

管理学基础

理论和实务

The Basis of Management

Theory and Practices

管 理 学 基 础

理 论 和 实 务

The Basis of Management

Theory and Practices

傅 介 声 编 选

编选说明

管理学是一门新兴学科，它主要研究一个组织的主管者（企业家、经理人员和领导者等）如何使其所经营的企业、机关取得更好的工作成果；它力图从理论上加以总结和归纳，给从事实务的主管人员以原则性的指导，使其在管理上获得极大成就。

管理学这门学科正在渐趋成熟，在此过程中也出现了一些世界知名的管理学家和名著，如美国管理学家孔茨的《管理学》和杜拉克的《管理学》等。这些著作所论述的问题和见解对我国是有借鉴意义的。

本书是从管理学的基本原理出发，结合我国的管理实情编辑而成的。编辑本书之目的是为了适应当前大专院校管理专业教学上和各类企业管理实务上的需要，它既可用作管理系学生（尤其是研究生）以及从事实际工作之管理人员的主要专业参考书，又可以用作管理系本科的专业英语教科书。

本书选材比较广泛，但选题却很集中，围绕的中心是经营管理的基本理论和实践。本书共收入三十六篇文章，大致分为三大部份：

第一部份的十三篇文章，概述了管理学的基本理论，回顾了管理学的形成、发展及演变过程；介绍了三个主要的管理学派——古典派、行为学派和管理科学学派的基本论点以及当代最新的管理思想——系统管理和应变管理思想，还介绍了古典管理学派的代表人物——泰罗和弗约尔的简略情况。

第二部份的九篇文章，说明了企业经营环境对组织工作的影响、进行组织设计时应考虑的基本因素以及组织设计的应变方法等。

第三部份的十四篇文章，从理论和实践上阐明了企业的含义，企业主管人员应负的职责，企业中生产部门的作用及其与别的部门的关系，计划工作的方法和激励原则等。

本书的选材既注重基本理论的探讨，又兼顾到实践经验的总结。属于基本理论部份的文章，主要选自世界著名管理学家孔茨的《管理学》、杜拉克的《管理学》、伯法的《现代生产与经营管理》以及小亚当的《生产与经营管理》等世界经营管理名著。属于经验总结部份的文章，主要选自美国一些大公司的总经理和主管者，例如威斯汀豪斯电气公司总经理伯恩汉等编写的经验总结。

本书各篇文章所探讨的问题是切合我国当前的管理实际的，对于实现我国管理现代化有借鉴作用。无论是对大专院校管理专业的教学、科研工作，还是对企业的主管者，都有较大的参考价值。

由于本书的选材比较广泛，各篇作者的写作风格和用语又各具特点，因此，如果以它作为管理专业英语的教材，则无论对英语的学习和专业知识的了解，都将会比仅使用一本由同一作者写成的英文管理原著有较大的收益。

编辑这类书籍属于初次尝试，因此无论是内容的选取还是文章的编排，都一定会存在不少问题，尚请读者批评、指正。

中山大学管理系 傅介声

一九八四年二月

CONTENTS

1. Management: Theory, Science and Practice, H.Koontz and others . . .	1
2. Management, E.E.Adam, Jr. R.J.Ebert	25
3. The Field of Management, J.H.Donnelly, Jr. and others	38
4. Operations Management, E.E.Adam, Jr. R.J.Ebert	50
5. Historical Overview, A.C.Laufer	76
6. Foundations of the Classical School, J.H.Donnelly, Jr. and others . .	88
7. Frederick W Taylor, Claude S. George, Jr.	110
8. Henri Fayol, Same as above	122
9. Foundations of the Behavioral School, J.H.Donnelly, Jr. and others	128
10. Foundations of the Management Science School, Same as above . .	142
11. The Modern View: Systems and Contingency Concepts, F.E.Kast, J.E.Rosenzweig	161
12. The Operations Function, Buffa	186
13. The Operations System, A.C.Laufer	210
14. Environmental Suprasystem, F.E.Kast, J.E.Rosenzweig	231
15. External Environment, D.Hellriegel, J.W.Slocum, Jr.	255
16. Organizational Goals, F.E.Kast, J.E.Rosenzweig	283
17. Organizational Design: Some Basic Considerations, D.Hellriegel, J.W.Slocum, Jr. . . .	306
18. Staffing and Developing the Line Organization, W.M.McFeely . . .	330
19. How to Utilize Staff Services, Boak, Jr.	341
20. Use of Outside Services, R.E.Levinson	347
21. The Operating Force, A.D.Newman	355
22. A Situational Approach to Organizational Design, D.Hellriegel, J.W.Slocum, Jr.	363
23. What Is a Business? P.E.Drucker	389
24. The Manager's Job, J.H.Donnelly, Jr. and others	405
25. The Role of Manufacturing in the Corporate Organization, D.C.Burnham	424
26. Relationship of Manufacturing and Marketing, T.E.Paurell	434
27. Relationship of Manufacturing and Research and Development, R.L.Swift	445

28. Relationship of Manufacturing and Personnel Relations, G.A.Sutton	453
29. Relationship of Manufacturing and Top Management, J.F.Fisher	463
30. Relationship of Manufacturing and Community and Public Relations Activities F.Golden	474
31. Production Planning, Scheduling, and Control Techniques, D.M.Boodman	483
32. Establishing Output Standards, R.L.Burdick	503
33. Motivation Principles, G.H.Gustat, J.A.Richardson	523
34. Incentive Plans for Indirect Workers, W.K.Hodson	532
35. Salary Determination and Incentives for Managerial Employees, D.H.Rosensteel	542
36. Employee Services and Benefits, J.L.Centner	558

1. Management: Theory, Science, and Practice

MAJOR CHAPTER OBJECTIVES

- 1 To point out that the major purpose of this book is to explain and analyze the basic science, theory, and principles of management and how they relate to the practice of managing.
- 2 To emphasize that in all kinds of enterprises, whether business or nonbusiness organizations,¹ the logical and socially desirable aim of all managers, as managers, must be "surplus:"
- 3 To recognize that managing as practice is an art, and that its practitioners, like those in other fields, will do best if they can understand and apply, in the light of situations, the underlying theory and science.
- 4 To show that concepts, theories, principles, and techniques furnish the basic elements of an operational science.
To emphasize that all managing requires a systems approach and that practice must always take into account situations and contingencies.

¹Note that the authors here and in many other places in the book use the term "organization" in the common way as denoting an enterprise or other group operation, such as a department, a company, a government agency, a church, or any other group of persons working together. While this term often causes confusion in distinguishing between an operation or enterprise and an organization structure, we know of no other term to use, especially since the term "enterprise" is too often employed to denote a business operation. However, in the chapters in Part 3 of this book, when we use "organization" in the structural sense, we try to be clear that we are so doing.

Perhaps there is no more important area of human activity than managing, for it is the basic task of all managers at all levels and in all kinds of enterprises to design and maintain an environment in which individuals, working together in groups, can accomplish preselected missions and objectives. In other words, managers are charged with the responsibility of taking actions that will make it possible for individuals to make their best contributions to group objectives.

Ever since people began forming groups to accomplish goals they could not achieve as individuals, managing has been essential to assure the coordination of individual efforts. As society has come to rely increasingly on group effort, and as many organized groups have become large, the task of managers has risen in importance.

It is the purpose of this book to study managers and what is involved in their task—to organize and summarize the important basic knowledge that underlies their task—so that their job, so important to social progress, can be done better. As incomplete as this knowledge may be, compared with knowledge in some of the more mature sciences, like physics and chemistry, there is a considerable and rapidly developing body of knowledge—concepts, theory, principles, and techniques—underlying managing.

In concentrating on the manager in this book, we must not forget that managers never operate in a vacuum or in a system unaffected by outside influences. We are not suggesting that management or managing is a closed system unaffected by the external environment. Quite the contrary. Whether they head a government, a company, a department, or a section within an organization, managers must always take into account the many influences, both inside and outside the organization, which affect their task. Can anyone imagine a sales manager, for example, trying to administer a group of salespeople without taking into account such internal factors as the company's engineering, manufacturing, and advertising, and such external influences as economic conditions, the market, the state of technology affecting a product, applicable government regulations, the vast areas of social concerns and pressures, and the attitudes and other personality factors salespeople bring from their family, educational, and other backgrounds? Similarly, would a company president attempt to make decisions without taking into account the multitude of influences both inside and outside the company?

WHY MANAGEMENT?

Not all groups believe that they need managing. Even faculties of many colleges and universities seem to feel this way and continually emphasize the need for maintaining "collegial" management. In their desire not to be managed, they forget that effective managers—whether presidents, or deans—do everything in their power to design an environment in which professors and researchers can best perform. Certain critics of

modern management feel that people would work together better and with more personal satisfaction if there were no managers. They prefer to refer to the ideal group operation as a "team" effort. They apparently do not realize that in most rudimentary form of team play, individuals playing a game have clear group goals as well as personal ones, are assigned to positions, follow play patterns, allow someone to call the plays, and follow certain rules and guidelines. Indeed, a characteristic of every effective group effort designed to attain group goals at the least cost of time, money, material, or discomfort is that it adopts the basic process, principles, and techniques of management.

Managing is essential in all organized cooperation, as well as at all levels of organization in an enterprise. It is the function not only of the corporation president and the army general but also of the shop supervisor and the company commander. In working with many enterprises and organizations, the authors have heard it said repeatedly that the "trouble" with the enterprise is the "management," meaning persons at a higher level in the organization. Even vice presidents of a company have made this observation to one of the authors, leaving only the president who was the "problem." While weaknesses and difficulties may appear at any level of management, effective and perceptive management demands that all those responsible for the work of others, at all levels and in any type of enterprise, regard themselves as managers. It is in this sense that the term is used in this book.

Thus the reader will find no basic distinction between managers and executives, administrators, or supervisors. To be sure, a given situation may differ considerably between various levels in an organization or various types of enterprise, the scope of authority held may vary, the types of problems dealt with may be considerably different, and a person in a managerial role may also be a salesman, engineer, or financier; but the fact remains that, as managers, all who obtain results by establishing an environment for effective group endeavor undertake the same functions.

Even so, those in a managerial role seldom devote all their time and talents to managing, and the organization roles which individuals fill almost invariably involve nonmanagerial duties. One has only to look at the duties and performances associated with perhaps the most complex managerial role in our society—that of the President of the United States—to realize that much of his work is nonmanagerial. Even in business corporations, company presidents find themselves doing a considerable amount of nonmanagerial work. And, as one goes down the organization ladder, the number of nonmanagerial duties tends to increase. Nevertheless, this fact of life should not detract in any way from the key significance of managing.

The Goal of All Managers

Nonbusiness executives sometimes say that top business managers have it easy—their profit is their goal. As will be elaborated in later discussions,

profit is only a measure of the surplus of business income over cost. It was pointed out earlier that in a very real sense, the goal of all managers must be surplus. Their task is to establish the environment for group effort in such a way that individuals will contribute to group objectives with the least amount of such inputs as money, time, effort, discomfort, and materials. By the very definition of the task, this becomes the goal of managers. But if they were ever to know whether the efforts of those for whom they are responsible are effective and efficient—whether they are attaining goals with least costs—they obviously must know what group goals are. Not only must these goals be known to managers, and preferably to all those for whom they are responsible, but they should also be known in a verifiable way. Otherwise, managers can never measure either their own effectiveness and efficiency or the effectiveness and efficiency of their group.

Thus the goal of managers, as managers, is fundamentally the same in business and nonbusiness enterprises. It is also the same at every level. The corporation president, the city administrator, the hospital department head, the government first-line supervisor, the Boy Scout leader, the bishop, the baseball manager, and the university president or dean, all, as managers, have the same kind of goals. The purposes of their enterprise or their department may vary, and these purposes may be more difficult to define in one situation than in another, but their basic managerial goal remains the same.

IS MANAGING A SCIENCE OR AN ART?

This question is often raised. Actually, managing, like all other arts (whether medicine, music composition, engineering, baseball, or accountancy), makes use of underlying organized knowledge—science—and applies it in the light of realities to gain a desired, practical result. In doing so, practice must design a solution which will work, that is, get the results desired. Art, then, is the “know-how” to accomplish a desired concrete result. It is what Chester I. Barnard has called “behavioral knowledge.”² Those who diagnose “by the book,” or design wholly by formula, or attempt to manage by memorization of principles are almost certain to overlook practical realities. With the possible exception of formulating science itself, art is the most creative of all human pursuits. When the importance of effective and efficient group cooperation in any

²As Barnard said in *The Functions of the Executive* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1938), pp. 290–291: “It is the function of the arts to accomplish concrete ends, effect results, produce situations, that would not come about without the deliberate efforts to secure them. These arts must be mastered and applied by those who deal in the concrete and for the future. The function of the sciences, on the other hand, is to explain the phenomena, the events, the situations, of the past. Their aim is not to produce specific events, effects, or situations, but explanations which we call knowledge. It has not been the aim of science to be a system of technology, and it could not be such a system. There is required in order to manipulate the concrete a vast amount of knowledge of a temporary, local, specific character, of no general value or interest, that it is not the function of a science to have or to present and only to explain to the extent that it is generally significant.”

society is appreciated, it is not difficult to argue that managing is the most important of all arts.

The most productive art is always based on an understanding of the science underlying it. Thus science and art are not mutually exclusive, but are complementary. As science improves, so should art, as has happened in the physical and biological sciences. Physicians without a knowledge of science become witch doctors; with science, they may be artful surgeons. Executives who attempt to manage without theory, and without knowledge structured by it, must trust to luck, intuition, or what they did in the past; with organized knowledge, they have a far better opportunity to design a workable and sound solution to a managerial problem. However, mere knowledge of principles or theory will not assure successful practice, because one must know how to use them. Since there is no science in which everything is known and all relationships are proved, science cannot be a comprehensive tool of the artist. This is true whether one is diagnosing illness, designing bridges, or managing a company.

One of the common errors in utilizing theory and science is to overlook the necessity of compromising, or blending, in order to achieve a total desired result. An airplane designer must make a compromise between weight and strength on the one hand and cost on the other. Managers may wisely assign employees more than one superior—breaking the principle of unity of command—if they are certain that this will improve the total results attained. But in disregarding principles and the other elements of science, one must calculate the cost and weigh it against the total result. The ability to compromise with the least amount of undesired consequences is the essence of the managerial art. As we will note in Chapter 3, this fact has given rise to a "contingency" or "situational" theory of management.

Another problem often results from the attempt to remedy a situation by applying a principle not designed to cover it. One would not apply a theory of metal stress to an engineering problem in which stresses were unimportant and the cost of material was of great significance, nor would one be likely to apply a principle of management to a problem of medical diagnosis. One of the difficulties of many management scholars and practitioners is that they try to force a principle into a situation it was not designed to explain.

Science and Management

Although the organization of human beings for the attainment of common objectives is ages old, a science of management is just now developing. Since World War II there has been an increasing awareness that the quality of managing is important to modern life, and this has resulted in extensive analysis and study of the management process, its environment, and its techniques.

Analysis of business failures made over many years by the credit

analysis firm of Dun and Bradstreet has shown that a very high percentage of these failures have been due to unqualified or inexperienced management. The prominent investor journal *Forbes*, which has studied American business firms for a number of years, has found that companies succeed almost invariably to the extent that they are well managed. The Bank of America said a few years ago in its publication *Small Business Reporter*: "In the final analysis more than 90% of business failures are due to managerial incompetence and inexperience."

The importance of management is nowhere better dramatized than in the case of many underdeveloped or developing countries. Review of this problem in recent years by economic development specialists has shown that provision of capital or technology does not ensure development. The limiting factor in almost every case has been the lack of quality and vigor on the part of managers.

While the culture of present-day society is characterized by revolutionary improvements in the physical and biological sciences, the social sciences have lagged far behind. Yet, unless we can learn to harness human resources and coordinate the activities of people, inefficiency and waste in applying technical discoveries will continue. One has only to look at the incredible waste of human and material resources, in the light of the unfulfilled social objectives, to realize that the social sciences are far from doing their job of guiding social policy and action.

Certain social sciences have progressed further than others. With all its deficiencies, economics, for example, has gone far toward explaining what course of action will yield optimum output at the least expenditure of labor and capital. But economic principles assume that economic objectives can be attained through the coordination of human activity and that the enterprise, as well as groups of enterprises, will be well managed. Other social sciences, such as sociology and anthropology, have gone far toward explaining our cultural environment. Even though the foundations of these sciences suffer from incompleteness and inexactness, the theories have helped us to understand our society.

The study and analysis of management have lagged behind other sciences until recent years. Yet, as in other fields, the development of an underlying science must precede an improved practice.

Science and the Scientific Method

Science explains phenomena. It is based on a belief in the rationality of nature—on the idea that relationships can be found between two or more sets of events. The essential feature of science is that knowledge has been discovered and systematized through the application of scientific method. Thus we speak of a science of astronomy or chemistry to indicate accumulated knowledge formulated with reference to the discovery of general truths in these areas. Science is systematized in the sense that relationships between variables and limits have been ascertained and underlying principles have been discovered.

Scientific method involves determining facts through observation of events or things and verifying the accuracy of these facts through continued observation. After classifying and analyzing the facts, scientists look for and find some causal relationships which they believe to be true. Such generalizations, called "hypotheses," are then tested for their accuracy. When hypotheses are found to be supported, to reflect or explain reality, and therefore to have value in predicting what will happen in similar circumstances, they are called "principles."

Application of scientific method to the development of principles does not totally eliminate doubt. Every generalization, however proved, may be subject to further research and analysis. Even so long-standing a generalization as Newton's law of gravitation might be modified with new knowledge and phenomena. But without new facts, induction from them of significant relationships, testing of hypotheses, and development of principles, we would never understand our universe.

Principles and Causal Relationships

If principles are to explain management behavior, they should be formulated to predict results. In connection with many of the principles presented in this book, it is not explicitly stated that a certain course of action will bring "good" results. This is implied. Since principles are designed to predict results in given circumstances, the reader must be aware of what the authors regard as "good." The standard used in this book—one with which managers would certainly agree—is the efficient and effective attainment of enterprise or departmental objectives, whether economic, political, educational, social, or religious.

This includes the objective of maintaining the organized enterprise as an effective joint effort over time, that is, of providing for the survival of the group until basic goals are reached. For most enterprises, these goals are so continuing and of so long a duration that this means indefinite survival. Thus a business enterprise may have a continuing goal of producing goods or services that people want and can buy, just as an educational or religious enterprise pursues continuing goals of disciplining the mind in the acquisition and pursuit of knowledge or of furthering spiritual life.

Even though the principles as stated in this book may not always be established as complete causal propositions, the reader should interpret them as such. They can always be read in the sense that if this or that is done, the result will be more efficient and effective attainment of objectives.

Management as an Inexact Science

It is often pointed out that the social sciences are "inexact" sciences, as compared with the "exact" physical sciences. It is also sometimes indicated that management is perhaps the most inexact of the social

sciences. The social sciences, and management in particular, deal with complex phenomena about which too little is known. Likewise, the structure and behavior of the atom are far less complex than the structure and behavior of groups of people, including both those inside and those outside an enterprise.

But we should not forget that even in the most exact of the exact sciences—physics—there are areas where scientific knowledge does not exist now and must be developed through speculation and hypothesis. As much as is known of bridge mechanics, bridges still fail as a result of such things as vibrations set up from wind currents. And as we move from the longer-known areas of physics into the biological sciences, we find that areas of exactness tend to diminish.

Since virtually all areas of knowledge have tremendous expanses of the unknown, people working in the social sciences should not be defeatist. A scientific approach to management cannot wait until an exact science of management is developed. Had the physical and biological sciences thus waited, we might still be living in caves.

Certainly, the observations of perceptive managers must substitute largely for the desirable laboratory-proven facts of the management scientist, at least until such facts can be determined. Statistical proof of theory and principles of management is desirable, but there is no use waiting for such proof before giving credence to principles derived from experience. After all, no one has been able to give statistical proof of the validity of the Golden Rule, but people of many religions have accepted this fundamental precept as a guide to behavior for centuries, and there are few who would doubt that its observance improves human conduct.

The earliest contributions toward viewing general management from an intellectual and scientific standpoint came from such experienced business managers as Fayol, Mooney, Alvin Brown, Sheldon, Barnard, and Urwick. Many of the concepts, propositions, and techniques offered in this book are based on the distilled experience of these and later practitioners. Admittedly, much of the research has been done without questionnaires, controlled interviews, laboratory experiments, or mathematics, but it can hardly be regarded as "armchair" or lacking in experienced observation. In recent years the burgeoning research by management scholars and practitioners has also added to the store of knowledge.

To be sure, management is an inexact science. But the questions one must ask are these: Does the use of such knowledge as is available help us understand management and aid in improving management practice now? Are we better off using such knowledge now—for guidelines in research and practice—or waiting until that perhaps distant future when the science can be "proven"? Does such knowledge help in substituting rationality for confusion? Does it increase objectivity in the understanding and practicing of management?

Principles and Theory

Principles and theory furnish the structural framework of a science. Principles are fundamental truths, or what are believed to be truths at a given time, explaining relationships between two or more sets of variables. In its purest form, a principle embodies an independent and a dependent variable. Thus in physics, if gravity is the only force acting on a falling body, it will fall at a uniformly accelerated speed (at 32.16 feet per second per second at the latitude of New York City). Or take the much less physical example of Parkinson's Law, which states that work tends to expand to fill the time available; thus work depends on time available.

March and Simon point out that propositions explaining relationships may be of various forms.³ One type includes propositions that state the dependence of one variable on one or more dependent variables. Another type includes those which embody a qualitative, descriptive generalization about a subject, for example: "One of the important activities that goes on in an organization is the development of programs for new activities that need to be routinized for day-to-day performance."⁴ As can be seen, this is little more than the concept type of proposition. A third type of proposition mentioned by these authors is one in which a particular phenomenon performs a particular function, such as: "Rigidity of behavior increases the defensibility of individual action."⁵ Although all three types of the March and Simon propositions might be used to indicate principles, the most meaningful principles are those which involve causal relationships with dependent and independent variables.

Theory is a systematic grouping of interrelated principles. Its task is to tie together significant knowledge, to give it a framework. Scattered data, such as the miscellaneous numbers or diagrams typically found on a blackboard after a group of engineers have been discussing a problem, are not information unless the observer has a knowledge of the theory which explains their relationships. With this knowledge the observer can tie them together and probably comprehend what they mean. Theory is, as Homans has said, "in its lowest form a classification, a set of pigeon holes, a filing cabinet in which fact can accumulate. Nothing is more lost than a loose fact."⁶

The importance of theory to the development of organized knowledge has been dramatically indicated by the various essays of Talcott Parsons. In one, he says:

It is scarcely too much to say that the most important index of the state of maturity of a science is the state of systematic theory. This

³J. G. March and H. A. Simon, *Organizations* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958), pp. 7-9.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 8.

⁵*Ibid.*

⁶G. C. Homans, *The Human Group* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1950), p. 5.

includes the character of the general conceptual scheme in use in the field, the kinds and degrees of logical integration of the different elements which make it up, and the ways in which it is actually used in empirical research.⁷

Any system of principles or theory requires clarity of concepts—mental images of a thing formed by generalization from particulars. Obviously, a clear definition of a word is an elemental type of concept. Concepts are the building blocks of theory and principles. Unless concepts are clear, meaningful to those who use them, and used consistently, what may be said by one person who attempts to explain knowledge will not transfer to another in the same way. Indeed, this is one of the major difficulties with management as a science. As will be noted in Chapter 3, the same word or term does not imply the same phenomena to different people. One need only reflect on the term “organization” to see how true this is.

Principles are often referred to as being “descriptive,” “prescriptive,” or “normative.” As might be surmised, a principle is descriptive if it merely describes a relationship between variables. A principle is prescriptive, or normative, if it is stated in such a way as to indicate what a person should do. Obviously, the principle of falling bodies, referred to above, is purely descriptive. It says nothing about whether you should jump from the top of a tall building; it is only an indication that, as far as gravity is concerned, if you do jump, you will fall at a certain speed. On the other hand, when principles are applied against some scale of values, they may be referred to as prescribing action or as being prescriptive, or normative. If the reader agrees with the thesis of the authors that it is the goal of all managers to operate in such a way as to accomplish the purposes of the organization effectively and efficiently, he or she has a value against which to apply management principles. It is consequently easy, by inserting a standard of value like efficiency in our thinking, to make management principles normative as well as descriptive.

THE NEED FOR THEORY AND TECHNIQUES OF MANAGEMENT

Obviously, knowledge of the basic principles and techniques of management can have a tremendous impact upon its practice, clarifying and improving it. Since in all fields of human cooperation, efficiency of group effort lags far behind that of machines, application of management knowledge will further human progress.

The need for a clear concept of management and for a framework of related theory and principles was recognized many years ago by such early practical scholars of management as Henri Fayol, Chester Barnard,

⁷*Essays in Sociological Theory, Pure and Applied* (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1949), p. 17.

and Alvin Brown.⁸ This need has been increasingly recognized by intelligent managers as time has gone on.

To Increase Efficiency

When management principles and techniques can be developed, proved, and used, managerial efficiency will inevitably improve. Then the conscientious manager can become more effective by using established guidelines to help solve problems, without engaging in original laborious research or the risky practice of trial and error.⁹

It is not always appreciated that only fundamentals can be learned from experience and transferred to new situations. The kind of experience on which many managers rely too heavily is only a hodgepodge of problems and solutions existing in the past and never exactly duplicated. Two management situations are seldom alike in all respects, and managers cannot assume that exact techniques applicable in one situation will necessarily work in another. However, if managers can distill experience and seek out and recognize the fundamental causal relationships in different circumstances, they can apply this knowledge to the solution of new problems. In other words, solutions become simplified if dealt with in terms of fundamentals. The value in understanding management as a conceptual scheme of concepts, principles, and techniques is that it lets one see and understand what would otherwise remain unseen. Theory and science can solve future problems arising in an ever-changing environment.

The value of knowing principles might be illustrated by several examples. We know from principles that having individuals report to more than one boss involves certain costs and disadvantages, even though the benefits of doing so may justify the costs; by knowing principles, we may be able to minimize these costs. Principles tell us that no manager can develop controls without basing them on plans, that managers must have organization authority necessary to accomplish the results expected of them, and that no manager can develop a meaningful plan without a clear idea of the goal to be accomplished and the future environment premised for its operation. While principles are, as they should be, distilled knowledge, awareness of them can help managers avoid mistakes. It is obviously wasteful for every manager to have to learn these truths from his or her own experience.

⁸In *General and Industrial Management* (New York: Pitman Publishing Corporation, 1949), pp. 14-15. Writing originally in 1916, Fayol bemoaned the lack of management teaching in vocational schools, but ascribed it to a lack of theory, since, as he said, "without theory no teaching is possible." Likewise, Barnard (op. cit., p. 289) deplored the lack of literature and instruction for executives and, above all, the lack of "an accepted conceptual scheme with which to exchange their thought." Alvin Brown, in *Organization of Industry* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1947), p. vi, held that the understanding and development of the art of management must be a study "grounded in principle."

⁹As Urwick has aptly said: "And we should not forget that in the field of management our errors are other people's trials."

To Crystallize the Nature of Management

Lack of understanding of the concepts, principles, and techniques of management makes it difficult to analyze the managerial job and to train managers. Fundamentals act as a checklist of the meaning of management. Without them, the training of managers depends upon haphazard trial and error. To some extent, this will be the case until an adequate science of management has been developed. Meanwhile, in business, government, and other enterprises a considerable body of management knowledge has already come into being and serves increasingly to crystallize the nature of management and to simplify manager training.

To Improve Research

As pointed out above, all hypotheses can be used to guide research. And if research is undertaken to build further theory or otherwise to expand the horizons of knowledge, establishment of a structural framework of knowledge would appear to be useful for productive research.

In view of the rising interest in management in the past three decades and the tremendous amount of study by students and managers, better channeling of research is bound to be productive. Since management deals in part with people and since groups of people are unpredictable and complex, effective research is difficult. Management also deals with the planning of action, the devising of controls, and the grouping of activities, and progress in research in all these areas is slow and costly. The need for tested knowledge of organized enterprise is great, and anything which makes management research more pointed will help improve management practice.

To Achieve Social Goals

In a broad sense, managing coordinates the efforts of people so that individual objectives become translated into social attainments. Development of management knowledge, by increasing efficiency in the use of human as well as material resources, would unquestionably have a revolutionary impact on the cultural level of society. To illustrate this point, nations with a high material standard of living tend to have a high level of intelligence and skill in their management of business. Ample raw materials and a favorable political climate have been important in accounting for the economic productivity of the United States. Equally significant, particularly in the twentieth century, has been the relatively high quality of management.

CONTINGENCY, OR SITUATIONAL, MANAGEMENT

There has been a fairly widespread tendency for certain scholars and writers in organization theory to misunderstand the approach to manage-