Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

"打开经济学之门"
原版注释基础读本

管理学基础

（注释版）

——人物篇

Fifty Key Figures in Management

（英）摩根·威策尔 著

经济科学出版社
Economic Science Press

“打开经济学之门”
原版注释基础读本

管理学基础——人物篇

FIFTY KEY FIGURES IN MANAGEMENT

（注释版）

经济科学出版社

图书在版编目（CIP）数据

管理学基础——人物篇（注释版）/（英）威策尔著：雷宵，初少磊译注．—北京：经济科学出版社，2011．12

（“打开经济学之门”原版注释基础读本）

ISBN 978－7－5141－0912－2

Ⅰ．①管…　Ⅱ．①威…　②雷…　③初…　Ⅲ．①管理学－英文　Ⅳ．①C93

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字（2011）第 165249 号

责任编辑：龚　勋　初少磊
责任校对：刘　昕
版式设计：代小卫
技术编辑：王世伟

管理学基础——人物篇
（注释版）
（英）摩根·威策尔　著
雷　宵　初少磊　译注
经济科学出版社出版、发行　新华书店经销
社址：北京市海淀区阜成路甲 28 号　邮编：100142
总编部电话：88191217　发行部电话：88191540
网址：www.esp.com.cn
电子邮件：esp@esp.com.cn
北京中科印刷有限公司印装
787×1092　16 开　28.5 印张　650000 字
2011 年 12 月第 1 版　2011 年 12 月第 1 次印刷
ISBN 978－7－5141－0912－2　定价：51.00 元
（图书出现印装问题，本社负责调换）
（版权所有　翻印必究）

策划人语

《“打开经济学之门”原版注释基础读本》系列丛书是经济科学出版社适应新形势下高校双语教学需求的精心策划之作。

秉承经济科学出版社“繁荣经济科学，宣传服务财政”的办社宗旨，丛书的策划者从中国读者的英文阅读实际水平出发，从海量的国外教材和教辅书中挑选了广义经济学的八本入门读本，内容涵盖经济学、管理学、金融学、营销学等门类，编写体例分为原理篇、概念篇和人物篇三大类，原理篇旨在介绍该学科最基础的理论框架；概念篇则一一介绍该学科最核心的概念；同时，丛书的另外一大创新是：还尝试着加入了人物篇，例如，《管理学基础——人物篇》介绍了自文艺复兴时期以来的50位著名的管理学大师的生平和思想。丛书力图通过原理、概念、人物的多角度、多层面呈现，为初涉经济学领域的青年学子和所有非经济学专业的读者们立体地勾画出一幅完整的学术图景，而且是原汁原味的呈现。

《“打开经济学之门”原版注释基础读本》系列丛书被设计成开放式结构：我们将根据读者的反馈逐渐地出版更多的切合中国读者需求的好作品。丛书知识性和趣味性并重，英文通俗易懂，适合大学本科低年级学生、高职高专学生阅读。

丛书的初衷是出版中文翻译版本，然而在漫长的试译、翻译、校译过程中，一方面是深感语言传达的艰难，另一方面是考虑到时至21世纪，中国读者的英文阅读水平早已经超越了出版者的预期，读者对译文标准性的挑剔也成为出版者的新高度，从而逐渐萌发了出版注释版的想法：为读者提供全英文的读本，只加上少量的中文注解。通过与国外出版者艰难的谈判，最终成功地说服了外方，获得了在中国出版英文注释版的独家授权。为此，我们付出了超出预期好几倍的

辛劳。

然而，这仅仅只是开始，读者的接受和喜欢才是我们最终的目标。希望读者喜欢我们的创意，为我们提供更多的创意！

2011年11月

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

目　录

克瑞斯·阿吉里斯
CHRIS ARGYRIS（1923 - ） …… 1
理查德·阿克赖特
RICHARD ARKWRIGHT（1732 - 1792） …… 11
查尔斯·巴贝奇
CHARLES BABBAGE（1792 - 1871） …… 22
托马斯·巴塔
TOMÁS BAT'A（1876 - 1932） …… 31
马克斯·布瓦索
MAX BOISOT（1943 - ） …… 41
詹姆斯·伯纳姆
JAMES BURNHAM（1905 - 1987） …… 50
爱德华·卡德伯里
EDWARD CADBURY（1873 - 1948） …… 59
赫伯特·N·卡森
HERBERT N. CASSON（1869 - 1951） …… 67
艾尔弗雷德·D·钱德勒
ALFRED D. CHANDLER（1918 - ） …… 78
阿里·德赫斯
ARIE DE GEUS（1930 - ） …… 88
威廉·爱德华兹·戴明
W. EDWARDS DEMING（1900 - 1993） …… 93
彼得·德鲁克
PETER DRUCKER（1909 - 2005） …… 102

皮埃尔·杜邦
PIERRE DU PONT（1870－1954） …… 113
哈林顿·埃默森
HARRINGTON EMERSON（1853－1931） …… 123
亨利·法约尔
HENRI FAYOL（1841－1925） …… 135
玛丽·帕克·芙丽特
MARY PARKER FOLLETT（1868－1933） …… 144
亨利·福特
HENRY FORD（1863－1947） …… 154
杰伊·赖特·福里斯特
JAY WRIGHT FORRESTER（1918－） …… 166
福泽谕吉
FUKUZAWA YUKICHI（1835－1901） …… 173
比尔·盖茨
BILL GATES（1955－） …… 182
埃德温·盖伊
EDWIN GAY（1867－1946） …… 193
弗兰克·邦克·吉尔布雷斯和莉莲·吉尔布雷斯
FRANK BUNKER GILBRETH（1868－1924）
LILLIAN GILBRETH（1878－1972） …… 201
安迪·格鲁夫
ANDREW GROVE（1936－） …… 211
查尔斯·汉迪
CHARLES HANDY（1932－） …… 220
亨利·J·海因茨
HENRY J. HEINZ（1844－1919） …… 230
吉尔特·霍夫斯泰德
GEERT HOFSTEDE（1928－） …… 239
井深大
IBUKA MASARU（1908－1997） …… 246

菲利普・科特勒

PHILIP KOTLER（1931 – ）…… 252

老子

LAOZI（LAO TZU）（*6th century BC*）…… 262

威廉・利弗

WILLIAM LEVER（1851 – 1925）…… 268

尼科洛・马基雅利弗

NICCOLÒ MACHIAVELLI（1469 – 1527）…… 276

马歇尔・麦克卢汉

MARSHALL McLUHAN（1911 – 1980）…… 282

亚伯拉罕・马斯洛

ABRAHAM MASLOW（1908 – 1970）…… 289

松下幸之助

MATSUSHITA KONOSUKE（1894 – 1989）…… 297

柯西莫・代・梅迪奇

COSIMO DEI MEDICI（1389 – 1464）…… 304

亨利・明茨伯格

HENRY MINTZBERG（1939 – ）…… 313

詹姆斯・D・穆尼

JAMES D. MOONEY（1884 – 1957）…… 321

加雷斯・摩根

GARETH MORGAN（1943 – ）…… 331

约翰・皮尔庞特・摩根

J. P. MORGAN（1837 – 1913）…… 341

野中郁次郎

NONAKA IKUJIRO（1935 – ）…… 352

大前研一

OHMAE KENICHI（1943 – ）…… 360

罗伯特・欧文

ROBERT OWEN（1771 – 1858）…… 367

汤姆・彼得斯

TOM PETERS（1942 – ）…… 378

迈克尔·波特
MICHAEL PORTER（1947 - ） …… 387
赫伯特·西蒙
HERBERT SIMON（1916 - 2001） …… 395
孙子
SUNZI（SUN TZU）（*c.* 4th century BC） …… 402
弗雷德里克·温斯洛·泰勒
FREDERICK WINSLOW TAYLOR（1856 - 1915） …… 408
丰田喜一郎
TOYODA KIICHIRO（1894 - 1952） …… 419
林德尔·福恩斯·厄威克
LYNDALL FOWNES URWICK（1891 - 1983） …… 425
杰克·韦尔奇
JACK WELCH（1935 - ） …… 435

参考文献 …… 441
主题词索引 …… 443

CHRIS ARGYRIS (1923 -)

克瑞斯·阿吉里斯

Chris Argyris is best known for his work, with his long-time collaborator Donald Schön, in developing the **theory of "action science"** and its application to business situations. Action science is a process of scientific research and analysis which is closely connected to the process it studies and continuously feeds back knowledge into that process, rather than trying to remain objective and impartial as does "normal" science. A recognition of the role of knowledge in breaking down barriers and driving forward organisational change and innovation lies at the heart of Argyris's later theories on organisation. His work on action science in the 1970s laid the groundwork for many of the theories of "knowledge management" that emerged in the 1990s.

行为科学理论

The son of Greek immigrants, Argyris was born in Newark, New Jersey on 16 July 1923. Part of his early childhood was spent in Greece, and by the time he first attended school he still had only a limited command of English. This, and more generally the fact that he came from a minority group, set him apart from the other children at school and instilled in him a tendency to reflection and introspection.[1] During the Second World War he served as an officer in the US Army Corps of Signals, going on to university after the war. He took his PhD from the School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University in 1951. His first academic post was at Yale University, as director of research in labour; by 1960 he was a professor of business administration and one of the rising stars in business education. In 1971 he moved to Harvard where he was appointed

James Bryant Conant Professor of Education and Organizational Behavior, a post he continues to hold.

Argyris's writings can be divided roughly into three stages, although there is considerable overlap and books in the later stages always refer heavily to earlier work. In the first stage, in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Argyris considers the problems of organisation and the "fit" between the needs of organisations and those of individuals. In the second stage, he looks at the problems of organisational change and the use of action science as a change tool. In the third stage, he moves beyond the specific problems of change to consider the role of organisational knowledge more widely. In so doing, he helped pioneer the field of knowledge management.

Reflective by nature, Argyris's wartime role and his subsequent academic career had developed his ability to analyse problems and look for long-term solutions. His first concern was with what he termed the lack of congruence between the needs and goals of organisations on the one hand, and the needs and goals of those people who are part of organisations on the other.[2] In particular, he criticised the "machine bureaucracy" that characterised (and continues to characterise) so many business organisations. Hierarchical and rigidly structured, machine bureaucracies are managed from the top downward: communication is nearly always from the upper levels to the lower levels of the hierarchy, and when communication does flow upwards it is usually at a time and in a format specified by senior management. The need for managerial control leads top management to impose limitations on the actions of their subordinates: while on the one hand, top management specifies to junior managers and workers what their roles and duties *are*, it also tends, even if only implicitly, to prohibit or at least discourage many activities that *are not* part of those duties. An individual is given a job specification: the elements of that specification are required to help meet the organisation's goals, while any activity not specif-

此为试读，需要完整PDF请访问：www.ertongbook.com

ically mentioned is considered a distraction from that goal and should be prohibited.

Managers manage, in other words, by controlling and limiting the efforts of those below them. This approach to management has two problems. First, it takes no account of individuals' own goals, which could be at variance with those of the organisation. If employees do not share the organisation's goals, they will not be motivated to pursue them: inefficiency, disharmony and conflict will result. More seriously, it takes no account of people's ability to grow and change with experience. Employees are not cogs in a machine, they are independent, self-aware entities. As they grow older and gain experience, they become more independent and active; therefore, to keep them "in line" and focused on the needs of the organisation, the limitations and controls on them grow correspondingly greater. To give a simple example, a young graduate placed in a junior management job will have much to learn and will probably be satisfied with the responsibilities placed on him or her; but a 40-year-old manager in the same position will see much more potential for growth and change and is likely to be frustrated by the restrictions imposed on his or her job.

Companies try to get around this problem by promoting people with potential into more responsible positions, widening their scope of activities and increasing personal freedom. However, by failing to understand the fit between organisations and people, they create problems of a different kind. In the late 1960s the Canadian psychologist Laurence Peter developed the Peter Principle, commonly expressed as: "in a hierarchy, every employee tends to rise to the level of his [*sic*] own incompetence".[3] According to Peter, although organisations promote employees to senior positions on the basis of merit, they tend to do so on the basis of how well an employee is doing his or her current job. Less important, if considered at all, is whether the employee will be able to do the job into which he or she is being promoted. In other words, promotion is a reward for past success, and bears little or no relation to future needs of the organisation, or indeed of the employee. This becomes a problem when, as is often the case, employees and managers are promoted into positions for which they are not suited. At this point the "level of incompetence" is reached. The employee is not capable of doing the job into which he or she has been promoted, and stops being successful. Further promotions are not forthcoming, and the organisation is stuck with a dissatisfied employee doing a job poorly.

Organisations limit the actions of their members, and this leads to resistance on the part of the latter. Sometimes this can lead to conflict and obstruction, or gold-bricking (giving the appearance of working while actually doing as little as possible), or even criminal behaviour such as theft in the office. Sometimes the dissatisfied employees simply leave. Most commonly, however, employees opt for an easy life, doing their jobs with little involvement and trying to keep the organisation from interfering with their lives as much as possible. For these employees, any change in the organisation is perceived as a threat. To counteract change, employees adopt what Argyris describes as "defensive routines", actions which can inhibit or slow down change, or even block it altogether. Some employees will employ defensive routines for negative reasons, purely because they do not wish to upset the status quo. More dangerous, says Argyris, are those who seek to block change for what they feel are positive reasons: they may be seeking to protect colleagues who are threatened by change, for example, or they may genuinely believe that the proposed changes are harmful and will damage the organisation. [4] Many of these defensive routines become deeply embedded in the organisation's culture, so that even new employees brought in to promote change become "infected" and thus part of the problem.

In the next phase of his work, Argyris began to look at how to overcome the problem of resistance to change. In the 1970s, after two decades of prosperity, American business was beginning to feel the pinch: the oil shocks, the end of international currency agreements and the challenge of imported goods, especially from Japan, were beginning to make themselves felt. Consultants and other observers were calling for radical change in the way American business was organised and run. In 1982, Tom **Peters** and Robert Waterman would publish their manifesto for radical change, *In Search of Excellence*, based on their experiences at McKinsey & Co. in the 1970s and their observations of the best and worst of American business. The need for change offered a challenge to Argyris: how to defeat defensive routines and make change management itself into an integral part of the organisation.

This led at the same time to a change in Argyris's own methodological approach. Up until then, like most social scientists, he conducted his research through observing the behaviour of people in groups. Now, in partnership with the sociologist Donald Schön, he switched his attention from behaviour *per se* to studying the reasons behind behaviour. What causes organisations and people to behave as they do? To get at the answers to this question, Argyris realised it was necessary to get away from the standard model of scientific research in which people and groups were observed objectively by neutral observers. Despite all precautions, this kind of research led inevitably to bias. This phenomenon had been observed in the 1920s and 1930s during research at Western Electric's Hawthorne plant, near Chicago, where the research team led by Harvard University scholars Fritz Roethlisberger and Elton Mayo were puzzled as to why the sample of employees they were studying and interviewing were performing consistently better than the average across the firm. After a number of experiments with environment, lighting and so on, the researchers reached the startling conclusion that the group being studied performed better *because they were being* *studied.* The presence of the researchers and the attention being paid to their own work gave the workers in the sample group a stronger sense of self-worth and motivated them to do better. [5]

For Argyris and Schön, it was time that scientific research came down out of its ivory tower and integrated itself into the organisation. The term "action research" was intended to denote a new kind of research, conducted by managers and workers themselves on a continuous basis and constantly feeding back into their work. [6] The purpose of action research was to create "actionable knowledge", "the knowledge that people use to create the world", [7] rather than knowledge that was irrelevant to everyday use, no matter how excellent the methods of acquiring it might be. In his ideal world, businesses do not call in outside experts to observe and make recommendations; they do their own scientific research, on the job, as they go along, and make the gathering of knowledge and its utilisation a part of the manager's daily task.

Argyris's method of integrating knowledge into the organisation is called by him "double loop learning". Single loop learning is a simple process whereby feedback from previous actions is used to alter future actions. This can be effective in limited situations, but does place management in a largely reactive situation. Double loop learning, on the other hand, uses feedback from past actions to question not only the nature of future actions, but all the underlying assumptions on which future decisions are to be made. When considering feedback, managers need to ask not only, "what should we do next?", but also, "why are we doing it?", and even more importantly, "what else ought we to be doing?" Only by asking these questions can organisational learning become deep-rooted and truly effective.

Again, there will be resistance in the organisation to double loop learning, as it necessarily involves challenging existing assumptions and, in turn, throwing out some of those assumptions if they are proved to be no longer valid. The response to new knowledge, especially if that knowledge is threatening, can often be, "I don't want to know that". This phenomenon has been observed elsewhere; back in the early years of the century, Herbert **Casson** had remarked with exasperation on the unwillingness of many executives to learn. But Argyris argues that the knowledge generated by double loop learning can be so powerful and so persuasive that it can break down even the strongest defensive routines. Action science is by no means a panacea; overcoming defensive routines also requires patience and persuasion. But in the long run, persuading people by sharing knowledge with them is bound to be more effective than issuing directives and orders that will be ignored or circumvented.

Action science and double loop learning entail the continuous generation of new knowledge, and also the diffusion of that knowledge widely throughout the firm. In his later works, Argyris has been concerned with how firms acquire and use knowledge. *Knowledge for Action* (1993) considers how managers should employ knowledge in their work, while *Flawed Advice and the Management Trap* (2000) suggests means by which managers can judge whether the advice they are getting from "independent experts" is likely to be of practical value to them. In the last book there are echoes of Mary Parker **Follett**, questioning whether experts are indeed custodians of truth. Both would agree that the knowledge we gain for ourselves is superior to that which we acquire second-hand from others: independent experts and advisors do have a role to play, but their ideas should not necessarily be accepted at face value, and in the end nothing can substitute for knowledge generated within, and specific to, the organisation. The need to create knowledge, and how to do it, is one of the central issues in current theories of knowledge management.

Argyris's books can be difficult reads. Newcomers to the field of management, particularly to organisation behaviour, are likely to find his books densely written and the central ideas not always easy to tease out. One criticism which has been levelled against him, with some fairness, is that, ironically, he is too concerned with the concept of action science and has not done enough to explain how it can be put into practice (some of his later books attempt to redress this problem). Against this, Argyris attempts to show how knowledge can be used to break down the monolithic structure of organisations and make them more fluid and adaptable and at the same time happier and better places to work. Less of an overt revolutionary than Tom Peters, less prescriptive than the likes of **Porter** and **Deming**, Argyris's nearest equivalents as a management thinker are probably Charles **Handy** and Henry **Mintzberg**, two others who, from vastly different perspectives, believe there are few hard and fast answers in an activity that is ultimately about human agency, and that it is what we know and how we employ that knowledge that ultimately determines managerial success or failure.

See also: **Boisot**, **de Geus**, **Follett**, **Forrester**, **Handy**, **Maslow**, **Morgan**, **Nonaka**, **Simon**

Major works 主要作品

Personality and Organization, New York: Harper, 1957.

Integrating the Individual and the Organization, New York: Wiley, 1964.

Organization and Innovation, Chicago: Wiley, 1965.

Intervention Theory and Method, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Management and Organizational Development, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

(With D. Schön) *Theory in Practice*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Increasing Leadership Effectiveness, New York: Wiley, 1976.

(With D. Schön) *Organizational Learning*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978.

Inner Contradictions of Rigorous Research, New York: Ac-

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com