denotes compliance of theorist with concept.

FIGURE 4

COMPARISONS OF SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT THEORIES
Chapter 4

HUMAN RELATIONS MOVEMENT, 1935-1950

INTRODUCTION

In 1924 the Englishman, Oliver Sheldon, wrote The Philosophy of Management which was widely used as a textbook in Britain and the United States. His thesis was that Taylor's scientific management system did not detract from the human job of managers to manage.¹

In 1926, Sam Lewisohn wrote "New Leadership in Industry" which presented a new perspective on responsibilities of personnel specialists for maintaining effective human relations in organizations. He contended that workers wanted "justice, status, and opportunity." It was the duty of managers to see that these needs were met.²

Before the Human Relations Movement, little attention was given the needs and feelings of workers or the quality of work environments. Coordination of organizational parts, especially authority roles, had been stressed a great deal. Administrative theory and policy before the Human Relations era were closely tied to organization for productive efficiency.

Human Relations experimentation, beginning in the 1920's, focused on creating desirable working relationships and agreeable


²Heyel, p. 929.
work environments. According to Kimball Wiles, the ideal Human
Relations administrator was one who believed in the worth of people,
respected others' feelings and attitudes, and wished to help all live
in harmony. Human Relations administrators should possess the skills
necessary to promote these ends.3

Human Relations in administration was influenced by an
experiment in 1938 at the Child Welfare Station at the University of
Iowa. These researchers explored the possible effects of leadership
types on group performance, and the experimentation was conducted by
Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph K. White.4 Another event which
was important to Human Relations was the Hawthorne experimentation of
Elton Mayo.5

Mary Parker Follett was a pioneering management philosopher
whose work helped bridge the gap between Scientific Management and
modern behavioral administration. She was most responsible for the
group process approach for solving the problems of administration or
supervision.6

3Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools (New York:

4Ralph K. White and Ronald O. Lippitt, Autocracy and Democracy:
cited by Jacob W. Getzels, James M. Lipham, and Roald F. Campbell,
Educational Administration As A Social Process (New York: Harper and

5Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, Management
and The Worker (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press,
1939), p. 3.

6Claude S. George, Jr., The History of Management Thought
Mary Parker Follett

Mary Parker Follett, a Radcliffe-educated writer and social critic, tried to create a management theory based on the idea that any useful society must recognize the motivations of individuals and groups. Drawing on her philosophy and social work experiences, she proposed a functional authority wherein workers would control their job areas. She perceived the key to good leadership as the ability of leaders to gain the best concepts of leaders and those being led.7

According to Getzels, "Mary Parker Follett was the first great exponent of the human relations point of view in administration."8 Her thought and work in the 1920's were very important in the effort to create a social philosophy of administration to fit the mood of the American people in the first half of the twentieth century. Her administrative philosophy integrated views of industrial and scientific management areas, individual and work relations psychology, political science, and public administration.9 One important quality of her administration was the treatment of administration as an art, a science, and an ethical practice with a proper balance of the three. It was Follett's view, in creating and maintaining effective administration,

7George, pp. 130-31.


that people could not be separated or divorced from the total environmental situation.\(^{10}\)

Follett was the great advocate of dynamic, harmonious human relations who viewed coordination as the key to organizational effectiveness. There were four basic principles involved in this.

1. Coordination by direct contact of the people concerned. There should be horizontal control through relations among departments, not vertical control through one person.

2. Coordination in the early stages. Direct contact was to begin while policy was being formed, not after its formation, when only compliance remained.

3. Coordination as the reciprocal relation of all factors in a situation. This was Follett's control principle, coordination of all elements of the operation.

4. Coordination as a continuous process.\(^{11}\)

Though Follett's studies and work provided the foundation for Human Relations, the research of Elton Mayo probably did more to popularize Human Relations. Concern for workers' human desires in organizational settings came into vogue because of Mayo.

**Elton Mayo and The Hawthorne Studies**

The work of Elton Mayo, a Harvard University professor, was mainly experimental rather than theoretical. Mayo, Harvard Business School colleague of researcher F. J. Roethlisberger, directed the


\(^{11}\) Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 132.
well-known Hawthorne Plant experiments in the latter 1920's and early 1930's. Mayo, who was head of the Department of Industrial Relations Research at the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard, cooperated with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences from November, 1924, until April, 1927. Professor C. E. Turner, Department of Public Health, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, worked with Mayo in the earlier phases of the Hawthorne research. Professor T. N. Whitehead, with his statistical analysis of test data, and Professor W. L. Warner, who analyzed the social structure of industry, were valuable contributors to Mayo's efforts.\footnote{William J. Dickson, The Encyclopedia of Management, ed. Carl Heyel (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1973), p. 299.}

The main reason for the Hawthorne Plant Studies was to check for possible effects of better plant illumination on worker production.\footnote{Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962), p. 89.} The researchers developed working communications with the women employees in the experimental group who were encouraged to take part in the experiments. These workers were told of any experimental change and convinced of its value. Regardless of the type and amount of work environment manipulation--rest breaks, incentives, or altered conditions of work--workers in the experimental group increased production. This unexpected occurrence, increased productivity, appeared even when experimental group members were returned to their original undesirable work conditions. The researchers realized that the feeling of being
important and essential to the operation made experimental group workers produce more, regardless of physical conditions of work.\(^{14}\)

One could support the hypothesis that being friendly to all the workers and giving them a sense of partnership in all undertakings would produce more (electrical) relays, regardless of other conditions.\(^{15}\)

Eventually, management and the experimenters recognized the complexity of human motivation and that humans were not always subject to experimenter whim.\(^{16}\) The assumption of management that workers were disorganized rabble with each person acting in his own self-interest to the best of his ability was, refuted by the Hawthorne Studies. It appeared that good administration could be gained by showing workers their self-interests coincided with the goals of management.\(^{17}\) This view was consistent with Mayo's concept of the business as an integrated, self-contained social system.\(^{18}\)

Mayo's work called into question several prevailing assumptions relative to workers and work. He revealed that motivation involved more than just money, a rejection of the traditional "economic man" motivational view. The impact of individual attitudes as determiners of behavior was recognized. The studies clarified the importance of


\(^{16}\) Swartz, p. 429.


the supervisor's role in worker morale and production. Study conclusions showed the importance of group spirit and cooperation to organizational aims and worker satisfaction. Finally, Mayo's studies revealed the lack of systematic knowledge of work group structures and its effect on organizational goals.\(^19\)

The Hawthorne research may be viewed in perspective because of the passing of time. First, the Human Relations approach to administration gained popularity in industry, particularly in the period after World War II. At its start, Human Relations theorists stressed first-hand, knowledgeable understanding of the human enterprise under the supervisor's direction and responsibility. Human Relations theorists encouraged awareness of and provision of the expression of worker attitudes and feelings. Consideration for workers caused them to experience a sense of belonging as organization members. This second practice lost favor with theorists because of its connotation of administrative laxness and "do-goodism"; Hawthorne study research had, in fact, suggested a hard-headed, factual administrative theory and practice.\(^20\)

The Hawthorne Studies contributed to personnel counseling which became popular after the Second World War. Personnel counseling precepts stressed the value of verbalizing problems and conflicts and cooperative relations within work groups.

Mayo pioneered in the area of industrial sociology. Some scholars charted the beginnings of this field to the descriptions


\(^20\)Dickson, p. 301.
of informal work groups given near the end of the Hawthorne research.

Much literature on small-group methods, implications, and research findings began with studies conducted near the end of the Hawthorne experiments.

The Hawthorne Studies greatly influenced the general conduct of industrial management. Hawthorne findings provided course content and research direction for many industrial departments in important institutions of higher learning to the present era.21

Fritz Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson

Roethlisberger and Dickson explained and clarified Elton Mayo's Hawthorne Plant research in their classic book, Management and The Worker, published in 1939.22 Their goal was the concise reporting of Mayo's work and its implications for management.

At the beginning of the Hawthorne Studies, the main experimental area was the possible relationship between work conditions and employee fatigue and monotony. Researchers believed that this knowledge could be gained from creating a unique testing environment. The effect of test variables such as hours of sleep, temperature, and humidity was to be measured. Most of the experimenters felt the answers would be found in a short time. Generally, the research raised more questions than answers. Mayo's findings demanded a restatement of some original questions and the formation of fresh ones. New hypotheses, and the

---

21Dickson, p. 301.

22Roethlisberger and Dickson, Management and The Worker.
modifying or discarding of old methods and assumptions, became necessary.\textsuperscript{23}

Roethlisberger and Dickson's aims in reporting the Western Electric or Hawthorne Studies were varied: to clearly report the studies; to impartially assess the contributions of study participants; to protect worker-management interests; and to give the reason for the studies--the desire of management to better understand human motivation and conduct, its own as well as the workers'.\textsuperscript{24}

In *Management and The Worker*, Roethlisberger and Dickson used the following format. Part I was an account of experiments in worker efficiency and work conditions, the "test room methods" phase. Part II was a record of interviews with twenty thousand employees from all plant work areas to identify parts of the work environment liked and disliked. Part III was an analysis of Part II comments and an hypothesis to explain the reasons for worker dissatisfaction. Part IV was a record of a study of fourteen workers when the Part II interviews were strengthened by direct observation.\textsuperscript{25}

In generalizing their experiences for personnel administration, Roethlisberger and Dickson agreed that adequate administration must fulfill two conditions: (1) Administrators, those in supervisory positions, and other organizational officials, were to become expert at diagnosis of worker Human Relations. (2) Human Relations skills were to be refined, taught, and transmitted to others. By using

\textsuperscript{23}Roethlisberger and Dickson, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{24}Roethlisberger and Dickson, p. 3-5.

\textsuperscript{25}Roethlisberger and Dickson, p. 3-5.
Human Relations skills, managers should become committed to the continuous study of human behavior, individual and group, and should form administrative policy of their learning.26

The Iowa Child Welfare Station Study

The Human Relations Movement was influenced possibly more by research in an area other than administration than by the Hawthorne Plant Studies. Research was conducted at the Child Welfare Station at the University of Iowa in 1938, which recorded reactions of children to different leadership types--democratic, authoritative, and laissez-faire, a situation in which little direction was provided.

The main experimentation, directed by Lewin, Lippitt, and White,27 involved children eleven years old, in groups of five, who met with teachers after school and engaged in stimulating activities such as carpentry, soap carving, or painting. The sole experimental manipulative factor was leadership style; other experimental elements were stabilized as much as possible. Trained observers continually noted behaviors of the children.28

The following conclusions were drawn from the Iowa Child Welfare Station Study.

1. Laissez-faire group results were different from those of groups with democratic leadership. Members of laissez-faire groups

26Roethlisberger and Dickson, p. 604.


did work of inferior quality, and less of it. Members of laissez-
faire groups expressed preferences for democratic leaders.

2. Work motivation and originality were greater in groups
with democratic leaders, but the amount of work completed was greater
in groups having autocratic leaders.

3. Autocratic leaders generated noticeable hostility and
aggression, including scapegoating.

4. Autocratic leaders created subsurface hostility, a
"hidden agenda." Some group members quit, and more discontent was
verbalized than in groups with democratic leaders. Nineteen of
twenty male members interviewed preferred democratic leaders.

5. Autocratic leaders caused more dependency and less
individuality than democratic leaders. Under autocratic leaders,
individual differences in task performance decreased.

6. In groups with democratic leaders, there was more
cooperation and friendliness. Spontaneously created subgroups were
larger, and group property was more readily shared. 29

... no other psychological experiment so rapidly
and completely captured the imagination of both students
and practitioners of administration, perhaps especially
educational administration. 30

As a result of the Iowa Child Welfare Station Study, democratic
leadership and Human Relations received favorable notice, and "group
dynamics" was begun, grounded in administrative language and practice.

29White and Lippitt, p. 38.

30Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, Educational Administration
As A Social Process, p. 40.
Yauch, author of one of many books advocating democratic administration, concluded:

Apparently, in terms of the environment in which individuals work, it is better to let individuals make their own choices, whether leadership is present or not, than it is to try to control the lives of others.\textsuperscript{31}

The following principles which applied to school administration grew out of the Iowa Child Welfare Station Study:

1. Democracy is primarily concerned with human relations; a matter of great import is the principal's individual and collective relations with teachers.

2. Simple human relations difficulties nearly always have wider application and frames of reference.

3. The most natural and efficient unit of democratic action is the single-school faculty.

4. Principals are in the best positions to lead faculties in efforts to provide themselves with democratic experiences.

5. The faculty is a complicated social group requiring expert handling to gain its own best desires.

6. The principal's main responsibility is facilitation of interaction of faculty for maximal teacher benefit.

7. All those affected by decisions should have a voice in the determination of their form and character.\textsuperscript{32}

The outcomes of the Iowa Child Welfare Study were very different from Taylor's efficiency studies and his scientific-methods-of-work


\textsuperscript{32}Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 39.
principle. The idea that management should assume responsibility for work methods, discover by use of science better ways of doing work, and train workers accordingly, was effectively refuted by the Child Welfare Study. The Iowa Child Welfare Study gave impetus to the Human Relations approach to administration, especially in the Post-1950's era. Studies of leadership types and qualities and group approaches to work and problem solving were encouraged.

SUMMARY

The desire for knowledge of the effects of human behaviors on factory production gave rise to the Human Relations Movement. Human Relations theorists were preoccupied with workers' needs and attitudes as well as the qualities of work environments.

Mary Parker Follett, an author and social observer, was the first powerful advocate of Human Relations practices for industry. She proposed research into the complex nature of workers' motivations, and worker autonomy in work areas. Follett, who conceived of administration as a high ethical art and science, identified precise, continuous coordination of the total human and material enterprise as the pivotal element in productive success.

Elton Mayo's Hawthorne Plant research focused the attention of the leaders of industry on Human Relations concerns and insights. He observed that simply noticing workers and treating them as humans brought significant productive gains. His Hawthorne research

---

33 Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 39.
demonstrated the wisdom of meaningfully involving workers in organizational decisionmaking.

Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson explained and popularized Mayo's Hawthorne Plant findings. At the conclusion of their examination of Mayo's work, Roethlisberger and Dickson agreed that administrators should cultivate and refine Human Relations skills and teach them to others in supervisory or administrative positions.

The Iowa Child Welfare Station Study, directed by psychologist Kurt Lewin, pointed to the advantages of democratic leadership in group problemsolving. These studies led to research into the components of effective leadership as well as group dynamics.

Introduction to Figure 5

Figure 5 is a brief presentation of the Human Relations era extending roughly from 1935 until the 1950's. Some administrative concepts of theorists Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, and Kurt Lewin are detailed in the order of their appearance in Chapter 4. An examination of Figure 5 should help the reader to better conceptualize the major components of human Relations theories from Follett's germinal 1920's precepts through Lewin's leadership research near the beginning of the behavioral era.

Introduction to Figure 6

Figure 6 is a chart-comparison of some Human Relations theories considered useful by Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, and Kurt Lewin. These theorists and the administrative
concepts to which they adhered are presented in a manner consistent with their appearances in Chapter 6, COMPARISONS AND CONTRASTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES.

The aim of Figure 6 is to help the reader visualize and bear in mind some administrative concepts which Follett, Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, and Lewin stressed. An examination of Figure 6 should reveal that the main Human Relations interest was the establishment of work climates which met workers' elementary and higher self-development drives. Figure 6 was intended to furnish a broad overview of the chapter contents.

Figure 6 shows some commonalities and divergencies in theories used by Human Relations practitioners Kurt Lewin, Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson, and Mary Parker Follett to promote firm and worker needs. The primary concern of Human Relations was theorists' creation of worker-centered work settings and conditions of work, whereas the primary interest in Scientific Management has been the mechanistic aspects of production.

Lewin, Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, and Mary Parker Follett used the following administrative and managerial practices to satisfy the needs of workers and the firm: studies of worker-work interdependencies; studies of democratic supervision and personnel relationships; concern for workers as people; studies of informal firm structures; creation and continuance of vigorous, creative work areas; recognition of the influence of workers' feelings on organizational conduct; recognition of the influence of administrators on morale and production; creation of harmonious, cooperative work relationships;
development of desirable work environments; and the satisfaction of primary and higher, more complex needs of workers.

Lewin, Mayo, and Follett--but not Roethlisberger and Dickson--paid particular attention to studies of worker morale and work group dynamics. Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, and Follett--but not Lewin--emphasized the importance of recognition of changeability of worker attitudes, the importance of group cohesion, and the meeting of workers' self-development drives.

Mayo and Roethlisberger and Dickson--but not Lewin or Follett--placed special emphasis on recognition of the limits of administrative control, frequent worker-manager consultations, recognition of the importance of teamwork, job satisfactions, and informal work groups, administrative expertise in Human Relations diagnostic techniques, and continual study and research into workers' organizational behavior.

Follett--but not Lewin, Mayo, or Roethlisberger and Dickson--recognized psychological and social barriers to organizational change and stressed equity, status, and opportunities for workers in work settings. Follett and Mayo recognized the complex nature of motivation, and Lewin conducted extensive research into the effects on workers of leadership types and styles.

Though Lewin, Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, and Follett used more of the same than different administrative concepts, their primary goal was satisfaction of workers' human interests and concerns in organizational settings. Unlike Scientific Management, Human Relations theorists' guiding thesis was meeting workers' desires; productive efficiency was an outgrowth of this--and secondary to it.
Kurt Lewin
Gave impetus to study of group dynamics. Popularized democratic leadership and Human Relations ideas.

Fritz Roethlisberger and William Dickson
Amplified and clarified Mayo's research. Said administrators should be expert at diagnosis of human relations and should constantly study human behaviors.

Elton Mayo
Popularized Human Relations ideas and practices. Stated "Hawthorne Effect"--that mere observation increased productivity of workers.

Mary Parker Follett
First notable Human Relations advocate. Favored total enterprise coordination, and a worker-controlled work environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1920's</th>
<th>1924-1927</th>
<th>1942</th>
<th>1938</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FIGURE 5
HUMAN RELATIONS THEORIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Lewin</th>
<th>Mayo</th>
<th>Dickson</th>
<th>Follett</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study of worker-work interdependence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies of worker morale and work group dynamics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies of democratic supervision and personnel relations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for workers as people</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies of informal firm structures</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of limits of administrative control</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of changeability of worker attitudes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent worker-manager consultations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of psychological-social barriers to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation and continuance of a vigorous creative work setting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of complex nature of motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the influence of workers' feelings on conduct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of influence of administrators on morale and production</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the importance of teamwork, job satisfaction, and informal work groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favored administrators becoming expert in human relations diagnostic techniques</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continual study and research into worker organizational conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research into leadership types</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of importance of group cohesion and meeting workers' self-development drives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on worker equity, status, and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of harmonious, cooperative work relationships</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of desirable work environments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting workers' primary and higher human needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X denotes compliance of theorist with concept.

FIGURE 6

COMPARISONS OF HUMAN RELATIONS THEORIES
Chapter 5

POST-1950'S ADMINISTRATIVE THEORY

INTRODUCTION

Behavioral administrative theory became current around 1950, but it originated in 1938 with Chester Barnard's book *The Functions of The Executive*. In this important work, Barnard combined with his own ideas much administrative theory which had appeared since Woodrow Wilson's 1887 essay on administration. Barnard's ideas ushered in an era of administration considered modern because he anticipated so much behavioral administration. He inspired students of administration to greater efforts toward the development of an administration based on scientific inquiry and practice.

The "new" in behavioral administrative theory was a synthesis of earlier concepts from Scientific Management and Human Relations. In the post-World War II period, many new administrative areas were explored by behavioral scientists through research into human behaviors.

---


4Owens, p. 11.
in organizations. This "new" administrative theory emphasized improved administrative training in the understanding of organizations and greater involvement of administrators in organizational settings.

Administrative changes in the postwar era followed the formation of educational conferences such as the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), and the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (CPEA). The NCPEA, founded in August, 1947, was initially concerned with educational leadership, a fresh topic for educators in 1947. The AASA, representing mainly the professional school superintendency, was concerned with the creation of better administrative higher education preparatory curricula. The CPEA leaders became involved in experiments and innovations leading to the current behavioral thrust in educational administration. For more than twenty-five years before 1947, Kellogg Foundation-sponsored community health projects had been concerned with the improvement of public schools.

National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration

An outgrowth of the first NCPEA conference in 1947 was a report titled Educational Leaders: Their Function and Preparation. Over the years, the NCPEA conferees exhibited these qualities: little formal "busywork," useful and fruitful work sessions, and chances for contact between educational professors and instructors of other disciplines such as economics, psychology, sociology, business and industry, and

---

5Owens, p. 11. 6Owens, p. 12. 7Owens, pp. 16-19.
public administration. Each year of its existence, NCPEA leaders followed a February planning period with a week-long August conference. NCPEA conferences consisted mainly of work meetings where members tried to discover ways to improve educational administration and university curricula.®

American Association of School Administrators

In the 1950's, members of the American Association of School Administrators made worthwhile contributions to educational administration. Writers in the 1955 *AASA Yearbook* analyzed the administrative process. The administrative functions identified by these AASA scholars and writers are listed below:

1. **Planning**, or the effort to control the direction of objectives. This was to be done through decisions based on careful estimation of the results of possible actions.

2. **Allocation**, or getting and allotting materials and human resources in a manner compatible with the operational plan.

3. **Stimulation**, or behavioral motivation toward desired goals.

4. **Coordination**, or integration of groups and operations into purposeful work patterns.

5. **Evaluation**, or constant examination of effects of performance of the other functions listed above.®

---

®Owens, pp. 16-19.

Members of the AASA recognized the value of strong leaders who could create organizational climates of work conducive to member growth and development. Much AASA study concerned leader emergence from within groups, enhancing the opportunity for shared responsibilities of group members.  

In 1968, AASA leaders created an Academy for School Executives, a "war-college" approach to in-service education for practicing administrators. The Academy offered practical workshops and seminars regionally to keep public administrators, particularly superintendents, abreast of the latest trends in administration. Many Academy leaders were the vanguard of the 1950's "new movement" in administration. These Academy for School Executive alumni brought an interdisciplinary and behavioral science view to administration.  

The CPEA and the Kellogg Foundation  

The Kellogg Foundations members provided help for over 1,500 projects and programs since 1930. The Foundation, created June 21, 1930, by W. K. Kellogg, was "dedicated to improving the health, happiness, and well-being of children and youth, without discrimination as to race, creed, or geographic distribution."  

---  

11 Owens, p. 18.  
12 The First Twenty-Five Years (Battle Creek, Michigan: W. K. Kellogg Foundation), n.d.  
13 The First Twenty-Five Years.
Kellogg, inspired to endow the foundation by his own lack of educational opportunities, believed that the one sure way generations could advance steadily was through improved educational chances for the young. By the mid-1950's, the Foundation had been committed to improving education by sponsoring the CPEA and the regional experimentation which followed.

The Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, which originated in 1950, was financed by the Kellogg Foundation. The American Association of School Administration, the National Association of County and Rural Superintendents, and the Council of Chief State School Officers sponsored, with the aid of Kellogg monies, five national exploratory regional meetings. The goal of these organizations was the betterment of educational administration, specifically the school superintendency. The CPEA, an innovative organization, grew out of these regional meetings. Each of eight regionally-based university CPEA centers carried forward its part of the CPEA project independently, though interchange of ideas among centers did exist. The general aims of the eight CPEA centers are listed below.

1. Better preservice administrative preparation programs and in-service training of field administrators.

2. Application of a social science-based interdisciplinary approach to major social problems.

3. Provision of research conclusions of field administrators.

4. Discovery of new knowledge of education and administration.

---

14 The First Twenty-Five Years.

15 Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 18.
5. Continuation of regional cooperation and communication among institutions of higher learning and between those institutions and agencies involved with educational administration.\textsuperscript{16}

At the start, CPEA leaders emphasized the improvement of higher education administration curricula. Class times of varied lengths, novel instructional techniques, and new teaching "tools" were discovered. Some CPEA center officials featured interdisciplinary curricula and seminars, while others used internships and better teaching to improve administration.\textsuperscript{17}

\textbf{Chester I. Barnard}

Chester I. Barnard, at one time President of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Company and a highly successful corporation executive, was not an educator or an academically trained theorist. Yet his famous book, \textit{The Functions of The Executive},\textsuperscript{18} may have contained more insights into the nature of administration than any other writing.\textsuperscript{19} According to George, Barnard's theories probably affected management and organization more profoundly than those of any other contributor.\textsuperscript{20}

\begin{flushright}

17Owens, p. 20.

18Barnard, \textit{The Functions of The Executive}.


\end{flushright}
Barnard attended Mt. Hermon Academy and in 1906 enrolled at Harvard University which he left three years later without graduating. In June, 1909, he joined the American Telephone and Telegraph Company as translator-engineer. He was employed in 1922 at Pennsylvania Bell Telephone Company where he first worked as a manager. From the early 1930's until just before his death in 1961, he was a student of contemporary management. This businessman was, at different times, president of the Bach Society of New Jersey, a famous lecturer, and a skilled classical pianist and improvisor.21

Barnard, whose thinking was influenced by Follett, Mayo, and Sheldon, logically analyzed organizational structures and adapted sociological concepts to management. In *The Functions of The Executive*, 22 he produced a theory of cooperation and organization and described the executive process. The formal organization was described as "that kind of cooperation among men that is conscious, deliberate, and purposeful."23 He felt that the executive function was the most important element in administration. His major thesis was that the organization was a *system of consciously coordinated activities, in which the executive is the most strategic factor*.24 Executives were vitally important to organizations because of their three major functions:

1. To provide a communications system for the organization.

2. To see that proper efforts were made for operation of the system.

---

21 George, p. 132.

22 Barnard.

23 Barnard.

24 George, p. 133.
3. To form and define system objectives.\textsuperscript{25}

Barnard researched management deeply, identifying forces at work and worker interactions. His studies began with the individual, moved to corporate organizations, and ended with the executive function.\textsuperscript{26}

Barnard worked extensively with organizational status systems which appeared because of different needs, capacities, and abilities in individuals. His varying of the difficulties and importance of tasks, desire for formal status as a social tool, and security needs influenced the development of social systems in organizations.\textsuperscript{27}

Barnard believed it was impossible to understand the formal organization without comprehension of its informal societies. A coincidence of the purposes of the formal and informal organizations was viewed as beneficial to the formal organization. This was so because informal organizations facilitated communications, provided group cohesion, and created feelings of member self-respect and self-worth. If, on the other hand, the informal organization lacked harmony, the entire organization would suffer. A continual creative balancing of human and organizational needs was required if organizational goals were to be realized.\textsuperscript{28}

Barnard contended that organizational cooperation depended on efficiency and effectiveness. Efficiency was defined as satisfaction

\textsuperscript{25}George, p. 133.  \textsuperscript{26}George, p. 133.


\textsuperscript{28}Barnard, p. 122.
of individual motives and needs, whereas effectiveness was conceived as the gaining of the cooperative goal or purpose. The test of effectiveness was the accomplishment of measurable objectives, whereas the test of efficiency was the gaining of individuals' cooperation. Effectiveness was designated as system-oriented and essential to the attainment of organizational goals. Efficiency was represented as person-oriented and necessary to worker satisfactions gained from organizational membership. This distinction between efficiency and effectiveness was important because it clarified the relationship of job satisfaction and goal attainment.

Material rewards were, according to Barnard, effective worker motivators only to a certain extent. Then, (1) the chance to distinguish oneself, (2) power acquisition, (3) favorable work conditions, (4) pride in workmanship, and (5) altruism ascended in importance as work incentives. Not all workers were repeatedly motivated or moved by identical stimuli. Most organizations were probably deficient in providing basic or primary incentives, and few, if any, offered all the incentives which motivated workers. As a result, organizations were forced to use persuasion, rather than coercion, to gain their goals.

---

30Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, p. 74.
Barnard's research and organizational analyses were broader and more inclusive than those of Scientific Management. His writings were particularly useful in alerting administrators and managers to problems not mentioned by the Scientific Management theorists. Ultimately, he perceived leadership and careful leader selection as the crucial factors in organizational effectiveness and efficiency.\(^{33}\)

**Kurt Lewin**

Kurt Lewin, associated with Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, and the Hawthorne Plant research, \(^{34}\) reported with Lippitt and White in 1939 an important study in the *Journal of Social Psychology*.\(^{35}\) Lewin, Lippitt, and White (The Iowa Child Welfare Station Study mentioned earlier) gave results of a study of reactions of boys to leadership types--democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire, a condition of minimal control. Not surprisingly, most of the boys preferred democratic leadership.\(^{36}\)

The idea of "democratic leadership" became popular in education because of these studies. Much educational leadership was judged for years as "democratic," thus desirable, or "autocratic" or "laissez-faire" and thus undesirable, because of these experiments.\(^{37}\) Regrettably, the components of "democratic leadership" were never

---

\(^{33}\) Dale, p. 179.

\(^{34}\) Owens, *Organizational Behavior in Schools*, p. 86.


\(^{36}\) Owens, p. 125.

\(^{37}\) Owens, p. 125.
specified, and eventually the term gained a negative connotation because many educators regarded it as a panacea. Cynicism concerning "democratic leadership" became commonplace, perhaps the rule, among administrators and professors to the present era.

Coch and French carried out the Harwood Manufacturing Plant Experiments largely because of the influence of Kurt Lewin. Harwood Plant managers enlightened garment producers, furnished background music, generally positive working conditions, worker recreation, and other employee benefits as part of a desirable work environment. As the Harwood managers introduced production innovations to remain competitive, work group members resisted change, and the troubleshooter experimenters were contacted. The workers were divided into three experimental groups, with the first group members receiving only the most brief and routine mention of production change. Members of the second group were told of change, why it was needed, and all that was involved in it. Group two workers were also asked to select their worker representative to help develop a job retraining program. Workers in the third experimental group were treated as were those

---


39 Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 126.

of group two except that all workers in group three helped plan the new jobs and develop the plan for retraining. ⁴¹

Production in group one fell, while production in groups two and three gained about the same degree. Additionally, job absenteeism, quitting the job, and worker grievances rose in group one but were practically nonexistent in the other two groups. At the end of about two and one-half months, a second experimental phase was introduced, a time-lapse which added validity to the study. Group one workers were treated as were those of group three, with the same generally positive results. Since the only identifiable experimental variable was the part group members played in deciding their destinies, the experimenters concluded that the amount of worker involvement in organizational decisionmaking affected production and the attitude of workers. ⁴²

The Harwood Manufacturing Plant Study researchers agreed generally with those in other organizations, including schools. ⁴³ Researchers findings on effects of teacher involvement in decisionmaking shows that the length and nature of teacher participation affects work satisfaction and teacher attitude toward principals. ⁴⁴

Kurt Lewin proposed a theory of organizational interpersonal behavior usually associated with "group dynamics." He assumed that

⁴¹Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 107.
⁴²Owens, p. 107.
⁴⁴Owens, p. 108.
the most important influences on human behavior were individual and group characteristics and cultural norms. This combination created the environment within which people behaved. Those wishing to change human behavior must then realize the necessity for group and cultural support. For the proposed change and that, without this support, regression and hindrance to change would occur.  

Herbert A. Simon

Herbert A. Simon, a university professor with training in psychology, political science, and business administration, produced the important book, Administrative Behavior, in 1945. Publication of this book ushered in a new era of administrative study.

In the 1940's and the postwar era, behavioral scientists were increasingly attracted to the challenging study of educational administration. Entire new areas in administrative theory were explored as scholars studied human interactions in organizations. Psychologists, sociologists, and political scientists used specialized knowledge, research methods, and theoretical concepts in studying administrative theory. This new behavioral theory concerned the administrator who was deeply involved with workers' actions in organizations.

---

45 Owens, p. 87.
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Simon claimed he wrote *Administrative Behavior* to create the necessary tools, concepts, and vocabulary for describing an organization. In the book, Simon clarified terms such as "decisionmaking," rational behavior," and "organization," while depending on political scientists, economists, psychologists, and sociologists for development of his concepts. He used the behavioral sciences extensively in analyzing organizations and the behaviors of people in them.

Simon revised and extended the theories of Chester Barnard in several important ways. According to Simon, the organization was, as Barnard had said, a "complex pattern of communications and other relations in a group of human beings." Organizational patterns affected goals, attitudes, and information flow of members, and shaped expectations of acts within the firm. The organization was viewed as the relationship patterns among imperfect members with all trying to be as rational as possible within limits imposed by the environment and themselves. He searched, as did Barnard, for reasonable solutions to organizational problems which would insure survival of the firm. He felt that the willingness of members to serve, the glue holding the

---
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organization together, depended on the net positive inducements offered members by the organization. 54

Simon perceived that the organization was an imperfect decision-making machine which was continually forced to choose from alternatives without realizing the consequences of choices. It was evident that administrators could not always make correct choices. They should, therefore, seek behavioral patterns conducive to satisfactory worker-firm conclusions. 55

Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick

Gulick and Urwick were outstanding among modern structuralist administrative scholars and students who attempted to synthesize or combine Scientific Management concepts for greater organizational efficiency. 56 They categorized organizational elements according to use or function, while creating formal charts which showed precise relationships of organizational divisions and offices. Their Papers on The Science of Administration, published in 1937, was one reason their ideas were well known after World War II. 57 They popularized command unity, line and staff, and span of control. Span of control meant

56 Owens, p. 9.
administrative efficiency increased when the span of control of a leader was confined to not more than five or six subordinates whose work interlocks.  

Gulick and Urwick believed that wise delegation of responsibility was essential to administrative and organizational success. Of this, Gulick wrote: "Work division is the foundation of organization; indeed, the reason for organization."  

Unity of command, the superior's right of sole influence over subordinates, was necessary to organizational success. The assurance of command unity was a constant concern of the able administrator. In creating coordination within organizations, administrators were often tempted to have more than one boss for work having more than one relationship. Strict adherence to unity of command helped managers avoid confusion, waste, and inefficiency.  

Conformity to line and staff organization was essential to administrative success. Line officers were those having decision-making authority, the right to act to get the job done, and authority to control subordinates. Staff officials' chief functions were to help line officers decide actions and to coordinate all efforts necessary for success. Traditional administrative policymakers

---
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dictated that those performing administrative functions were either line or staff officers. Public school supervisors were usually designated as staff officers.62

Gulick and Urwick felt that planning and the outlining of goals and methods of attaining them were basic to administrative and organizational success. Organizing the creation of formal authorities through which work subdivisions flowed was the second part of their administration. Staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting were the other five steps in the process. Gulick and Urwick acknowledged that their administrative scheme was a variant of Henri Fayol's functional analysis administration.63

Dale and Urwick knew, though it definitely increased efficiency, that specialization presented administrators with unique problems.64 Their trend toward increased task specialization generated new difficulties of coordination and organization. Successful leadership of workers in specialized areas, and proper provision for human interactions and needs in the organization, demanded that managers innovate and exercise initiative.65


63Gulick and Urwick, p. 13.


65Dale and Urwick, p. 9.
Leadership roles in group settings have been exhaustively investigated in numerous sociological studies. Many such studies have pictured leadership as interactive among group members, particularly between leaders and members. The point of departure in many of these studies was inherent group differences. John K. Hemphill described group differences in terms of observable data such as size, stability, homogeneity, and flexibility. He identified and added two more group qualities or dimensions, viscosity and hedonic tone. Viscosity was a measure of group cohesion, and hedonic tone was satisfaction which workers experienced from group membership. Researchers in situational leadership factors, group decisionmaking, and work groups provided insights into the nature and operation of groups.

After characterizing many work groups, Hemphill and Westie identified several dimensions influencing group behavior. These qualities were, excluding the six named above, control, autonomy, intimacy, potency (meeting member needs), polarization, and permeability (readiness to admit new members).

Hemphill concluded there was no such thing as the ultimate or absolute leader because leaders were constrained to accommodate to

66Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 119.

67John K. Hemphill, Situational Factors in Leadership (Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, The Ohio State University, 1949), pp. 30-34.

the characteristics of their different groups. Demands on leaders were then as diverse and individualistic as the people in groups. Group dynamics could be understood only within the contexts of group social settings. Hemphill was, therefore, a supporter of a situational approach to leadership and group behavior.69

Talcott Parsons

Parsons developed a general theoretical framework for the study of organizational social systems.70 He believed that all healthy organizations solved four basic problems: (1) adaptation: system accommodation to environmental demands; (2) goal attainment: setting objectives and gathering materials to meet them; (3) integration: coordination of system units into one entity; and, (4) latency: continued maintenance of system motivation and cultural patterns.71 His social systems model was general enough to apply to varied social systems. He recognized the formal organization as a modern means of mobilizing power for gaining objectives.72

Of the three systems levels in organizations named by Parsons—the technical, institutional, and managerial—actions directing

69Hemphill, p. 58.


teachers toward goal attainment were considered managerial.73

Raising money for schools from the community at large exemplified the institutional level. He said that traditional administrative study had placed excessive emphasis on the managerial and institutional levels.

Parsons believed that the greatest incentive toward efficient job performance was job satisfaction. In writing of this, he identified five components of job satisfaction: self-respect, recognition, want satisfaction, pleasure, and affection.74

Parsons viewed power as important and central to organizational goals. He believed the chief phenomenon of organizations to be power mobilization for the attainment of their goals.75

Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba

Social systems theory is used to study factors influencing human conduct in organizations. Getzels and Guba described organizations as social systems with a hierarchy of roles.76 For each role structure, principal, teacher, or custodian, certain behaviors were


expected. For example, each member of the organizational social
system would expect a certain behavioral role of the school
principal. 77

According to the Getzels-Guba model, there were two major
influences on organizational behavior—personal and organizational
dimensions. Their model is illustrated below. 78

[Diagram of two models: Organizational (Nomothetic) Dimension and Personal (Idiographic) Dimension]

When viewed as suggested by the model, it became clear that
human acts in the organization originated in both the personal and
organizational dimensions. Amount of personal or organizational
interaction depended largely on role, type of organization, and firm
climate. 79

Getzels and Guba pointed out that organizational roles were
played by individuals in highly individualistic ways. Each person
assuming a role imprinted it with his distinctive character, qualities
of personality, and behaviors; no two persons fulfilled roles

77 Halpin, p. 156.
78 Halpin, p. 156.
79 Halpin, p. 156.
identically. Comprehension of worker organizational conduct was insufficient if only role expectations were understood. Characteristics and needs of persons who played roles called for continual evaluation. Correct assessment and evaluation of organizational behavior included understanding of idiographic (personal aspect) and organizational (nomothetic aspect) behavioral dimensions. Sociological and psychological aspects of behavior must be accurately appraised if administrators were to comprehend human motivation in organizations.80

Abraham Maslow

Abraham Maslow suggested that the driving force which caused people to join, remain with, and work for fulfillment of organizational goals was a hierarchy of needs.81 Maslow, a distinguished Brandeis University psychologist, created a human needs pyramid to explain human motivation. His system, while integrating a common-sense approach, established an operational base for administrative behavior. His human needs arrangement differed from others because motivation was not seen as a set of independent drives. He examined each human need as it concerned other needs, an interactive concept, and arranged it in a hierarchy of importance.82

---
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Maslow's hierarchy possessed five needs levels given below.  

1. Physical or bodily needs, food, shelter, and other survival necessities.

2. Safety needs, freedom from fear, danger, and deprivation.

3. Social needs such as love and friendship.


5. Achievement or self-actualization needs such as opportunities to grow and develop on the job.

Needs in the five hierarchy levels were related by description and importance. The most pressing need of an individual--food, for example--monopolized the person's attention to the exclusion of other needs. When the immediate need for food was met, the next set of hierarchy needs dominated the person's attention. According to Maslow, satisfied or met needs did not motivate. It was only after people felt that their physical needs had been met, and experienced environmental security and warmth of personal association with others, that they became concerned with self-actualization--the development to high levels of their talents, skills, and abilities.

---
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Frederick Herzberg

Frederick Herzberg, a psychologist, proposed a controversial yet much studied explanation for job satisfaction. When experimenters used methods resembling Herzberg's, their conclusions generally supported his ideas, but when questionnaires and other so-called "objective" measures were used, Herzberg's thesis was usually refuted.88

He produced a dual-factor motivational and job satisfaction theory which grew out of a study of two hundred accountants and engineers. His hypothesis was that certain factors were job satisfiers when present but not job dissatisfiers if absent, other factors producing dissatisfaction, when eliminated, did not produce job satisfaction.89 Experimental subjects were asked to recall a time when they felt very positively toward the job. The experimenters questioned the subjects to identify factors responsible for these positive worker attitudes and to identify effects on job performance. Identical questioning was used in a second interview, but workers were asked to recall a time when their feelings toward the job were highly negative.90

Herzberg developed special interest in analyzing factors producing job satisfaction and dissatisfaction to increase his knowledge of worker motivation. Because his research findings showed job satisfiers motivated most workers toward increased efforts, he

---
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inferred that absence of dissatisfiers produced no motivational effect. He concluded that workers of varied occupations under age twenty were reasonably well satisfied with their jobs whereas great job dissatisfaction was shown by workers from ages twenty to twenty-nine.91 Nancy Morse observed, "in general, the shorter the time the employee has been with the company the more satisfied he is with his salary and his progress in it."92

Herzberg's thesis, which appeared about twelve years after Maslow's needs hierarchy, appealed to leaders of many American corporations.93 To this theorist, there were two fundamental views of man, "the human animal has two categories of needs."94 One needs category included primary animal needs, safety, pain avoidance, and the like.95 The other more complex needs group concerned "man's compelling urge to realize his own potentiality by continuous psychological growth."96 Herzberg believed that healthy persons looked for responsibilities, developed commitments, and established challenges.97

---
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Griffiths was concerned about "the theory problem," the fact so few public school administrators used theory. He felt in 1949 that educational administration was undergoing great and drastic changes. Before 1950, administration was well-defined with little controversy existing concerning its content and substance. Administration textbooks generally resembled Moehlman's and were, in fact, frequently validated by comparison with it. In the 1950's, texts of newer viewpoint were characterized by searches for the content and the theory trying administration together. Interest in administrative theory was relatively new in the 1950's, though there had been national conferences of administrators and writings on theory since about 1946.

Griffiths was convinced that one reason for neglect of theory in the public schools was lack of comprehension of its administrative implications. He realized, though theory could be good or bad, that useful theory was a rarity. Useful theory was more than common-sense rules of thumb; nor was it just rules applied to problems as they appeared. Effective, practical theory was comprised of theory subject matter making possible precise predictions in

---
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accordance with established criteria. Sound theory, a reliable guide
to action, was a definite aid to educators.102

Griffiths theorized that the quality of firm social climates
was a key ingredient in success. He characterized open social systems
as maintaining themselves in steady states with constant ratios among
system components. He believed that open systems possessed enough
"dynamic equilibrium" to correct inherent imbalances. Continuous
feedback and smooth operation of open firm subsystems were reasons
for maintenance of steady states in open systems.103

Griffiths contended that the main responsibility of adminis­
trators was the creation and maintenance of an effective administrative
organization. He suggested the following steps in this process:

1. The purposes of the school should be clearly stated in
   operational terms.

2. The conceptual framework of the organization must be
   agreed upon.

3. Administrative functions essential to gaining stated
   objectives must be listed.

4. The current administrative structure must be evaluated
to determine which functions were being performed by whom.

102Daniel E. Griffiths, "Toward A Theory of Administrative
Behavior" in Administrative Behavior in Education, by Roald F.
Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, eds. (New York: Harper and Brothers,

103Daniel E. Griffiths, Organizing Schools for Effective
Education (Danville, Illinois: The Interstate Printers and Publishers,
5. An organizational plan must be created having compatibility with the organizational concept.

6. Administrative function must relate directly to administrative position.

7. Administrative job descriptions must be developed for administrative positions to which functions were given.

8. Administrative positions and job descriptions must relate to incumbent administrators.

9. A timetable must be developed to implement the organization. 104

Griffiths was convinced of the worth of scholarly study of administrative theory and its constructive, practical use in public schools. He felt strongly that, without theory, educators lacked a systematic plan and that duplication and inefficiency would inevitably accrue.

Paul R. Mort

Paul R. Mort and his students and colleagues at Columbia Teachers College conducted surveys while searching for a reason-based theory of educational administration. 105 He favored the dependability and practicality of theory while comparing actions divorced from it to the aimless movements of frightened animals. He felt that theory provided the most direct path to a goal. 106 In considering this,

104 Griffiths, p. 357.
105 Owens, p. 44.
Mort wrote, "theory is . . . the best and most accurate mental picture of how an organism works."\textsuperscript{107}

Mort, an advocate of necessary educational change, explained that typically fifteen years elapsed before needed changes reached three percent of school systems. Another twenty years ordinarily passed before the change spread over an area the size of an average state, and the national rate of spread was even slower.\textsuperscript{108} He perceived money as the key to this dilemma. Leaders of wealthier school systems were generally more progressive and quicker to examine and explore the newest practical developments. Mort theorized that adequate finances would provide the solution to many educational problems.\textsuperscript{109}

\underline{Andrew W. Halpin}

Andrew W. Halpin was concerned, as was Daniel E. Griffiths, with analyzing organizational systems and climates.\textsuperscript{110} He observed variations in social climates as he visited schools over the country. He wrote of school climates, "You don't have to be in a school very long before you feel the atmosphere of a place."\textsuperscript{111}
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Halpin preferred "open" school climates because they were high in teacher participation and creativity and low in dictatorial qualities.\textsuperscript{112} He recognized the intangible atmosphere or character of schools and realized there was frequently little outward, concrete evidence distinguishing them.\textsuperscript{113} Most evidence separating school climates came from observations of teacher behaviors. He theorized that administrative behavior, relatively democratic and informal, or primarily authoritative, set the organizational tone of schools. As Halpin summarized, "... personality is to the individual what Organizational Climate is to the Organization."\textsuperscript{114}

Halpin arbitrarily rated school atmospheres on a scale from "open" to "closed" while recognizing that few or none would be totally "open" or "closed." He maintained that a chief responsibility of school administrators was the fostering of "open" climates. He was, though, realistic enough to know that not all principals could achieve this, especially those in disturbed urban crisis areas requiring strong control for mere survival.\textsuperscript{115}

Halpin pointed out three difficulties which must be surmounted if effective theory for educational administration was to appear. First, the meaning of theory required clarification. Second, educational theorists were required to become less concerned with orderly

\textsuperscript{112}Owens, \textit{Organizational Behavior in Schools}, p. 190.

\textsuperscript{113}Owens, p. 167.

\textsuperscript{114}Halpin, \textit{Theory and Research in Administration}, p. 131.

\textsuperscript{115}Andrew W. Halpin, "Change and Organizational Climate," \textit{Ontario Journal of Educational Research}, VIII, No. 3 (Spring, 1966), 235.
classifications or taxonomies. Third, the precise domain of theory must be established.\(^{116}\)

Halpin, while believing that theory was evolutionary and developmental and not mass produced on demand, taught that theory appeared and developed in variant shapes and sizes. The shape or conformity of theory might vary; its postulates, constructs, and assumptions might be solid or molecular or narrow and specific. It was consequently not surprising that wonderment existed among administrators as to the area and dimensions of theory. Halpin showed that theories evolved at various rates and by many means. The crux of the theory problem was that theory had no common or standardized meaning for educators.\(^{117}\)

Chris Argyris

Chris Argyris, a researcher and practical experimenter in organizational aspects of industry and government, affirmed that the needs of individuals and organizations could not be entirely compatible.\(^{118}\) In his book, Personality and Organizations: The Conflict Between The System and The Individual,\(^{119}\) he stated that ways must be found to minimize conflicts between organizational members and firms. Creation of firm climates leading to quick, open resolution

---


\(^{117}\)Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, p. 7.

\(^{118}\)Owens, pp. 169-70.

of conflicts within organizations was suggested as a partial solution to the dilemma.  

Argyris pointed out that the first responsibility of administrators and other leaders was the creation and continuance of organizational rationality. One sure way to guarantee this was for administrators to make only rational demands of employees. Urwick, an early experimenter in organizational theory who described the property of intended organizational rationality, insisted that the development of formal organizations required objectivity. Builders of organizations should, wrote Urwick, proceed in as logical and detached a manner as possible. Task specialization, power emphasis, and conformity to organizational goals characterized organizational rationality. Four principles of Scientific Management containing rational emphases were given by Argyris in *Understanding Organizational Behavior.*

1. **Task (Work) Specialization.** Administrative and organizational efficiency would be raised and increased by assigning specialized tasks to workers possessing skills essential to the performance of these tasks.

2. **Chain of Command.** In keeping with the logic of task specialization, a new leadership function was created whose

---

120Owens, p. 130.


122Urwick, *The Elements of Administration*.

responsibilities would consist of controlling and coordinating relationships of organizational parts to insure that every part performed as well as possible. This scheme was founded on the assumption that administrative efficiency increased as organizational parts were hierarchically arranged so the part on top controlled the bottom part.

3. **Unity of Direction.** If the tasks of unit workers were to be specialized, the purpose of the unit must also be specialized. The unity of direction principle stated administrative efficiency improved if each unit had but one activity planned and directed by the administrative leader.

4. **Span of Control.** According to Argyris' control principle, efficiency of administration was enhanced by limitation of a leader's span of control to not more than five or six workers whose work interlocked. 

Argyris' organizational behavior theory focused on these assumptions: (1) Individuals possessed personalities and goals. (2) Organizations had needs and goals. (3) These two were incompatible in significant ways. It was his contention that organizational effectiveness depended on goal achievement, internal system maintenance, and system adaptation to the environment. He observed that efficient

---


organizations accomplished these three objectives at steady or increasing rates over time.  

Douglas M. McGregor

Douglas M. McGregor, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, led several groups of able researchers in the study of human problems in industry. McGregor and Arenberg collaborated in a pioneering study of human communications problems and worker satisfaction in industry. McGregor, a researcher who was concerned with attitude and perception and their effects on production, explained his idea of participative management in The Human Side of Enterprise. His administrative theory differed from prevailing theories of worker relationships. Concerning this, he wrote: "we require a different theory of the task of managing people based on more adequate assumptions about human nature and human motivation."

McGregor cited four crucial variables of administrative behavior in The Human Side of Enterprise: leader characteristics, leader attitude, group needs, and follower uniqueness. He viewed

---


127 Whyte, Organizational Behavior, Theory and Application, p. 9.


130 Knudson, Human Elements of Administration, p. 182.
leadership as complicated relationships among variables, not the exclusive domain of leaders. In situations involving leadership, organizational policy was set by the top firm personnel. After policy was solidified, organizational limitations restricted leader conduct, role, and action. Intervening variables such as top management changes, readjustments at lower levels, or external pressures such as market fluctuations, might cause changes in the philosophy and direction of the organization. When this happens, immediate redefinition of the leadership role is in order.\textsuperscript{131}

McGregor was best known for his Theory X and Theory Y, an effort to explain and clarify man's nature and motivation. Theory X and Theory Y are given below:

Three fundamental propositions were presented in Theory X.

1. Average humans possess hereditary aversions to work and will avoid it whenever possible.

2. Because people hate work, coercion, control, and threat become necessary to gain organizational goals.

3. Average people prefer external direction, security, and avoidance of responsibilities.

Postulates of Theory Y contrasted sharply with those of Theory X.

1. Physical and mental work, if satisfying, were inherently natural.

\textsuperscript{131}Knudson, pp. 182-83.
2. If man was committed to organizational goals, he would exhibit goal directiveness and self-control.

3. Rewards satisfying ego and self-actualization needs created worker commitment.

4. Average folk could be taught to seek and accept responsibilities. Responsibility avoidance and excess desire for security were acquired, not inherited.

5. Many ordinary people possessed qualities of ingeniousness, imagination, and creativity.  

McGregor suggested the use of Theory X and Theory Y in order to create rational decisions and practical actions. Administrators who accepted precepts of Theory X (or Theory Y) would naturally use its principal ideas in policy formulation.

Amitai Etzioni

Amitai Etzioni developed a compliance theory to improve administration. He claimed "goodness of fit" between individuals' needs and organizational demands depended mainly on ways organizations attracted and held members. He designated firms coercive if participation was forced.

"Goodness of fit" of a power strategy or compliance depended on three elements--goals, tasks, and involvement. Suitability of a particular strategy was measured by costs relative to goal attainment.

\[132\] Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, pp. 24-25.

\[133\] Owens, pp. 24-25.

\[134\] Owens, p. 170.
If the organizational goal was order and the task routine, coercion might be the most effective strategy for goal attainment. The price, however, of coercion was worker alienation and hostility. In cases of this type, administrators would have to decide if using a particular strategy was worth the cost in worker morale. Concerning this, the decisive consideration for the organization was time. Worker alienation would ruin even the strongest of organizations over a long enough period, but it could perhaps occasionally be tolerated in the short run.135

Etzioni contributed to administration the concepts of role, social systems, and compliance theory.136 He urged administrators to devote the greater portion of their time to techniques and strategies of planning and running the organization. The environment of the professional administrator was the organization (school), and it was there that the administrative function was carried out. Etzioni recognized the important role of organizations in the lives of all members of society, not just school administrators.137

T. Madison Byar

T. Madison Byar, former Chairman, East Tennessee State University School of Education, developed a tripartite power theory


136Owens, p. 141.

137Etzioni, Modern Organizations, p. 1.
to explain organizational change and the behaviors of people in organizations. 138

Byar's theory contained three parts or dimensions. First, a person pursuing a problem solution used both physical and psychological power, the latter being mental ability to conceive a testable solution the person could carry out alone. In society, people routinely watched and judged an individual's acts. Thus when the individual solved his and the problems of others, his method of solution would doubtless be attempted by others. 139

Second, early efforts of others to solve the original problem failed because few people possessed the total power to develop a new problem solution and carry it out without help. To overcome this, group members persuaded the person who had solved the problem to repeat his performance. The leaders of the groups tried to retain his services while conferring on him a group position. 140

The third part of tripartite power, the position, was social power which was not part of an individual. Social power was group power to confer special status on one of its own. In exchange for this, the group accepted the authority of the person occupying the power position. When creative leaders occupied this position, they did so on terms acceptable to the group. Because group members could not do what the leader did, they lacked his prowess or power.

139 Wilson, Byar, Shapiro, and Schell, pp. 83-84.
140 Wilson, Byar, Shapiro, and Schell, p. 84.
Through acceptance of the position, the leader assumed group expectancies which only he was qualified to fulfill.\textsuperscript{141}

Before planned change could occur in a school, those in the organization who possessed important positions must believe that their positions were not threatened by the proposed change. They must, in fact, feel that the change would enhance their status with their firm superiors.\textsuperscript{142}

\textbf{Robert G. Owens}

Robert G. Owens wrote \textit{Organizational Behavior in Schools} in 1970 for school superintendents, principals, and middle management administrators.\textsuperscript{143} Owens encouraged school administrators to gain knowledge of organizational behavior because of the commonalities of schools with other organizations. Owens' thesis was that valuable knowledge of individual and group behavior in organizations existed for school administrators.\textsuperscript{144}

Meaningful changes in educational administration occurred in the ten to twenty years before 1970. Until the mid-1960's, the effects of the "new" administration were confined to university professors of educational administration and a few school superintendents. Much of the "new" in administrative study consisted of fresh insights into

\textsuperscript{141}Wilson, Byar, Shapiro, and Schell, p. 84.
\textsuperscript{142}Wilson, Byar, Shapiro, and Schell, p. 87.
\textsuperscript{143}Owens, \textit{Organizational Behavior in Schools}, p. iii.
\textsuperscript{144}Owens, p. iii.
theory which aided administrators in meeting the challenges of American education.145

Owens, advocate of an interdisciplinary approach in university administrative training programs, described the traditional higher education method of training administrators. Owens' plan included the teaching of technical knowledge in practical situations and the perception of the content of administration as adequate to merit a place with the professions and academic disciplines.146

SUMMARY

Chester Barnard's managerial observations and philosophy stimulated much modern structuralist administrative theory. He perceived organizations as consciously structured activities in which the executive or leader's actions were the determining factor. Some of his theoretical concerns, which were investigated in the 1950-1970 period, were: leadership quality and its effects on firms; status systems in organizations; worker-firm needs congruences; the complexity of motivation; satisfying workers' human needs at work; firm work climates; communications systems; and formal-informal firm compatibility. In addition to the theoretical interests just mentioned, modern, behavioral theorists examined and employed insights relating to group behaviors, delegation of responsibility, qualities of worker input into decisionmaking, worker autonomy in work areas, chain of command, line and staff, span of control, work division, and many other managerial concepts. The majority of current theorists advocated

145Owens, p. 1. 146Owens, p. 3.
administrative training and expertise in organizational dynamics, and the ability to properly diagnose and meet workers' total needs at work.

Behavioral administration was primarily a reassessment and rearrangement of certain precepts of Human Relations and Scientific Management. The humane, worker-centered character of Human Relations influenced modern administration more, however, than did the mechanistic aspects of Scientific Management.

**Introduction to Figure 7**

Figure 7 is a brief illustration of the contents of Chapter 5, POST-1950'S ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES.

The purpose of Figure 7 is to reveal some of the major theories of Post-1950's administrative theorists. This presentation begins with the ideas of Chester Barnard and ends with those of theorist Robert G. Owens. Figure 7 should enable the reader to gain an overview of the materials contained in Chapter 5.

**Introduction to Figure 8**

In Figure 8, a comparison is made of some of the important modern administrative theories and the theorists who employed them. The purpose of the chart is to provide easy access for the reader to most of the significant ideas of the chapter--COMPARISON OF POST-1950'S ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES. Modern, behavioral theories (1950-1970) are presented in the order of their appearance in Chapter 5.

The impact of Human Relations can be clearly seen in the great majority of modern administrative theories. Each modern theorist, no matter how humane, planned and worked toward firm efficiency; in this endeavor, the influence and interests of Scientific Managers were often evident.
Administrative theorists of the current, modern era generally produced progressive, enlightened, and humane theories. Concern for the human qualities of employees, analysis of group and leadership dynamics, and attention to characteristics of organizational climates were important interests and responsibilities of current theorists. However, provision was made by each theorist for productive efficiency—the major Scientific Management emphasis.

Chester Barnard and Herbert Simon emphasized the following administrative concepts to satisfy firm demands and meet workers' needs: professionally-trained administrators, worker-firm needs balance, total firm coordination, communications efficiency, statements of firm goals or objectives, care in leader selection and training, leader knowledge and expertise in group dynamics, firm formal-informal group congruence, use of varied motivators, worker-firm needs harmony, meeting workers' needs through excellence of firm construct, leadership analysis and its implications, consideration of the impact of social forces on the firm, recognition of the effects of firm atmospheres on goals, work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization needs, recognition that firm roles comprise the organization, system maintenance and stability, correctness of match of workers and work, rationality in firm construct, care in firm construction and operation, provision for firm status systems, and recognition of the effects on firms of leaders. Simon—but not Barnard—stressed use of varied incentives to keep and hold members and creation of worker-centered work settings.

Hemphill, McGregor, and Owens stressed the following administrative concepts: leader knowledge of group dynamics, leadership
analysis and its implications, recognition of the effects of firm atmospheres on goals, creation of worker-centered work settings, situational approaches to leadership, provision for the unique needs of group members, work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization requirements, recognition of the importance of the quality of workers to the success of the firm, recognition that firm roles comprise the organization, human relations training for administrators, and recognition of the effects on firms of leaders.

McGregor— but not Hemphill or Owens— advocated worker-firm needs balances, statements of firm goals or objectives, open social systems, and rationality in firm construct. Hemphill— but not McGregor or Owens— advocated isolation of the components of efficiency and recognition and prompt resolution of worker-firm conflicts. Owens— but not McGregor or Hemphill— encouraged professionally-trained administrators, care in leader selection and training, firm formal-informal group congruence, worker-firm needs harmony, system maintenance and stability, worker input into firm decisionmaking, recognition of the impact of individual and group qualities, and use of theory by administrators.

Herzberg and Maslow emphasized creation of worker-centered work areas, provision for the unique needs of group members, work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization needs, human needs schemes or hierarchies to explain worker motivations, and work settings for meeting workers' total human needs.

Getzels-Guba, Parsons, and Etzioni employed and encouraged firm formal-informal group congruence, worker-firm needs harmony, consideration of the impact of social forces on the firm, recognition
of the effects of firm atmospheres on goals, creation of worker-centered work settings, provision for the unique needs of group members, work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization needs, recognition that firm roles comprise the organization, social systems models to explain worker-firm needs, system maintenance and stability, correct match of workers and work, human relations training for administrators, and recognition of the effects on firms of leaders.

Getzels and Guba—but not Parsons or Etzioni—urged and practiced communications efficiency, leader knowledge of group dynamics, and situational approaches to leadership. Parsons—but not Getzels and Guba or Etzioni—urged total firm coordination, use of varied motivators, and total firm environmental adaptation. Getzels and Guba and Etzioni—but not Parsons—encouraged worker-firm needs balances. Parsons and Etzioni—but not Getzels and Guba—promoted statements of firm goals or objectives, and the intelligent mobilization of firm power.

Griffiths and Halpin promoted and encouraged statements of firm or organizational goals or objectives, recognition of the effects of firm atmospheres on goals, creation of worker-centered work settings, provision for unique needs of group members, work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization needs, recognition of the importance of the quality of workers to firm success, open social systems approaches, human relations training for administrators, use of theory by administrators, and recognition of the effects on firms of leaders.

Griffiths—but not Halpin—encouraged leader knowledge of group dynamics, system maintenance and stability, and worker input
into firm decisionmaking. Halpin--but not Griffiths--stressed the need for care in leader selection and training.

Argyris and Gulick-Urwick advocated and promoted communications efficiency, statements of firm goals or objectives, the meeting of workers' needs through excellence of firm construct, isolation of the components of efficiency, system maintenance and stability, correct match of workers and work, rationality in firm construct, leader detachment, control span, and chain of command, line and staff, care in firm construction and operation, and division of work and task specialization.

Argyris--but not Gulick and Urwick--encouraged leader knowledge of group dynamics, firm formal-informal group congruence, provision for unique needs of group members, recognition of the importance of the quality of workers to firm success, recognition, and prompt resolution, of worker-firm conflicts, intelligent mobilization of firm power, recognition of the effects on the firm of leaders, and total firm environmental adaptation. Gulick and Urwick--but not Argyris--advocated coordination, direction, reporting, and budgeting, precise charting of firm relationships, and delegation of responsibilities.

Byar favored and advocated communications efficiency, statements of firm goals or objectives, leader knowledge of group dynamics, firm formal-informal group congruence, use of varied motivators, worker-firm needs harmony, recognition of the effects of firm atmospheres on goals, creation of worker-centered work settings, provision for unique needs of group members, work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization requirements, recognition of the importance of the quality of workers to firm success, recognition
that firm roles comprise the organization, open social systems approaches, work settings for meeting workers' total human needs, system maintenance and stability, correct match of workers and work, human relations training for administrators, synergistic work areas, and recognition of the effects on the firm of leaders.

Mort promoted work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization needs. He also advocated use of theory by administrators, prompt, suitable adoption of innovations, and recognition of the effects on firms of leaders.
Talcott Parsons
Created and refined administrative systems theory.
Identified three systems levels—the technical, managerial, and institutional.

John K. Hemphill
Qualified groups on basis of observable data. Studied group cohesion and worker satisfaction as influences on production.

Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick
Blended certain Classical or Scientific Management ideas.
Stressed importance of grouping firm parts according to their functions.

Herbert A. Simon
Advocate of wise use of authority as a requirement of sound administration.

Chester Barnard
Wrote The Functions of The Executive in 1938. Anticipated much Post-1950's administrative theory.
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Andrew W. Halpin

Studied organizational "personalities" and "open" and "closed" firm climates.

Paul R. Mort

Advocate of educational change in the United States. Said lack of financing was the chief obstacle to innovation and change.

Abraham Maslow

Developed human needs arrangement encompassing human needs from basic to complex and abstract.

Frederick Herzberg

Father of motivation-hygiene theory of job satisfaction similar to Maslow's hierarchy.

Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba

Authors of social systems theory model to explain firm and worker interactions.

Amitai Etzioni

Developed a compliance or power strategy as a method of administering firms.
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Douglas M. McGregor

Creator of Theories X and Y as explanations for worker behaviors.

Chris Argyris

Set forth four administrative emphases: Task, Chain of Command, Unity of Direction, and Span of Control.

Daniel Griffiths

Said that theory was little used or understood. Qualified "open" and "closed" social systems.

T. Madison Byar

Creator of tripartite power theory as an explanation for institutional development and control.

Robert G. Owens

Advocate of an interdisciplinary approach to administration and the improvement of college and university administration curricula.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Barnard</th>
<th>Simon</th>
<th>Hemphill</th>
<th>McGregor</th>
<th>Owens</th>
<th>Herzberg</th>
<th>Maslow</th>
<th>Ginzberg-Guba</th>
<th>Parsons</th>
<th>Etzioni</th>
<th>Griffiths</th>
<th>Halpin</th>
<th>Argyris</th>
<th>Gulick-Urick</th>
<th>Byar</th>
<th>Mort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionally-trained administrators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker-firm needs balance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total firm coordination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications efficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm goals or objectives</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care in leader selection and training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader knowledge of group dynamics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm formal-informal group congruence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of varied motivators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker-firm needs harmony</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting workers' needs through excellence of firm construct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership analysis and its implications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of impact of social forces of the firm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Barnard</th>
<th>Simon</th>
<th>Hemphill</th>
<th>McGregor</th>
<th>Openes</th>
<th>Herzberg</th>
<th>Maslow</th>
<th>Gatzels-Guba</th>
<th>Parsons</th>
<th>Etzioni</th>
<th>Griffiths</th>
<th>Halpin</th>
<th>Argyris</th>
<th>Gulick-Urick</th>
<th>Byar</th>
<th>Mort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of effects of firm atmosphere on goals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of varied firm incentives to keep and hold members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of worker-centered work settings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational approaches to leadership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isolation of components of efficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for unique needs of group members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of importance of the quality of workers to firm success</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition that firm roles comprise the organization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open social systems approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human needs schemes to explain worker motivations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 8 (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Barnard</th>
<th>Simon</th>
<th>McGregor</th>
<th>O'connell</th>
<th>Herzel-Guba</th>
<th>Parsons</th>
<th>Etzioni</th>
<th>Griffiths</th>
<th>Halpin</th>
<th>Argyris</th>
<th>Gulick-Urwick</th>
<th>Byar</th>
<th>Mexton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work settings for meeting workers' total human needs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social systems models to explain worker-firm needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System maintenance and stability</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correct match of workers and work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations training for administrators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and prompt resolution of worker-firm conflicts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality in firm construct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership detachment, control span and chain of command</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line and staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care in firm construction and operation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination, direction, reporting and budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergistic work settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker input into firm decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 8 (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Barnard</th>
<th>Simon</th>
<th>Hamphill</th>
<th>McGregor</th>
<th>Owens</th>
<th>Herzberg</th>
<th>Maslow</th>
<th>Getzels-Guba</th>
<th>Parsons</th>
<th>Etzioni</th>
<th>Griffiths</th>
<th>Halpin</th>
<th>Argyris</th>
<th>Gallick-Urick</th>
<th>Byar</th>
<th>Mort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provision for firm status systems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of individual and group qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precise charting of firm responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of work and task specialization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent mobilization of firm power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of theory by administrators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt, suitable adoption of innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of effects on firms of leaders</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total firm environmental adaptation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X denotes compliance of theorist with concept.

FIGURE 8 (Continued)
Chapter 6

COMPARISONS AND CONTRASTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES

The means, used by managers promoting industrial efficiency and concern for product or service were identified and described in Chapter 6.

The second part of the chapter was an examination of concern for persons and some ways that certain theorists of different eras expressed concern for workers' human needs.

Finally, an effort was made to lend study cohesion and unity through identifying and analyzing certain likenesses and differences in some of the major theories of different eras.

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT ERA

Concern for Efficiency

Theorists' in the Scientific Management era main concern was the discovery of ways to increase industrial efficiency or output. Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber searched for efficiency precepts consistent with the scientific method.

Frederick W. Taylor believed the refinement of both management and workers' tasks would lead to improved efficiency.¹ An art was made

of task specialization and labor division while both were applied to factory production.\(^2\) He was first to systematically study factory productivity to demonstrate that it could be scientifically managed.\(^3\) Exhaustive time and motion studies in steel mills led to increased efficiency of both managers and workers.\(^4\) Taylor, who was sure human performance variances could be scientifically analyzed,\(^5\) ultimately conducted detailed studies of each facet of the productive process.\(^6\)

The cornerstone of Taylor's system was (1) discovery of the most efficient means of task performance and (2) creation of an improved labor division between workers and managers.\(^7\) Tasks requiring high levels of proficiency were created to standardize management. The control of work conditions and high technical training by management for all firm members characterized maximum efficiency.\(^8\)

Taylor first reduced each job to a science in analyzing a factory. Equally important was a careful analysis and refinement of machinery. There was one best way to perform each job which could


\(^3\)Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 25.


\(^6\)Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, p. 23.


only be determined by an efficiency expert. The second part of Scientific Management—work standardization—was introduced after completion of the job analyses. Tools and motions of pilot analyses were introduced for all similar jobs. The third component of "Taylorism" was the establishment of definite daily jobs for workers. These tasks, which contained bonus provisions, were fixed by planning departments. The final part of his plan was functional foremanship, a system under which workers were taught to properly conceive and execute their duties.9

Henri Fayol placed most responsibility for organizational efficiency on top managers. Fayol and Taylor tried to formulate administrative principles based on the scientific method; Fayol, however, differed with Taylor because he (Fayol) searched for universal management insights.10 Some of his concepts eventually were a part of functionalism, the belief that use of an object dictated its shape.11 Organizational efficiency was considered unattainable without expertly-trained top managers.12

Fayol perceived the efficient administrator as primarily responsible for overall firm planning, organizing, and controlling.13

13Fayol, Chapter 5.
Fayol and Taylor adhered to command unity, correct authority delegation, varied work incentives, and attention to workers' morale. Fayol, who was more flexible in his managerial approach than Taylor, believed firm efficiency included situational approaches to management.\footnote{Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970), pp. 6-7.}

Fayol and Taylor believed that industrial production was a fertile area for scientific investigation. They concentrated primarily on factory productive and administrative processes as efficiency measures while largely ignoring workers as humans.\footnote{Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966), p. 70.}

Max Weber contended that bureaucracy was the most efficient organizational form in the world because of its technical excellence. Productive efficiency was guaranteed by its excellent construct.\footnote{H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946), p. 214.}


Job assignments were made only after exhaustive, scientifically-based and administered aptitude testing;\footnote{Amitai Etzioni, Complex Organizations (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 49.} and bureaucratic appointment was
a lifetime vocation.\textsuperscript{20} Correct, scientifically determined labor
division and task specialization\textsuperscript{21} and guaranteed worker promotions as
rewards for superior performances also characterized efficiency.\textsuperscript{22}

Taylor, Fayol, and Weber's efficiency measures contrasted
sharply with those of Human Relations. Scientific Managers concentrated
on administrative processes and worker performances whereas Human
Relations thinkers analyzed work environments and workers' needs.
Human Relations theorists tried to determine the effects on efficiency
of workers' feelings and attitudes.

**HUMAN RELATIONS ERA**

**Concern for Efficiency**

Whereas Scientific Managers emphasized the mechanistic aspects of
efficiency, Human Relations theorists created worker-oriented organiza-
tional environments and generally agreeable conditions of work. Human
Relations managers felt that efficiency was enhanced when workers were
treated as humans and were meaningfully involved in firm decisionmaking.
Mary Parker Follett and Elton Mayo pioneered early Human Relations efforts.

Mary Parker Follett thought that workers who were satisfied
with their jobs were generally efficient and productive. She recognized
the complexities of human motivation and called for research into it.
Administrators were the key figures in determining organizational

\textsuperscript{20}William Foote Whyte, *Organizational Behavior, Theory and
Application* (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., and The

\textsuperscript{21}Whyte, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{22}Owens, p. 8.
atmosphere and efficiency. The needs of workers and the firm were met if workers were meaningfully integrated into the total work setting. Follett regarded total project coordination as vital to productive efficiency. The harmonious arrangement of the components of efficiency involved direct contact with those involved and horizontal control throughout departments.

Fritz Roethlisberger and William Dickson clarified the Hawthorne Plant Studies of Elton Mayo. They attempted, in the book Management and The Worker, to explain and accurately appraise Mayo's research.

Roethlisberger and Dickson wrote that organizational efficiency was raised by training administrators in Human Relations skills and by administrative use of appropriate Human Relations beliefs. Administrative expertise in diagnosis of workers' Human Relations and attention to the improvement of work conditions were qualities of efficiency. The most efficient firms were those in which administrators taught Human Relations skills to all supervisory personnel. Continuous observations

---

23Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, p. 60.


27Roethlisberger and Dickson, p. 604.
of workers' organizational conduct--and a corresponding refinement of Human Relations skills--insured operational efficiency. 28

The Iowa Child Welfare Station Study researchers greatly influenced the direction of Human Relations. Leadership style was identified as a strong portion of group morale and firm efficiency. Some Iowa Study efficiency implications for organizations were: (1) democratic leadership was preferred because it utilized Human Relations insights; (2) employee problems usually involved more than just the question at hand; and (3) the major duties of administrative leaders were to facilitate communications within the organization and to meaningfully involve all firm members in decisions affecting them. According to the Iowa Child Welfare Station Study researchers, organizational efficiency was best gained by enlightened, democratic leadership. 29

The Harwood Manufacturing Plant research took place partly because of the influence of Kurt Lewin. 30 He developed an organizational behavior theory which used a group dynamics approach.

Lewin thought the greatest influences on human organizational conduct were characteristics of groups and workers and social or cultural behavioral standards. Social norms and human qualities constituted the setting for organizational behavior. Administrators promoted firm change by gaining group and cultural support, or they

28Roethlisberger and Dickson, p. 604.

29Getzels, Liham, and Campbell, p. 39.

would fail. Astute administrators promoted efficient change by discovering ways to reduce or neutralize the factors which impeded it. Lewin perceived careful group and social manipulations as the key factors in organizational efficiency.

Elton Mayo, director of the Hawthorne Plant research, observed that efficiency was promoted when workers felt important and essential to the job at hand. Efficiency was further enhanced when workers identified their interests with those of management. Noticeable efficiency gains took place whenever workers experienced a sense of belonging and group cohesiveness. Worker attitudes and the complexities of human motivation were identified as efficiency considerations. Finally, Mayo showed that administrators lacked practical knowledge of work group dynamics and their relationship to efficient operation.

Human Relations researchers exerted a greater influence on structuralist administration than did those of Scientific Management. Current structuralist administration included provision for workers'
feelings and the careful structuring of work environments. Businessman Chester Barnard's administrative observations were the foundation for much modern theory.

POST-1950'S ERA

Concern for Efficiency

Many administrative theorists of the current era considered organizational efficiency secondary to satisfaction of workers' desires and the establishment of worker-oriented work settings. Organizational efficiency was a natural outgrowth of the meeting of workers' basic and higher human needs. Some of the administrative interests of Chester Barnard--explored in the behavioral era--were leadership qualities, motivation, organizational social systems and structures, and firm communications.

Barnard identified executives or administrators as the principal determiners of firm efficiency. The executive or leadership function was the main responsibility and component of administration. Efficient leaders were expected to (1) develop and continue excellent firm communications, (2) coordinate the total enterprise, and (3) formulate and clarify firm goals. Firm efficiency was considered impossible without qualified leaders.37

Efficiency included administrative comprehension of organizational status systems and the forces influencing them. Status systems were affected by characteristics of jobs, workers' desires for jobs to gain social leverage, and workers' natural wish to be needed and

37George, The History of Management Thought, p. 133.
necessary to the operation. Administrative understanding of the workings of formal organizations and their informal subgroups encouraged efficiency. Competent administrators employed legitimate means to bring coincidence of the formal and the informal organizations. Efficiency was characterized by awareness of the need for a constant creative equilibrium between the interests of workers and those of the firm.

Effective, progressive motivation involved much more than just the hope of material reward. After the satisfaction of fundamental, basic human needs, self-actualization drives—desire for power, pride in work, desirable work conditions—became significant work motivators. Enlightened administration included continuous refinement of means of motivation, as well as its judicious use in work settings.

Finally, Barnard identified leadership quality and care in leader selection as primary requirements of efficiency.

Herbert A. Simon based much of his administrative theory on the insights of Barnard. He wrote the book, *Administrative Behavior*, to foster among administrators a more complete comprehension of organizational behaviors.


Administrators should understand, and suitably adjust to, organizational complexities as efficiency measures. Chances for productive operations grew when administrators correctly assessed the effects on firm goals of various organizational styles and patterns. Competent administrators brought a reasonable correspondence between the concerns of workers and managers.

The more successful firms' leaders offered sufficient incentives or inducements to gain and hold productive workers. Simon hoped that efficient administrators, who could not always discern correct choices, would consistently make decisions of equal benefit to workers and the firm.

The dynamics of organizational conduct and efficiency—a major concern of Barnard and Simon—were a special interest of Talcott Parsons, who created a general theory for analyzing firm social systems. According to Parsons' all efficient, progressive administrators: (1) adapted to the environment, (2) set goals and their means of attainment, (3) coordinated the total enterprise, and (4) created and continued system pattern maintenance.

---

43 Simon.


Workers' job satisfactions were the best guarantor of firm efficiency. Five elements in job satisfaction were: self-regard, appreciation, freedom from want, fun, and affection.\(^{48}\)

Sensible use of firm power, organizational congruence with the environment, and continuance of high worker motivation were cited by Parsons as efficiency techniques.\(^{49}\)

Jacob Getzels and Egon Guba's social systems theory resembled Parsons' in many respects. Getzels and Guba maintained that the most important determinant of efficiency was compatibility between the workers' needs and those of the firm. The chief duty of successful administrators was creating and continuing a needs congruity between workers and the firm.\(^{50}\) Getzels and Guba regarded suitability of workers and roles, firm atmosphere, administrative expertise in Human Relations diagnostic skills, and administrative training in psychology and sociology as efficiency characteristics.\(^{51}\)

Daniel E. Griffiths discerned quality of organizational atmospheres as the chief cause of efficiency. The efficient nature of "open" work environments--high in democratic qualities and low in authoritarianism--arose from the large amount and high quality of worker input into firm decisions. The main duty of administrators was the establishment and continuance of "openness" of climate--the most


\(^{49}\)Parsons, pp. 183-86.

\(^{50}\)Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, p. 192.

\(^{51}\)Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 30.
crucial part of firm efficiency. Logically, higher standards were desirable in hiring administrators.\textsuperscript{52} Halpin expressed awareness, as did Griffiths, of the role of useful theory in administrative efficiency.\textsuperscript{53}

Daniel E. Griffiths regarded sound, practical theory as a reliable guide to organizational efficiency. He said that its use in organizations prevented much duplicated effort and wasted time. Two reasons for the neglect of theory by administrators were (1) lack of understanding of its meaning and value and (2) lack of comprehension of its area of authority.\textsuperscript{54}

The quality of organizational social climates was important to firm efficiency. "Open" social systems were identified by pattern maintenance--"dynamic equilibrium"--which was conducive to correction of mistakes and imprecisions while furnishing positive member feedback to administrators.\textsuperscript{55}

Efficient administrators called for the creation of effective administrative organizations and the clear stating of firm goals, concepts, and functions. Other efficiency needs were an organizational plan in which jobs pertained directly to position, job descriptions.

\textsuperscript{52}Owens, p. 158-90.


and the setting of time limits for goal attainment.\textsuperscript{56} Finally, Griffiths viewed comprehension of organizational decisionmaking and control of its direction as the pivotal points of efficiency.\textsuperscript{57} Douglas M. McGregor also studied organizations and the behaviors of their occupants as a means of increasing efficiency.

McGregor, in gaining efficiency, allowed for human variabilities and complexities of human motivation.\textsuperscript{58} In \textit{The Human Side of Enterprise},\textsuperscript{59} he identified four critical efficiency elements in the well-administered firm: (1) worker attitudes or feelings, (2) worker needs or desires, (3) worker uniqueness and individuality, and (4) leader characteristics.

Efficient administration, primarily situational in thrust, included leader accommodation to differences in groups and persons. Obviously, useful leadership varied from case to case. The quality of administration---the governing efficiency influence---rested on leaders' ability to successfully adapt to changing conditions.\textsuperscript{60}

One goal of McGregor in his Theory X and Theory Y was increased efficiency. According to McGregor, in Theory X, humans were inherently

\textsuperscript{56}Griffiths in Administrative Behavior in Education, by Campbell and Gregg, p. 357.


\textsuperscript{60}Knudson, pp. 182-83.
lazy, immature, and irresponsible. Theory X adherents regarded use of forced compliance and external controls by management as natural and necessary.

McGregor in Theory Y pictured humans as responsible, capable of mature commitment to organizational goals, and possessed of creativity and ingenuity. McGregor in Theory Y fostered efficiency by constructing enlightened work settings in which workers could simultaneously move toward self-actualization and firm objectives.\(^{61}\) The needs hierarchies of Maslow and Herzberg contained many Theory Y insights.

Abraham Maslow, who believed meeting workers' total human needs was the best assurance of efficiency, developed the most famous of the human needs arrangements. His purpose was the identification and diagnosis of human firm needs. Comprehension of the needs pyramid, and its motivational implications, was a requirement of efficient administration. Maslow in his hierarchy spanned the spectrum of human desires—from basic food needs to abstract psychological and emotional ones.\(^{62}\) Efficient administrators correctly diagnosed and satisfied workers' needs levels. When lower needs were satisfied, higher ones appeared which called for more complex motivational techniques. Administrators who skillfully anticipated and met workers' human needs were guaranteed productive efficiency. Human needs were examined and

\(^{61}\) Owens, pp. 24-25.

\(^{62}\) Whyte, Organizational Behavior, Theory and Application, p. 135.
diagnosed—in the Maslow hierarchy—only as they pertained to other human needs.  

Frederick Herzberg believed, as had Maslow, that workers possessed sets of interactive needs which grew in complexity near the top of the needs pyramid. To create and maintain efficiency, workers' needs at all levels must be met. Healthy, normal workers actively looked for commitments, responsibilities, and challenges—all conducive to efficiency—when primary animal drives were satisfied.

Herzberg's proposal was a new concept of worker efficiency motivation, the division of work into "hygiene factors," and motivators. High wages, capable supervision, and desirable conditions of work prevented worker unrest, but did not motivate. Positive worker motivation came only through chances for workers to experience personal growth and a sense of responsibility. Amitai Etzioni, author of a compliance theory aimed at organizational efficiency, expressed concern for workers' needs and feelings.

Firm compliance or power strategies, according to Etzioni, should be tailored to the uniqueness of groups and individuals. The suitability of a strategy depended on firm objectives, requirements of

the project jobs, and the character of worker commitment and involvement to the firm. Time was the determining factor in choice of a negative strategy for the gaining of a firm goal. Even the strongest, most stable firm endured lowering of worker morale caused by use of negative strategies only for limited periods. Selection of appropriate, positive, and varied strategies--while using negative ones infrequently, if at all--was encouraged. Firm leaders chose strategies which brought congruity between workers' needs and those of the firm. Much of T. Madison Byar's synergistic work setting revolved around accommodation of the concerns of workers and the firm.

Byar's synergistic work environment included the efficiency needs of the firm and the human needs of its members. In a synergism, interactive parts created a service or product superior to that produced by independent efforts of parts of the system. Leaders' goals familiar to all members were guided by a system of commonly understood ethics. Members who comprised the three organizational groups in this special setting--person, plan, and position--were welded by common interests into a cooperative synergism.

Leaders of institutions who promoted and refined the precepts of synergism advanced firm efficiency and a healthy work setting which met human aspirations. In the open-minded tolerance of synergism, human
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uniqueness and individuality were conceived as strengths which called forth members' best efforts. Efficient work relationships characterized firm internal maintenance patterns and corrected the errors of firms. Members were freed and actually encouraged to strive toward fulfillment of their self-development drives and aspirations. Andrew W. Halpin concentrated, as had Byar, on firm climates and member behaviors as efficiency measures.

Halpin looked upon organizational climate as the decisive quality of efficiency. Firm freedom of climate, openness of communications, and member cooperation were practices of open, democratic leaders of organizations. The superior quality and large amount of constructive worker input into decisionmaking in open atmospheres was a quality of efficient organizational output. Administrators were most responsible for setting firm tone or climate and for creating and continuing high member morale. Exacting standards were essential in administrative employment and retention because of their influence on efficiency. Halpin contended the subtleties of firm climates or tones—the emotional or psychological environment—were largely responsible for organizational efficiency. Unprogressive, authoritarian leaders logically bred worker resistance, low morale, and general negativism and hostility toward management. Additionally, John K. Hemphill was aware of the effect on firm productivity of enlightened leadership and a democratic climate.
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Hemphill, who favored situational leadership, argued that appropriate administrative provision for group differences was the best ally of efficiency. In diagnosing the leadership needs of groups, size, composition, morale, dependability, and level of workers' job satisfactions were measures of accurate administrative evaluation. Administrators with special talents in situational leadership quickly recognized and provided for the needs of groups and individuals. Progressive, expert administrators involved knowledge of situational leadership skills, group decisionmaking, and the dynamics of work groups. According to Hemphill and Westie, some important work group efficiency determiners were: control of the productive process, interfirm autonomy, satisfaction of members' needs, and firm readiness to accept and provide for needs of new members. Robert G. Owens identified currency of administrative knowledge of organizational behaviors as necessary for efficient productivity.

Owens wrote in Organizational Behavior in Schools that knowledge of organizational behaviors existed, and it was the responsibility of progressive administrators to master and use it. An enlightened interdisciplinary approach to administration in higher education training courses and curricula characterized an efficient leadership corps.
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Owens favored, as had Hemphill, progressive situational leadership approaches in management. Efficient management was conceptualized as a complex art—an earlier observation of Human Relations founder Mary Parker Follett. Styles of administrative leaders and their corresponding effects on workers' morale were a potent efficiency force. The final success and effectiveness of administration was brought about by adoption of varied suitable leadership types and the positive effects of the leader's personality. The extent to which firm administrators successfully adapted, combined, and balanced their leadership abilities and skills with the requirements of various firms exerted a great impact on efficiency. Chris Argyris, who subscribed to effective leadership skills and leader comprehension of organizational dynamics, adhered to many Scientific Management efficiency strategies.

Argyris knew that the inevitable conflicts between workers and firms demanded immediate diagnosis and resolution if efficiency was to be maximal. Establishment of a firm climate directed at speedy, open resolution of difficulties was vital to production. Institutional leaders were most responsible for creating democratic, open work atmospheres. One of their chief efficiency contributions was guaranteeing firm logic, detachment, and rationality.

The influence of Scientific Management on Argyris was readily apparent. Organizational rationality, task specialization, worker

---

76 Owens, p. 136.

adaptation to firm power, adherence to firm objectives, and use of
time limits for goal achievement—all beliefs of Scientific Managers
Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber—were adapted by
Argyris to the needs of efficiency. Also basic to Argyris' Scientific
Management emphasis were span of control, limitations of supervisory
authority, and direct control of workers. Hierarchically-devised
command structures included coordination and correct assignment to
workers of specific responsibilities.

Efficient organizational leaders demanded continuous
congruence of the aspirations and ambitions of firms and their
occupants. Efficiency related directly to the gaining of firm
objectives, pattern creation and maintenance, successful environmental
adaptation, and continuance of work climates in which these objectives
could be realized. Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick placed greater
emphasis on Scientific Management than had Argyris.

Gulick and Urwick, who stressed Scientific Management more
than any other current theorists, produced administrative theory
which resembled that of Henri Fayol. Gulick and Urwick, as had
Argyris, promoted efficiency by using span of control and command
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unity and line and staff.\textsuperscript{82} Careful, wise sharing of firm responsibilities and division of tasks characterized the more productive firms.\textsuperscript{83} Total project and firm coordination, the assurance that workers owed responsibility to but one person, and the minimizing of decision-making levels characterized by avoidance of worker frustrations and duplication of efforts.\textsuperscript{84} Correctness of line and staff was perceived by Gulick and Urwick as central to productive efficiency.\textsuperscript{85}

Though the main responsibility of Scientific Management, Human Relations, and behavioral theorists was finding ways of increasing efficiency, theorists of each era made certain provisions for the satisfaction of workers' human requirements. In the era of Scientific Management, Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber relied chiefly on intrinsic firm qualities for this.

**SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT ERA**

**Concern for Workers**

The constant preoccupation of Scientific Managers was the discovery and refinement of more efficient management leading to increased, more efficient productivity. Despite this, Taylor, Fayol, and Weber recognized and provided for workers' human desires in factories.


\textsuperscript{83}Gulick and Urwick, p. 3.

\textsuperscript{84}Gulick and Urwick, p. 9.

Taylor, while manager of the Midvale Steel Company, encouraged worker-manager harmony to promote efficiency and to create better working conditions and more productive relationships. Foremen were taught to regard the men under their authority as equals, a relationship similar to that of dedicated teachers and students. The goal of Taylor in his time and motion studies was to discover ways to generate greater efficiency and productivity; additionally, worker fatigue and energy were lessened. Standardization of management, centralization of control of work conditions in departmental heads, and high technical expertise for all firm members increased production. Workers' frustrations caused by being responsible to more than one person were lessened. Technical training was essential for worker achievement and fulfillment of self-development drives. Discovery of correct times for task performances and a new, needed labor division whereby managers assumed greater responsibilities were needed for improved work conditions and lessened pressures on workers.

Taylor knew one reason for worker-manager antagonisms was ignorance by management of the constituents of a proper, reasonable work day for workers. His scientific determination by measurement clarified
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workers' job expectations and lessened their anger, frustrations, and misunderstandings. Financial and production incentives for workers helped meet their lower materialistic aspirations as well as higher, more complex ones. Henri Fayol, unlike Taylor, made few if any explicit provisions for the satisfaction of firm members' human drives or need requirements.

Fayol discovered management principles which he regarded as equally useful for all managerial tasks. Use of these universally applicable administrative precepts, as well as a highly trained staff, characterized organizational excellence. Logically, many of firm members' requirements—general work satisfaction, appreciation and recognition, pride in workmanship, meritorious promotions—were guaranteed by intrinsic firm construct excellence.

Leaders' meticulous planning, fair, rational directing, systematic firm and project coordination, and scientific productive control assured workers' interests, security, and morale. Command unity and a variety of work incentives were necessary to satisfy many higher human drives. Fayol and Max Weber made little explicit provisions for workers' human concerns. Under their supervision, qualities of firm structural excellence included security, fairness, order,
recognition, and work satisfaction. Promotions by leaders naturally met many remaining aspirations and wishes of members.

The high technical expertise of bureaucracy, scientifically structured logic and rationality, and impersonal fairness were reasons for its superiority over all other organizational forms. Nepotism and many other inequities common to most organizations were unknown in bureaucracy. Bureaucratic atmospheres were characterized by high member spirit and outstanding work. Clear, written job descriptions and responsibilities, the conception of work as official duty, hierarchical job arrangement, and explicitly stated conduct codes for all members were ways of preventing misunderstandings and quarrels. Bureaucratic leaders assured member commitment to firm goals and the meeting of many work-related human concerns. Impartially administered, objective aptitude tests and corresponding job assignments were needed for high worker morale and the meeting of many self-improvement drives and ambitions. Care in choosing members and occupational appointment for life included the meeting of some of workers' security and work-associated drives.

Unlike Scientific Managers, whose provision for workers' human aspirations was largely incidental to efficiency, Human Relations theorists' major responsibility was to clearly meet human needs at work. Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and
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William Dickson, and Kurt Lewin strenuously promoted the occupational desires of workers.

**HUMAN RELATIONS ERA**

**Concern for Workers**

Human Relations exponents created work settings favorable to workers and utilized workers' verbal input into firm decisionmaking. Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and William Dickson, and Kurt Lewin were outstanding among Human Relations exponents.

Though Mayo received most of the credit for initiating the Human Relations Movement, Mary Parker Follett made an earlier, more permanent and significant contribution to Human Relations. Follett, who visualized work environments which provided for basic and higher workers' drives, recognized the complexity of motivation and encouraged research into it. Work settings in which worker input was a major component and work area autonomy for workers were basic to caring for human desires.99

Follett's perception of administration as an ethical discipline and practice and the inclusion of workers' feelings and attitudes in firm planning were progressive and enlightened practices for her day. Workers' involvement in the total work environment, especially in decisions directly affecting them, were expressions of managerial concern for workers' feelings and interests.100 Total enterprise
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coordination and the involvement of workers in projects from start to finish was standard operating procedure. 101

Follett's worker-centered structure was intended to meet many human aspirations of workers. In addition to satisfaction of primary needs such as food, she met many higher self-actualization requirements—recognition, importance, satisfaction in workmanship, and other self-gratification desires. Administrative concern for workers, as shown by the anticipation and meeting of their interests, was at the heart of her management philosophy. Administrators were, in fact, identified as most responsible for creating worker-centered work areas and for soliciting and assuring worker input into organizational decisionmaking. Follett anticipated future trends in (1) recognizing the complexity of motivation and encouraging research into it, (2) calling for worker control of work areas, (3) viewing administration as an ethical sphere, (4) citing administrators as most responsible for organizational atmospheres and the meeting of workers' human needs, and (5) calling for total project and worker coordination. The Hawthorne researcher Elton Mayo demonstrated the impact of worker input into decisionmaking and its effect on morale and productivity.

Mayo identified the so-called "Hawthorne Effect," the fact that simple observation or attention increased workers' output and raised morale. When workers' self-development drives of feeling important and necessary to the operation were met, cooperation and

general harmony increased, as did productive efficiency. Because of the Hawthorne Plant studies, management recognized the complicated qualities of motivation. Elton Mayo demonstrated that workers were capable of self-direction and the fulfillment of at least some of their higher needs, if given the chance.

Mayo's disciples and followers advocated the structuring of work environments where workers' human needs for recognition and input into policymaking and firm decisions would be realized. Coincidence of worker-manager interests and concerns was considered necessary for meeting the needs of both.

Administrators or supervisors were identified as most responsible for eliciting worker input into decisionmaking and for creation of worker-oriented work environments. Cooperation, group spirit, and cohesion effectively were needed for the meeting of workers' needs.

Mayo met workers' higher, self-improvement hopes by (1) creating worker-oriented work settings, (2) encouraging and using worker input into policymaking, (3) calling for greater worker-manager cooperativeness and harmony, (4) training administrators in Human Relations diagnostic skills, and (5) conducting research into human motivations and structuring administration accordingly. Fritz Roethlisberger and William T. Dickson evaluated Mayo's research and made certain recommendations to administrators for helping workers.

---
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Roethlisberger and Dickson reported Mayo's Hawthorne project to provide insights into the responsibility of management toward workers and, of course, to raise production. They agreed that workers' needs were best met by administrators who possessed knowledge of varied Human Relations skills and their proper managerial application. Studies of worker organizational behaviors and their corresponding suggestions for meeting the mutual needs of workers and the firm were structured and executed. Leaders' Human Relations skills should undergo constant observation, testing, and refinement and should be taught to all plant supervisors. In addition to creating worker-centered work areas, Human Relations theorists' insights should lead to a continual upgrading and improving of work areas to more fully satisfy their human occupants and firm objectives. Kurt Lewin was intrigued, as were the majority of Human Relations advocates, with the traits and qualities of efficient, enlightened leadership.

Lewin's Iowa Child Welfare Station Study was a cause of Human Relations research into the effects on groups of different leadership styles. He cited democratic leadership as superior to autocracy or laissez-faire, a situation of little direction or real leadership. Democratic leadership, including worker input into decisions and group decision-making, was a way of meeting workers' human desires. Democratic leaders avoided, whenever possible, coercion while emphasizing group decisions and genuine worker-manager cooperation. Democratic leaders employed various work motivators or incentives, while considering workers' aptitudes, desires, and ambitions before assigning tasks or jobs. The Iowa Child Welfare Study and Lewin's leadership observations were an influence on administration in the behavioral era. The major
emphases of Human Relations—carefully structured work areas and utilization of worker input into firm decisionmaking—were special interests of current administrative scholars. Chester Barnard was one of the first to balance the requirements and needs of firms and their members.

**POST-1950'S ERA**

**Concern for Workers**

Modern theory was greatly influenced by Human Relations theorists' interests—the effects of work arenas on worker attitudes, morale, and production, organizational decisionmaking, human conduct in firms, and the balancing of human and firm needs. Chester Barnard bridged the gap between earlier theories and behavioral research.

Barnard's management was comprehensive, humane, and practical. The majority of behavioral theorists originated or drew upon his research and writings. He successfully combined the desire for efficiency of Scientific Management with the Human Relations belief that workers should be recognized as people.

The chief responsibility of administrators was setting firm tone or quality and promoting members' interests. Leader comprehension of formal and informal firm structures and their workings, and correlation of their goals, created an environment favorable to workers. Administrative understanding of group dynamics and decisionmaking and comprehension of Human Relations skills and their appropriate uses was a benefit to workers. Leaders who understood firm structures furthered
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Human Relations, raised worker morale, enhanced communications and cooperation, and raised workers' perceptions of their talents, skills, and abilities. Human Relations interests of workers—work satisfaction, desire to be useful, and the wish to grow as humans—were integral to firm efficiency. Barnard was one of the earliest, if not the first, to recognize the positive relationship between workers' job happiness and efficiency.

Effective interfirm communications included openness of firm atmosphere, creativity of members, and harmonious relationships. Correct, precise firm operational policy was conducive to security among workers and the clear enunciation of firm objectives.

Awareness and provision for the forces giving rise to and propagating firm status systems were needed if workers were to be satisfied. Task characteristics, use of firm position for social purposes, and human insecurities were influences on firm social systems. Positive status system leaders promoted interfirm communications and group cohesion and raised workers' self-concepts.

Material rewards were motivators of workers only to certain levels of performance. Opportunities for satisfaction of human drives toward power and responsibilities, care for fellow creatures, and job pride were higher motivators. Selectivity in use
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of work motivators--and a "fit" between job, motivator, and worker--were needed for meeting employees' interests.\textsuperscript{111}

Barnard's managerial concepts and philosophy were more practical and compassionate than those of Scientific Management. His theories and managerial style were especially effective in balancing the needs of firms and their occupants for the benefit of both. Herbert A. Simon researched and changed some of Barnard's theses to promote the interests of firms and their members.

Simon believed, as had Barnard, that firms were composed of complicated communications systems and human interactions.\textsuperscript{112} Firm climates, characterized by openness and freedom of information flow, were most nearly conducive to meeting workers' needs. Simon and Barnard looked for logical solutions to firm problems of equal benefit to workers and the firm.\textsuperscript{113} The principal duty of administrators was promoting behaviors while simultaneously meeting worker-firm interests.\textsuperscript{114}

Simon was convinced that firm rewards, encompassing basic though higher, self-improvement drives, satisfied workers and created loyalty to the firm.\textsuperscript{115} Leaders' minimizing of firm decision-making levels met
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security needs of workers and reduced work-related irritations and
frustrations.\textsuperscript{116} Talcott Parsons explained, as had Barnard and
Simon, that firm-environmental compatibility insured workers' best
interests.

Parsons believed that stable, orderly firm climates served
workers well. The stating of firm goals and the means to meet them,
a total firm coordination similar to Follett's--and continual high
member interest and motivation--were necessary for security, work
satisfactions, and other work-related benefits.\textsuperscript{117} Environments which
most fully met workers' self-actualization desires included work
satisfactions, self-regard, appreciation, freedom from want, fun, and
worker liking.\textsuperscript{118} Correct, humane use of organizational power--
characterized by minimal coercion--characterized smoothness of organi-
zational operation as well as a worker-centered environment.\textsuperscript{119} Parsons
believed that progressive, enlightened firms maintained a proper balance
between their needs and those of their members. Jacob Getzels and Egon
Guba claimed that agreement of worker-firm interests and intents was in
the best interests of firm members.

The personal, idiographic portion of Getzels and Guba's
social systems model included human organizational interactions
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and behaviors. A creative adjustment of firm objectives and goals to the requirements of their human members was integral to both primary and upward human necessities. Maintenance of a productive equilibrium between workers' needs and those of the firm was a continual problem for skilled administrators.¹²⁰

Effective administrators comprehended human organizational conduct and the formal and informal nature of organizational structures. Administrators grasp of roles and proper adjustment of members to them, acquaintance with the complexity of motivation, and attention to the psychological climate of the firm created worker-centered environments.¹²¹ Getzels and Guba suggested that administrators should correctly diagnose the psychological and sociological aspects of workers' needs and supervise accordingly.¹²² Daniel E. Griffiths advocated, as had Getzels and Guba, compatibility between the interests of firms and their members.

Griffiths held open organizational climates in high esteem while designating them most agreeable to workers' interests. The constant pattern maintenance and internal stability, self-correcting qualities, continual member feedback, and general operational smoothness
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of open climates were motivators for members' creative, ingenious contributions--and the meeting of their human growth drives.  

Excellent administrators were integral to firm climates which encouraged human growth. Expertise in identifying and articulating the goals and aspirations of firms and their human occupants, persistent evaluation of the administrative function and its involvements, and the assessment of organizational structure and substructures were administrative responsibilities toward workers. The main job of leaders was the creation and maintenance of an effective administrative organization. Douglas M. McGregor's managerial theory resembled Griffiths' because it encompassed administrative expertise in diagnosing human motivations, organizational conduct, and needs.

McGregor thought that situational leadership brought an organizational milieu which encouraged the best efforts of workers. Environmental openness--characterized by essential employee input--challenged high human aspirations. Firm policy, especially all decisions having direct bearing on workers, was to be composed of firm and worker input. Arbitrary supervisory decisionmaking and
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dictatorial managerial tactics produced worker rebelliousness and organizational chaos.127

McGregor created Theory X and Theory Y to explain workers' organizational motivations and conduct. Theory Y—the positive component—included the idea that workers' requisites were appeased when work presented satisfying physical and mental challenges. The gaining of commitment to firm aspirations by management were integral to worker self-control and maturely directed activities. Company incentives leading to worker obligations to firm desires were satisfiers of workers' egos and higher human growth needs. Administrators' conceptualizations of workers as intelligent, capable of self-direction, and the successful assumption of responsibilities, led to favorable conditions of work. The wise engagement by management of the imaginative problem-solving capacities of ordinary employees brought about work conditions favorable to human development.128 Abraham Maslow and Frederick Herzberg called attention to employees' higher concerns.

According to Maslow, capable, effective administrators created work environments which enveloped elemental to abstract human requirements. His well-known needs hierarchy was an aid in diagnosing and satisfying these human concerns. Expert administrators demanded knowledge of the interactive, overlapping nature of human motivators and desires. Anticipation of workers' upward hierarchy necessities—and the corresponding structuring of work areas—characterized
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progressive, worker-oriented administration. If basic and elevated human needs were to be met, leaders of work areas should furnish safety, meet physical and social needs, and satisfy workers' self-expression desires—the highest needs category. Herzberg's dual-factor motivational structure complemented Maslow's hierarchy in many ways.

Herzberg believed, as had Maslow, that man possessed two broad needs categories—primal animal necessities and higher, complicated self-improvement ambitions. Normal, healthy folk sought challenging situations, established, mature, lasting obligations, and possessed a sense of responsibility—an optimistic view of man similar to McGregor's and Maslow's. Amitai Etzioni encouraged work areas where "goodness of fit" existed between firm and workers' interests.

Employees' basic and elevated ambitions were furthered when firms gained compliance by legitimate persuasion and cooperation, rather than by arbitrary, dictatorial means. Managers' methods of gaining firm objectives—by use of fair or unfair power strategies—were influences on workers' attraction to and participation in the firm. Negative compliances to promote organizational aims was incompatible with employees' primary and higher desires. Agreement of worker-firm goals—and the types and character of firm incentives used to gain and
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hold members were indicative of an enlightened managerial philosophy and a mature, humane concern for employees as humans.\(^{133}\) The worker-centered environment envisioned by T. Madison Byar included meeting workers' total requirements involving correctness of match between their interests and those of the firm.

Byar's synergistic work setting encompassed employees' fundamental and complex, abstract human concerns. Commonly understood firm goals—and methods of attaining them—interfirm cooperation, and the creation of worker-oriented tasks and relationships were guarantors of employees' loyalties and self-actualization ambitions. Communications facilitation and openness, optimal worker input into decisionmaking, and the suitable matching of person to task maximized human development at work. In the enlightened, progressive synergistic work area, human variances, such as expressions of individuality or deviations from the ordinary, were promoted and encouraged to satisfy the broad spectrum of human concerns. Byar's compassionate work setting included interfirm relationships to constantly maintain the internal condition of the firm and to call forth the best of workers' self-development talents and skills.\(^{134}\) The synergistic work arena was essential for optimum development of human talents, skills, and abilities.\(^{135}\) Worker uniquenesses, individualities, and diversities were valued, encouraged,
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and promoted for the benefit of firm and members. Progressive, mutually helpful work relationships among all firm occupants were balances for the internal state of the organization and freed human talents for self-realization. Andrew W. Halpin shared Byar's interest in the influence of organizational atmospheres on workers.

Halpin popularized organizational openness of climate as most beneficial to workers. High worker interest and participation in the firm and creative and cooperative work relationships were satisfiers of many basic and more advanced worker drives. Freedom of information flow and recognition and adaptation of suitable change or innovation were motivators toward self-fulfillment.

Efficient, competent administrators generated progressive organization climates helpful to workers. Establishment of worker-manager trust and cooperativeness--and democratic, informal work conditions--was an important task of modern, behavioral administration. Non-threatening work areas challenged workers' interests and called forth their best efforts. The psychological climate or tone of work places encouraged--or hindered--workers' quests for work-related satisfactions and personal development. Negative, regressive work surroundings ordinarily elicited low morale, resistance to the firm, and aggressive worker behaviors. Wise use of theory by firm leaders
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was essential to satisfaction of human desires. Leader judicious, suitable use of theory promoted worker satisfactions and the meeting of human ambitions. Halpin realized, however, that few administrators employed theory because of failure to comprehend its meaning and uses.\textsuperscript{140} John K. Hemphill shared Halpin's view of effective administration as crucial to worker concerns.

Hemphill believed that workers' desires were well met by administrative use of situational approaches to leadership and correct provision for group variances. Size, stability, and adaptability of groups affected or determined suitability of leadership styles. Group cohesiveness and work satisfactions were especially important determiners of leadership type and other provisions for group differences.\textsuperscript{141} Perceptive, speedy diagnosis of the concerns of workers in groups was essential to the satisfaction of human motives.

Comprehensive administrative knowledge and corresponding managerial application of the components of situational leadership techniques—work group dynamics and group decision-making processes—were creators of work environments leading to human development.\textsuperscript{142} Important influences on the ability of groups to satisfy members were: degree of control or freedom, intimacy or closeness of members, and
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readiness to admit and foster adjustments of new members.\textsuperscript{143} Robert G. Owens recognized many of the same leadership insights as Hemphill.

Owens believed that enlightened administration called forth the best efforts of firm members. Administrators--whose organizational conduct mainly determined the quality of firm atmosphere--should understand organizations and their members. Rapid, accurate administrators recognition and diagnosis of the requirements of individuals and firms showed concern for workers.\textsuperscript{144}

Leadership, a complex management art, was comprised of more substance and approaches than usually admitted or realized. Administrators' conscious and unconscious adaptation of suitable, practical leadership styles and techniques to the uniqueness of settings, staffs, and the leader's personality created worker-centered conditions.

Owens, behavioral plan for satisfaction of workers, stressed individuals' organizational roles. Firm leaders who correctly assigned roles and workers ordinarily perceived members humanely and encouraged maximal use of human talents--a view consistent with openness of system climate.\textsuperscript{145} Chris Argyris' plan encompassed agreement between the needs of individuals and their firms. Primary emphasis was on firm rationality and mechanistic aspects of production--and excellence of firm construct and operation.

Argyris believed that firm adaptation to workers' needs and the physical environment was evidence of its health and vigor.
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Managers' clarification of firm goals--and internal system maintenance--created work conditions satisfying to workers and managers.  

The main responsibility of administrators was establishing and maintaining firm logic and rationality and assuring that only sensible, reasonable demands were made of employees. Wise managers recognized and kept within limits inevitable conflicts between firms and their occupants.

Total administrative command and a hierarchically-based parts plan included job assignment and productive coordination--qualities essential to the creation of secure, stable work areas. Span of control, limitation of supervisory responsibility, and chain of command were integral to organizational operation. Control span was necessary for reasonable worker-manager ratios and to work areas where responsibility could be fixed. Argyris intended to satisfy the higher, abstract drives of workers, as well as their elementary ones, through excellence of organizational construct and smoothness of operation. In this environment, work satisfactions would accrue, and abstract human drives and ambitions would be realized. Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick depended more than had Argyris on Scientific Management to satisfy and hold capable workers--and meet the goals of the firm.
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Gulick and Urwick interpreted and used many Scientific Management precepts to satisfy workers and to create and maintain productive efficiency. Administrators who used command unity, line and staff, and the careful delegation of decision-making powers and responsibilities maintained the internal equilibrium of the firm and assured secure, orderly work conditions. These theorists, unlike Herbert A. Simon, favored span of control—the limitation of a leader's authority to but five or six workers. Strict attention to details of firm operation, spheres of work authority for workers, work subdivisions, and meticulous overall firm planning and coordination were promoters of the interests of workers and the firm.

Gulick and Urwick's management theory was a satisfier of indirectly rather than explicitly. Intrinsic firm qualities—security, safety, and provision for work satisfactions, meritorious promotions, and rationality—and the exercise of great care in firm operational procedures, were guarantors of workers' primary needs and complex, self-realization ambitions. When firms were properly built—and wisely and efficiently run—workers' concerns would naturally be met.

The third, final part of Chapter 6 was a comparison and contrast of some administrative concepts used by theorists of varied eras to gain efficiency and meet workers' human needs. Though theorists of all eras expressed concern for industrial efficiency, each provided—explicitly or implicitly—for workers' human development at work.


THEORY COMPARISONS AND CONTRASTS

Theorists of each era naturally promoted the main interest of management—efficient production of a product or service. Theorists of all eras were, though, considerate and perceptive enough to recognize and clearly or inherently provide for employees' human concerns. Figure 9 (COMPARISONS-CONTRASTS OF MAJOR THEORIES) shows administrative concepts common to Scientific Management, Human Relations, and the Post-1950's eras as well as concepts common to all three eras.

Taylor, Fayol, and Weber promoted the following administrative precepts and practices to further the interests of firms and their members: human engineering, the most efficient employment of workers, scientifically-chosen and trained foremen, creation and continuance of vigorous work settings, statements of firm goals, firm rationality and logic, and excellence of firm construct.

Taylor and Fayol paid special attention to "economic man" motivation, worker-manager cooperation, and the use of scientific managerial principles. Fayol and Weber favored professional training for administrators. Taylor and Weber adhered to scientific analyses of the total firm and task arrangement and assignment.

Taylor alone routinely used and popularized scientific job analyses, creation of harmonious worker-manager relationships, the near equality of employee-manager work division, financial rewards for workers, and the scientific measurement of a proper work day for workers. Fayol (but not Taylor or Weber) encouraged separate factory administration, the search for a universal set of administrative precepts, and planning, coordinating, controlling, forecasting, and
commanding. Weber placed special stress on scientific task specialization, written rules of firm behavior and duty, the scientific matching of workers and work, and lifetime appointment to the organization.

Human Relations theorists' most pressing concern was satisfaction of worker ambitions in the work place. Frequent worker-manager consultations—and the careful structuring of work areas—were two common Human Relations practices. Human Relations researchers Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Kurt Lewin, and Fritz Roethlisberger and William Dickson encouraged the following administrative precepts to satisfy workers' and firm needs: research into worker-work interdependencies, studies of democratic supervision and personnel relationships; research into informal firm structures; establishment and continuance of vigorous, creative places of work; provision for workers' feelings and their effects on firm behaviors; recognition of the effects of administrators on worker morale and efficiency; creation of harmonious, cooperative work relationships; establishment of desirable places of work; and the meeting of workers' primary and higher, abstract human needs.

Lewin, Mayo, and Follett (but not Roethlisberger and Dickson) adhered to research into worker morale and work group dynamics. Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, and Follett emphasized recognition of changeability of worker attitudes, worker-manager cooperation, worker-manager consultations, the value of group cohesion, the satisfying of workers' self-actualization ambitions, and firm goals or objectives.

Mayo and Roethlisberger and Dickson (but not Lewin or Follett) stressed recognition of the limits of administrative control, most efficient employment of workers, realization of the value of teamwork,
job satisfactions, and informal work groups, administrative expertise in Human Relations diagnostic skills, and constant research into workers' organizational behaviors.

Follett in particular recognized psychological and social impediments to firm change and stressed equity, status, and opportunities for workers' human development at work. Follett and Mayo understood the complexity of motivation; and Lewin researched the effects on workers of leadership style, and recognized the effects on firms of leaders.

Behavioral administrative theory was largely a composite, blending, and rearranging of Scientific Management and Human Relations beliefs. Organizational behavior of workers and group dynamics were two areas of special interest to current, modern administrative theorists.

Post-1950's Era

In the current, behavioral era, theorists employed varied methods and means to promote firm concerns and to meet workers' human interests. Though the influence of Scientific Management was evident in many modern theories, Human Relations—with its strong emphasis on consideration for workers and worker self-development through work—greatly affected current structuralist theory.

Barnard, Simon, Hemphill, McGregor, Owens, Herzberg, Maslow, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, Griffiths, Halpin, and Byar encouraged work settings compatible to workers' self-actualization drives and ambitions. Each of the theorists named above except Herzberg and Maslow—plus Argyris and Mort—recognized the effects on firms of leaders. Barnard, Argyris, Gulick and Urwick, and Mort
advocated worker-centered work areas. Recognition of the effects of firm atmospheres on goals was a tenet of all behavioral theorists except Herzberg, Maslow, Gulick and Urwick, and Mort.

Statements of firm goals or objectives was advocated by the following theorists: Barnard, Simon, McGregor, Parsons, Etzioni, Griffiths, Halpin, Argyris, Gulick and Urwick, and Byar. Provision for the unique needs of group members was employed by Hemphill, McGregor, Owens, Herzberg, Maslow, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, Griffiths, and Byar. Leader knowledge of group dynamics was a precept of Barnard, Simon, Hemphill, McGregor, Owens, Getzels and Guba, Griffiths, Argyris, and Byar. Barnard, Simon, Hemphill, McGregor, Owens, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, and Byar recognized and encouraged the insight that firm roles comprised the organization.

Barnard, Simon, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, Griffiths, Argyris, Gulick and Urwick, and Byar promoted and urged system maintenance and stability. Human Relations training for administrators was favored and practiced by Hemphill, McGregor, Owens, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, Griffiths, Halpin, and Byar.

Barnard, Simon, Owens, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, Argyris, and Byar promoted formal-informal firm group congruence or needs agreement. Correct match of workers and work was a precept of Barnard, Simon, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, Argyris, Gulick and Urwick, and Byar. Worker-firm needs harmony was considered necessary by Barnard, Simon, Owens, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, Argyris, and Byar. Hemphill, McGregor, Owens, Griffiths, Halpin, Argyris, and Byar realized--and urged others to--the importance of quality workers to firm success. Barnard, Simon, Getzels and Guba,
Argyris, Gulick and Urwick, and Byar fostered communications efficiency within the firm. Barnard, Simon, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, and Byar pointed to the impact of social forces on the organization.


Barnard, Simon, and Owens advocated professionally-trained administrators. Barnard, Simon, and Parsons established total firm systems coordination. Isolation of the elements of efficiency precept of Hemphill, Argyris, and Gulick and Urwick. Maslow, Getzels and Guba, and Byar proposed work areas to meet the total human requirements of workers. Getzels and Guba, Parsons, and Etzioni developed social system models to explain worker-firm needs. Hemphill, Owens, and Byar identified and called attention to the impact of
individual and group qualities. Parsons, Etzioni, and Argyris popularized and favored intelligent delegation of firm authority and power.

Maslow and Herzberg created human needs schemes or pyramids to explain worker motivations in organizations. Hemphill and Argyris identified and promptly resolved worker-firm conflicts. Leader detachment, control span, chain of command, and line and staff were practices advocated by Argyris and Gulick and Urwick. Barnard and Simon provided for firm status systems. Argyris and Gulick and Urwick used division of work and task specialization. Owens and Mort encouraged use of theory by administrators. Parsons and Argyris favored and promoted total firm environmental adaptation.

Simon urged use of varied work incentives or motivators. Gulick and Urwick studied coordination, direction, reporting, and budgeting. Byar emphasized synergistic work environments. Gulick and Urwick charted firm relationships and counseled responsible delegation of authority. Finally, Byar encouraged and promoted prompt, appropriate adoption of innovations.

All theorists of each major era of theory creation--Scientific Management, Human Relations, and Post-1950's--expressed concern for productive efficiency and for workers as human beings. Each Scientific Manager--Taylor, Fayol, and Weber--tried to employ firm workers most efficiently, as did Mayo and Roethlisberger and Dickson of the Human Relations era. In the behavioral era, Barnard, Simon, and Argyris, and Gulick and Urwick were advocates of the most efficient employment of firm workers and care in firm construction and operation. Worker-manager cooperation was a special concern of Scientific Managers Taylor
and Fayol, Human Relations proponents Follett, Mayo, and Roethlisberger and Dickson, and behavioral theorists Barnard, Simon, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, and Byar. Development and continuance of vigorous, creative work environments was considered essential by Scientific Managers Taylor, Fayol, and Weber, Human Relations theorists Follett, Mayo, and Roethlisberger and Dickson, and behavioral theorists Barnard and Simon, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Etzioni, Griffiths, Halpin, and Byar. The establishment of harmonious, cooperative work relationships was advocated by Taylor (Scientific Management), Follett, Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson (Human Relations), and Barnard and Simon, McGregor, Getzels and Guba, Parsons, Griffiths, Halpin, and Byar (Post-1950's). Finally, meeting workers' primary and higher human drives was a prime interest and concern of Human Relations theorists Follett, Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, and Lewin and behavioral managers Barnard, McGregor, Herzberg, Maslow, Getzels and Guba, Halpin, and Byar.

Relatively few administrative concepts were used in all three major eras of theory creation--Scientific Management, Human Relations, and Behavioral. Most administrative precepts remained essentially unaltered within eras. For example, human engineering, the scientific choosing and training of foremen, and the scientific determination of a proper work day for workers were explicit practices of Scientific Management, but of no other era as such. Frequency of worker-manager consultations, recognition of the influence of workers' feelings on conduct, and administrative expertise in human relations diagnostic skills were mainly Human Relations practices.
Most behavioral theories were a synthesis of Scientific Management and Human Relations beliefs. In the modern, structuralist era, earlier theories (mainly Human Relations) were combined with the ideas of current theorists—and worded or enunciated differently. For example, certain modern theorists advocated precepts which were similar to those of Scientific Management and Human Relations.

Scientific job analyses, scientific analysis of the total firm, near equality of worker-manager work, monetary incentives for workers, task arrangement and assignment, worker-manager cooperation, professionally-trained administrative staffs, and scientific task specialization were Scientific Management precepts which were altered in the behavioral era. Some Human Relations beliefs which were rearranged in the behavioral era were: studies of worker-work interrelationships or dependencies, research into worker morale and work group dynamics, research into democratic supervision and personnel relations, studies of informal firm structures, recognition of psychological-social barriers to change, recognition of the influence of administrators on morale and production, continual studies and research into workers' firm conduct, leadership studies, recognition of the importance of group cohesion, meeting workers, self-improvement needs, and the creation of desirable conditions of work.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Scientific Management Era</th>
<th>Human Relations Era</th>
<th>Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Economic man&quot; motivational view</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human engineering</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most efficient employment of workers</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific administrative principles</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific job analyses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific analysis of the total firm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientifically chosen and trained foremen</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near equality of worker-manager work division</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary incentives for workers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task arrangement and assignment</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific determination of a proper day's work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMPARISONS-CONTRASTS OF MAJOR THEORIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Scientific Management Era</th>
<th>Human Relations Era Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Fayol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker-manager cooperation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally-trained administrative staff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separate factory administration</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search for universal administrative principles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan, control, coordinate, forecast, and command</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm rationality and impartiality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific task specialization</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written rules of duty and conduct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientifically matched workers and jobs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime appointment to the firm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Workers' needs met through firm construct excellence | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Human Relations</th>
<th>Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>Herzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayol</td>
<td>Roethlisberger-Dickson</td>
<td>Maslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>Getzels-Guba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follett</td>
<td>Lewin</td>
<td>Parsons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnard</td>
<td>Ezioni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Griffiths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hemphill</td>
<td>Halpin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Argyris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gulick-Urwick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Byar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 9 (Continued)**

- Studies of worker-work interdependence
- Research into worker morale and work group dynamics
- Concern for workers as people
- Recognition of informal firm structures
- Recognition of psychological-social barriers to change
- Recognition of limits of administrative control
- Recognition of administrative control of workers' attitudes
- Frequent worker-manager consultations
- Recognition of change abilities
- Frequent worker-manager consultations
- Recognition of psychological-social barriers to change
- Creation and continuance of vigorous and creative work settings
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Scientific Management Era</th>
<th>Human Relations Era</th>
<th>Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>Fayol</td>
<td>Weber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of complexities of the nature of human motivation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the influence of workers' feelings on conduct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of influence of administrators on morale and production</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the importance of teamwork, job satisfaction, and informal work groups</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expertise in human relations diagnostic skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant study and research into workers' organizational conduct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research into leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Scientific Management Era</th>
<th>Human Relations Era</th>
<th>Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of the importance of group cohesion and meeting workers' self-development drives</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on worker equity, status, and opportunities</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of harmonious, cooperative work relationships</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of desirable work settings</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting workers' primary and higher human needs</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally-trained administrators</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker-firm needs balance</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total firm systems coordination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications efficiency</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm goals or objectives</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care in leader selection and training</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Scientific Management Era</th>
<th>Human Relations Era</th>
<th>Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leader knowledge of group dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm formal-informal group congruence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of varied motivators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker-firm needs harmony</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting workers' human needs through excellence of firm construct</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership analysis and its implications</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of impact of social forces on the firm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of effects of firm atmospheres on goals</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of varied firm incentives to attract and hold members</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of worker-centered work settings</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational approaches to leadership</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Scientific Management Era</th>
<th>Human Relations Era</th>
<th>Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isolation of components of efficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for unique needs of group members</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environments conducive to workers' self-actualization drives</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of importance of the quality of workers to firm success</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition that firm roles comprise the organization</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open social systems approaches</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human needs schemes or hierarchies to explain worker motivations</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work settings for meeting workers' total human needs</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social systems models to explain worker-firm needs</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System maintenance and stability</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Concepts</th>
<th>Scientific Management Era</th>
<th>Human Relations Era</th>
<th>Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct match of workers and work</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations training for administrators</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognitions and prompt resolution of worker-firm conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationality in firm construct</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader detachment, control span, and chain of command</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care in firm construction and operation</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination, direction, report, and budgeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergistic work settings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker input into firm decisionmaking</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision for firm status systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of individual and group qualities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for productive efficiency</td>
<td>X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 9 (Continued)
## Administrative Concepts

### Scientific Management Era
- Taylor
- Fayol
- Weber
- Follett
- Mayo
- Roethlisberger-Dickson
- Lewin
- Barnard
- Simon
- Hemphill
- McGregor
- Owens
- Herzberg
- Maslow
- Golezko-Guba
- Parsons
- Etzioni
- Grifiths
- Halpin
- Argyris
- Guilick
- Urwick
- Byar
- Mort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concepts</th>
<th>Post-1950's Era</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precise charting of firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of responsibilities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of work and task</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialization</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent mobilization of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firm power</td>
<td>X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of theory by administrators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt, suitable adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of innovations</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of effects on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firms of leaders</td>
<td>X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total firm environmental</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adaption</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X denotes compliance of theorist with concept.
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Chapter 7

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was conducted to determine if there were common beliefs and strains of thought in major administrative theories of different eras. An examination was made of the related subproblems of (1) whether theories of the Cameralists and Woodrow Wilson influenced later theories, (2) whether Scientific Management theories were altered in the Human Relations era, (3) whether Human Relations theories were changed in the behavioral era, and (4) whether the antecedents of behavioral theories were certain Scientific Management and Human Relations theories.

The study was limited to an examination of selected administrative theories from approximately 1900 to 1970. The pre-twentieth century administrative thought of the Cameralists and Woodrow Wilson was also briefly examined as a prelude to later theories. A further limitation was the placing of major emphasis on Scientific Management and Human Relations and their influences on behavioral theories.

It was assumed (1) that common elements or beliefs were present in all important theories, (2) that Scientific Management was unrelated to theories of the Cameralists and Woodrow Wilson, (3) that Scientific Management or Classical theories were altered in the behavioral era, (4) that Scientific Management and Human Relations theories were the foundation for behavioral theories,
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That comprehension of administrative theories is useful to administrators, and that knowledge of administrative theories should improve administrators' performances.

All major administrative and supervisory theories, especially in the Scientific Management and Human Relations eras, contained some common beliefs, concepts, and goals. All major Scientific Management theorists—Frederick W. Taylor, Henri Fayol, and Max Weber—were most concerned with worker or productive efficiency. Yet each theorist's administrative concepts were guarantors for meeting the human needs of workers—a major Human Relations emphasis.

Each Human Relations theorist—Mary Parker Follett, Elton Mayo, Fritz Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson—was concerned mainly with satisfying workers' needs—an expression of concern for the person. All Human Relations theorists, however, were interested in gaining and improving productive or firm efficiency—the most pressing interest of Scientific Managers.

Behavioral theorists blended and combined their administrative ideas and precepts with those of earlier theorists, particularly those of the Human Relations era. The humane, worker-centered philosophy of Human Relations theorists—the structuring of work places and conditions to further workers' interest and human requirements, and studies of leadership quality, group dynamics, and organizational climates—exerted a far greater influence on modern, behavioral theories than did the mechanical, impersonal character of Scientific Management.

The primary focus and concern of Scientific Management (1910-1935) theorists—which arose as a consequence of the accelerating Industrial Revolution in the United States—was productive or factory efficiency,
its discovery and ways to increase it. Frederick W. Taylor, pioneer Scientific Manager, believed time and motion studies at work—and manipulation of workers and the mechanics of the productive process—was the most logical means to improved efficiency. Henri Fayol met the demands of efficiency through expertly trained top administrative and supervisory personnel—and careful, systematic control of the productive process. Max Weber's means of promoting efficiency was in the exemplary character and quality of bureaucracy, the ideal organizational form. The professionalization of bureaucracy—including lifetime appointment for members—was to be a guarantor of efficiency.

Neither Scientific Manager—Taylor, Fayol, or Weber—made clear, explicit provisions for meeting the human concerns of workers. This was to be done—if at all—as an adjunct to excellence of firm construct and the careful ordering and regulating of the work place and the productive process.

Human Relations was a reaction to the methodical systematization of Scientific Management—and its evident lack of compassion for workers as people. Whereas under Scientific Management, concern for workers' humanness had been secondary to efficiency, the reverse of this situation was true of the Human Relations era. Consideration for workers as people, utilization of workers' feelings, attitudes, and verbal input into firm decisionmaking, and manipulations of the work place to please and satisfy workers were common to Human Relations. Productive gain or efficiency was taken for granted by Human Relations theorists who believed that happy, well-satisfied employees would naturally be efficient producers.
Behavioral era administrative theories were generally a combination and synthesis of Scientific Management and Human Relations. Modern, structuralist administrative theorists gave much attention to the Human Relations concerns of organizational needs congruences and employees' behaviors in firms, group decisionmaking, status systems within organizations, motivational studies, and organizational work climates and firm communications. The influence of Scientific Management was evident in concern for line and staff, chain of command, control span, and work division.

Comparisons and contrasts in use of selected administrative concepts among certain theorists in Chapters 3, 4, and 5--SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT AND EARLIER THEORIES, HUMAN RELATIONS MOVEMENT, and POST-1950'S ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES--were made in Chapter 6. The major unifying parts of the study--theory comparisons and contrasts--were made among certain selected administrative concepts within eras and, if warranted, between or among theorists of different eras.

The only administrative concepts employed by all selected administrative theorists of each era--Scientific Management, Human Relations, and behavioral--were concern for productive efficiency and concern for workers as humans. Most Scientific Management administrative concepts remained essentially intact within the Scientific Management era. For example, human engineering, scientific determination of a proper work day for workers, and the scientific matching of work and workers were, for all practical purposes, exclusive to Scientific Management. In contrast, few Human Relations administrative concepts remained exclusive to that era, though many (perhaps most) were worded differently when adopted by theorists of the behavioral era. The
majority of Human Relations concepts were adopted and combined with their own ideas by modern, structuralist theorists.

**FINDINGS**

1. Before the twentieth century, the European Cameralists and United States leader Woodrow Wilson had codified certain aspects of administration. The aim of Cameralists was to identify and increase sources of revenue for rulers of autocratic states. Woodrow Wilson's primary contribution was his search for scientific administrative principles to promote governmental efficiency. No direct relationship was discovered between the ideas of the Cameralists and Woodrow Wilson and later administrative theories. The Cameralists and Wilson were naturally concerned with operational administrative efficiency, as were all theorists.

2. Scientific Management ideas, theories, and practices were modified by Human Relations practitioners and experimenters. Scientific Managers concentrated on organizational excellence and mechanistic operational efficiency—time and motion studies. Human Relations researchers, though concerned with organizational efficiency, made creation of a work environment favorable to the meeting of workers' human needs their primary objective. Scientific Managers believed that the path to productive efficiency lay in excellence of firm construct and in strict attention to the details of the productive process. Human Relations theorists emphasized the amount and quality of worker input into decisionmaking and the establishment and maintenance of a worker-centered organizational atmosphere. Scientific Managers and Human Relations adherents stressed—to varying degrees—operational
efficiency, but their primary paths to this lay in different directions. Scientific Managers manipulated the productive process to gain efficiency, while Human Relations adherents conceived of efficiency as a byproduct of pleasing workers.

3. In the behavioral era of administrative development, Human Relations theories were modified, amplified, and combined with current administrative thought. Each behavioral theorist expressed concern for workers' needs. Desire to generate productive efficiency also received considerable emphasis in the modern era. Current, behavioral theorists were concerned with administrative efficiency relating to the amount and quality of the product or service. Many behavioral theorists employed Scientific Managers' span of control, command unity, line and staff, strict care in organizational planning and stressed the importance of setting and achieving firm goals.

4. The antecedents of behavioral administrative theories were mainly Scientific Management and Human Relations theories. Behavioral theorists extensively researched human organizational conduct and behaviors. In the current era, the Human Relations practices of training administrators in the comprehension of organizational behavior and increased administrator involvement in the firm were major emphases. Several other Human Relations concepts emphasized in behavioral theories were: leadership studies, increased worker involvement in firm decision-making processes, creation of worker-oriented work environments, use of organizational incentives for workers, situational leadership approaches, social systems theories, human needs hierarchies, and provision for meeting workers' total human needs.
Scientific Management beliefs were borrowed and incorporated into many administrative theories in the modern era. Emphasis was focused on the executive process, as well as organizational construct, efficiency, and effectiveness—all Scientific Management interests. Many behavioral theorists encouraged the creation and maintenance of organizational rationality, work division, careful authority delegation, total firm coordination, identification of firm goals, and the establishment of formal organizational authority structures—all Scientific Management precepts.

Current administrative theories arose from Scientific Management and Human Relations theories. Behavioral administrative researchers, writers, and theorists were mainly influenced by Human Relations, as was shown by their constant preoccupation with meeting workers' human concerns. Scientific Management's primary thrust—concern for the product or productive efficiency—was secondary to meeting human needs for most behavioral administrative thinkers and experimenters.

**IMPLICATIONS**

1. There are more similarities than differences in the thinking of Scientific Managers and Human Relations theorists. Theorists of both schools were concerned with productive efficiency and the meeting of workers' human needs. The major variances in Scientific Management and Human Relations were the means to these ends.

2. United States educators of all historical eras have generally not comprehended the meaning and value of theory to educators. Teaching about theory and its uses has traditionally been done, if at all, as an adjunct to other, supposedly more important disciplines.
3. Administrative theory in the United States appeared and evolved almost entirely as a reaction to the accelerating demands of the Industrial Revolution in the United States. Industrial and educational administrative theories originated primarily within the United States.

4. Minimal attention in contemporary educational literature has been given relationships among administrative theories. This continuing historical omission has caused confusion as to the meaning and practicality of theory for educational administrators and supervisors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Extensive research should be conducted on all major eras and processes of administrative theory creation. Historical influences on theory evolvement should be identified, analyzed, and set forth.

2. The revival of interest in the development and practicality of administrative theory should be accompanied by a corresponding appropriate allocation of research funds.

3. Separate departments and knowledgeable, stimulating instructors should be provided for the teaching of administrative theory--its meaning, historical development, and practical usage. Suitable studies in administrative theory should be required of all who plan to enter educational administration and supervision.

4. Exhaustive, continuous research should be done on the processes of theory building. Research conclusions should be periodically published and made available to interested, concerned educators. Care should be taken to clarify the meaning of theory, its construction processes, and its practical uses.
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