Management Ideas Poem

Paul Holland

With Herzberg, Mintzberg and Mr Argyie
I'm desperately trying to develop a style
But will I ever get the chance to Schein
Often I feel I'm in de Klein

I'm looking for a Handy solution I shout
But as soon as I'm interested it just Peters out
I've looked everywhere (at Fielder on the roof and Maslower down)
Till I'm Reddin the face and begin to frown

I'm not as Jung as I used to be (keep it quiet)
But Freud egg and Drucker 'O'man are not my diet
Even in Tesco during Shopenhauers
They Kant stop talking about the brain's mystical powers

I've looked at TA and got my fingers Bernd
My cross-transactions have Vroom for improvement - so I learned
Without Fayol when I'm counselled I just get a Block
I get de Board feeling so easily I never take stock

Learning styles may have helped me (but I lied)
However, I discovered, 'Honey, it's Kolb outside'
My search has been rewarded (partial I'd admit)
When asked for my opinion I say it's all Tannenbaum and Schmidt

I'm sorry if the above doesn't scan
But I'm afraid I missed the meter man

(Holland 1989: 96)
The analogy of the filter funnel can help to explain why only a very small fraction of all the available management ideas ever achieve popular status. As the ideas are tipped in at the top, they flow down through ever finer filters. These filters have labels such as managers' needs, idea benefits, timeliness, promotion and presentation. Because the majority of the management ideas fail to meet requirements, they get filtered out, only a very small number of them re-emerge at the other end as popular management ideas (see Figure 1.1). This explains why there have only been six truly popular management idea families in the last hundred years.

The 1960s generated a great interest in management ideas and gurus. During that time, a small number of management commentators attained guru status. Their books sold in their thousands and even millions, royalties flowed in, and their ideas were merchandised through diaries and newsletters, as well as through traditional outlets such as audio and video cassettes. The appearance money that they charged to make presentations at conferences and in company programmes matched that of film, television and pop stars. How can certain management ideas be so attractive and bring such high rewards to those who develop and present them? The purpose of this book is to answer these questions.

Certain ideas, such as those of Herzberg et al. (1959), continue to be popular even after other writers have demonstrated flaws in the research methods and have challenged them. The fact that newer and methodologically sounder ideas have become available, has not reduced the popularity or discussion of older ones like those of Abraham Maslow (1943), Douglas McGregor (1960) or Reniso Liker (1961). These continue to have a profound effect on management teaching.

Many years ago, John Dryden said that 'falsehood once received from a famed writer becomes traditional to posterity'. Since then, other authors have commented that the truth or falsehood of an idea was one thing, but that its acceptance and dissemination was another; that there was no apparent correlation between the significance of an idea and its popularity; that what was said was less important than how it was said; and that ideas received acclaim not because they were true, but because they were interesting.

Since nomenclature represents a potential problem, this will be dealt with immediately. What is collectively referred to as management thought in historical accounts of the subject by authors such as Wren (1973) consists of theories, research findings, frameworks, propositions, beliefs, views, insights and suggestions. It is an untidy hotchpotch of diverse offerings. Linguistically therefore, it is convenient to adopt a set of standardized labels for use throughout this book. The term management idea is applied to all abstract theoretical thoughts or systems of such units. Kramer defined a management idea as a fairly stable body of knowledge about what managers ought to do. He said that it was derived from inductive and deductive reasoning. It is systematically organized knowledge applicable to a relatively wide area of circumstances. As a system of assumptions, accepted principles and rules of procedures . . . [it] assists managers to analyze and explain the underlying causes of a given business situation and predict the outcome of alternative courses of action.

(Kramer 1975: 47)

Where there can be said to be sufficient similarity between these ideas or systems of ideas, then the term family of management ideas will be used. Finally, where the idea or idea system spans a clearly defined set of actions which go beyond mere thought, but actually seek to alter the behaviour of individuals, groups or organizations in some way, then the label idea technique will be applied.

Which then are the most popular management ideas of the twentieth century? The results of a survey of academics and practitioners in the field and a content analysis of professional journals, popular texts of selected readings and a reprint series was used to establish this. Matheson (1974) reported the findings of a survey carried out among the 2,123 members of the American Academy of Management which sought to identify contribu-

---

**Figure 1.1** Distilling the popular management ideas

---
tions that 'had greatly influenced management thought and research'. In the late 1970s Pollard (1974; 1978) summarized the work of forty-two writers on management ideas which gave students a 'fair cross-section of the writings on management'. Books by Pugh, Hickson and Hinings (1983) and Pugh (1984) summarized the contributions of selected management writers and contained extracts from their original books. Authors were chosen because
All have attempted to draw together information and distill theories of how organizations function and how they should be managed. Their writings have been theoretical in the sense that they have tried to discover generalizations applicable to all organizations. (Pugh et al. 1983: 9).

Another source with which to identify the popular management ideas comes from Miner (1968; 1982). The management ideas in his book were nominated by 'recognized scholars in the field of organizational study. More than thirty-five individuals suggested theories for consideration. All theories on which most of the scholars were agreed are discussed here' (Miner 1982: 453).

Finally, some more recent texts were consulted (Tsui 1984; Koontz 1961 and 1980; Clutterbuck and Crainer 1988 and 1990; Pierce and Newstrom 1988 and 1990). The last of these considered the popular texts of the 1980s based on the dimensions of their market acceptance (volume of sales achieved); provocativeness (presenting viewpoints which run counter to traditional management thought); distinctiveness (presenting a variety of interesting topical themes to managers); author reputation (those having a strong reputation and the quality of their thinking and the insights they have historically generated). Using these references, each management idea mentioned was held to be 'voted for'. A total of 129 names were identified. More recent writers did not appear often in the voting. The length of the final list indicated that beyond a hard core of writers, there is little consensus as to who the really influential contributors are. The top-ranked management writers are shown in Table 1.1.

A total of 129 management writers and their votes were grouped into 'families' of management ideas. Table 1.2 lists these families in chronological order. To these five families a sixth is added. This is labelled guru theory. This school acquired prominence in the 1980s. While not yet featuring extensively in management textbooks it has received widespread attention in the financial and business press (Lorenz 1986a; Byrne 1986; Clutterbuck and Crainer 1988; Pierce and Newstrom 1988 and 1990).

These diverse writings which together constitute guru theory include the thoughts of well-known chief executives such as Lee Iacocca, Harold Geneen, John Harvey-Jones and John Scully; of management consultants like Tom Peters and Philip Crosby; and of modern business school academics like Michael Porter, Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Henry Mintzberg and Kenneth Blanchard. Since they are so diverse and since they draw so much of their authority from the idea developers themselves, it was felt that guru theory was an appropriate label. The focus of this book will not be upon the validity or accuracy of these management ideas, but on the reasons for their appeal to practising managers and management students.

Reflecting on the history of management thought, one can discern bodies of organizational practice which draw upon a tradition of research and theorizing (of sorts) which goes back to the work of Taylor at the beginning of the century. Despite the efforts to dignify this body of writing as 'theory', a distinguishing feature of it has been its fierce pragmatism. Such pragmatism reflects both the concern to be applied knowledge and, in the view of many critical observers, the result of a conscious or formulated refusal to ask any fundamental questions about the nature of organization.

A consideration of popular management ideas involves an examination not only of the world of applied theory at the level of subject matter, but also of the enormously lucrative world of management consultancy and training which requires 'a touchstone idea' for its own legitimation and development. This imposes two types of constraint on the nature and form of the evolving management ideas. First, the ideas and their associated techniques must be acceptable to the organizations which pay the fees. Key aspects of organizational life, such as its political nature, thus tend to be excluded. Issues of conflicting attitudes are also frequently displaced into various semi-therapeutic and psychological treatments.

A second limitation on what can be said and written, if it is to achieve popularity, arises from the connection between management thinking and the paying organization. This affects how the management idea is packaged and sold by a consultant as a training service. The popular management ideas which will be considered in this book are likely to be presented in the form of logos or pseudo-theoretical models which form the basis of a two or three day training programmes. Thus, pragmatic ideas in the form of McGregor's 'Theory X and Theory Y. Maslow's 'Hierarchy of Needs', Herzberg's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Henri Fayol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Douglas McGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Peter Drucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frederick Herzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tom Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Frederick Winslow Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Renaiss Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Argyris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2 Grouping of the most popular writers into management idea families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea family</th>
<th>Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Blau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crozier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selznick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific management</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gantt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gibbuth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barnard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fayol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mooney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sloan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative management</td>
<td>Mayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roethlisberger and Dickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations</td>
<td>Argiris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blake and Mouton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herzberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Likert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McGregor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maslow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neo-human relations</td>
<td>Drucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kantor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jacobson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blanchard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Motivators and Hygiene Factors’ and Peters and Waterman’s ‘7-S’ model will be included. All of these can be summarized on one page of a course handout in the form of a logo or on an overhead projector transparency.

Introduction

They have had to be understood by both middle and junior managerial ranks as well as by those being managed. Although the families of management ideas to be investigated appear superficially to differ greatly, they can all be said to represent a broad consensus on the nature of organizational management in a capitalist society that goes back for a hundred years. While there is no formulated agreement on particular areas in the field of management ideas, there is a broadly accepted model and a set of assumptions about organizational structure and technique. This represents a sort of common-sense understanding of what management is or should be in an organization.

Such a high degree of consensus is not surprising. The common underlying agreement referred to might be called the ‘capitalist imperative’. The ideas to be discussed all emerged from Europe and the United States. The capitalist form of organization therefore specified objectives such as profit maximization, and the role and power relations between those involved in the production process. It set limits on which goals could be pursued and which forms of work organization were acceptable if the fundamental system was not to break down. Mimicking the communist system of organization, the capitalist system rejected any questioning of either the basic terms on which the management of the organization was conducted, or of the political disposition in which it existed. These potentially formidable questions were simply bracketed, acknowledged in aside, or obliquely referred to in externally determined matters such as the contracts of employment and their regulation by law. The political nature of organization is rarely referred to directly in any of the popular management literature.

A distinction needs to be drawn between the task of criticizing the management ideas themselves and that of conducting an analysis to explain their popularity. Each of the management idea families has been subjected to a great deal of censure. Some of this has come from critical writers who have challenged the implicit values and perspectives of the management ideas. A second body of criticism has emanated from those who have claimed that the management writers’ assumptions were invalid, that there were major methodological flaws, and that the proposed techniques which were implemented did not produce the results claimed. This particular body of criticism will not be explicitly addressed in this book since its primary objective is to explain the popularity of the management ideas themselves. The critical literature will be selectively used since these writers have challenged those aspects of the management ideas which, it is argued, give them their appeal to managers. It has been found that it is often the critical perspectives on these management ideas which provide the initial indication of the likely reasons for the popularity.

A major difficulty is seeking to explain the popularity of certain sets of ideas in the history of management thought is the uncertainty of what is being considered. Given a theoretical framework such as scientific manage-
Introduction

Hawthorne studies have discovered that management has at long last learned to improve productivity. The results of work are reflected in higher wages, more job opportunities, and better working conditions. In the past, management has often overlooked the importance of human relations. However, recent studies have shown that employees respond positively to management efforts to improve working conditions. As a result, productivity has increased significantly.

Management Guru

1. What the employee really wants is more money and better working conditions.
2. The relationship between the employee and the manager is crucial.
3. Management must understand and respect the needs of the employees.

The Hawthorne studies have shown that management can improve productivity by improving working conditions and providing better wages. This has led to increased productivity and higher wages for employees. However, managers must also understand the needs of the employees and work to improve these conditions. This is essential for maintaining a positive relationship between the employee and the manager.

References

Peter Drucker (1976) argued that the well-known fact is about Taylorism. Drucker claimed that the Hawthorne experiments had shown the factors that were responsible for improving efficiency. However, according to him, these factors were not the main reason for the success of the experiments. Instead, he believed that the Hawthorne researchers had discovered the importance of management and the need for management to understand the needs of the employees.

Hawthorne researchers argued that management needs to focus on the needs of the employees, and that this focus is essential for improving productivity. However, Drucker believed that the Hawthorne experiments had shown the importance of management and the need for management to understand the needs of the employees. He argued that this focus is essential for improving efficiency.

Peter Drucker (1976) also noted that the Hawthorne experiments had shown the importance of management and the need for management to understand the needs of the employees. However, he argued that the experiments had also shown the importance of management and the need for management to understand the needs of the employees. This focus is essential for improving efficiency.

Peter Drucker (1976) argued that the well-known fact is about Taylorism. Drucker claimed that the Hawthorne experiments had shown the factors that were responsible for improving efficiency. However, according to him, these factors were not the main reason for the success of the experiments. Instead, he believed that the Hawthorne researchers had discovered the importance of management and the need for management to understand the needs of the employees.

Hawthorne researchers argued that management needs to focus on the needs of the employees, and that this focus is essential for improving productivity. However, Drucker believed that the Hawthorne experiments had shown the importance of management and the need for management to understand the needs of the employees. He argued that this focus is essential for improving efficiency.
aim of appropriate theory was not to be right but to be useful. What Lee in effect offered was an argument to legitimise the reformulation of original management ideas into a form which would give them wide ranging popular appeal along the lines being identified in this book. Indeed, he identified theories of useful error which were management ideas which, despite their scientific inadequacy, were useful for the development of insights among practitioners who were not themselves scientists. He contrasted these with theories of necessary simplification which, although accurate by scientific criteria, were so complex that they had to be introduced to practitioners in an appropriate (simplified) form by conscious reformulation on the part of the consultant or business academic. Alongside these one might add Patzig and Zimmermann's (1985) theories of unconscious reformulation where scientifically adequate or inadequate ideas were incorrectly communicated by lecturers or consultants. Lee argued that the management ideas used in post-experience management education, even though they may be of limited validity were:

essential for the proper education of managers [but] ... it is the widespread use of such theories which is responsible for many of the attacks directed at those who teach management in the academic world. Our discipline is not seen as academically respectable by our colleagues who work in more traditional areas. (Lee 1987: 247)

Critics of this view have argued that if engineers or doctors were taught such 'appropriate' theories they could kill either themselves or others. Discussing the techniques based upon the vast range of what have been collectively referred here to as management ideas, Anthony noted that the basic idea from which such techniques were distantly derived could not have been appropriate, 'but the image in which it is presented must be acceptable and be deemed appropriate' (Anthony 1987: 258). Given this difference between the original and the reformulated management idea, the author will examine the latter which might be termed 'popularly received wisdom'.

Chapter 2

Popular management ideas

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1 showed that throughout this century, only six management idea families had achieved widespread popularity and managed to establish themselves in the history of management thought. This chapter briefly considers each of these families in turn. It begins with bureaucracy, and goes on to examine scientific management, administrative theory and human relations. The post Second World War idea families - neo-human relations and guru theory - are considered in proportionately greater depth, since past management books have tended to neglect them.

BUREAUCRACY

Weber's theory of bureaucracy is often presented alongside the work of administrative management writers such as Fayol, Gulick and Urwick, who will be considered later. Weber's own work was set in a historical-philosophical context. However, its specific conclusions established the basis for the work of these other writers. Weber was a German sociologist-philosopher (1864-1920) and not a manager, engineer or a management consultant. His interest was in the process of social change, and in particular, in the effect of rationality on religious thought and capitalism. By rationality he meant the kind of action or mode of organizing in which goals are clearly conceived and all conduct, except that designed to achieve the particular goal, is eliminated.

From this historical perspective he examined different types of authority. Charismatic authority, he said, was based upon a belief in the sacred or extraordinary characteristics of the person giving the order (e.g. Christ). In the traditional form of authority, orders were obeyed because people believed that the person giving them had traditionally done so (e.g. king or lord). In the legal-rational form of authority, the orders were obeyed because people believed that the person giving them was acting in accordance with legal rules and
regulations. The term that Weber applied to the organizational form built upon pure legal-rational authority was bureaucracy.

Fully developed and in its most rational form, bureaucracy necessarily presupposed the concepts of legitimacy and authority. The Weberian model of bureaucracy offers a stable and predictable world which provides the blueprint for "rationally designed" structures in which "rational" individuals carry out their prescribed roles and actions. For Weber, "rationality of action" had to be judged against some objective standard and this formal rationality was reflected in the management thought and literature that succeeded it. For Weber, the bureaucratic form of organization possessed the features of specialization, hierarchy, rules, impersonality, full-time officials, clear focus and a split between public and private activity.

Weber (1948) wrote that bureaucracy existed in ever purer forms in the modern European states and, increasingly, in all public organizations since the time of primordially absolutism. The larger a modern capitalist enterprise was, the more complicated it exhibited a more or less stable pattern based upon a structure of roles and specialized tasks. The interest here is not directly upon the validity of Weber's ideas but upon the appeal that bureaucracy, as a management idea, has had for managers over the years through to the present day.

SCIENTIFIC MANAGEMENT

A second popular idea family to be considered is scientific management. This focused upon the shopfloor and upon the techniques that could be used to maximize the productivity of manual workers. While it is not likely to be applied in its pure form, scientific management does represent a template for a great deal of job design work that has been done during the twentieth century. Scientific management principles continue to be widely applied today. In a typical manufacturing organization one will see scientific management ideas and techniques being applied to the shopfloor, and bureaucratic principles of organization being used in the office areas. Watson reminded his readers that:

Books which relate the history of management thought frequently give the impression that scientific management is a thing of the past but, in the realm of practical realities, its doctrines and techniques still dominate contemporary work designs...the psychological assumptions underlying the approach still hold great sway among practical men.

(Watson 1980: 36)

Developed originally by Frederick Winslow Taylor during the early years of this century, scientific management has exerted a continuing influence on organizational design and management practice. Taylor was an American engineer who established the foundations of the process of work measurement.

ment. Time-and-motion study techniques gave Taylor's ideas the claim to be a science. He based his work upon the accurate and scientific study of unit times (Taylor 1901: 58). His aim was to increase productivity by improving the performance of the workers by selecting manual tasks and fragmenting them into their simplest and smallest components.

Taylor is best known for his book, The Principles of Scientific Management, which was published in 1911. In it, he explained that in order to increase the productivity of labour, it was necessary to highlight the national loss being incurred through inefficiency; that such inefficiency could be remedied by systematic management; and that the best management was a true science, and rested upon a foundation of clearly defined laws, rules and principles.

Even before his rise to eminence, Taylor had developed and espoused his ideas on management. He argued for an empirical approach to the management of industry that was based upon the application of some specific techniques. These had the capability of being applied to any industrial setting since, he argued, organizations were subject to certain laws in their operation. There were certain constant and regular features in organizations. Observation and experimentation could discover what these were.

Taylor was appalled by the inefficiency of industrial practices that he witnessed and set out to demonstrate how managers and workers could both benefit by adopting his scientific approach. The history of scientific management is well known and documented. Taylor drew attention to 'systematic solidweging' (deliberate underworking by employees). This he attributed to weak management control which allowed individuals discretion about the work methods they used. They wasted time and effort, in his view, by using inefficient rules-of-thumb work methods.

At the turn of the century in the United States, managers expected their employees either to possess the appropriate skills for the work they were given, or to learn them from those around them. Notions of systematic job specifications, clearly established responsibilities and training needs analyses, were all unknown. Taylor sought to change this. He argued that mental and manual work should be separated. Management, he claimed, should specialize in planning and organizing the work, and the workers should specialize in actually doing it. Taylor regarded this as a way of ensuring industrial harmony as everyone would know clearly what was expected of them, and what their responsibilities were. He also saw clear advantages in making individuals specialize in activities so that they would become expert and highly proficient in them.

Scientific management was based upon four key principles which Taylor (1911: 36-7) said involved new and heavy burdens for managers. These were:

1. the development of a science for each element of a person's work which would replace the old rule-of-thumb methods. Second, the scientific
The original diffusers of administrative management ideas were not social science or business school faculty but consultants and other managers. Once administrative management had established itself in this way, it passed into management history, began to feature extensively in textbooks and was taught by management teachers and students.

Those who followed Fayol refined these concepts and added to them, often stressing some particular point or theme. Mooney and Riley (1931), for example, emphasized the 'co-ordinative principle' seeing it as the central one. They laid particular stress upon the scalar principle—the process within an organization whereby authority was co-ordinated from the top. Other classical writers such as Gulick and Urwick developed the notion of rationalizing the work process by bringing it together in as centralized an area as possible.

The assumptions of the administrative management have received extensive critical analysis. They have been subjected to intensive research. Nevertheless, the majority of practices recommended by this idea system continue to be central to the way in which modern organizations are organized. While some of the principles advocated by the administrative management writers may have been defective, their overall scheme for building machine-like bureaucracies, with managers and officials strongly in control, have continued to be applied over time. Administrative management is not a historical fossil but continues to represent a major model for the design of large highly-integrated organizations of today.

The criticism that the proponents of administrative management have received has centred around the status of the principles which they expounded. Some of these describe management activities, while others indicate what managers should be doing and exhort them to do things in a certain way. Occasionally, among the writings, one finds an expression of a relationship between organizational variables ('The narrower the span of control, the more levels of hierarchy there will be').

Criticism of the principles came thick and fast. 'Contradictory proverbs' said March and Simon (1958: Chapter 2). 'Simple minded deductions' wrote Perrow (1973). 'They form neither a coherent conceptualization pattern of determination nor an accurate description of concrete reality' said Clegg and Dunkerley (1980: 102). Despite failing all the tests set for them by academics, the principles of administrative management, like those of scientific management, have had a major and continuing effect on management thought and practice. Even their most hardened critics have had to admit that the ideas have been enormously influential in shaping and structuring organizations to the present day. Administrative management may have been scorned by social scientists. Nevertheless, there is a highly successful, durable and expanding field of management consulting as well as an endless series of successful management books, which rest upon the principles of administrative management.

ADMINISTRATIVE THEORY

The primary focus of this management idea family was the determination of what types of specialization and hierarchy would optimize the efficiency of organizations. The application of these two concepts produced a very mechanistic form of organizational design which paid little attention to people and which saw them as cogs in a wheel. Administrative management is built around four key pillars. These are the division of labour, the scalar and functional processes, organizational structure and the span of control. Additional concepts include discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, remuneration, subordination of the individual interest to the general interest, centralization and esprit de corps.

The writer who is most closely, although not exclusively, associated with this management idea was Fayol. Fayol spent his career in a French mining company and rose to the post of managing director. He believed that the techniques of successful management could be described and taught, and that managerial organization was as valid an area of study as worker organization. Fayol sought to discover a body of principles which would enable a manager to build up the formal structure of the organization and to administer it in a rational way. To quote Mouyalis:

The solution to this problem, according to the theory lies in the discovery of a set of principles which, when correctly applied to the particular situation, will prove invaluable guides to the construction of a rational-efficient framework for management. (Mouyalis 1967: 89)
At the beginning, the investigators adopted a physiological approach. Early results, however, suggested that this variable was not as useful as expected. The researchers then turned to the study of administrative management and its effects on productivity. Their findings were not entirely conclusive, but they did reveal some interesting patterns.

The literature review confirmed that economic incentives were often used as a way to increase productivity. However, this was a controversial topic, and there were differing opinions on the effectiveness of such methods. The researchers conducted surveys and interviews to gather more data and refine their conclusions.

The study of institutional factors and social environment was another important aspect. The researchers observed that the social environment in which an organization operated could significantly influence its productivity. They also noted that the institutional context could affect the implementation of management strategies.

The research team also examined the role of technology in enhancing productivity. They found that the use of technology could be an effective way to improve productivity, but they highlighted the importance of ensuring that the technology was well-integrated into the work processes.

In conclusion, the study of productivity is a complex and multifaceted field. The researchers hope that their findings will contribute to a better understanding of how to enhance productivity in organizations. They emphasize the need for ongoing research to further explore this area.
as taboo competition between departments in the same company.

Instead of communicating the depressing message that informal groups worked against management wishes, Mayo became the hero of the age by providing a new gospel. Managers could smile once more and could hope to manipulate the informal group. The solution that he offered was simple. Because the workers' need to belong was so obsessive, their emotions would lead them to espouse the cause of any group which had exhibited social concern for them. Worker were therefore psychologically vulnerable to capture. The informal group captured the individual, but the firm could capture the informal group. Mayo had the formula with which to do this. All the previously bad referents to groups were wiped clean and, as far as management was concerned, group theory began (again) with Mayo.

The reception given to Mayo's message by managers showed that they, as much as workers, were ready to welcome the psychological safety of a comforting myth. Watson (1960) argued that the 'so-called evidence of human relations ideas was regularly and heavily interpreted to fit the beliefs and bunched which derived from Mayo's political preferences and social beliefs. The Hawthorne studies, wrote Watson, could best be viewed as an instructive test of half-truths and half-truths. Like any myth, it mixed fiction, exaggeration and one-sidedness with an element of truth.

The appeal of human relations to managers was considerable. It offered an edifice of scientifically acquired evidence in support of the most satisfactory (managerial) conclusion that 'the requisite skills could release the enthusiasm for co-operation with management which work groups possessed as the result of their deep-felt need for belonging' (Child 1969a).

The 'human relations fad', as Argyris (1957) termed it, was prompted by a number of factors, only one of which were the research studies themselves. The authors of the studies, Mayo, Roethlisberger and Dickson, presented evidence to managers to show that productivity and human relations were closely related. If workers could be helped 'to belong', human relations would be improved, and the workers made more productive.

A second potent factor was the growth of unionism. This revealed to management the extent of worker discontent. Much of this was blamed on poor management. The third factor, according to Argyris, was the development among managers of a sense of responsibility. Additional factors cited included an increase in the size of organizations which caused a lack of communication between top and bottom levels. There was the greater specialization in work in the eighties and technical developments which created human problems. Increased labor costs encouraged management to make full use of labour while the higher standard of living permitted an emphasis on human factors. As will be argued in greater detail in Chapter 4, the time was right for human relations ideas to take off.

Human relations represented just the first of many attempts to bring social science into the service of management. Despite endless disappointments the applications continue to this day because of the hope that is offered. First, the hope of increased efficiency; that social science can produce unparalleled co-operation in the workplace which will transcend or utilize conflict, and potentially displace the necessity and rationale for trade unions. Second, there is the hope of satisfaction; the belief that efficiency will bring about the possibility of achieving the satisfaction of deep human needs at work at no cost to the employer. Third, there is the hope of management contribution that the achievement of efficiency and satisfaction will be attained by a newly enlightened and expert management in command of the total technical, social and human environment. Through its control of work, management controls human happiness, fulfilment and even perhaps sanity.

NEO-HUMAN RELATIONS

The survey of popular management ideas which was reported at the beginning of this book placed the neo-human relations (NHR) management ideas family in top position. The influence of these US writers on management thought began in the late 1950s and has continued ever since. The ideas have passed into American and British management practice in the form of staff appraisal and counselling, supervisory training and job design. All the writers to be discussed in this section:

1 viewed 'conventional' formal organization as a set of techniques embodying specific psychological assumptions
2 asserted that the conventional formal type of organization generated individual psychological distress and suggested that managers replace these with more organic structures
3 offered technical organizational prescriptions to improve matters
4 held that managers should trust their subordinates to be more responsible for the performance of their jobs
5 suggested that managers should permit their subordinates to participate in making up the content of their own jobs

The basic thesis of neo-human relations (NHR) was that, above all, the worker wanted the opportunity to grow and develop on the job. The workers visualized that it would be this which would bring an end to industrial conflict. They assumed that if employees were allowed to do responsible and meaningful work, their attitude to the company would become entirely positive, and they would come to share the goals of management.

During the 1950s and the 1960s the implicit authoritarianism of human relations had become socially unacceptable. This hastened the adoption of the neo-human relations. In their view, competition between individuals and departments in the company continued to be an anathema. However, NHR
1. It should allow a return to dealing with the individual rather than the group.
2. It should be an amalgam, retaining the best aspects of Turoff and Goodchild.
3. May observe, while limiting their dispositions.
4. Employees should be able to develop their own self-identity only through their actions.

It would be advisable to expect any theory (or at least any theory) that is not the mere opposite of the original one. However, the concept of a self-identity is not one that is well observed. All the self-identities that have been observed are those those who make up the (and they are not necessarily valid for the same reasons)

The concern is that change is not necessarily the same thing as organisational change. The concept of a self-identity was developed by those who headed the whole range of ability and obtained satisfaction through changing:

A major aspect of OD, indeed, defining an organisational change, is that of defining the relationships between the new management and the old. According to Beckhard (1969), it is the involvement of senior management in transforming the organisation, and the processes of change, which are the key factors in the success of OD programmes. Thus, the concept of a self-identity was developed by those who headed the whole range of ability and obtained satisfaction through changing:

...
Popular management ideas had a significant impact on the way organizations were run in the mid-20th century. Among these ideas, the Maslow's hierarchy of needs and McGregor's theories of leadership stand out. McGregor's theories, in particular, challenged the traditional management practices of the time and offered a new perspective on motivation and leadership.

Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs is a theory in psychology proposing a hierarchical ranking of human needs. The hierarchy consists of five levels: physiological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization. According to Maslow, individuals progress through these levels, moving from basic needs to higher-level demands as they are satisfied.

Douglas McGregor's theory of management, known as Theory X and Theory Y, introduced a new way of thinking about employee motivation and leadership. Theory X assumes that employees dislike work and need to be coerced into performing their jobs. In contrast, Theory Y assumes that employees are motivated to perform well when they are given the opportunity to do so.

These ideas have had a lasting impact on management practices, shaping the way organizations are structured and operated. The focus has shifted from a top-down approach to one that encourages employee participation and motivation. The Maslow's hierarchy of needs and McGregor's theories have been influential in shaping modern management practices and continue to be studied and applied in organizations today.
24 Management gurus

and secure worker commitment, they advocated remedies such as group decision-making and participative management styles.

Maslow's needs hierarchy theory has been widely taught to managers, and has been used by them to guide their decisions about employees (Matheson 1974) and which should be managed (Crick 1981: 1-20).

It is attractive to managers because it is an on-the-average theory.

The generalization which can be universally applied is that ‘employees may be expected to always want more’. Except for the case of the need for safe, actualized, the theory, as understood by managers, neither stresses individual differences nor requires the measurement of individual motivational patterns before action is taken. Instead, it considers groups of individuals as being defined partly by external circumstances. In this form, the theory is well suited to the needs of broad managerial policies on human relations matters. This is because these operate in on-the-average terms.

The theory implies that, to the extent that management could control conditions in the workgroup's environment, it could induce certain motivational patterns and obtain the benefits of increased production output and reduced turnover and absenteeism. The theory also includes ‘when-then’ propositions. For example, when job conditions are poor in terms of pay and security, then employees will focus attention on the work itself, so then, if management wishes to obtain significant motivational consequences, it has to change these work conditions. Similarly when job conditions improve, then the behaviour of the supervisors become important, so then management needs to train them. When the job conditions improve still further, then the role of the supervisor becomes less important and the work itself re-establishes its importance as a motivator. Finally, when people move up the needs hierarchy, then they will become motivated only by the higher level needs.

Many managers have used the theory to understand changing employee motivations. It applies to everyone, to tend to telescope the needs hierarchy into a dichotomy with physical and safety needs on one side and higher level needs on the other. In this formulation, the watershed mark is quite low on the hierarchy, whereas in Maslow's original formulation it was placed much higher. The theory has not contributed to the development of scientifically based managerial practice and has instead been added to the stock of working ideas used by managers to understand, predict and influence employee motivation and performance. In Etzioni-Halevy's (1985) terms, it has provided a general orientation towards human or social reality.

Douglas McGregor, 'Theory X and Theory Y', 1960

McGregor shares with Maslow the distinction of having an incorrect interpretation of his theory gain wider circulation than his original idea. McGregor (1960: 33-4) presented a set of assumptions about human motivation and behaviour which he said were implicit in management literature, theory and practice. He labelled these Theory X assumptions. These were that average human beings had an inherent dislike of work and would avoid it if they could. That because of this, people had to be coerced, controlled, directed and threatened with punishment in order to get them to put in the necessary effort to achieve organizational goals. Finally, the average individual wished to avoid responsibility, had little ambition, wanted security above all else and preferred to be directed. The consequences of holding such assumptions, according to McGregor, led managers to rely on 'rewards, promises, incentives, or threats and other coercive devices' (1960: 42).

The first three words of the preceding quotation are most important. They are the ones most often omitted in accounts of what McGregor wrote. McGregor then went on to outline the assumptions related to Theory Y.

In an earlier article, McGregor described the range of management styles which were based on Theory Y assumptions. These behavioural patterns ranged from coercion, threat, close supervision and control at one extreme, to 'soft' methods involving being persuasive and achieving harmony at the other. However, popular accounts of McGregor focus only on one aspect of behaviour that Theory X managers employed ('hard' techniques) and ignore the others. Finally, not only can note that most books incorrectly report McGregor as saying either that Theory X and Theory Y are the only two sets of assumptions that managers make about people or that they are at the extreme ends of a continuum. McGregor's work has been dissected in terms of management style. Worker's hostility to management and his directions was the result not of personality characteristics of the employees, but as a reaction to their lack of job satisfaction. Following Maslow, the McGregor argument held that worker needs were related to the intrinsic rather than extrinsic aspects of work, and thus could not be directly met by management. The manager's job from this perspective was to create the conditions which would allow workers to meet these needs themselves by the way they led and managed their employees (McGregor 1967).

Taking these ideas as their points of departure, consultants and business academics reinterpreted and sought to convince managers of the one-best-way of Theory Y management. Management control was retained in this formulation since managers continued to be responsible for organizing the elements of the production process. The two were held to be complementary. Discussing the relationship between Maslow and McGregor, Butler (1985) argued that 'without McGregor the management world would never have heard of Maslow. But Maslow gave McGregor intellectual credibility, and in management circles, McGregor gave Maslow fame'.
Frederick Herzberg, 'Motivation Hygiene Theory', 1959

Herzberg's impact on management thinking (Herzberg et al. 1959) has been described as spectacular (Brown, 1960: 190). There were two major aspects of Herzberg's contribution. First there was the theory itself, and second there was the technique that it spawned - job enrichment. Writers have made the distinction between the theory that Herzberg originally wrote and what academics and managers believe that he said. What he actually said was that two sets of variables (called hygiene factors and motivators) together influenced worker motivation. What he did not say was that hygiene factors were less important than motivators. The cost-conscious manager was attracted to the proposition that investments in hygiene, fringe benefits and working conditions were economically limited and results.

The message that has been passed down in seminars and short management texts is that the only way to motivate people is to offer them psychological growth. This is an incorrect concept which is hugely appealing to many managers. His attractive technique can be applied within an existing organizational framework. The job enrichment approach, which was initially developed from Herzberg's work, came to be promoted by many representatives of the non-human relations school. It even became institutionalized in the 'Quality of Working Life' programmes in many countries. Lupton described Herzberg's ideas in the following way:

If you wish (as employer or manager) to have an efficient organization, you must set to work to improve the performance of the individuals who presently work in it. He does not matter who the individuals are, what they can do, what they are doing, what the organization does, how it does it, or what it is, there will always be scope for re-educating and re-designing its tasks so as to enrich them, and for so arranging the context of administrative procedure, supervision and interpersonal relationships, that they will not inhibit motivation and satisfaction.

(Lupton 1976: 123)

In the re-interpreted version of Herzberg's theory one can discover virtually all the elements which will be shown to give an idea of manager-appraisal (see Chapter 3). The Lupton quotation clearly signals the universality of the idea's application. It was held to be relevant to all organizations. Herzberg's idea stressed only two types of motivation variables and then was easily communicable to managers. It specified a set of precise steps through which the technique of job enrichment could be applied. Blacklaw and Shimmin mentioned the fascination which the theory possessed for managers who did not seek such conceptual insights into analytical theory but who wanted guiding principles for action.

Herzberg's theory ... while poorly regarded by psychologists nowadays, is accepted readily enough by hard pressed managers who want no more than a general rule of thumb to help guide their approach.

(Blacklaw and Shimmin 1984: 133)
Lubart, "System Theory," 1967

Lubart (1967) developed a psychoanalytically focused, universally applicable theory. His message was that democracy paid universally. He advocated the integration of these ideas into the organization through critical development of the 1960s.
To emphasize the criticality of understanding leadership, the book introduces an approach to leadership development that is based on a model of leadership behavior and performance. The model is constructed on the premise that leadership behavior is a function of the relationship between the leader and the followers. The model is divided into three parts: the leader, the followers, and the context. The leader's behavior is influenced by their characteristics, values, and beliefs, while the followers' behavior is influenced by their perceptions of the leader and the context in which they operate. The context includes the organizational culture, the task characteristics, and the external environment. The model provides a framework for understanding leadership behavior and performance, and it is used to guide the development of leadership programs and training initiatives.

The book also presents a framework for assessing leadership behavior and performance. The framework consists of a series of questions that are designed to help individuals and organizations identify areas for improvement in leadership behavior and performance. The framework is divided into two parts: the leader and the followers. The leader's behavior is assessed on the basis of their characteristics, values, and beliefs, while the followers' behavior is assessed on the basis of their perceptions of the leader and the context in which they operate. The context includes the organizational culture, the task characteristics, and the external environment. The framework provides a systematic approach for assessing leadership behavior and performance, and it is used to guide the development of leadership programs and training initiatives.

The book concludes with a discussion of the implications of the model and framework for leadership development. It is emphasized that leadership development is a continuous process that requires ongoing assessment, feedback, and learning. The book concludes with a discussion of the implications of the model and framework for leadership development. It is emphasized that leadership development is a continuous process that requires ongoing assessment, feedback, and learning.
offended anyone. The 9/9 manager was one who commanded the confidence of her subordinates, was solicitous as to their welfare and personal development, but who, at the same time, could deploy both human and non-human resources in ways that led to high operating efficiency. The 3/5 manager was on the right lines but had a long way to go. She was the honest trier.

The step-by-step approach was a major feature of Grid approach. The programme consisted of seven phases. These started with the individual and worked through the group up to the level of the organization. Thus the Grid method had an individual, a team and a company focus. Further 'stepping' or staging was provided within each of the phases by the use of self-administered questionnaires. Such tight structuring has been a major feature of the Grid Development packaged approach. These instruments were used as part of the training room materials in an educational programme which sought to create and develop 'more productive problem-solving relationships' (Blake et al. 1964).

The Grid programme has been widely used throughout the world since the 1960s. Part of its appeal can be attributed to the fact that it offers a single solution perspective or preferred single management style (labelled 9/9), which is claimed to be universally applicable. Moreover, that style is held to be positively associated with career success, productivity and profitability, as compared to any other style (Blake and Mouton 1970: 128).

At the same time, however, the Grid approach has received criticism from many writers. Quinn and McGrath (1982) suggested that there was little empirical evidence to demonstrate the validity of Blake and Mouton's claims. Moreover, the Grid's values and prescriptions have been challenged (Strauss 1973; Bernardin and Alvarezes 1976). However, it is not within the remit of this book to deal with these criticisms. One should merely note Anthony's (1977) assessment that the pronouncements of Blake and Mouton 'probably represent one of the strongest influences in current management thinking, it is solemnly (and uncritically) taught in many management centres and universities and it has influenced the policies and structure of companies such as BP and ICI.'

Christopher Argyris, 'Goal Congruence Theory', 1964

Goal congruence theory was developed by Chris Argyris. It has been outlined in three of his publications (Argyris 1957; 1964; 1973). The basic idea that Argyris put forward was the necessity for organizations to create circumstances in which adults could develop healthy personalities. Organizational design should ensure that the personal growth needs of individual development and organizational needs for productivity were matched. This view gave the name to his theory. Argyris therefore contributed to the self-actualization theme which was at the heart of the neo-human relations movement.

He argued that individuals developed or progressed to different degrees along six dimensions. Forces within society (including organizations) and within people could inhibit this process of development. A second building block in Argyris's theory was the concept of organization as epitomized in administrative management theory. Here he was concerned with principles such as task specialization, chain of command, unity of direction and span of control. In his view, such a formal organization was incompatible with the development of a healthy, mature state in the individual. The effect of this contradiction was, over time, to make healthy employees passive, dependent and submissive.

Argyris argued that most workers existed in companies that oppressed them to some degree. Close supervision, minute instruction and job specialization were considered as burdensome. Workers were likely to react...
by developing some defence mechanism such as apathy, aggression, vacilla-
tion or ambivalence. All of these reactions imposed some strain upon in-
dividuals and, through them, upon the organization. Argyris's very
tentative answer was ‘job enlargement and reduced supervision. Work design
and supervision by management were the control tools of administrative
management. They impeded adaptation to change, had a deadening effect
on individual motivation and broke the link between individual input and
organizational performance. Argyris argued that they also prevented an
individual achieving self-actualization.

Argyris did not have a one-way view of causation, from management style
to performance. He acknowledged the need to amend the structures to
support a modified management style. His prescriptions were underpinned
by a view of human beings who looked for challenges, worked in adaptive
groups and sought common goals. He claimed a universal application for
his theory. However, the theory had difficulty in explaining violent conflict,
opposing constituencies and power fights.

Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard, 'Situational Leadership Theory',
1969

Originally called the Life Cycle Theory of Leadership, the renamed
Situational Leadership Theory used a contingency approach which stated
that the effective leadership style was the one that fitted the particular
situation. As with the Ohio studies mentioned earlier, managerial behaviour
was classified into two categories. The first was task behaviour, which was
concerned with a manager engaging in one-way communication with a
subordinate to explain what has to be done. The second was relationship
behaviour, which involved the manager in engaging in two-way communica-
tion with a junior so as to provide him with socio-emotional support,
psychological coaching and facilitating behaviour.

The key feature of Hersey and Blanchard's leadership theory which
Distinguished it from its predecessors was its emphasis on subordinate
maturity. At a person's willingness to direct their own
behaviour. Such maturity, it was argued, should be considered only in
relation to each specific task. In Hersey and Blanchard's formulation,
employees were not considered to be mature or immature in a general way,
but instead, they were held to possess different degrees of maturity in
relation to specific tasks.

From this brief description of Situational Leadership Theory, one can see that,
although words may differ, the echo of the Ohio studies, the Tannenbaum and Schmick's (1973) leader-
ship style progression model and the Blake and Mouton Grid Development model are all strong.
Explaining its major commitment to Situational Leadership, the Xerox

Corporation cited 'the model's intuitive appeal and quick acceptance by our
managers' (Gimpert and Hambleton 1979).

It may be that intuitive appeal did play a major part in this particular
idea's popularity amongst personnel and training managers. Bryman (1986)
noted that this leadership theory had not generated a great deal of research.
He concluded 'that there is virtually no evidence to substantiate its
fundamental tenets' (1986: 147). Did such a lack of evidence matter to the
manager? Bryman thought not:

its...[Situational Leadership Theory],...concentration on just one
situation variable, and the absence of a research tradition deriving from
it, render it of little utility for leadership researchers. Ironically, it may be
the very simplicity of the model and the absence of negative evidence that
has made it so popular within management circles.

(Bryman 1986: 149)

The recurring features of some of the main neo-human relations ideas are
presented in Table 2.1.

GURU THEORY

In order to bring popular management thinking up to date, it is necessary
to consider developments in management thought that have occurred since
1980. This period has seen a great number of diverse management ideas
being offered. One commentator observed that business writing had become
big business. Publishers Weekly noted that, 'Dieting, sex, whistle, food
and gossip are no longer first in the heart of bibliophiles. With no near
competitors, business was the strongest selling subject in the United States

At first sight, it appears that guru writings represent a random collection
of diverse contributors with no linking theme, brought to prominence by a
newsworthy interest in business and management. However, closer inspection
does give credence to Heller's (1990) suggestion that the central contention
of this management idea family is that 'the only object of business is to
compete with others for the favours of the customer as King'. Indeed,
Ohmae (1987) had earlier stated that the central fact of business today was
the emergence of consumer sovereignty.

Underpinning this guiding notion are at least five beliefs. First, that the
innovation which leads to improved products and services cannot be
planned, but is dependent on many 'tried by many employees. Second, that
you are more likely to 'act yourself into a feeling' than 'feel yourself
into action'. Third, that an organization can be effectively co-ordinated
through its value system and culture, rather than through rules and
commands. Fourth, that customers are the main source of innovation.
Fifth, that a strong customer orientation is important and has implications
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of origin</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Magic Words</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>No. of dimensions</th>
<th>Dimensions or Magic Word vocabulary</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>Fleishman/Ohio studies</td>
<td>consideration initiating structure</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>democratic and autocratic leadership</td>
<td>democratic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Hersey</td>
<td>hygiene-motivation theory</td>
<td>motivation</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>physiological safety, love, esteem and self-actualization needs</td>
<td>motivational needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>McGregor</td>
<td>assumptions of human nature</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Theory X and Theory Y</td>
<td>System 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>participative management</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>leadership style - autocracy - benevolence - consultative - participative - approach</td>
<td>System 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of origin</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Magic Words</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>No. of dimensions</th>
<th>Dimensions or Magic Word vocabulary</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Blake and Mouton</td>
<td>grid management</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1/1, 1/9, 9/1, 9/9, 5/5</td>
<td>grid manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Berman</td>
<td>transactional analysis</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>parent, adult, child</td>
<td>adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Tannenbaum and Schmidt</td>
<td>choosing leadership patterns</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>leader control shared control group control</td>
<td>leader control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Hersey and Blanchard</td>
<td>situational leadership</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>task behaviour relationship behaviour</td>
<td>task behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Adair</td>
<td>action centred leadership</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>group needs individual needs task needs</td>
<td>awareness of needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Reddin</td>
<td>3-D theory of managerial effectiveness</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>concern for people, task, effectiveness</td>
<td>concern for people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Vroom and Yetton</td>
<td>decision quality</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>leader decides, consults, shares, delegates</td>
<td>leader decides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of origin</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Magic Words</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Level of analysis</th>
<th>No. of dimensions</th>
<th>Dimensions or Magic Word vocabulary</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Vroom and Yetton</td>
<td>decision quality</td>
<td>leadership style</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>leader decisions, consults, shares, delegates</td>
<td>leader decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Popular management ideas

...
explain the increasingly complicated world of finance, the stock market, exporting or whatever. A fourth category is represented by books which are survival guides seeking to help readers cope with difficult times. John Kenneth Galbraith described this sector of the publishing business as the 'cottage industry in predicting disaster'. Titles include Surviving the Great Depression of 1990 (Batra 1988); How to Prosper during the Coming Bad Years (Ruff 1979); Crisis in Investing (Casy 1983); and Megatrends (Naisbitt 1982). The focus here will be upon the first two categories of books mentioned. Some others will also be referred to due to their high volume sales. These do not fit exactly into the categories just presented. Having distinguished between the different contents of the books, one can classify them more usefully according to the background of their authors. Heller wrote:

More pervasive, and more profitable than the computers of IBM, were the acolytes of American management technology. They came from all sides - highly motivated professors of motivation, consultants commanding the world's highest fees, expatriate managers whose salaries and tax positions would embarrass an Italian boardroom, visiting lecturers of every posture, sellers of packaged management development aids, witch-doctors. (Heller 1986: 40)

The authorization of a management idea stems from its author's position, which can be based upon academic research, experience of consultancy or experience of management. Table 2.2 indicates the book sales of these different authors. A useful way of considering guru theory authors is to differentiate between academic gurus, consultant gurus and hero-managers.

As the label suggests, academic gurus are business school professors and others who have an educational institution affiliation. Consultant gurus are independent writers and advisers. Hero-managers are current or past chief executive officers (usually of major American or British multinational companies) who are acknowledged to have been successful. Each speaks from a different base of authority. The different writers in each class are shown in Table 2.3.

Contrasting these three classes of guru one can argue that, having been prominent during the 1950s and 1960s, academic management gurus are now experiencing more competition. Among the best known academic ones are Michael Porter (competitive advantage), Kenneth Blanchard (One Minute Manager), William Ouchi (Theory Z), Henry Mintzberg (roles of managers) and Rosabeth Moss Kanter (innovation and organizational change).

The consultant-guru school was probably founded by Frederick Winslow Taylor. Its most popular current representatives are Tom Peters, John

---

**Table 2.2** Best-selling business books in the United States 1979-88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Copies in the year</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruff</td>
<td>How to Prosper During the Coming Bad Years</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>No. 3 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>Crisis in Investing</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>438,640</td>
<td>No. 1 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>You Can Negotiate Anything</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>No. 9 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naisbitt</td>
<td>Megatrends</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>No. 15 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>In Search of Excellence</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1,160,491</td>
<td>No. 1 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterman</td>
<td>Iacocca: An Autobiography</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>No. 1 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iacocca</td>
<td>Iacocca: An Autobiography</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1,510,000</td>
<td>No. 1 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halberstam</td>
<td>The Reckoning</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>208,000</td>
<td>No. 22 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batra</td>
<td>Surviving the Great Depression of 1990</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>549,000</td>
<td>No. 6 among all best-sellers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump</td>
<td>Trump: The Art of the Deal</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>Ranking unavailable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fortune, 13 February 1988, pp. 61-3

Naisbitt and Gifford Pinchot. These people are the inheritors of the traditional re-established by Peter F. Drucker after the end of the Second World War.

Finally, there is the hero-management school currently represented by the tycoons of people like Lee Iacocca, Harold Geneen, Mark McCormack, Victor Kiam, John Sculley and John Earvey-Jones. The modern contributions in this tradition are practising (or recently retired) successful managers who write down the 'secrets of success' and also take the opportunity to expound their philosophy of life. Henri Fayol and Alfred P. Sloan were
Table 2.3 Academic gurus, consultant gurus and hero-managers of the 1980s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Consultants</th>
<th>Hero-managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mintzberg</td>
<td>de Bono</td>
<td>Gessen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohler</td>
<td>Naisbitt</td>
<td>McCormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porter</td>
<td>Chua</td>
<td>Key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denna</td>
<td>Pinchot</td>
<td>Kiam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>Avis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ouchi</td>
<td>Weickman</td>
<td>Cameron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levitt</td>
<td>Guirdrat</td>
<td>Harvey-Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katell</td>
<td>Crosby</td>
<td>Morel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Iacocca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sculley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

probably the founders of this approach, but they did not engage in personal promotion to the extent of their more recent successors.

In discussing these writings the business press rarely if ever makes any distinction between these three types of contributors. They are referred to collectively as management or business gurus. One dictionary definition of 'guru' is a Hindu or Sikh spiritualist teacher. The personal nature of his guidance is stressed. Gurus appear in all walks of life and in all aspects of business. They may therefore meet some basic human need. One finds production management gurus (Goldratt), quality gurus (Deming) and financial gurus. This is an issue which will be considered in Chapter 5 where such a functionalist explanation is presented.

The use of the word 'guru' in business journals emphasizes three features. First, in the British press (but not in the American) the word seems to be used with a slightly pejorative tinge. The Americans tend to use it more positively to indicate a far-sighted and visionary individual. The British press perhaps reflecting British management's preoccupation with practical and immediate issues and with a suspicion of anything theoretical or abstract, generally give the term a negative connotation. Second, the term guru stresses the active search by business people for hidden knowledge or secrets. Third, it indicates the preparedness of individuals to carry out, sometimes uncritically, the recommendations or directions of the guru whom they follow.

Guru theory took off as a time when managers appeared to need extra guidance and ideas. The rise of modern management gurus theory can be dated to the early 1980s. The movement is still strong. At one level, guru theory represents a break with the academically dominated neo-human relations movement represented by people like Argyris, McGregor, Maslow, Herzberg and Libet. At another level, however, it represents a continuation of those ideas, albeit adapted to the circumstances of the 1980s and 1990s. An analysis of the message themes being put forward shows that employee commitment, responsibility, creativity and putting people ahead of the bureaucracy are still very much in vogue. Peters and Waterman (1982) argued against the rational, the quantitative and the logical. They stressed the importance of leadership vision, culture and people and concluded that 'soft was hard'.

The difference between the NRH and the guru schools has much to do with the underlying needs of managers. In the 1960s when NRH rose to prominence, its people-oriented message was set in the context of the American boom. In the United States, the 1946-45 period saw its industry at full stretch as it tried to meet underfilled domestic demand which had been pent up during the Great Depression. Such demand remained largely unsatisfied during the period of the Second World War. Hence, from the mid-1960s, after its internal demand had been satisfied, American industry turned its attention to the needs of European markets. The profits and industrial problems of this period led to a management concern to make work more interesting for employees. In this way, it was felt, industrial action, stereomechanism and high labour turnover could be reduced in a period of prosperity.

The Quality of Work Life (QWL) projects were instituted to achieve the aforementioned aims and to increase productivity and employee commitment. Their purpose was to meet the inner needs of workers so that they would not go elsewhere. During the later years of this period, consultants misinterpreted the ideas of academics like Argyris, McGregor and Likert. The turning point for the United States and Europe came in the 1970s with the combined effects of the OPEC oil price rises, the Japanese challenge and the increasing political and social unrest.

The change was documented by many writers, none of whom became management gurus. The bristles of bad news are rarely rewarded. In this context one might mention Pascale and Athos (1982) who, while well known in academic circles, never achieved the popular acclaim or visibility of Peters and Waterman. Pascale and Athos might be termed 'pessimistic writers' in that they berated American industry and its managers for their failures and shortcomings. They pointed to Japan and suggested that US companies should adopt their practices. While such comments might have been valid, they were generally resisted by those at whom they were directed. Few people enjoy having their faults pointed out. Pascale and Athos's book sold in respectable although not astronomical numbers.

William Ouchi's book, Theory Z, represented a middle-ground approach. Published in 1981, he was an early-wave guru of the modern era. Ouchi was not at all pessimistic about America's ability to fight back economically. He was referred to Japanese industry, and identified aspects of it which were easily exportable to the United States. He offered his Theory Z as a hybrid which combined the best elements of both Japanese and American practice. He pointed out that some US companies, such as Hewlett-Packard and IBM,
were already performing excellently and could provide models that other American corporations could emulate. This Osaki was among the first to
emerge as the standard of American management practices. His ideas
were eventually adopted by many other companies, including those that
had previously resisted American influence. This adoption helped to
solidify the reputation of American management as a reliable and
effective model for businesses around the world.

3. The role of management in the growth of American corporations:
The growth of American corporations was closely tied to the develop-
ment of effective management practices. As companies grew, the
need for skilled managers increased, and this created opportunities
for American management consultants to enter the market. These
consultants, such as Photovolt and its subsidiary, American Man-
germent, played a crucial role in shaping the management practices
of American corporations. Their influence extended beyond the
United States, as many companies around the world looked to
American management practices for guidance.

4. The impact of management on American society:
The growth of American corporations had a significant impact on
American society. The increase in corporate wealth and power
resulted in a concentration of economic power, which had both posi-
tive and negative effects. On the one hand, the growth of American
corporations created jobs and opportunities for workers, and the
industry contributed to the overall economic growth of the United
States. On the other hand, the concentration of power in the hands
of a few companies led to criticism of the corporate model, and
some argue that it contributed to the decline of American manufac-
turing and the growth of an economic system based on service
industries.

5. The role of management in the global economy:
The growth of American corporations had a significant impact on
the global economy. As American companies grew and expanded,
they began to look for opportunities outside of the United States.
This led to a globalization of American management practices,
which spread to other countries and influenced the development of
management practices in those regions. The impact of American
management on the global economy is still felt today, as many
companies continue to adopt management practices that are influ-
ed by American models.

6. The role of management in the development of American
management:
The growth of American corporations led to the development of
American management as a distinct field. As companies grew,
the need for skilled managers increased, and this created oppor-
tunities for American management consultants to enter the market.
These consultants, such as Photovolt and its subsidiary, American
Management, played a crucial role in shaping the management
practices of American corporations. Their influence extended
beyond the United States, as many companies around the world
looked to American management practices for guidance.

7. The impact of management on American society:
The growth of American corporations had a significant impact on
American society. The increase in corporate wealth and power
resulted in a concentration of economic power, which had both posi-
tive and negative effects. On the one hand, the growth of American
corporations created jobs and opportunities for workers, and the
industry contributed to the overall economic growth of the United
States. On the other hand, the concentration of power in the hands
of a few companies led to criticism of the corporate model, and
some argue that it contributed to the decline of American manufac-
turing and the growth of an economic system based on service
industries.

8. The role of management in the global economy:
The growth of American corporations had a significant impact on
the global economy. As American companies grew and expanded,
they began to look for opportunities outside of the United States.
This led to a globalization of American management practices,
which spread to other countries and influenced the development of
management practices in those regions. The impact of American
management on the global economy is still felt today, as many
companies continue to adopt management practices that are influ-
ed by American models.
Finally, one can add the point made by Rein et al. (1987) about the existence of a supporting media machine. While film stars, television personalities and sports stars feed their stories to a hungry media (and thereby attain continuing self-publicity and self-promotion), academics and business leaders do not have that same support. Such business guru support as there is, is stronger in the United States than in Britain.

All gurus offer some form of reassurance to their readers. In an uncertain world, managers seek such reassurance. They want to know that if they only imitate these marvellous men and adopt their management recipes, they can overcome the most difficult management challenge. All the gurus gain their currency from their relevance to the changing times. Despite the fact that deep down, most managers may know that there are no universal rules of success (otherwise they would have been found by now), they nevertheless continue to seek out, and perhaps overvalue, examples of perceived success.

The inspirational value of the guru texts should also not be underestimated either. The books extol the virtues of the managers deemed to be responsible for corporate success. America's business champions are presented and accorded heroic qualities. They are elevated, even in temporality, to the position of role models. Successful entrepreneurs such as Mark McCormack give readers tips on how to stay one step ahead of the competition. The message of the guru texts is that everyone can be a winner, if they only try.

The three sub-schools of guru theory distinguished are labelled academic, consultant and hero-manager. Anthropologists have traditionally distinguished between medicine men (whose power and wisdom was claimed to be based upon a specific body of knowledge that they possessed) and sorcerers (who were held to have superhuman qualities). Following this classification, one would place academics and most management consultants in the medicine man category, and locate the hero-managers in the other.

ACADEMIC GURU SCHOOL

The definition of an academic guru is someone who, while occupying a position at an educational institution, has developed and popularized his or her ideas on some aspect of management. Thus Kenneth Blanchard, who has been a professor of leadership and organizational behaviour at the University of Amherst in Massachusetts, and who is joint author of The One Minute Manager (Blanchard and Johnson 1983), is among the best known and one of the highest earning academic gurus in the United States. His topic is management leadership which is very general and therefore has a wide appeal.

Most academic gurus specialize in particular fields. During the strategic planning vogue of the 1970s, Igor Ansoff was considered to be the leading...
Management gurus

Like so many first-class researchers by fellow academics, have also found a popular appeal among managers. In addition to publishing highly technical books, these writers have also been invited to present their ideas to meetings of managers. Are we therefore witnessing the development of a new type of academic guru? If so, what has changed to blur the division referred to earlier?

If this is indeed happening, it may be that as more managers complete MBA-type programmes, they become more sophisticated, and are able to understand and apply more complicated management ideas. Whether such an explanation is correct is difficult to test. One can probably make more progress by assuming that the American academics themselves have done something different from their predecessors to make their message appeal to two different audiences. Approached from this angle, one can test some of the ideas presented by Davis (1971).

Davis argued that in order to be interesting to the widest range of listeners, researchers needed to design the propositions to be communicated (based on their research findings) in a way that took account of the assumptions of their different audiences. Knowing that an audience would find interesting any proposition that attacked the assumption it held about a topic, the guru needed first to identify and then publicly specify the assumptions about their topic (new technology, employee motivation, competitive advantage). The guru then needed to come up with a proposition that refuted them. There were, however, some complications.

While it was relatively easy to come up with a proposition that refuted an audience assumption, it was usually difficult to specify precisely what was the potentially debatable audience assumption was. The reason for this was that the assumption was not necessarily a unitary thing. The audience frequently divided itself into segments. The most important of these were those who held a common-sense assumption about a topic (usually managers), and those whose assumptions were conditioned by the intellectual specialty of their discipline (usually fellow academics). Berger and Luckmann (1967) made this distinction between laymen possessing conventional wisdom on the one hand and experts possessing esoteric knowledge on the other. Further sub-divisions were likely to exist but the guru's task was to produce propositions which refuted assumptions so as wide a scale as possible. It may be possible to explain the across-the-board success of the new wave of academic gurus in terms of their ability to identify and differently refute the different assumptions of their two main audiences - managers and fellow academics. Their predecessors were either unable or unwilling to do this.

CONSULTANT GURU SCHOOL

Consultant guru school

The second category of gurus are the consultants. Perhaps the best known consultant guru is the Austrian-born Peter Drucker. Descriptions of his influence on western management thought (that is, American management thought) dwell on the breadth and depth of his knowledge and upon his ability to draw on and reconstruct the relevant parts of his knowledge store into a form that can help managers. This is an excellent description of a man who in the traditional anthropological context

in a unique article entitled 'Why Read Peter Drucker?', Kanter (1980) referred to Drucker's rigour of formulation and his encyclopedic knowledge of management and related fields. In the eyes of his supporters, Drucker has the ability to offer in-depth analysis of situations and to relate different ideas and facts to each other. He therefore is not only a popular guru, but also a knowledgeable and respected one. His influence is felt far and wide. In Japan, for example, Drucker is considered to be one of the leaders of management thought. His writings have been translated into many languages and are widely read. His management ideas have influenced the work of many important Japanese companies, including Sony, Hitachi, and Toyota. In addition, his theories have been applied in the areas of healthcare, education, and other industries. The impact of Drucker's work can be seen in the way that businesses around the world are organized and managed today. His ideas have had a profound effect on the way that organizations are structured and how they operate.
Despite espousing the Theory Y management style, Drucker advocated that managers "made (rather than encouraged) people to become productive.
He is traditionally identified with the notion of the large industrial
corporation occupying the centre of society. This gives him a top-down
image which is in contrast with the decentralised world of the 1990s which is seeking to
stimulate entrepreneurial innovation and rely on managerial initiatives and
strategic alliances. If Drucker is an Old Testament consultant guru, who
are the New Testament ones? Table 2.5 offers some suggestions.

HERO-MANAGER CURU SCHOOL
Hero-managers constitute the third type of management guru. They are the
successful chief executive officers (CEOs) who have committed their
thoughts to print. In the analogy of an unstructured being used, they are the devisers rather
than the medicine men. The root in the popularity of the hero-managers
might be explained by the need of the reading managers for gossip or their
optimistic belief that they too could do well if they learned the tricks.
Chapter 5 examines the evidence for the proposition that managers
constantly seek unorthodox sources of power and knowledge and that they
are eager to listen to those who have developed their own approach to
enrich their profession through profit.

The hero-manager's approach is not based on research, study or
consultancy experience. It is developed from learning-from-experience. Its
authority comes directly from success. By distilling the essence of what
successful managers do (irrespective of consent) it is believed that the secrets
of success can be revealed. Thus, it is the hero-manager (there are few
women) who is held to possess this supernatural force. Their guidance is on
offer. That said, lower being, would not carry the
same force. As will be shown, most of the 'skills' contained in the books of
hero-managers can be found in any popular management guide. They tend to
be of the 'tell people what to do' variety. Each has expressed their view or vision of
difference comes from the person who writes down or utters the words.
Because that person has been the chief executive of a major multinational
corporation, those words are held to possess magico qualities.

There are two types of hero-manager books. These are the multi-
biographical ones shown in Table 2.6 and the quasi-autobiographical shown in
Table 2.7. The prevalence of the former in Britain may reflect the lack of
British management ability to hero status, or their reluctance to
commit their thoughts to paper. In the past, some potential British hero-
managers such as Sir Ernest Saunders, Gerald Ronson and Avis Nadir have
embarrassingly fallen off.
The problem of having managers as heroes is that hero-status depends not
on one-off achievement, but upon the ongoing health and prosperity of the
company. This may be outside of the control of that manager. Whereas
consultants and academics may move in and out of companies, hero-
managers have their future linked with one organisation. In Britain,
the majority of CEOs in well-performing companies have had a lower
viability than their US counterparts. In Germany too, chief executives are
expected to be outstanding but not to stand out'. In the introduction to
their multi-autobiographical book on hero-managers, Ritchie and Goldsmith
wrote that:
the fate of British industry, the jobs of millions of people and the
standard of living of the whole country rests in the hands of a few
exceptional businessmen... There have been some heroic struggles to
overcome the problems of major companies towards bankruptcy.
In every case, these desperate efforts have been led and inspired by
individuals. These are the men we call the New Elite.

(Ritchie and Goldsmith 1987: 1)

The second type of hero-manager contribution is quasi-autobiographical.
'Quasi' because the successful businessman or manager, with the help of a
named or unnamed ghost-writer (usually a journalist), recounts the secrets
of his success and frequently uses the opportunity to include some of his
own personal philosophy about life. This genre of managerial literature has a
long tradition. The earliest form of it was produced by the Frenchman,
Henri Fayol in 1916. In that year, the Bulletin de la Société de l'Industrie
Minérale printed Fayol's Administration Industrielle et Générale. Indeed, as
Pugh (1984) has pointed out, despite producing a range of writings, Fayol's
reputation rests on a single monograph which is frequently printed as a
book.

Having retired after thirty years from the job of Managing Director of the
meat-surgical combine Commodity - Fourchambault - Decazeville, Fayol
wrote down his definition of management, and the principles of how to
manage. He thus occupies the first place in a line of authors who have done
practically these two things. Each has expressed their view or vision of
management. They have emphasized their particular understanding of what
is important. Having done so, they frequently itemize the steps to be taken
or principles to be adhered to, in order to fulfill that vision. At one end of this
time continuum is Henri Fayol, while at the other are Jan Carlzon,
John Harvey-Jones and Lee Iacocca.

One should perhaps just notice a trend in this literature. As one
progresses through to the present day, the general emphasis of these types of
books is towards stressing the individual and his own qualities and
contributions. By contrast, Fayol focused on the nature of the managerial
role as seen by him. Alfred Sloan in his book, My Years with General Motors,
did not write about himself but about the history of the corporation of
which he was an architect. Some recent quasi-autobiographical texts are
shown in Table 2.7.
# Table 2.6 Hero-managers: multi-biographical texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de Bono, E</td>
<td>Tactics: The Art and Science of Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, J</td>
<td>The Risk Takers: Portraits of Money, Ego and Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle, E</td>
<td>Mac - Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay, W</td>
<td>Tycoon: Where They Come From and How They Made It</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Year of publication discussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritchie, B and Goldsmith, W</td>
<td>The New Elite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters, T. J and Austin, N</td>
<td>Passion for Excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Bailey</td>
<td>Chris Bonnington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Breyten</td>
<td>Terence Conran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Evans</td>
<td>Hans Eysenck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Forte</td>
<td>Heather Jenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verity Lambert</td>
<td>Mark McCormack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Maxwell</td>
<td>Peter Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Sinclair</td>
<td>Jackie Stewart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Wade</td>
<td>Richard Branson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence Conran</td>
<td>James Hayworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashraf Marwan</td>
<td>Robert Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Nadir</td>
<td>Ian Portgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Raymond</td>
<td>Tiny Roland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Ronson</td>
<td>Jacob Rothschild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clive Sinclair</td>
<td>The Roux Brothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Thorne</td>
<td>Gordon White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Brockles</td>
<td>Terence Conran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Golden</td>
<td>Harry Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gulliver</td>
<td>John Gunthorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Lister</td>
<td>Robert Maxwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald Ronson</td>
<td>Clive Sinclair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Thompson</td>
<td>Mark Weinburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Edwards</td>
<td>John Egan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Grinwade</td>
<td>John Harvey-Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Hogg</td>
<td>Trevor Holdsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colin Marshall</td>
<td>David Peatow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Walters</td>
<td>Don Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Carson</td>
<td>Jill Grech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max DePree</td>
<td>Bill Gore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Leonard</td>
<td>Tom Melcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Monaghan</td>
<td>William Schaffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Len Stepanelli</td>
<td>Bob Swigart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Wehrer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary attraction of the hero-manager literature, whether multi-biographical or quasi-autobiographical, is as an exemplar. The management readers of these books appreciate that their authors have 'been there and seen it'. They have been through the swamp and come out, perhaps a little scarred, on the other side. Analysing John Harvey-Jones' BBC series Troubleshooter, The Economist (1990) attributed its success to the fact that it ignored numbers. It captured work and the challenge of management through one ecstatic personality, and depicted companies through the people who worked for them (and not just their bosses or balance sheets). All this displayed ideas and problems with which viewers felt familiar. Best-selling management books have done something similar.

Second, the publishing houses have realized that they can sell business books by the hundreds of thousands if they create a market for them. They have therefore been developing ever more effective ways of marketing the CSOs and their books. Why do people buy these books in such numbers? Writing about the great and the good is a time-honoured tradition which is not restricted to managers or businesspeople. The managers who wrote these books had in most cases reached celebrity status before their publication. Thus they merely took their place alongside the TV and film stars.
## 54 Management gurus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Organization described</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townsend, P.</td>
<td>Up the Organization</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Avis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards, M.</td>
<td>Back from the Brink</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>British Leyland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genseen, H.</td>
<td>Managing</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash, M. K.</td>
<td>Mary Kay on People</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Mary Kay Cosmetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormack, M.</td>
<td>What They Don’t Teach</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You at the Harvard School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Management Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiam, V.</td>
<td>Going for it: How to</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Remington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Succeed as an Entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morita, A.</td>
<td>Made in Japan</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Sony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey-Jones, John</td>
<td>Making it Happen</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>ICI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trump, D.</td>
<td>Trump: The Art of the Deal</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Politicians, pop stars and members of royal families, whose biographies and autobiographies have always sold well.

Lee Iacocca's autobiography has now outsold even Peters and Waterman's book, *In Search of Excellence*. This can be partly explained by the fact that few of the most senior executives of America's largest corporations have appeared 63 times on television advertising their company's products or have been seen in 93 percent of households in the United States. Moreover, few people have lived through the boardroom battles that Iacocca did. Thus, his high book sales are at least partly due to the high level of public visibility that he has achieved during his career.

If guru theory was the staple diet of the 1980s, what will be the theme of the 1990s? *The Economist* (1990) reported that organizations like the Bank of England, British Gas, Ernst & Whinney, Mars, and Legal & General were sending their executives to be taught how to do the Whirling Dervish Dance, so as to allow these top managers to find their 'core of inner peace, and so increase their business potential'. This holistic approach to business seeks to blend the inner directed focus of the 1970s neo-human relations ideas, with the hard-nosed, profit-focused theme of the 1980s. The aim it seems is to produce *spiritual warriors*, and the label given to this activity is *new age training* (NAT).

Writing from the American perspective, Rose (1990) observed that the new age paradigm presents a new way of looking at the world, and stimulates new behaviours. The old world view, built upon Newtonian physics, is seen as mechanistic and overly analytical. The new paradigm draws upon quantum physics, cybernetics, chaos theory, cognitive science, and eastern and western spiritual traditions which view everything as interconnected. Reality is not seen as absolute, as a by-product of human consciousness. In the United States, a new age think-tank, Global Business Network, is underwritten by companies such as AT&T, Volvo, Nissan and Inland Steel. In addition, Proctor & Gamble and Du Pont are offering their employees personal growth experiences to spur them on to creativity, encourage learning, and promote 'ownership' of company results.

The Easen Institute, located at Big Sur in California, and out of fashion since the self-aware 1970s, is planning to play a major role in new age training (Rose 1990). Following the precepts of akikdo, the emphasis is on harmony rather than dominance. Easen is back in business offering a new menu of techniques from stress reduction to creativity enhancement.
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personal growth thinkers who, in the 1960s, would have avoided all organizations for fear of contamination, now view them as thriving laboratories in which to try out their ideas.

Some of the NAT recommendations do not differ greatly from the management guru ideas of the 1980s. Flexible, less hierarchical organizations, empowered workers taking their own decisions, and global thinking replacing national horizons in a borderless world. NAT is underpinned by the notion that organization and automation has its limits, and that productivity leaps are achieved only through winning the hearts and minds of employees.

So, is new age thinking new? Tichy (Rose 1990) wrote of NAT that no one element of it was new, but that attention to the soft issues of management was new to American multinationals. Given the attention paid by gurus like Peters and Waterman (1982) and Deal and Kennedy (1982) to the soft (human) issues from the early 1960s, one can challenge Tichy’s assessment. The antecedents of NAT lie elsewhere and concern the exploration of the inner self rather than the social role.

In the mid-1960s, research by Agor (1986) revealed the part played by intuition in management decision-making. The theme was developed in Financial Times articles (Dixon 1988), and perhaps achieved academic respectability when studies by the International Management Development Institute (IMD) confirmed the extent of the use of intuition (Dixon 1989).

What Agor called intuition, the IMD researchers labelled vision. It is partly this mental ability to piece together the various notions which have not previously been combined, that new age training seeks to develop through dancing, medicine wheels, and the use of the I Ching. The IMD is now running courses to help managers use their intuition to better effect. Thus, what’s new about them human conscious, and its link to organizational performance. Jacal Welch, CEO of General Electric, said that he wanted people rewarded in both the pocket and the soul.

The elements come by adding creativity and intuition to numerical analysis in order to aid decision-making; recognizing love and caring as a workplace motivator; and placing the mental and spiritual enrichment of employees alongside the pursuit of profit as a valid enterprise goal.

Britain, one company which offers new age training is called Decision Development. In the words of one of its partners, ‘We are not dealing merely with minds and techniques, but with the spiritual, emotional and creative aspects of human beings’. The company also uses the American Indian Medicine Wheel (International Management 1991) to take managers on a journey to discover their spiritual, emotional and creative self. The word is to access the inner selves by examining their dreams and fantasies. In addition to dancing and medicine wheels, new age training uses an inward focused vision of outdoor activities which involve mythical quests of the ‘Dungeons and Dragons’ variety (International Management 1991) where managers dress as druids and witches to find magic elixirs to revive a dying dragon child.

Thynne (1991) reported that TV-am, a British breakfast television station, had adopted a new age strategy in its effort to regain its franchise when these were to be auctioned. Mr Bruce Gyngell, the company’s Australian chairman, was reported to be a supporter of American personal growth therapies. At a personal growth seminar and development workshop, the staff of the station were invited to focus their spiritual energy and inner peace. This collective consciousness-raising event sought to achieve a renewal, not only of the participants themselves, but also of the television franchise. Unfortunately for TV-am, this process of renewal did not extend to the company’s franchise. In late 1991, it was announced that its bid had failed and Sunrise TV had won the breakfast television franchise.

New age training is also run internally by companies. IBM’s ‘Fit for the Future seminars introduce employees to the I Ching, a Chinese divination oracle and fortune-telling exercise. It is planned that it links internal intuition with external events. IBM’s managers of employee development was quoted as saying that, ‘It helps employees understand themselves better.’ (International Management, 1991: 44).

Some visions of new age training are controversial. The Scottish Office sent thousands of its employees on a ‘New Age Thinking’ course run by Louis Tice of the Pacific Institute, which aimed to train the minds of workers to make them ‘high performance people’ in their work and private lives. Some US workers objected to being exposed to this sort of training and used their employees. The US Federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission decreed that under the Civil Rights Act, employees were free not to participate in motivational training if it conflicted with their religious beliefs.

As examples of a progression in management ideas, NAT ideas col-
Chapter 3
Recurring theme

INTRODUCTION
In the previous chapter, the six idea families were introduced, and each was found to possess certain recurring features that contributed to their popularity among managers. This chapter identifies the recurring features among these ideas and posits its own set of characteristics.

Main theme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of work world</th>
<th>Status enhancement</th>
<th>Practical application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• communicability</td>
<td>• legitimacy or self-affirmation</td>
<td>• control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• individual focus</td>
<td>• unitary perspective</td>
<td>• steps or principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• malleable human nature</td>
<td>• contribution-ownership potential</td>
<td>• universal application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• authorization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While only three of the six management idea families possessed all twelve features described, each had the majority of them. These attributes are interdependent, complementary and overlapping. Let us consider them in more detail.

UNDERSTANDING OF WORK WORLD
The first recurring theme to be found in popular management ideas is that they help managers understand better the world of work. Understanding refers to elements of the idea which make it easy for managers to get to grips with it. It has three components. Communicability refers to the manage-