

Course # RRT 385 Date In 8/25

Reading #: 5 \$ 1.80
R

CHAPTER

2

No job is more vital to our society than that of the manager. It is the manager who determines whether our social institutions serve us well or whether they squander our talents and resources. It is time to strip away the folklore about managerial work, and time to study it realistically so that we can begin the difficult task of making significant improvements in its performance.¹

**THIS MAY BE COPYRIGHTED
MATERIAL.**

Traditional Concepts of Management

IS MANAGEMENT AN ART OR A SCIENCE? What are its basic theoretical models and structures? Although people have held the roles of business entrepreneurs, government officials, or directors of other types of organizations for many centuries, it was only in the latter half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century that management became a specialized field of professional practice that was scientifically studied and in which precise rules were laid down.

It was at this time, just at the height of the Industrial Era, that a number of basic concepts evolved regarding the ideal internal structure of organizations, the design of work functions, and the assignment of authority, which were widely adopted in the world of business and public administration. These concepts, stemming from the so-called classical period of management theory, still influence us today.

UNDERSTANDING MANAGEMENT

Exactly what *is* management, and how is it carried on? Is it a mysterious, arcane craft or simply a common-sense, down-to-earth area of professional practice?

Management is a process or function that is common to all human organizations and institutions. Large hospitals, public-service agencies, the armed forces, educational systems, and businesses of every type are only a few of the settings in which it must operate. Whenever people join together to accomplish specific goals, the management process is at work. Although much of the impetus for developing professional management approaches has come from private industry, it would be false to assume that the only place management skills are needed is in profit-making enterprises. Instead, whenever two or more people become involved in cooperative efforts, the process of management comes into play.

The key to successful performance in any organization is the efficient use of human and physical resources. Therefore the basic element of management is the dynamic and changing process by which the activities and material resources of the

group are set in motion, organized, and coordinated toward accomplishing selected objectives.

Management is more than just a set of job titles or a division of an organization that has been assigned administrative or supervisory responsibilities. Rather, it is a process that relates to and is part of all other organizational functions. In a sense, it is like the brain of a person or the steering mechanism of a car; it coordinates and directs all other operations.

KEY ELEMENTS AND PURPOSES OF MANAGEMENT

Successful management is totally dependent on the *human element*. Divisional directors or program unit heads do not get the job performed by themselves, regardless of their individual talents or drive. Instead, they must work with and through others to achieve organizational goals and objectives.

The manager's essential purpose is to make *things happen* and to *achieve results*. No matter how great the effort, it is worth little unless it is meaningfully directed to improving the organization's performance. Therefore managers must concentrate on creating innovation and taking positive action rather than simply responding to crisis or challenge.

Management is a *dynamic process*. It is not stiff, rigid "bossism" or bureaucracy by the book. Circumstances, agency needs and priorities, and available resources are constantly changing. Therefore managers must remain alert to shifts in the surrounding environment to plan future developments with vision and perspective.

MANAGEMENT AS A PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINE

In recent years, management has been widely recognized as a professional discipline requiring special knowledge and expertise. Many schools and special institutes of management have been established, and extensive research has explored every aspect of management performance in various types of organizations. Yet its essential character is still debatable, and authorities have described it both as a form of science and as an art.

The justification for describing management as a *science* is based on the growing body of empirically gathered knowledge and theories that has developed over the past several decades in various academic fields, including social psychology, economics, urban planning, sociology, and business administration. It is held that, whenever possible, managerial policies and decisions should be based on principles that have been verified through sound research procedures.

Yet it must be recognized that many aspects of agency management or organizational life cannot be precisely quantified, measured, and analyzed. Interpersonal relationships and outcomes do not lend themselves to easily proven cause-and-effect research studies. Mintzberg argues that management cannot be considered a science:

A science involves the enactment of systematic, analytically determined procedures or programs. If we do not even know what procedures managers use, how can we prescribe them by scientific analysis?

Beyond this, many successful managers feel that scientific theories of management belong in the ivory towers of academia, rather than in the real, everyday world of organizations. On the other hand, those who argue that management is an *art* point out that it depends heavily on the judgment, sensitivity, intuition, and leadership qualities of the practitioner. Particularly in dealing with other persons, managers must be highly flexible and responsive to individual temperaments and capabilities.

The truth is that management is both a science and an art. Science provides the practitioner with facts regarding his or her professional mission and the probable effects of alternative courses of action. Within the limits of individual circumstances, managers must then use judgment and other personal skills in arriving at a decision and implementing it.

THEORY AND PRACTICE IN MANAGEMENT

Successful management practice is based on a combination of theoretical understanding and practical skills. In fields such as government or business management, a number of theoretical approaches to effective practice have been developed over the past century. The most influential of these approaches have usually been referred to as part of classical management theory. Howard and Crompton write:

Of all management notions, classical theory has had the greatest impact on shaping the organizational character of recreation and park service agencies. . . . In large measure this was due to the fact that recreation and park services formed part of the larger public bureaucratic structure which already conformed to formal organizational ideas. The municipal recreation and park movement underwent its greatest period of growth during the late 1940s and 1950s. Classical theory, riding the crest of its popularity, was by that time firmly established as the prevailing public administration organization model.¹

Development of Classical Management Theory

The traditional approach to conceptualizing the administrative process came from the contributions of a number of pioneering thinkers in this field. Among these were Frederick Taylor, Max Weber, Luther Gulick and his associate Lyndall Urwick, and Henri Fayol. Their management principles and recommendations for the organization and operation of businesses and other forms of bureaucratic structures were immensely influential throughout the industrialized world.

Scientific management and the machine model: Frederick Taylor

In the United States during the early decades of the twentieth century, the "scientific management" approach was gradually developed. This approach consisted of a formal, highly structured management style, in which work responsibilities were divided so that each task was highly specialized and in which there was a clearly established assignment of authority and the power to demand conformity and obedience from subordinate employees. Within this framework, executive power was highly centralized, and there was a precise and orderly chain of command from the top to the bottom of the enterprise.

One of the leading contributors to this approach was Frederick Taylor, an engineer and steel company executive noted for his efforts to introduce a high level of efficiency into factory production. Taylor's famous text, *Scientific Management*,⁴ gave rise to the movement itself and to what was often called the "machine model" approach to industrial management.

Taylor was convinced that most factories and other industrial enterprises were marked by a continuing conflict between management and employees, with many workers systematically resisting efforts to increase production. In addition, he believed that work assignments were wasteful and poorly designed. To overcome these problems, Taylor carried out time-and-motion studies that identified the most efficient and productive ways of streamlining work methods and eliminating unnecessary effort. These approved methods were to be standardized throughout an industrial plant and work-output rates established. Kelly describes Taylor's approach as

specifying a "standard time" for each separate motion necessary to perform a task by timing tasks with a stopwatch; selecting the right person for the job; carefully planning the balance of machines, men, speed of working, and payment (usually on a piece basis); and developing line and staff management. Taylor invented a piecework system, which typically led to a threefold increase in productivity for a 50 percent increase in wages.⁵

The scientific management model was designed primarily for business enterprises, although it had strong implications for other large bureaucracies. Taylor believed that there had to be a commonality of purpose for management and workers and that the key element in effective management was gaining the full cooperation of employees. His views were summarized as follows: "Management was interested in high profits and workers were interested in high wages; both would be able to reach their goals through cost reductions resulting from increased productivity."⁶

Daft and Steers comment that the scientific management approach was consistent with prevailing social beliefs of its period; it held that the average worker was basically lazy and was motivated almost entirely by money. They write:

Traditional management assumed that few workers wanted or could handle a high degree of autonomy or self-direction on their jobs. The best way to motivate employees based on these assumptions was to pay them using a piece-rate system, then redesign their jobs so the average worker could maximize his or her output. This job redesign . . . was aimed not at enrichment but at increased job simplification and fractionization. The simpler the task, the greater the output.⁷

Max Weber and the bureaucratic ideal

The scientific management school drew many of its ideas from a school of philosophical and sociological analysis that promoted respect for highly organized, depersonalized bureaucratic management. Max Weber, a leading German sociologist during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, was greatly impressed by the way in which Bismarck had unified Germany and transformed its government into a

modern and technically efficient organization. Today we tend to regard bureaucracy as cumbersome and excessively controlled by red tape. Weber, however, believed that bureaucratic management systems were technically far superior to other management approaches: "Precision, speed, unambiguity . . . continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal cost — these are raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic administration."⁸

Weber viewed employees as emotional and often unpredictable, characteristics that tended to interfere with efficient organizational processes. Therefore in his view the depersonalized form of organization represented by bureaucracies with precisely defined, mechanistic roles, functions, divisions, and regulations would minimize the negative effect of dysfunctional or inefficient human behavior. He urged the adoption of "rational" administrative structures in which persons holding managerial posts would be subject to the following policies:

1. There would be a division of labor, in which authority and responsibility would be defined for each employee and all official duties would be clearly detailed. Strict rules, controls, and disciplinary procedures would be applied to ensure uniform, efficient performance of such tasks.
2. Managers would be selected on the basis of their demonstrated expertise, which would be determined by formal examinations and education or on-the-job training rather than by favoritism or other personal qualities.
3. All positions within the organization would be organized according to a vertical chain of command or hierarchy of authority, which came to be known as the "scalar" principle. Each lower office would fall under the command of a higher one, and the relationships among different departments and managers would be clearly specified.

Fayol's principles of management

Another major contribution to the evolving school of management theory was made by Henri Fayol, a leading French industrialist. Fayol held that five managerial processes or functions were critical in the entire administrative process, whether in business, military, government, or other types of organizations. These were planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling. In his book, *Administration Industrielle et Generale*, published in 1929, Fayol presented 14 key principles, which extended Weber's theories and made them operational (see box on p. 32).⁹

Fayol's principles had a strong international impact in that a number of other management theorists combined his views with those of Taylor and Weber and began to develop a number of management concepts that were widely adopted in schools of public administration or business and other training programs.

Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick: administrative functions

Focusing on the process of effective management, Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick¹⁰ published a major work that used the term "POSDCORB" as a memory device to summarize the chief administrative functions of managerial personnel in public agencies. The letters represented words descriptive of these key tasks: plan-

ning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. As interpreted by Lynn Rodney in a leading text on public recreation administration, several of these functions were applied to the leisure-service field as follows:

1. *Planning*. What are the objectives of the department? What programs and activ-

FAYOL'S 14 PRINCIPLES

1. *Division of work*. Work assignments should be highly specialized and concentrated on narrower functions, in order to produce more and better work with the same time and effort.
2. *Authority and responsibility*. Authority is the right to give orders and to demand obedience and responsibility.
3. *Discipline*. Discipline implies respect for the agreements between the company and its employees, and is essential for the smooth operation of the organization. Without it, enterprises cannot prosper, and it must be enforced if necessary by judiciously applied sanctions.
4. *Unity of command*. An employee should receive orders from one superior only.
5. *Unity of direction*. There should be one plan and one head for each group of activities having the same objectives.
6. *Subordination of individual interest to general interest*. The interests of any employee or group of employees should not prevail over those of the company or overall organization.
7. *Remuneration of personnel*. Personnel compensation should be fair and satisfactory both to employees and to the organization, to maintain the loyalty and support of employees.
8. *Centralization*. Centralized management authority is a natural consequence of organizing, although the appropriate degree of centralization will vary according to the particular organization.
9. *Scalar chain*. The scalar chain is the chain of superior-subordinate relationships, ranging from the highest authority to the lowest rank of employees.
10. *Order*. The organization should provide an orderly place for each individual; a place for everyone and everyone in his place.
11. *Equity*. Equity, consisting of balanced fairness and a sense of justice, is found throughout the organization.
12. *Stability of tenure of personnel*. Time is needed for the employee to adapt to his work and perform efficiently. Since high turnover increases inefficiency, a mediocre manager who stays is preferable to a highly competent manager who comes and goes.
13. *Initiative*. At all organizational levels, employee initiative is augmented by zeal and energy.
14. *Espirit de corps*. Teamwork marked by the harmonious interpersonal relationship of employees provide strength to the organization.

Modified from Fayol, H.: *General and Industrial Management*, London, 1949, Pitman & Sons, Ltd.

- ities should be provided to meet the objectives? What policies should be formulated? What should be the scope of operation?
2. *Organizing*. How should the plans be carried out? How will the work be allocated or divided? What organizational units should be established to carry out basic functions? What relationships should exist between units of operation?
 3. *Staffing and resources*. Who is to perform the many and varied tasks? What human and material resources are available? How are they to be allocated?
 4. *Directing*. Who is to oversee how the work is being carried out? How are orders to be issued to get the organization operating and carrying out its function? Who will direct general operations? How will this direction be given?
 5. *Coordinating*. How will the various units of work be fused together in a team effort? What means should be used to ensure that divisions of work are functioning in harmony and are synchronized in effort?¹¹

This list of key functions has gradually been consolidated. Today many management texts suggest that there are four key tasks: *planning*, *organizing*, *motivating* (or *directing*), and *controlling*. At the same time, some authorities suggest that these terms are arbitrary and that many of the actual tasks of managers do not fit conveniently under any single heading. For example, Mintzberg writes:

When [a manager] is called and told that one of his factories has just burned down, and he advises the caller to see whether temporary arrangements can be made to supply customers through a foreign subsidiary, is he planning, organizing, coordinating or controlling? How about when he presents a gold watch to a retiring employee? Or when he attends a conference to meet people in the trade?¹²

Four Basic Principles of Management

As management theory became more fully developed, four basic principles became broadly accepted. They dealt with such elements as the nature of work and work assignments and the structure of organizations. A brief discussion of each follows.

Division of labor and task specialization

Under this principle the operational functions of an organization must be sharply identified and placed in separate departments. Departments in turn are subdivided into separate units or sections, reflecting different areas of work responsibility. New departments or units are added and older ones subdivided as the organization expands.

Based on the principles of Taylor and Fayol, work assignments are differentiated according to specialized functions, and exact procedures and standards are applied.

Assignment of authority and accountability

The overall administrative structure generally depends on the principle that authority is legitimated; that is, superiors have the right to command others to take certain actions and subordinates must obey their commands. Accompanying this principle is the tenet of accountability; once given an assignment, a person must carry it out and is responsible for its successful completion.

Within the "machine model" framework, the higher-level employee clearly had the right to impose orders on subordinates, provided that these did not violate personnel policies, labor union contractual agreements, or other departmental regulations.

Scalar principle and unity of command

According to this principle, authority is established at the top of the organization and flows in a vertical line down to the lower levels of the structure. This was often referred to as a "ladder," with each rung representing a level of authority or administrative responsibility. Linked to this is the concept of *unity of command*, which held that each subordinate employee should be directly responsible to only one superior. A related principle is that of *centralized decision making*, which held that decision-making powers in all important areas of concern must be tightly restricted to those at the upper end of the chain of command or to the heads of departments or subdivisions.

Span of control

This principle refers to the number of immediate subordinates that a supervisor or other manager can effectively direct. This may be shown diagrammatically by having a "narrow" or "tall" span of control contrasted with a "broad" or "flat" span of control. In the narrow structure, with several layers, each manager is able to exert a high degree of supervision and control over a limited number of subordinates. In the broad structure, with fewer layers but more employees in each layer, the manager is able to supervise more individuals, but cannot give them as much attention and control.

Some authorities have suggested that the maximum number of employees that a manager can supervise directly is between six and ten. However, no rigid standard may be applied in this area. Instead, the optimal span of control is influenced by: (1) the capability of the supervisor; (2) the skills and commitment of the employees being supervised; (3) the level of difficulty and degree of uniformity of the tasks assigned; and (4) the overall managerial approach and the extent to which it is willing to trust subordinate employees with a degree of independent authority in making routine decisions.

Structure of Organizations

In addition to these principles, classical management theory was concerned with the *structure* of organizations. The term "structure" refers to the tangible framework of operational units, functions, work assignments, job titles, and relationships through which an organization is managed. Structure may be regarded as the established arrangement of the components and subsystems of an organization; it provides the channels of communication, coordination, and decision making.

Formal and informal structures

A logically organized structure is essential to effective operations, while a poorly designed one hampers performance at every level. The ultimate purpose of an orga-

nization's structure is to ensure smooth operation in day-to-day functioning. Although the chief emphasis was given to the *formal* structure of organizations, it was recognized that there was also an *informal* system at work.

The formal structure of an organization consists of explicitly stated rules, operating policies, work procedures, and other devices that are put into effect by management to organize all the components of the work enterprise to meet established goals. It may be based not only on administrative decisions but also on union contracts that regulate hours, leaves, disciplinary action, arbitration of disputes, and even work output. It is usually reflected in organization charts, job descriptions, personnel manuals or regulations, and similar written documents.

In contrast, the informal structure of organizations does not appear in writing; it represents a fluid and dynamic process of interpersonal behavior and decision making. It is the way in which the formal code of operations is realistically adapted to the day-to-day problems of management and in which personnel on all levels actually carry out their functions, communicate with each other, and contribute to organizational goals.

Use of organization charts

Under the scientific management approach, businesses, government departments, and other organizations typically developed charts that presented pictorial models of their formal structures, showing each level of managerial responsibility, as well as the various departments or administrative divisions holding specialized functions. Each position or department normally has a title and place on the chart indicating its specific area of responsibility. In some organization charts, dotted lines and arrows indicate structural relationships, such as who reports to whom. In others, the actual names of individuals holding specific positions are shown, along with the number of employees in each job slot.

Examples of several organization charts in representative leisure-service agencies are presented in Chapter 4. They show how administrative structures may be viewed in both vertical and horizontal subsystems.

Vertical organization The vertical division of personnel reflects the basic hierarchy of power, or chain of command. Position within the structure usually identifies the status and responsibilities of each employee, with the climb up the career ladder typically representing a struggle for increased power and greater rewards.

Horizontal organization The horizontal division of organization charts usually involves placing separate departments side by side, identifying each according to one of three factors: function, product, or location.

Function is used as a basis for departmentalization when divisions or administrative units are established to carry out specialized assignments. In a public recreation and park department, for example, they might typically be assigned functions such as facility operation and maintenance, fiscal management, personnel, programs, and public relations.

Product specialization would be illustrated when different departments are assigned responsibility for developing and marketing different products. Within a

large conglomerate in the commercial recreation field, one department might produce phonograph records and tapes, while another might operate a chain of lodges in the national parks, and still another might be in the cable television business. In a larger and more complex structure, each of these specialized products would be represented not by a separate department but by a separate subsidiary company.

Location departmentalization occurs when all the administrative responsibilities within a geographical area are brought into a single unit for effective management. It would be illustrated in the division of a large state park system into several districts or service areas, each under the direction of a regional supervisor.

Organization charts should be as simple and understandable as possible, not cluttered with myriad titles and excessive detail. If a chart is too complicated, it suggests that the organization itself is chaotic or confused. Charts should be updated regularly and should be displayed in appropriate places or publications to be most useful in providing needed information about the organization.

Differentiation of line and staff functions

In emerging management theory, a distinction was made between two types of personnel: line and staff.

Line employees are generally regarded as those responsible for carrying out the central function or mission of the agency. In a large voluntary organization, for example, they would be the administrator or executive, the heads of program departments, and the actual leaders or program specialists who direct activities. The line structure is usually perceived as a set of direct vertical relationships, or a chain of command, through which authority flows, such as the scalar principle.

Staff employees are not responsible for carrying out the central mission. In military units, for example, staff members are generally aides to executive officers rather than attached to fighting units. Staff personnel are often given advisory or consultative functions in tasks related to public relations, research, systems analysis, budget development, or simply as staff assistants to line administrative managers.

Challenges to the Scientific Management Approach

Many aspects of the scientific management approach proved to be distasteful to employees. For example, reducing jobs to highly specialized and routinized tasks made them mechanical and monotonous. In many industrial plants the "speed-up" system that was based on time-and-motion studies with extremely high rates of worker output frequently caused tension and stress on the assembly line.

Some industrial psychologists pointed out that the machine model approach to management reduced the worker to the status of a machine. Neglecting the human element, it falsely assumed that money-based incentive systems alone would be enough to motivate workers. Often there was open resistance to such systems, involving job slowdowns and even sabotage. The highly organized, depersonalized management system visualized by Weber was simply not acceptable to many twentieth century American workers living in a democracy.

Further, the rigid separation of functions prescribed in traditional management theory did not lend itself to modern business or government agency needs. As organizations became more complex in their operations, it became increasingly difficult, within the established vertical hierarchy, to provide the needed combination of varied services working closely together.

Needs for flexible approaches

A public leisure-service agency might wish to initiate, for example, a major new program in a large community center. Several administrative divisions might be involved in this process, including: (1) the recreation program department through its leaders or supervisors; (2) the maintenance department through its building custodians; (3) the personnel department, which would have to assign full- and part-time personnel to the center; (4) the budget or fiscal management department, which would have to approve funding for the center; and (5) public relations personnel, who would be involved in publicizing the program.

If full reliance were placed on the formal vertical structure, each person responsible for any of these functions would have to go up the chain of command to obtain approval of all specific plans involving assignment of individuals or financial allocations. Decisions would then flow — or creep — down the vertical chain of command to the line personnel responsible for taking action. If there were problems in the operation, the process would have to be repeated.

Realistically, within this tangled web of relationships, the vertical line of authority and the unity of command concepts might have to give way to a more flexible approach. In some cases there might be "diagonal" or even "horizontal" relationships, in which staff members function in cooperation with managerial personnel in administrative units *other* than their own.

Thus it became apparent that there was a need to develop more effective coordinating mechanisms between the separate divisions of an organization rather than to rely exclusively on the vertical chain of command within a rigidly departmentalized agency structure.

Growing tension among employees

It was also evident that the scientific management approach was resulting in increased alienation and hostility on the part of many employees. The rigid application of authority within the chain of command often led to conflicts and labor-management unrest in major companies and other bureaucratic organizations.

Although the scientific management approach held appeal for industrialists and the heads of other large corporations and institutions, it did not represent a complete and consistent body of theory based on scientific research and empirical evidence. Beyond this, its major weakness was that it failed to consider the human factor in organizational life. People were regarded as cogs in a machine, with little concern for their feelings or the important elements of group process, human motivation, or individual creativity.

Human Relations Era

As a consequence of problems with scientific management, a new wave of exploration and concept-building emerged in the management field. What came to be called the "human-relations era" was concerned primarily with the nature of individual and group interactions within the work setting and the impact of different styles of management behavior on worker motivation and productivity.

Linked to the expanding scholarly field of social psychology, the human-relations approach began during the 1920s and had its greatest influence from about 1930 to the 1950s. The view that effective management could be based on rigid laws and principles that ignored the human element or that saw monetary pay as the only meaningful incentive was challenged.

Elton Mayo and the Hawthorne studies

The human-relations approach was strongly influenced by a famous study of working conditions and productivity that was carried out by Elton Mayo,¹³ a psychologist, and Fritz Roethlisberger, a sociologist, at the Hawthorne branch of the Western Electric Company in Cicero, Ill., during the late 1920s (see box).

HAWTHORNE STUDIES

Heading a group of Harvard researchers, Mayo conducted a lengthy series of experiments that explored the effect of different changes in working conditions (including location and scheduling of work hours, rest periods, lighting, ventilation, and similar factors) on the output of teams of women workers on an assembly line. As various changes were introduced, it was found that absenteeism was reduced, and both the morale and the productivity of the employees increased. Even when working conditions were made less favorable, such as by reduced lighting, the elimination of rest periods, or lengthening of the work day, output continued to rise.

The key factor was that, when employees thought their needs were being considered, they responded with a higher level of individual and group motivation. The experimenters found that workers within any organization tended to coalesce into groups that developed their own values and codes of approved behavior. These in turn influenced the extent to which each worker would cooperate with management and the effort the worker would make to meet production goals. For example, when industrial engineers at the Hawthorne plant established an output standard of 7312 terminal connections per day for the bank wiring room, workers were unwilling to accept this figure and established their own informal output goal. Despite the pay inducements offered by the company, group pressures kept workers in line. Those who sought to exceed the group's self-imposed work limits "were controlled by a rigorously enforced code of conduct established by the closely knit work group. Group-applied sanctions such as social ostracism, name-calling, and ridicule brought about compliance to informal group norms."

From Mayo, E.: *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, New York, 1933, Macmillan Co.

Rather than focus on a mechanical analysis of work assignments, the human relations approach stressed such elements as communication, leadership, and interpersonal processes and their effect on closely knit groups of employees. For the first time the human substructure within management systems was recognized, and supervisory and managerial human-relations skills were developed.

In subsequent years a number of other social scientists explored group dynamics and the effect of different leadership styles. During the late 1930s, Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph White¹⁴ conducted a number of studies at the University of Iowa designed to measure the effects of three leadership styles — autocratic, democratic, and laissez-faire — on group behavior. They found that most group members preferred democratic leadership and reacted either aggressively or passively to authoritarian leadership. Other studies, conducted at Ohio State University and by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, explored situational variables affecting leadership and the effect of different leadership approaches on group productivity.

Later developments: industrial humanism

In the 1950s and 1960s, a number of other behavioral scientists, including Douglas McGregor, Abraham Maslow, Rensis Likert, and Chris Argyris, continued to explore the ways in which leadership approaches and management styles affected work productivity and satisfaction.

Their approach, which came to be called the *industrial humanism model*, represented an extension of the human relations approach. It stressed the need to consider all aspects of human personality in the design of job functions and the work environment. Some of the basic tenets of this management theory follow:

1. Work must be made psychologically acceptable, rather than threatening or boring to the individual.
2. Work must permit employees to develop their individual faculties, creativity, and sense of responsibility. It must allow the opportunity for self-determination and must provide a sense of achievement and self-satisfaction.
3. The worker must have the possibility of controlling, in a meaningful way, the environment in which he or she functions. Personal commitment can be fostered and strengthened through participation and involvement by employees.
4. The organization should no longer be the sole and final decision-making agent; instead, this power should be shared more widely, and both the organization and the individual should be subject to an external code of values and moral order.
5. Since the human element is the key factor in determining the success or failure of achieving objectives, patterns of supervision and management must be built on the basis of an overall positive philosophy about people and their feelings about their work.¹⁵

In-Depth Analysis of Managerial Roles

Beyond such changes, increasing attention was paid to the roles played by managers

TABLE 2-1 Importance of Managerial Activities by Levels

Activities	Managerial Level		
	Executive	Middle	First-Line
Long-range planning	84	45	25
Products and services	58	50	33
Supervising	33	50	65
Coordinating	70	52	31
Customer relations/marketing	69	49	27
External contact	57	45	38
Consulting	70	52	30

From Daft, Richard L., and Steers, Richard M.: *Organizations: Micro/Macro Approach*, Glenview IL., 1986, Scott, Foresman and Co., p. 17.

in varied social institutions. It was recognized, for example, that there were three general levels of management: *executive*, *middle*, and *first-line*. Daft and Steers write:

Executive managers are at the top of the hierarchy and are responsible for the entire organization. Middle managers work at the middle of the hierarchy, are responsible for major departments, and may supervise other lower-level managers. First-line managers supervise rank-and-file employees and carry out day-to-day activities within departments.¹⁶

Studies of managerial activities on each of these levels show that executive-level business managers rate high on such tasks as long-range planning, coordinating, and consulting. Lower-level managers rate high on supervising tasks, whereas middle managers rate in the middle for most functions (Table 2-1).

Distinctions between levels

Supporting this analysis, Safire points out that a sharp distinction must be made between executives and other managers. He identifies the Latin *ex* ("out of") and *sequi* ("follow") as the roots of the English words *execute* or *executive*. Thus, the term implies following out or following through on a mission, with strong policy-making and decisional powers. On the other hand, he writes:

Manage is from the Latin *manus*, "hand," and the original meaning of the verb *handle* was "to direct by hand." Even today, we speak of *hands-on managers* . . . emphasizing direct control.¹⁷

Thus Safire concludes, whereas a *manager* organizes and supervises the work of others, an *executive* is in overall charge of the enterprise itself, but does not have direct responsibility for hands-on operations. In leisure-service agencies, managers obviously exist on a number of levels, ranging from top executives in large state or municipal recreation and park departments or major commercial recreation businesses to program or center supervisors in smaller agencies.

SUMMARY

Management is described in this chapter as a process or function common to all human organizations and institutions. Its key element is the efficient and intelligently planned use of human and physical resources. The practice of management constitutes both a science and an art.

Historically, the major contributors to classical management theory included Frederick Taylor, Max Weber, Luther Gulick, and Henri Fayol. Taylor developed the "machine model" approach to management, which emphasized careful analysis and standardization of work tasks through time-and-motion studies. Max Weber promoted the bureaucratic structure as an impersonal, carefully defined management system, with a vertical chain of command and explicit job functions and responsibilities. Fayol identified the five processes of planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling as the key elements in management and developed 14 key principles that widely influenced management thinking. Gulick developed the term, "POSDCORB," which identified and analyzed the major elements in the management process.

The chapter also describes several basic principles of classical management theory, including division of labor and task specialization, assignment of authority and accountability, the scalar principle and unity of command, and span of control. It analyzes the use of organization charts, describes line and staff functions, and reviews the human relations approach and the industrial humanism model of personnel management. It concludes by discussing the distinctions that have been made among managers concerning different levels of job responsibility and status.

STUDY QUESTIONS AND TOPICS FOR CLASS DISCUSSION

1. Summarize the major principles underlying the classical school of management theory as presented in Taylor's machine model, Weber's view of organizational bureaucracy, and Fayol's 14 principles. What elements made them appropriate for their time, a period of heavy industrialization in assembly-line factories? In what kinds of organizations would they not be effective?
2. Examine several of the key concepts established in this early period, such as: (1) division of labor and task specialization; (2) the scalar principle and unity of command; (3) span of control; and (4) assignment of authority and accountability. Select a fairly large recreation agency, such as a major theme park or large armed forces recreation program. What aspects of these principles would be illustrated in such a setting?
3. Why did the human relations and industrial humanism approaches gain popularity? What were their fundamental concepts?

CASE STUDY FOR CLASS ANALYSIS**Case 1 *The Mayor Cracks Down***

YOU ARE BARRY PARSONS, commissioner of a medium-sized municipal recreation and park department. For the past 3 years your budget has been frozen. With continuous inflation, your maintenance costs have risen, and despite this new facilities have been added, which stretch your capabilities to the limit.

This is an election year, and your mayor, Jeannine Day, is determined not to raise taxes. She has just announced her budget for the following fiscal year. Your department's budget has been frozen for the fourth straight year. You view this as the last straw and call a press conference, which reporters from the two city newspapers and several television and radio stations attend. You announce that, rather than operate a number of inadequate facilities with increasing complaints about poor maintenance and supervision, you are going to have to cut back on your program.

Specifically, you have decided to close a large swimming pool, a golf course, and a nature center and withdraw all personnel from a large park. By doing this, you will be able to provide adequate maintenance for other parks and recreational areas, even with the limited budget. At the same time, you send a memorandum outlining your plan to the mayor and the city council.

Within an hour, Jeannine Day is on the phone. She is furious. Curtly she informs you, "I am not going to take complaints from all the families and neighborhood groups that want these facilities open. Politically, this move is a disaster, and I refuse to be blackmailed by you. You will open these facilities up or you will be fired. Period!"

Questions for Class Discussion and Analysis

1. Apart from resigning, which you do not want to do because you like your job and your family is comfortably settled in the community, what are your options?
2. Was your strategy a wise one? How could the problem have been handled differently?
3. If additional funds cannot be found in the budget for your department, what other kinds of approaches could you explore to ensure that maintenance and recreation programs are adequately staffed?
4. What principles of traditional management theory are illustrated in this case study?

REFERENCES

1. Mintzberg, Henry: "The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact," in Quinn, James, Mintzberg, Henry, and James, Robert: *The Strategy Process: Concepts, Contexts, and Cases*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1988 Prentice Hall, p. 31.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 26.
3. Howard, Dennis R., and Crompton, John L.: *Financing, Managing and Marketing Recreation and Park Resources*, Dubuque, Iowa, 1980, William C. Brown Co., p. 199.
4. Taylor, Frederick W.: *Scientific Management*, New York, 1911, Harper & Row, Publishers.
5. Kelly, Joe: *How Managers Manage*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1980, Prentice-Hall, Chapter 2.
6. Johnson, Richard A., Monsen, R. Joseph, Knowledges, Henry B., and Saxberg, Borje: *Management, Systems, and Society: An Introduction*, Pacific Palisades, Calif., 1976, Goodyear Publishing Co., pp. 26-27.
7. Daft, Richard L., and Steers, Richard M.: *Organizations: A Micro/Macro Approach*, Glenview, Ill., 1986, Scott, Foresman and Co., p. 93.
8. Johnson *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
9. Fayol, Henri: *General and Industrial Management*, London, 1949, Pitman & Sons, Ltd., pp. 20-41.
10. Gulick, Luther, and Urwick, Lyndell (editors): *Papers on the Science of Administration*, New York, 1937, Institute of Public Administration.
11. Rodney, Lynn S.: *Administration of Public Recreation*, New York, 1964, Ronald Press Co., pp. 26-53.
12. Mintzberg, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
13. Mayo, Elton: *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, New York, 1933, Macmillan Co., Chapters 3-5.
14. Lewin, Kurt, Lippett, R., and White, R.K.: "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," *Journal of Social Psychology*, 10: 271-301, 1939.
15. McGregor, Douglas, in Bennis, Warren, and McGregor, Caroline (editors): *The Professional Manager*, New York, 1967, McGraw-Hill Book Co.
16. Daft and Steers, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
17. Safire, William: "How 'Managing' is Managing," *New York Times Magazine*, Feb. 19, 1989, n.p.