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THE STAFFING FUNCTION

"To manage is", Henri Fayol said, "to forecast and plan, to organise, to command, to co-ordinate and to control."¹ As to the soundness and good working order of the organisation, these depend, he believed, on certain "principles". He stressed that these principles were not immutable laws, but rather rules of thumb to be used as the occasion demanded. These principles number - although the list has no precise limit - some fourteen in all and include division of work, authority, discipline, unity of command, unity of direction, subordination of individual interests to general interests, remuneration, centralisation, the scalar chain order, equity, stability of tenure of personnel, initiative and, finally, esprit de corps.

In the hands of Gulick, Fayol’s elements and principles of management reappear. Gulick saw work division as the foundation of organisation — indeed, the reason for it. However, he stated that, if sub-division is inescapable, co-ordination is mandatory. Thus, he concluded that a theory of organisation has to do with the structure of co-ordination imposed upon the work divisions of an enterprise. In this structure of co-ordination, he identified some seven functional elements of management which he attributed to Fayol. This breakdown he coined POSTCORB. They are: planning, organising, staffing, directing, co-ordinating, reporting, and budgeting. Gulick’s emphasis on reporting arose from his realisation of the problem of building up an effective network of communication and control between the executive at the centre and the sub-divisions of work on the periphery. It could, therefore, be said that reporting is, for him, a means of control rather than a separate function, as indeed is his budgeting.

Both the survival and success of an organisation depend upon, in Barnard’s view, two interrelated and interdependent factors. First, upon its “effectiveness”, by which is meant the ability of the organisation to carry out its purposes. Fundamentally, this relates to the system of co-operation as a whole in relation to its environment, and consists of the ordering of personal efforts — that is, of devising the scheme of specialisations of effort and function — and of their co-ordination.

The second factor he calls (perhaps surprisingly) “efficiency”, by which he means the organisation’s ability to control and maintain the contributions of its “members” necessary to effect its purposes. Since, for him, an organisation is a co-operative system best understood in terms of the “properties of persons” or, if you like, of the properties of the individuals who come together in pursuit of a common purpose, the securing and maintaining of individual contributions, which is of the essence of management of an organisation, depends upon (a) the motives of the individual and (b) the alternative opportunities available to him. “Efficiency”, as here defined, therefore raises the vital question of “Staffing”.

“To organise . . .”, said Fayol, “is to provide the [enterprise] with everything useful to its functioning . . . see that the human organisation is consistent with the objectives, resources and requirements of the concern.” Still discussing organisation, he added: “Arrange for efficient selection . . . define duties clearly . . . encourage a liking for initiative and responsibility . . . have fair and suitable recompense for services rendered.” Gulick saw these latter functions as sufficiently important to justify a separate classification under the heading “Staffing”, which he defined as “the whole personnel function: of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favourable conditions of work”. Gulick made this distinction

---

5 Fayol, H. Ibid., Page 54.
for the pragmatic reason that he believed that it was a division of activities which took place in practice. He did, however, realise that this is a question largely of the size and complexity of an organisation:

If these seven elements [namely, Planning, Organising, Staffing, Directing, Co-ordinating, Reporting and Budgeting] may be accepted as the major duties of the chief executive, it follows that they may be separately organised as sub-divisions of the executive. The need for such sub-divisions depends entirely upon the size and complexity of the enterprise. In the largest enterprises it may be presumed that one or more parts of POSTCORB should be sub-organised.7

Gulick also realised that every manager, up to the chief executive, must handle some phases of Staffing. However, regardless of the organisation’s size, certain Staffing or personnel management sub-functions must be performed within it. These sub-functions of the personnel function can be generalised upon as “the procurement, development, utilisation, and maintenance of the work force that is to be managed”.8 Procurement includes the recruitment and selection of qualified individuals for employment. Development involves educating and training employees to meet the requirements of their jobs and to keep abreast of changes in these requirements. Utilisation means what Fayol called “the right man in the right place”;9 in addition, it involves appraisal towards the end of ensuring such order by means of transfers, demotions and promotions. Finally, the administration of compensation plans or, more succinctly, remuneration involves not only wages or salaries paid to employees directly but also fringe benefits such as paid holidays, life assurance, and pensions. Job evaluation may be used to determine, with reasonable accuracy, the relative worth of each job in terms of the demands that it makes of the employee who performs it.

The Institute of Personnel Management defines personnel management somewhat more comprehensively as follows:

Personnel Management is that part of management concerned with people at work and with their relationships within an enterprise. Its aim is to bring together and develop into an effective organisation the men and women who make up an enterprise and, having regard for the well-being of the individual and of working groups, to enable them to make their best contribution to its success.

In particular, personnel management is concerned with the development and application of policies governing:

- Manpower planning, recruitment, selection, placement and termination;
- Education and training; career development;
- Terms of employment, methods and standards of remuneration;
- Working conditions and employee services;
- Formal and informal communication and consultation both through the representatives of employers and employees and at all levels throughout the enterprise;
- Negotiating and application of agreements on wages and working conditions; procedures for the avoidance and settlement of disputes.

Personnel management is also concerned with the human and social implications of change in internal organisation and methods of working, and of economic and social changes in the community.\(^{10}\)

The Institute of Personnel Management
January 1968 (Amended March 1970)

This “broad” concept, role and range of activities involved in personnel management is . . .

. . . derived from the fundamental problem underlying any enterprise . . .: that is how the efforts of the people who make up the enterprise can be so organised and developed in order to attain the highest levels of efficiency, adaptability and productivity.\(^{11}\)

Corson posed the same problem, with respect to the university organisation, as follows: “Can it, on the one hand, develop a systematic organisation to co-ordinate all its members in achieving its purpose while, on the other hand, stimulating and facilitating the enterprise of each of them?”\(^{12}\)

If this broad concept of personnel management is accepted, it follows that personnel policy must be seen as an integrated part of overall organisation policy. “Briefly it should be attempting to develop an effective organisation structure, man it with suitable people [— “Whilst it is important to have a good organisation structure, . . . it is still more important to fill the jobs with the right people” —],\(^{13}\) and ensure that such employees have the opportunity to make their best contribution.”\(^{14}\)

However, such a broad concept of personnel management contains certain assumptions about the management of people at work. First, to speak of personnel management having “regard for the well-being of the individual and of working groups, to enable them to make their best contributions to the organisation’s success,” assumes that the individual has certain needs which he seeks to satisfy at work. What are these needs,

\(^{10}\) Institute of Personnel Management, Membership and Services, Lawrence Bros., Weston super-Mare, Page 593.


and why should they be the concern of personnel management? Secondly, to speak of “enabling workers to make their best contribution to the organisation success” assumes that management by shared objectives is superior to authoritarian management. Is it? Who says so, and why? Thirdly, this concept simply speaks of personnel management as part of management, but tells us nothing of its relationship to other management functions. Is personnel management, therefore, a Line or a Staff function? It is this third and last question that will be considered first.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AND THE LINE

“Staff” is another means by which to make co-ordination more effective; for it is deemed to be another means by which to extend the chief executive’s capacity for control without, it is thought, interfering with his Line authority.

An adequate staff organisation designed to take full advantage of specialised knowledge, concentrated attention, unified effort and definite accountability for results within its appropriate fields can go a long way towards relieving the burden and increasing the effectiveness of [Line] management. Such an organisation may be relied upon (a) to determine needs and formulate appropriate plans, objectives and controls, (b) to review, co-ordinate, digest and pass expert opinion upon proposals, and (c) to keep executives informed of significant developments and thus make it possible for management to concentrate its attention on matters requiring its consideration.15

It is apparent that Staff departments do not create new functions but rather concentrate specialised attention on certain phases of the Line management problem as these reach extensive proportions. The most obvious dimension of the latter are the size of the organisation and the burdens already imposed upon Line management; equally important are the complexities of management-union relationships, the complications of industrial relations law – for example, the GB Industrial Relations Act, 1971 – the increase in human relations knowledge and the refinements of personnel management techniques – for example, in selection. Let us assume for a moment that for any, some or all of these reasons, the chief executive, in consultation with his Line managers and the board to which he is responsible, has decided to appoint a personnel manager and, thus, to set up a personnel department. The question then arises: Should the personnel department “handle personnel problems” or should it assist Line management in handling their own problems?

It is generally accepted that the Line are those concerned with the “doing” functions. A chief executive has full responsibility for the success or failure of his organisation in achieving its goals, so too has his Line managers to whom he has delegated part of his authority and responsibility for the

achievement of certain sub-goals. Since the goals of the organisation, both wholly and in part, are accomplished through people, the effective management of people, it would seem that personnel management "is a Line responsibility". Is it, however, possible to extend a chief executive's capacity for control by, for example, setting up a personnel department without interfering with Line authority?

Although most human relations theorists see the major function of the Staff to be that of advising, counselling, assisting, and servicing the Line, the more perceptive admit that the concept is not without its ambiguity. Above, the personnel manager was referred to as a professional. As such, and like other Staff specialists, he is responsible for knowing, thinking, and planning, as they relate to his specialist function. As a professional, it is argued, he brings to his role a certain authority as a consequence of which the distinction between Line and Staff may become blurred. This authority may be reflected in his technical competence, his articulacy, his place in organisations’ hierarchy and his propinquity to top management. The latter, it is said, gives him easy access to top management as appeal of last resort in having errant Line managers conform to his advice. It is also said, no doubt correctly, that it is easy for him to exercise his authority by default if Line management is too busy or lacks interest. Thus, runs the argument, the Staff man’s role is more than merely advisory. What is involved here is implied authority; the closer the personnel manager to the chief executive and the higher his status in the organisation, the stronger his control over Line supervision and the greater, it will be contended, the hazard to Staff-Line relationships.

Line management is responsible for the success or failure of his department or unit in achieving its goals and, since the achievement of these goals is largely through the effective management of people, it will be argued here that personnel management is a Line responsibility but – where a separate department is created – a Staff function. Every Line manager, who manages people, is concerned with Staffing; it is a responsibility which permeates all levels of management beginning with the chief executive and all types of functional management; it is a responsibility which should not be usurped. The personnel manager should remain in a Staff role, as originally defined; that is, he should be concerned to offer advice, counsel, assistance and service to the Line manager in matters relating to the effective management of people:

If a personnel administrator has any authority it is the authority of established personnel policies and procedures that he has helped to formulate and the authority of his specialised knowledge rather than the authority of his position.16

The personnel manager will, no doubt, bring to his role a philosophy of management – see below – and an expertise with which to assist Line management in getting effective results with people. However, it is not his business to issue orders to Line management, but rather to advise it on sound personnel policies and procedures, to seek their adoption by persuasion and to assist in their uniform and consistent application throughout the organisation. (Within his own department, the personnel manager will, of course, have Line authority; “here [he] has an opportunity to demonstrate in practice the validity of concepts about getting results with people which he is helping to try to instil in other members of the management group.”)\(^{17}\)

Above, the Staff concept was spoken of as another means by which to extend the chief executive’s capacity for control. Thus, the personnel manager can be seen as carrying out his function as co-ordinator of Staffing activities, sometimes described as “functional control”. The chief executive’s responsibility remains:

> Because all the functions of management are accomplished through people, the principal responsibility for achieving the objectives of personnel administration is vested in the chief executive. This necessitates the establishment of controlling policy for the organisation as a whole and, particularly, attention on his part to the promotion of harmonious day-to-day relationships...

Given the establishment of controlling personnel policies, the role of the personnel manager as co-ordinator of staffing activities is “merely to act as the right arm of the [chief] executive to assure him that personnel objectives, policies and procedures, which have been approved and adopted by the Line organisation itself, are being consistently carried out”.\(^{18}\)

However, this does not confer on personnel the right to give orders to the Line. What is obviously called for is a high degree of management skill, both in insight and timing. “Under these circumstances any ‘authority’ which the personnel department may exert is derived from clearly defined personnel policies which require consistent application.”\(^{20}\) This is not to say that, in the event of disagreement, persuasion and guidance may fail; but when it does, and only then, resort will have to be made to the chief executive. When this happens, every effort should be made by both parties to maintain their relationship on a cordial level and, where possible, the appeal should be made by both together to the chief executive. Thus, care should be taken by a personnel manager not to usurp Line authority; his role should ideally be that of exercising control “through” the Line, but not “on it”.\(^{21}\)


The view adopted here is, therefore, that personnel management is a Line responsibility but a Staff function. Thus, the reply to the earlier question is that it is not the personnel department's responsibility to handle personnel, rather it should assist Line management in handling problems which are, in fact, theirs. This is not simply nor merely a strictly theoretical interpretation of Staff as distinct from Line. Cognisance has been taken of the blurring that can occur and its causes. It should be added that the distinction (or lack of it) is affected by the philosophy of management adopted by an organisation. An authoritarian philosophy reflected (usually) in a centralised pattern of organisation—that is, management by centralised direction and control—lends itself to personnel management (where there is such a department) by control through policing; in addition, the department may very probably be asked to perform a number of specialised functions. A philosophy of management by shared objectives—reflected usually in the decentralised model—lends itself more easily to the view of personnel management adopted here.

Most people refer to the university organisation as an institution. They do so, it would appear, in the belief that the university is comparable, at least in concept, to the family, the church and the government as institutions of our society. When we use the word institution, we are generally referring to "an organisation for the promotion of some public object . . ." excluding, of course, the family. It will be recalled that it was also noted that the word "management" is rarely used in respect of institutions and the question was asked: "does this follow from the fact that 'administration' is concerned to facilitate the accomplishment of some public object?"

The task of administration is to "facilitate", not to "manage".

For most non-professional organisations, it is probably true that there is a high correlation between the Line and managers and between the Staff and experts. However, in the professional organisations such as, for example, the university, given that the major goal activity of that organisation is "to institutionalise knowledge and sustain its creation"—namely, the activity that is carried out by the "experts"—it can be said that the latter constitute the Line (major authority) structure of the institution. And, as "managers" exist to facilitate them, they constitute the Staff. In other words, as Etzioni concluded, in the university organisation the Line and Staff concept, in so far as it applies at all, is reversed.

This sounds a reasonable hypothesis, especially when it is recalled that, in institutions, the task of administration is to "facilitate", not to "manage". However, a too rigid interpretation of the hypothesis ignores the fact that, in the university organisation, there are administrators who are "experts"—such as, for example, bursars (usually accountants) and (where they have been appointed) personnel administrators. This does not, it must be emphasised, invalidate in any way the specific point that the executive instrument of the governing bodies of British universities, that is the administration, also constitutes the Staff as opposed to the Line, and, as

such, exists to advise, counsel, assist and service the members of faculty in the pursuit of the goals, purposes, or ends of the university organisation.

Above, it was stated that the decentralised model lends itself more easily to personnel management as a Line responsibility but a Staff function. Since the university organisation is characterised by a wide dispersion of authority – each faculty member believes that he has final authority over the substance of his teaching and over his research – and by a wide diffusion and decentralisation of decision-making, this hypothesis is confirmed in the university organisation . . . at least with respect to non-academic staff! The critical question is, of course, whether or not a Vice-Chancellor and/or the head of an academic department are prepared to call upon a personnel department for “advice, counsel, assistance and service” in the effective “management” of members of the university and/or department. It is one of the important hypotheses of this study that they can, but this opinion is not widely held in universities in the United Kingdom. A few universities have set up personnel departments covering all staff, both academic and non-academic; a greater number have created departments for non-academic staff, but the majority deny the applicability of a personnel department to academic staff. Is this a correct view? How valid are the premises upon which it is based?

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AND MOTIVATION

For the Institute of Personnel Management to speak of personnel management having regard for the well-being of the individual and of working groups, to enable them to make their best contribution to the organisation’s success, makes certain assumptions about “the needs of man”. What are these needs, and why should they be the concern of personnel management?

The essential question is: “Why do people work?” When a scientist asks why a phenomenon occurs, he typically asks, “under what conditions does it occur?” Consequently, when we ask, “why do people work”, we mean, “under what conditions do people work?” There are two types of conditions that affect the likelihood that people will work: first, there is the economic condition; obviously, there must be the opportunity to work. Secondly, there is the motivational condition; people must prefer working to not working, or, in other words, the expected utility of working must outweigh the expected utility of not working. (Recall Barnard’s “efficiency” factor, by which is meant the ability of an organisation to control and maintain the contributions of its members necessary to affect its purposes. He argued that, since individuals enter organisations on the basis, on the one hand, of their “motives” or the satisfaction of their needs, and, on the other hand, of the alternatives recognised by them as available to them, the efficiency of an organisation depends primarily upon the degree to which these “motives” are satisfied. For management, he concluded, this is a matter of providing effective incentives which offer positive advantages or which reduce or eliminate negative advantages or burdens.)
It is therefore apparent, as Douglas McGregor realised, that “at the core of any theory of the management of human resources are assumptions about human motivation”. For reasons which will be considered in the next section, McGregor drew upon the “need hierarchy” concept (a dynamic model of Aristotle’s soul hierarchy) of A. H. Maslow. The latter presents a positive theory of motivation which, he believes, satisfies the necessary theoretical demands whilst, at the same time, conforming to the known facts, clinical and observational as well as experimental.

It is Maslow’s view that among the propositions about personality that must be incorporated into any sound theory of motivation are the following: (1) The individual is an integrated, organised whole. (2) If we examine carefully the average desires that we have in daily life, we find that they have at least one important characteristic – namely, that they are usually means to an end rather than ends in themselves. However, there are certain goals or needs beyond which we cannot go. The study of motivation is, in part, the study of ultimate goals, needs, or desires. (3) The fundamental or ultimate desires of all human beings do not differ nearly as much as do their conscious, everyday desires. Apparently, ends in themselves are far more universal than the roads taken to achieve these ends, for these roads are determined locally in the specific culture. (4) Motivation is constant, never ending, fluctuating, and complex. (5) Man is a wanting animal and rarely reaches a state of complete satisfaction, except for a short time. As one desire is satisfied, another pops up to take its place. It can be said that the human being is never satisfied, except in a relative or one-step-along-the-path fashion, and that wants seem to arrange themselves in some sort of hierarchy of prepotency – for the appearance of a desire practically always depends upon the state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of all other motivations that the total organism may have, that is, on the fact that such and such other prepotent desires have attained states of relative satisfaction. (6) Desires do not arrange themselves in an arithmetical sum of isolated discrete members, must be treated dynamically, and are not mutually exclusive. (7) As to the environment (as opposed to the nature of man), motivation, it must be granted, rarely actualises itself except in relation to the situation and to other people. (8) In order to understand the differences in motivations between various classes in our society, we must take cognisance of the fact that, on the whole, we yearn consciously for that which might conceivably be actually attained.

Man, therefore, is a wanting animal. His needs are organised in a series of levels – see Figure I, page 46 – such that they appear to organise themselves in some sort of hierarchy of prepotency. By the latter is meant simply that as soon as one need is satisfied another appears. “Man continuously puts forth effort – works – to satisfy his needs.”

Level I The Physiological Needs

In the classic instances, the Physiological Needs are hunger, thirst and sex. In other words, in the human being who is missing everything in an extreme fashion, it is most likely that the major motivation would be the physiological needs rather than any others. It is therefore quite true that man lives by bread alone, especially when there is no bread.

FIGURE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HUMAN NEEDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A HIERARCHY OF PREPOTENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL V:</strong> SELF-FULFILMENT NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL IV:</strong> EGOISTIC NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL III:</strong> SOCIAL NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL II:</strong> SAFETY NEEDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL I:</strong> PHYSIOLOGICAL NEEDS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A SATISFIED NEED IS NOT A MOTIVATOR OF BEHAVIOUR

Among the important implications of this fact are the following:

1. If all man's needs are unsatisfied and he is then dominated by his Physiological Needs, all other needs may become simply non-existent or be pushed into the background.

2. When man is dominated by a certain need, his whole philosophy of the future tends to change; for example, to the hungry man, Utopia is to have plenty of food.

3. When man's Physiological Needs are satisfied at once, other (and higher) needs emerge and these, rather than his Physiological Needs, dominate him. And when these in turn are satisfied, again new (and still higher) needs emerge, and so on. Thus: (a) man's basic needs are organised into a hierarchy of relative prepotency; (b) a satisfied need is not a motivator of behaviour.

Thus, the gratification of a need becomes as important a concept as its deprivation in motivation theory, for it releases man from the domination of a relatively more physiological need, permitting thereby the emergence of more social goals.

Level II Man's Safety Needs

At the next higher level to the Physiological Needs are man's Safety Needs. In the classic instances, these are for protection against danger,
threat and deprivation. All that has been said of the Physiological Needs is equally true of these needs (although in less degree). the principal fact being that, when the Physiological Needs are reasonably satisfied, needs at the next higher level (his Safety Needs) begin to dominate his behaviour.

We normally assume that man in our culture is largely satisfied in his “classic” Safety Needs; that is, at least in normal times. Therefore, in a very real sense he no longer has any Safety Needs ... in the classic sense ... as active motivators of his behaviour. In normal times, if we wish to see these needs directly and clearly, we must turn to neurotic or near neurotic individuals and to the economic and social underdogs of our society. However, there is another dimension to man’s Safety Needs, what can be called his Secondary Safety Needs as opposed to his Primary or “classic” Safety Needs.

Maslow’s approach to an understanding of man’s Safety Needs, broadly conceived, was by observation of infants and children. This was because Safety Needs are much more simple and obvious in the infant or child. Infants do not inhibit their reaction to danger at all and they exhibit a much more direct reaction to illnesses of all kinds. For the sick infant sometimes his illness seems to be immediately and per se threatening, and it seems to make him feel unsafe. Another indication of the infant’s need for safety is his preference for some kind of undisturbed routine. For instance, injustice, unfairness, or inconsistency in the parents seem to make a child feel anxious and unsafe. Thus, Maslow concluded that we may generalise and say that the average child in our society generally prefers a safe, orderly, predictable, organised world, which he can count on, and in which unexpected, unmanageable, or other dangerous things do not happen, and in which, in any case, he has all-powerful parents who protect and shield him from harm.

This brings us to the important point that the classic Safety Needs are not needs for security unless man is in a dependent relationship where he fears arbitrary deprivation. The needs which arise in this situation we call Secondary Safety Needs. And, of course, in organisations, all of us are in partly dependent relationships either upwards, downwards, or laterally – see Figure II.

In an organisation, a man may feel arbitrary deprivation upwards through, for example, arbitrary management actions, behaviour which arouses uncertainty with respect to continual employment, behaviour which reflects favouritism or discrimination, or unpredictable administration of policy; these can be powerful motivators of Secondary Safety Needs. Essentially, these needs are for the fairest possible break at all levels in the organisation. When, as McGregor pointed out, the individual feels confident of this, he will be more than willing to take risks. But when he feels threatened, his greatest need is for protection or security. As for managers or supervisors, their Secondary Safety Needs are often aroused by their dependence downwards – thus their emphasis on management prerogatives – and laterally – thus their insistence on clear assignments of authority.
Level III The Social Needs

When man's Physiological Needs are satisfied and he is no longer fearful for his Safety Needs, his Social Needs become important motivators of his behaviour. Man's Social Needs include his needs for belonging, for association, for acceptance by his fellows and for giving and receiving friendship and love. In terms of the prepotency of his needs, if both the Physiological and Safety Needs are fairly well satisfied, his Social Needs will emerge, and the whole cycle described above will repeat itself at this new level. Now the individual will feel keenly, as never before, the absence of friends, or a sweetheart, or a wife, or children. He will hunger for affectionate relations with people in general, namely, for a place in his group, and he will strive with great intensity to achieve this goal. Man, therefore, has group needs – a fact not without consequence for the management of human resources as many studies, and especially those of Likert, have emphasised.

Level IV Man’s Egoistic Needs

These needs are referred to by Maslow as Esteem Needs. All people in our society (with a few pathological exceptions) have a need for a stable, firmly based, usually high evaluation of themselves, for self-esteem (or self-respect) and for the esteem of others. These needs may therefore be classified into two subsidiary sets: (a) those that relate to man's self-esteem or self-respect: needs for achievement, for adequacy, mastery, and competence, for independence and freedom, for confidence in the face of the world; (b) those that relate to the esteem of others: needs for status, recognition, appreciation, for the deserved respect of one's fellows.

These Egoistic Needs do not appear in any significant way until the lower level needs are satisfied. Satisfaction of Self-Esteem Needs leads to feelings of self-confidence, worth, strength, capability, adequacy, and being useful and necessary to the world; their thwarting produces feelings of inferiority, weakness and helplessness, which, in turn, give rise to either basic discouragement or neurotic trends.

Level V Man’s Need for Self-Actualisation

Even if all these needs are satisfied, we may still often (if not always) expect that a new discontent and restlessness will soon develop unless, that is, man is doing what he is fitted for. “What a man can be, he must be”; that is, self-actualisation. It is a man's desire for self-fulfilment. It refers to the tendency for man to become actualised in what he is potentially, to become everything that he is capable of becoming.

These Self-Actualisation Needs are the capstone in the hierarchy of needs; their clear emergence usually rests upon prior satisfaction of the lower level needs. It could appear that the deprivation most people experience with respect to their lower level needs tends to divert their energies into the struggle to satisfy these needs, and the Need for Self-Actualisation therefore tends to remain dormant.

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF MAN’S BASIC NEEDS

(1) Among the pre-conditions for man’s basic-need satisfactions, are freedom (to speak, to do what one wishes as long as no harm is done to others, to express oneself, to investigate and to seek for information, to defend oneself), justice, fairness, honesty and orderliness in the group. Danger to these is reacted to as if it were direct danger to the basic needs themselves. These conditions are not ends in themselves, but they are almost so since they are so closely related to the basic needs, which are apparently the only ends in themselves. These conditions are defended because without them the basic satisfactions are quite impossible, or, at least, severely endangered. Thus, the thwarting of these “freedoms” will be reacted to with a threat or emergency response.

(2) Since man’s cognitive capacities (perceptual, intellectual and learning) are a set of adjustive tools which have, among other functions, that of satisfaction of his basic needs, then it is clear that any changes to them, any deprivation or blocking of their free use, must also be indirectly threatening to the basic needs themselves.

(3) So far, man’s hierarchy of needs has been spoken of as if it was a fixed order, but actually, as Maslow stressed, it is not as rigid as implied. It is true that most people seem to have these needs in the order that has been indicated. However, there would appear to be a number of exceptions; for example, there are some people in whom, for instance, self-esteem seems more important than love; also, in certain people, the level of aspiration may be permanently deafened or lowered through, perhaps, chronic unemployment. It is apparent that reversals do take place in the hierarchy; one cause is that, when a need has been satisfied for a long time, this need may be under-evaluated – for example, a man who has given up his job rather than lose his self-respect, and who then starves for six months or so, may be willing to take his job back even at the price of losing his self-respect.

Perhaps more important than these exceptions are the ones that involve ideals, high social standards, high values. With such ideals etc., men become martyrs; they will give up everything for the sake of a particular ideal. These people may be understood, suggests Maslow, at least in part, by reference to what he calls increased frustration – tolerance through early gratifications. People who have been satisfied in their basic needs throughout their lives, particularly in their earliest years, seem to develop exceptional power to withstand present or future thwarting of these needs simply because they have strong, healthy character structures as a result of basic satisfaction.

(4) A need must not be satisfied one-hundred-per-cent before another need emerges. In actual fact, most people who are normal are partially satisfied in all their basic needs and partially unsatisfied in all their basic needs at the same time. A more realistic description of the hierarchy would be in terms of decreasing percentages of satisfaction as we go up the hierarchy of prepotency. As for the concept of emergence of a new need after satisfaction of the prepotent need, this emergence is not a
sudden, saltatory phenomenon, but rather a gradual emergence by slow
degrees from nothingness.
Thus, within the sphere of motivation determinants, any behaviour	
tends to be determined by several or all of the basic needs simultaneously	
rather than by only one of them. The latter would appear to be more an	
exception than the former.
(5) Man's basic needs are neither necessarily conscious nor unconscious.
On the whole, however, in the average person, they are more often
unconscious.
(6) The claim made by Maslow is only that the classification of human
needs is relatively more ultimate, more universal, more basic than the
superficial conscious desires, and that it makes a closer approach to
common human characteristics.
(7) Everyday conscious desires are to be regarded, Maslow tells us, as
symptoms, as surface indicators of more basic needs.
(8) Finally, a man who is thwarted in any of his basic needs may fairly
be envisaged, in Maslow's view, simply as a sick man.
Thus, man is a wanting animal. His basic needs are organised in a
series of levels such that they seem to organise themselves in a hierarchy
of prepotency. Douglas McGregor realised that Maslow's ideas on motiva-
tion had considerable power and, whilst he was careful to empahsise that
the generalisations he stressed were over-simplified, he thought them
sufficient for his purpose. His conclusions - at least those relevant to the
immediate discussion - can be summarised as follows: (1) At the core of
any theory of the management of human resources in organisations, are
assumptions about motivation. Man continuously puts forth effort -
works - in order to satisfy his basic needs. (2) A satisfied need is not a
motivator of behaviour. (A fact, for McGregor, of profound significance.)
(3) Since, in organisations, every employee is in at least a partially dependent
relationship, Secondary Safety Needs can assume considerable impor-
tance. (4) Man's "group" needs should not be suspected nor neglected
for they may be used for greater organisational effectiveness. (5) Since
everyday conscious desires (or behaviour) are to be regarded as symptoms,
as surface indicators of more basic needs, it would be a grave error to
interpret this behaviour as a consequence and not a cause. (6) Above the
Social Needs of man - "in the sense that they do not usually become
motivators until lower needs are reasonably satisfied are the needs of
greatest significance to management and to man himself" - man's Egoistic
and Self-Actualisation Needs.
McGregor's postulates have been tested. Among the most significant
studies are those by Herzberg and his colleagues, Mausner and Snyderman,
and Scott Myers. The former began by asking three questions: (1) How
can you specify the attitude of any individual to his job? (2) What leads to
these attitudes? (3) What are the consequences of these attitudes? Their
principal hypothesis was that "the factors leading to positive attitudes and
those leading to negative attitudes would differ". Their major sample

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. and Snyderman, B. B., The Motivation to Work,
was concentrated upon 200 engineers and accountants in nine varying industrial undertakings in the Pillsbury area. Their findings can be summarised as follows:

(1) **Motivators:** When the respondents reported feeling happy 'bout their jobs, they most frequently described factors related to their tasks, to events that indicated to them that they were successful in the performance of their work and to the possibility of professional growth. Thus Motivators, for the most part, are the factors of achievement, recognition, responsibility, growth, advancement, and other matters associated with the self-actualisation of the individual on the job.

(2) **Dissatisfiers:** Conversely, when feelings of unhappiness were reported, they were not associated with the job itself but with conditions that surround the doing of the job. Dissatisfiers are made up, essentially, of such matters as pay, supplemental benefits, company policy and administration, behaviour of supervision, working conditions, and several other factors somewhat peripheral to the task. These factors suggest to the individual that the context in which he performs his work is unfair or disorganised and, as such, represents to him an unhealthy, psychological work environment. These factors Herzberg called factors of Hygiene, since they act in a manner analogous to the principles of medical hygiene. The latter operates to remove health hazards from the environment of man. It is not a curative; it is, rather, a preventive. When there are deleterious factors in the context of the job, they serve to bring about poor job attitudes. Improvement in these factors of hygiene will serve to remove the impediments to positive job attitudes. However, when they deteriorate to a level below that which the employee considers acceptable, the job dissatisfaction ensues . . . but the reverse does not hold true — A SATISFIED NEED IS NOT A MOTIVATOR OF BEHAVIOUR. “When the job context can be characterised as optimal, we will not get dissatisfaction, but neither will we get much in the way of positive attitudes.”

Thus, Herzberg and his colleagues concluded that, although the factors relating to the doing of the job and the factors defining the job context serve as goals for the employee, the nature of the motivating qualities of both are essentially different. The factors that lead to positive job attitudes, that is, the Motivators, do so because they satisfy the individual’s need for self-actualisation in his work . . . “Man tends to actualise himself in every area of his life, and his job is one of the most important areas.” The conditions that surround the doing of the job — that is, the Hygiene factors — cannot give the employee this basic satisfaction; they do not have that potentiality. “Though traditionally perceived by management as motivators of people, these factors were found to be more potent as dissatisfiers. High motivation does not result from their improvement, but dissatisfac-
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tion does result from their deterioration." In contrast to this type of motivation associated with the factors of hygiene, the "job factors" themselves are the "motivators" for they reward the needs of the individual to reach his aspirations.

Myers' study was conducted in Texas Instruments at Dallas. During the 1950s, TI grew from annual sales of $2 million to $200 million, and its work force from 1,700 to 17,000. Highly motivated employees and managers found it easy during the growth years to overlook or take in stride existing and latent problems associated with supervisory ineptness and communication breakdowns. But, when company growth decelerated in 1960, motivation ceased to be self-generating and became increasingly dependent on the skill of supervision. Starting in 1958, attempts were made to measure symptoms and causes of motivation and dissatisfaction among company workers. "Since Herzberg's research presented a possible key to the motivation problem in TI the company was eager to test whether his theory could be validly applied to its own workers." There were 282 people in his sample, 230 men and 52 females. These people were distributed almost equally over the three salaried job categories of scientist, engineer, and manufacturing supervisor, and the two hourly-paid classifications of technician and assembler. The inclusion of hourly-paid workers and manufacturing supervisors in Myers' study was a significant extension to the research of Herzberg. His approach was essentially that of Herzberg and his colleagues. His results verified those of Herzberg and his colleagues and can be summarised as follows:

(1) What motivates employees to work effectively?

A challenging job which allows a feeling of achievement, responsibility, growth, advancement, enjoyment of work itself, and earned recognition.

(2) What dissatisfied workers?

Mostly factors that are peripheral to the job – work rules, lighting, coffee breaks, titles, seniority rights, wages, fringe benefits and the like.

(3) When do workers become dissatisfied?

When opportunities for meaningful achievement are eliminated and they become sensitised to their environment and begin to find fault.

Myers was at pains to stress that the potency of any of the job factors mentioned, as a motivator or dissatisfier, is not solely a function of the

nature of the factor itself; it is also related to the personality of the individual. Most people are "motivation seekers" and, as such, are motivated primarily by the nature of the task and have high tolerance for poor environmental factors. They realise great satisfaction from accomplishment and had positive feelings towards work and life in general. They are more often inner-directed, self-sufficient persons whose belief systems are deliberately chosen and developed. However, the absence of motivators causes many motivation seekers to behave like maintenance seekers, and to become preoccupied with the maintenance factors in their environment, thus confirming what McGregor had said:

Under today's conditions management has provided relatively well for the satisfaction of physiological and safety needs... But the fact that management has provided for these... needs has shifted the motivational emphasis to the social and egoistic needs. Unless there are opportunities at work to satisfy these higher level needs, people will be deprived; and their behaviour will reflect this deprivation... People will make insistent demands for more money under these conditions. It becomes more important than ever to buy the material goods and services which can provide limited satisfaction of the thwarted needs. Although money has only limited value in satisfying many higher level needs, it can become the focus of interest if it is the only means available.33

Management can, of course, ignore the on-the-job situation and motivation factors and rely on maintenance factors to satisfy employees. If it does, it "helps to create", Argyris tells us, "a psychological set which leads the employees to feel that basic causes of dissatisfaction are built into industrial life, that the rewards they receive are wages for dissatisfaction, and that, if satisfaction is to be gained, the employee must seek it outside the organisation".34 Such a policy assumes, in his view wrongly, (a) that a healthy human being can divide his personality so that he will feel satisfied in knowing that the wages for his dissatisfaction will buy him satisfaction outside the organisation; (b) that the employee is primarily interested in maximising his economic gains (a satisfied need is not a motivator of behaviour); and (c) that the employee is best rewarded as an individual producer, thus ignoring the relevance of the work group to which he belongs as an important factor (Man's Social Needs).

"Maintenance seekers", on the other hand, are motivated primarily by the nature of their environment and tend to avoid motivation opportunities. They are chronically preoccupied and dissatisfied with maintenance factors. They realise little satisfaction from accomplishment and express cynicism regarding the positive virtues of work and life in general. They show little interest in the kind and quality of work, may succeed on the job from sheer talent, but seldom profit professionally from the experience.

They are, it would appear, usually outer-directed and may be highly reactive or ultra-conservative. Their values tend to "blow with the wind" and take on the colouring of the environment. However, in an environment of achievement, responsibility, growth and earned recognition, they tend to behave like, and to acquire the values of, motivation seekers.

Myers reports that all of five occupational groups, except the female assemblers, seemed to be largely comprised of actual or potential motivation seekers. Scientists were the group most strongly orientated as motivation seekers. Engineers revealed a pattern similar to that shown by the scientists. For both, long-lasting good feelings were associated with work itself and long-lasting bad feelings stem from responsibility disappointments. In respect of manufacturing supervisors, a pattern was revealed which is significantly different from that of engineers and scientists; although still motivation seekers, work itself was not even mentioned; instead, emphasis was placed upon advancement, growth and responsibility, reflecting a higher aspiration towards success through administration than was apparent for either engineers or scientists. For hourly technicians, responsibility and advancement were strong motivators; work itself was a dissatisfier, as was the competence of supervision and company policy and administration; pay was an important factor, slightly more as a dissatisfier than a motivator. Unlike the hourly male, the female assembler did not find advancement and increased responsibility potent motivators, and she tended to prefer close supervision. Her supervisor should be impartial, competent, decisive and friendly. Achievement – the most potent motivator for all classifications derived its primary importance for her from the affirmation it won from her supervisor. Female assemblers were the most strongly oriented as maintenance seekers; this “probably stems from the tradition of circumscribed and dependent roles of women in industry as well as from their supervisors’ failure to provide them with motivation opportunities.”

“This study clearly points out that the factors in the work situation which motivate employees are different from the factors that dissatisfy employees.” Thus, Myers’ study verified the principal hypothesis of Herzberg ct cl that the factors leading to positive attitudes and those leading to negative attitudes would differ. Effective job performance depends, he concluded, upon the fulfilment of both motivation and maintenance needs. Motivation factors focus on the individual and his achievement of organisation and personal goals. Peripheral-to-the-task and, usually group-administered, maintenance factors have little motivational value, but their fulfilment is essential to the avoidance of dissatisfaction. “An environment rich in opportunities for satisfying motivation needs leads to motivation-seeking habits, and a job situation sparse in motivation opportunities encourages preoccupation with maintenance factors.” Thus, motivation, in the organisational context, is not
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facilitated by management actions which overrate maintenance needs, but rather by actions which provide conditions of motivation.

However, the problem is not simply a matter of management overrating hygiene or maintenance needs – complex as that is . . .

The typical industrial organisation offers only limited opportunities for the satisfaction of [Egoistic and Self-Actualisation Needs] to people at lower levels in the hierarchy. The conventional methods of organising work, particularly in mass production industries, gives little heed to these aspects of human motivation. If the practices of "scientific management" were deliberately calculated to thwart these needs – which, of course they are not – they could hardly accomplish this purpose better than they do.38

Argyris39 affords us some clarification on this critical point. He asked himself the following questions: (a) What are the basic properties of the human personality? (b) What are the basic properties of formal organisations? (c) What happens when these two initial components are married to form social organisations?

Human beings tend to develop in our culture, he tells us, along a continuum of self-actualisation: (1) from a state of being passive as an infant to a state of increasing activity as an adult; (2) from a state of dependence on others as an infant to a state of relative independence as an adult, where "relative independence is the ability to stand on one's own feet and simultaneously to acknowledge healthy dependencies",40 (3) from being capable of behaving in only a few ways as an infant to being capable of behaving in many ways as an adult; (4) from having erratic, casual, shallow, quickly-dropped interests as an infant to a deepening of interests as an adult; (5) from having a short time perspective (i.e., the present largely determines behaviour) as an infant, to a much longer time perspective as an adult (i.e., behaviour is affected more by the past and the future); (6) from being in a subordinate position in the family and society as an infant to aspiring to occupy a more equal and/or subordinate position relative to one's peers as an adult; (7) from a lack of awareness of the self as an infant to an awareness of and control over oneself as an adult. "Self-Actualisation may now be defined more precisely as the individual's plotted scores (or profile) along the above dimensions."41

Next, he focuses his analytical spotlight on the formal organisation. What are its basic properties? What are its "givens"? What probable impact will they have on the human personality? He takes three "givens" of the formal organisation: Task Specialisation, the Chain of Command, and Unity of Direction.

(1) Task Specialisation: In the formal organisation specialisation is a necessity: “If concentrating effort on a limited field of endeavour increases the quality and quantity of output, it follows that organisational and administrative efficiency is increased by the specialisation of tasks assigned to the participants in the organisation.” Inherent in this assumption there are, Argyris suggests, three others (a) that the human personality will behave more efficiently as the task becomes specialised; (b) that there can be found, as Taylor stated, one best way to define the job so that it is performed at greater speed; (c) that any individual differences in the human personality may be ignored by transferring more skill and thought to machines. As to the impact of these upon the human personality, Argyris tells us that, since the human personality is always trying to actualise itself and task specialisation requires the individual to use only a few of his abilities, the principle of Task Specialisation can be said to violate two of the basic “givens” of the human personality: “it inhibits self-actualisation and provides expression for few shallow, skin-surface abilities that do not provide the ‘endless challenge ‘desired by the healthy personality”.

(2) Chain of Command: “If sub-division of work is inescapable, co-ordination becomes mandatory.” Co-ordination may be achieved, as was noted earlier, in two primary ways, the first of which was by organisation itself; that is, by interrelating the sub-divisions of work by allotting them to men who are placed in a structure of authority so that the work may be co-ordinated by orders of superiors to subordinates, extending from the top to the bottom of the entire enterprise. The assumption is made that, by this means, organisational and administrative efficiency is increased. The individuals in the hierarchy must be motivated to accept control, direction, and co-ordination of their behaviour. The impact of such a state of affairs is to make the individuals dependent on, passive to and subordinate to the superior. As a result, the individuals have little control over their working environment. At the same time, their time perspective is shortened because they do not control the information necessary to predict their future. Thus, Argyris concludes that this principle of the formal organisation acts to inhibit four of the seven growth trends of personality, exemplifying, in adults, dimensions of immaturity not adulthood.

(3) Unity of Direction: The principle is expressed as: “one head and one plan for a group of activities having the same objective.” Argyris elaborates as follows: “The principle . . . states that administrative and organisational efficiency increases if each unit [of an organisation] has a single (or homogeneous set of) activity (activities) that is (are) planned and directed by the leader.” This means that the work goal(s) towards which the
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individuals are working, the path towards the goal(s), and the strength of the barriers they must overcome to achieve the goal(s), are defined and controlled by the leader. Assuming that work goals do not ego-involve the employee, then, in Argyris’ view, ideal conditions for psychological failure have been created, and it can be said that this principle also violates a basic “given” of personality.

Thus, bringing the evidence together, Argyris concludes that the picture is somewhat worse than that portrayed by McGregor, that “there are some basic incongruencies between the growth trends of a healthy personality and the requirements of a formal organisation.” Assuming the principles of formal organisation are used as ideally defined, then, he tells us, employees will tend to work in an environment where (a) they are controlled; (b) they are expected to be passive, dependent, and subordinate; (c) they are expected to have a short-time perspective; (d) they are induced to perfect and to value the frequent use of a few skin-surface, shallow abilities; and (e) they are expected to produce under conditions leading to psychological failure.

Such characteristics are much more congruent with the needs of infants than of adults. Indeed, he suggests that, if the analysis is correct, this inevitable incongruency increases as (a) the employees are of increasing maturity; (b) the formal structure, based on the above principles, is made more clear-cut and logically tight for maximum formal organisational effectiveness; (c) one goes down the line of command; and (d) as jobs become more and more mechanised.

The results of this lack of congruency are frustration, failure, short-time perspective, and conflict. Under these conditions, employees will tend to maintain self-integration by creating specific adaptive behaviour, such as: (a) leaving the organisation; (b) climbing the organisational ladder; (c) manifesting defence reactions such as day-dreaming, aggression, ambivalence; (d) becoming apathetic and disinterested towards the organisation and its goals; (e) creating informal groups to sanction the defence reactions and apathy, disinterest and lack of self-involvement; (f) formalising the formal group (into unions?); and (g) evolving a psychological set – already referred to – where maintenance factors become increasingly important and motivation factors increasingly unimportant.

It would, therefore, appear from Argyris that, contrary to McGregor, it is not a matter of “the practices of scientific management deliberately calculating to thwart man’s higher-level needs”, rather that the requirements of the organisation are more congruent with the needs of the child than with the needs of the adult.

Most theorists will agree that at the core of any theory of the management of human resources in organisations are assumptions about motivation. However, some do not accept Maslow’s fundamental premise that the basic motivational needs of man tend to be universal both within a culture and between cultures: “Human beings bring varying patterns of needs and

motives into the work organisation." Thus, Morse and Lorsch are able to assert that the fundamental incongruency alleged by Argyris need not exist, and they are able to go on to deny that there is any such thing as one best method of supervision.

If we accept Maslow's fundamental premise concerning the universality of the motivational needs of man, it follows that it is directly relevant to our understanding of the management of human resources in most, if not all, formal organizations. Since, in the university organisation, the primary element is the faculty, and since the latter are increasingly, by nature, specialists, it is probably true to say that the opportunities afforded to them for the satisfaction of their higher-level needs is great indeed. Given that their Physiological and Primary Safety Needs are satisfied, it is possible to reach the following conclusions: First, since most faculty are members of departments and, in those departments, they pursue roles advisory to their heads, it can be said that their relationships to the latter are highly dependent. Secondly, in respect of their Social or Group Needs within the university context, it can be said that some faculty, by the nature of their speciality, work in isolation and others in teams; for some, feelings of group identity extend across institutional boundaries to other faculty interested in the same speciality. It is apparent that we know insufficient about faculty's group needs which, as Likert emphasises, should not be neglected in any organisation. (See next section.) Thirdly, for all specialists, their Esteem Needs are of vital importance: for achievement, for adequacy, mastery and competence, for recognition and the deserved respect of one's peers. Fourthly, it is probably an understatement to add that the desire to become everything he is capable of becoming is probably less dormant for faculty than for many other participants in organisations.

However, faculty are not the only participants in the university organisation; they are assisted in their pursuit of the goals, purposes, or ends of the institution by administrative staff, technicians, clerical and secretarial staff, and other ancillary staff. The "efficient" management of these resources also means satisfying their basic motivational needs broadly conceived: pertinent questions, therefore, arise as to the degree to which this is achieved. If we take two categories of staff - technicians and junior graduate administrators - the inadequacy of job content does arise; also present in respect of the former are barriers due to "low" career ceilings.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT AND MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOUR AND STYLE

For the Institute of Personnel Management to speak of "enabling workers to make their best contribution to the organisation's success"*


*See page 179 for the Institute of Personnel Management's Definition of Personnel Management.
assumes that management by shared objectives is superior to authoritarian management. Is it? Who says so, and why? The latter question we will attempt to answer first. The first question must be answered by the reader.

As to "Who says so?", once again we must turn to Douglas McGregor.\(^49\) It is his view that the conventional view of management's task can be stated broadly in terms of the following three propositions:

1. Management is responsible for organising the elements of productive enterprise – money, materials, equipment, people – in the interest of economic ends.
2. With respect to people, this is a process of directing their efforts, motivating them, controlling their actions, modifying their behaviour to fit the needs of the organisation.
3. Without this active intervention by management, people would be passive – even resistant – to organisational needs. They must therefore be persuaded, rewarded, punished, controlled – their activities must be directed.

Behind this conventional theory there are, he suggests, several additional beliefs less explicit, but widespread:

4. The average man is, by nature, indolent – he works as little as possible. Thus "the stress that management places on productivity, on the concept of a 'fair day's work', on the evils of feather-bedding and restriction of output, on rewards for performance – while it has a logic in terms of the objectives of enterprise – reflects an underlying belief that management must counteract an inherent human tendency to avoid work."\(^50\)
5. He lacks ambition, dislikes responsibility, and prefers to be led.
6. He is inherently self-centred and is indifferent to organisational needs.
7. He is, by nature, resistant to change.
8. He is gullible and not very bright.

These assumptions can lead, of course, to different styles of management. At one extreme, there is the "hard" or "strong" style, which involves directing behaviour by coercion and threat (usually disguised), close supervision and tight controls over behaviour. Unfortunately, force breeds counter-forces – restriction of output, antagonism, militant unionism, subtle but effective sabotaged management objectives. It is an approach which is especially difficult during times of full employment. At the other
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extreme, management can be "soft" or "weak", which assumes that people will be tractable and will accept direction if management is permissive and is prepared to satisfy their demands. Unfortunately, this latter approach may lead to the abdication of management – to harmony, perhaps, but at the cost of indifferent performance. It is possible, of course, to try to gain the advantages of both of these approaches and to try to minimise their disadvantages: to be "firm but fair".

These propositions and beliefs McGregor labels "Theory X". It is his opinion that the human side of enterprise today is fashioned from propositions such as these: "Conventional organisation structures, managerial policies, practices and programmes reflect these assumptions", and he added elsewhere, "moreover the principles of organisation which comprise the bulk of the literature of management could only have been derived from assumptions such as [these]". Well, is this conventional view correct?

It is McGregor's belief that the findings which are beginning to emerge from the social sciences challenge the propositions and beliefs of Theory X.

The social scientist does not deny that human behaviour in industrial organisations is approximately what man perceives it to be. He has, in fact, observed it and studied it fairly closely. But he is pretty sure that this behaviour is not a consequence of man's inherent nature. It is a consequence rather of the nature of industrial organisations, of management philosophy, policy and practice. The conventional approach of Theory X is on the mistaken notion of what is cause and what is effect.

Convinced that at the core of any theory of the management of human resources in organisations are assumptions about human motivation, McGregor turned to the work of Maslow (see previous section). To indicate the inadequacy of Theory X, he relies in particular upon two of the latter's insights. First, Maslow had suggested that a man who is thwarted in any of his basic needs may fairly be envisaged simply as a sick man. "We recognise readily enough", says McGregor, "... that the deprivation of physiological needs has behavioural consequences . . .". The same is true – although less well recognised – of deprivation of higher level needs. The man whose needs for safety, association, independence, or status are thwarted is sick just as surely as he who has rickets and his sickness will have behavioural consequences. [Thus] we will be mistaken if we attribute his resultant passivity, his

hostility, his refusal to accept responsibility to his inherent human nature. These forms of behaviour are symptoms of illness – of deprivation of his social and egoistic needs.\(^{55}\)

Secondly, Maslow had maintained that a satisfied need is not a motivator of behaviour. McGregor realised that, if this latter insight were taken together with the first, then Theory X could be seen for what it was – an inadequate theory: for this

... carrot and stick theory does not work at all once man has reached an adequate subsistence level and is motivated primarily by higher needs. Management cannot provide a man with self-respect, or with the respect of his fellows, or with the satisfaction of needs for self-fulfilment. It can create conditions such that he is encouraged and enabled to seek such satisfactions for himself, or it can thwart him by failing to create these conditions.\(^{56}\)

Thus, McGregor concluded that management by direction and control – whether implemented with the hard, the soft, or the firm but fair approach – fails under today’s conditions to provide effective motivation of human effort towards organisational objectives. It fails because direction and control are useless methods of motivating people whose Physiological and Safety Needs are reasonably satisfied and whose Social, Egoistic, and Self-Fulfilment Needs are predominant.

It is for these reasons that, in McGregor’s view, we require a different theory of the task of managing people, based upon more adequate assumptions about human nature and human motivation. The theory he has given us, and which is, I believe, implicit in the Institute of Personnel Management’s definition of personnel management referred to above, he calls Theory Y. . . .

(1) Management is responsible for organising the elements of productive enterprise – money, materials, equipment, people – in the interest of economic ends.

(2) People are not, by nature, passive or resistant to organisational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organisations.

(3) The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behaviour towards organisational goals, are all present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognise and develop these human characteristics for themselves. The essential task of management is to arrange organisational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts towards organisational objectives.


Implicit in this theory of McGregor's are the following beliefs:

(4) The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

(5) External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort towards organisational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

(6) Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement. The most significant of such rewards, for example, the satisfaction of ego and self-actualisation needs, can be direct products of efforts directed towards organisational objectives.

(7) The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

(8) The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organisational problems is widely, not narrowly, distributed in the population.

(9) Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially utilised.

Theory Y is therefore quite different from Theory X. The latter places exclusive reliance upon the external direction and control of subordinate by superior through the exercise of authority – what we noted earlier was called the Scalar Chain by classical theorists. Theory Y, on the other hand, relies heavily upon self-direction and self-control. Looked at through the eyes of Argyris – see above – it is the difference between treating subordinates as children and treating them as mature adults. For McGregor, the central principle which derives from Theory Y is that of "Integration" (which should be seen as complementary to the principle of the Scalar Chain): "the creation of conditions such that the members of the organisation can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts toward the success of the enterprise."\(^{57}\) For him, "this is a process primarily of creating opportunities, releasing potential, removing obstacles, encouraging growth, providing guidance".\(^ {58}\) The IPM (i.e., the Institute of Personnel Management) have called it – see above – "management by shared objectives". Harry Levinson has described the process as follows:

The organisational task becomes one of first understanding the man's needs, and then, with him, assessing how well they can be met in this organisation; doing what the organisation needs to have done. Thus the highest point of self-motivation arises when there is a complementary conjunction of the man's needs and the organisation's requirements. The requirements of both mesh, interrelate, and become


The energies of man and organisation are pooled for mutual advantage.\textsuperscript{59}

In the previous section, it was noted that McGregor's view of the individual in the organisation is more sanguine than that of Argyris. It will be recalled that the latter concluded that there are some basic incongruencies between the growth trends of a healthy personality and the requirements of the formal organisation. He admitted that there are certain factors, such as job enlargement, "which, if used correctly, can go a long way toward ameliorating the situation. However, these are limited . . ." Whilst McGregor acknowledged the problem exists,

The conditions imposed by conventional organisation theory and by the approach of scientific management . . . have tied men to limited jobs which do not utilise their capabilities, have encouraged passivity, have discouraged the acceptance of responsibility, and have eliminated meaning from work;\textsuperscript{60}

McGregor believes that the assumptions of Theory Y point to the fact that the limits on human collaboration in the organisational setting are not limits of human nature but of management's ingenuity in discovering how to realise the potential represented by its human resources. He would, therefore, appear to admit of incongruency in the situation. One suspects that what distinguishes him from Argyris is that he believes the incongruency to be less than the nature of things and to be possible not simply of amelioration but of turn round: "Change in the direction of Theory Y will be slow, and it will require extensive modification of the attitudes of management and workers alike."\textsuperscript{61} For both the avenues of innovation are probably the same; decentralisation and delegation, job enlargement, participative and consultative management, and performance appraisal.

There are two other contributions from behavioural theorists which overlap with those of McGregor and which should be noted, if briefly. First, there is the systems approach of Rensis Likert. His research suggests to him that:

. . . the supervisors and managers in American industry and government who are achieving the highest productivity, lowest costs, least turnover and absence, and the highest levels of employee motivation and satisfaction, display, on the average, a different pattern of leadership from those managers who are achieving less impressive results.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{61} McGregor, D., \textit{Ibid}.
With the assistance of social science research, it is his belief that it is possible to state a generalised theory of organisation based on the management practices of these highest producers. If management is to make optimum use of its human resources it must, he suggests,

(a) foster the motivation of employees to work not by the old system of rewards and threats, but by modern principles and techniques:

A highly motivated, co-operative orientation toward the organisation and its objectives is achieved by harnessing effectively all the motivational forces which can exercise significant influence in an organisational setting and which, potentially, can be accompanied by co-operative and favourable attitudes.63

(b) perceive employees as individuals with their own needs, desires and values, whose self-worth must be maintained or enhanced:

The attitude and behaviour of the superior toward the subordinate as a person, as perceived by the subordinate, [should be] as follows: he is supportive, friendly, and helpful rather than hostile. He is kind but firm, never threatening, genuinely interested in the well-being of subordinates... He shows confidence in the integrity, ability and motivations of subordinates rather than suspicion or distrust... His confidence in subordinates leads him to have high expectations as to their level of performance...64

(c) - and here he adds a new dimension relevant to Maslow's Social Needs (see above) - build up an organisation of tightly-knit and highly effective work groups committed to achieving the objectives of the organisation:

[Since] the most important source of satisfaction for [the desire to achieve and maintain a sense of personal worth] is the response we get from the people we are close to, in whom we are interested, and whose approval and support we are eager to have... management will make full use of the potential capacities of its human resources only when each person in an organization is a member of one or more effectively functioning work groups that have a high degree of group loyalty, effective skills of interaction, and high performance goals.65

Such a style of management, giving the optimum solution and which should be adopted by all organisations, Likert identified as the Participative Group System, which could be said to approximate to McGregor's Theory Y assumptions. It is that style of management where, in summary, leadership is by superiors who take into account all the basic motivational needs of their subordinates, where economic rewards are based on com-

pensation systems developed through participation, where personnel feel real responsibility for organisation's goals and are motivated to behave in ways to implement them, where there is much communication with individuals and groups, where there is a very substantial amount of co-operative teamwork present throughout the organisation, and where, except in emergencies, goals are usually established by means of group participation. At the other extreme to this style of management is the Exploitative-Authoritative System, closely analogous to the assumptions of McGregor's Theory X where superiors have no confidence and trust in subordinates, where superiors tap their subordinates' lower-level motivational needs and rely upon fear, threat, punishment and occasional rewards, where high levels of management feel responsible for achieving organisation's goal, where rank and file feel little identity with and often welcome the opportunity to defeat organisation's goals, where there is very little communication, where there is no co-operative teamwork, where the bulk of decision-making takes place at the top of the organisation, and where orders are issued, goals overtly accepted, but covertly resisted.66

Likert's major contribution would appear to be his identification of the work group as the nucleii of the Participative Group System. The following are some, among others, of the properties and characteristics of the ideal, highly effective group: (1) the members are skilled in all the various leadership and membership roles and functions required for interaction between leaders and members and between members and other members; (2) the group has been in existence sufficiently long to have developed a well-established, relaxed working relationship among all its members; (3) the members of the group are attracted to it and are loyal to its members, including the leader; (4) the members and leaders have a high degree of confidence and trust in each other; (5) the values and goals of the group are a satisfactory integration and expression of the relevant values and needs of its members; they have helped shape these values and goals and are satisfied with them; (6) in so far as members of the group are performing linking (-pin) functions, they endeavour to have the values and goals of the groups, which they link in harmony, one with the other; (7) the members of the group are highly motivated to abide by the major values and to achieve the important goals of the group; (8) all the interaction, problem-solving, decision-making activities of the group occur in a supportive atmosphere (by "support" is meant mutual respect); and (9) the superior of each work group exerts a major influence in establishing the tone and atmosphere of that work group by his leadership principles and practices.67

The second contribution which overlaps with that of McGregor is the work of Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton. "Every manager carries on


his own shoulders responsibility for solving human problems associated with achieving maximum results through the productive utilization of people.\textsuperscript{69} The question they asked is the same as that asked by McGregor and Likert: “How can this best be accomplished?” Their theory is an attempt to summarise and synthesise relevant research in the behavioural science field and especially that of McGregor and Likert. However, they claim that it is more than a theory or a formula – that it is a key for mobilising human effort and for getting the maximum performance results of which participants in industrial organisations are capable:

... a manager's job is to perfect a culture which (1) promotes and sustains efficient performance of highest quantity and quality, (2) fosters and utilises creativity, (3) stimulates enthusiasm for effort, experimentation, innovation and change, (4) takes educational advantage from interaction situations and (5) looks for and finds new challenges. Such managerial competence can be taught and it can be learned ... The Managerial Grid provides a framework for learning some of this knowledge.\textsuperscript{69}

Blake and Mouton identify three universals of organisations, the effective management of which is the condition of efficient production through sound organisation. These are (a) purpose or production (where production is not limited to things but covers whatever it is that organisations engage people to accomplish), (b) people, and (c) hierarchy.

The process of achieving organisation purpose (the first universal) through the efforts of several people (the second universal) results in some people attaining authority to supervise others; that is to exercise the responsibility for planning, controlling and directing the activities of others through a hierarchical arrangement (the third universal).\textsuperscript{70}

It is their opinion that a variety of theories regarding managerial behaviour are based on the way in which these three organisational universals are connected to one another and that these theories can be identified. “Whenever a man acts as a manager, he is in some way making assumptions about how to solve problems of achieving organisation purposes of production through people.”\textsuperscript{71}

The Management Grid is, literally, a chart (see Figure III). The horizontal axis indicates “concern for production” while the vertical axis indicates “concern for people”. Each is expressed on a nine-point scale. By “concern for” is meant the degree of “concern for”, which is present in the manager. Since his actions are rooted in and flow out of his own basic attitudes, what is significant is how [he] is concerned about production and how he

concerns himself about people, and how these concerns intertwine. Thus, the number 1 on each axis represents minimum concern; the number 9 stands for maximum concern; and the total Grid shows the range of possible interactions between these two concerns. It should be emphasised that the manner in which these two concerns are linked together by a manager determines how he uses "hierarchy" (the third universal).

There are, therefore, 81 positions (or squares) on the Grid which can be used by a manager to rate his behaviour and style of management. His rating is supposed to indicate for him one of the positions. Of the 81 positions, Blake and Mouton identify five – those at the corners, 9.1, 1.9, 1.1 and 9.9, and the mid-point 5.5. "Each of these five theories defines a definite but different set of assumptions regarding how individuals, in fact, do orient themselves for managing situations or production that involve people."[72]

**FIGURE III**

**THE MANAGEMENT GRID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern for People</th>
<th>HIGH</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>5.5</th>
<th>9.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</table>

| LOW | 1.1 |     |     |     |
|     |     | LOW | 1   | 2   |

*Grid Position 9.1:* At this position, a high concern for production, 9, is coupled with a low concern for people. The managerial behaviour and style of this position places a heavy emphasis on task and job requirements – "The art of management has been defined as knowing what you

---

want men to do and then seeing that they do it in the best and cheapest way.” (F. W. Taylor of the Classical School.)

73 The relationship of the superior to the subordinate is a process of direction and control (McGregors Theory X). The managerial style assumes that there is an inevitable contradiction between organisational needs of production and the personal needs of people (Argyris’ incongruency analysis).

Grid Position 1.9: At this position, a low functional concern with production, 1, is coupled with a high concern for people, 9. The managerial behaviour and style associated with this position focuses on how to arrange conditions of work which will permit people to fit them with comfort and security. Direction is typically characterised by leading rather than pushing and gentle persuasion. The aim is to get the people to set general goals which everyone can support. The manager with this orientation “is more likely to go for groupness, not to achieve work purposes, but for sociability”. Typically, such a manager believes in aiding a subordinate toward self-actualisation. Since the group, not the individual, is the key unit of the organisation (Likert), such a “country club” style of management can, in Blake’s and Mouton’s view, smother conflict and seek to avoid the conditions that produce, in pursuit of harmony; but production suffers. Like Position 9.1, an incompatibility is assumed to exist between production requirements and the needs of people (Argyris).

Grid Position 1.1: At this position, a low concern for production, 1, is coupled with a low concern for people. A management behaviour and style more common in routine operations and staff functions, it is better described as “lost among” rather than “managing” people; it is characterised by low involvement with people and the contribution of minimum effort towards organisation purpose. The goal of such behaviour is purely self-centred; it is aimed at personal survival within the system. Like Positions 9.1 and 1.9, this position assumes an incompatibility between production requirements and the needs of people (Argyris), but faces it by opting out as much as possible.

Grid Position 5.5: At this position – the middle position of the Grid – intermediate concern for production, 5, is coupled with moderate concern for people, 5. The guiding assumption of 5.5 is that the best position for either production or people is too ideal – rather, a compromise must be sought. In other words, a balance must be struck between taking people into consideration and emphasising the relevant aspects of work. So, attention is given to morale in terms of its potential production contribution. A 5.5 manager does not direct or control in a 9.1 way so much as he leads, motivates and communicates to get the job done; he assumes that people will work willingly and do as they are told if the reasons for doing so are explained; he typically sets achievable production targets; he tends to rely heavily upon conformance with his organisation’s traditions.

73 Taylor, F. W., Scientific Management, Page 21.
precedents and rules and regulations for directing his day-to-day contacts with subordinates; and he probably believes in the wide use of committees. Position 5.5 also assumes conflict between organisation purposes of production and the needs of people (Argyris), but believes that workable solutions can be found through compromise. However, reliance on traditions and norms provides a poor basis for innovation and creativity, dependence on compromise solutions can be merely a palliative and not a cure; in the extreme case, it is a style of management which can produce a fat, flabby and ineffectual organisation. Blake and Mouton suggest that this style of management can be viewed best from an historical perspective:

Antagonistic and hostile reactions to 9.1 management produced for a brief period an overreaction into the 1.9 direction of excessive concern for feelings and attitudes. However after a period of the "human relations binge", as in 1.9, counterforces developed to move people in the opposite direction . . . the pendulum got damped and stopped in the middle . . . \(^{75}\)

**Grid Position 9.9:** At this position, a high concern for production, 9, is coupled with a high concern for people, 9. The guiding assumption of this management style and behaviour is that the effective integration of people is possible if they are involved in determining the strategies and conditions of work. Mutual understanding and agreement as to what the organisational goals are and the means by which they are to be attained is seen as being at the core of work direction . . . to be achieved by creating conditions of work where people understand the problem, have a stake in the outcome and where their ideas have a real contribution to the result obtained. Thus, through the exercise of self-direction and self-control and with effective leadership, individuals can mesh their efforts in an interdependent way: "the 9.9 manager works to establish direction, then, once that is accomplished, the job is self-directed by those doing it . . . In a real sense the key to control is commitment",\(^{76}\) where commitment means no more nor no less than that organisation goals and individual goals are in line with one another (McGregor's principle of integration). This management behaviour and style is characterised by "open, authentic and candid communication – full disclosure";\(^{77}\) the approach to managing conflict is clear: the solution to the problem is that of direct confrontation; and, unlike the other basic approaches, this style of management assumes that there is no necessary and inherent conflict between organisation purpose of production requirements and the needs of people (McGregor's view): "the needs of people to think, to apply mental effort to productive work and to establish sound and mature relationship on an hierarchal plane and with one another are utilised to accomplish organisation requirements."\(^{78}\)

In contrast with the 9.1 Position, the solution to a given problem is not necessarily defined by management decision and, unlike the 5.5 Position,
the approach is orientated towards discovering the best and most effective solution, not one defined by compromise. Because of the emphasis on participation and involvement of people in work activities, innovation in the work setting is more likely to arise. Also, the work situation, through problem identification, critique and follow-up action, is a learning situation *par excellence*. Over all, this style of management brings about the kind of team action that leads to high organisation accomplishment.

**Some Comments on the Grid**

(1) The Grid tells us the manner in which the "concern for people" and the "concern for production" are linked together by a manager; it defines how he uses hierarchy. However, it should be noted that the character of "concern for" at different Grid positions differs, even though the degree may be the same. For example, when a high concern for people is coupled with a low concern for production, 1.9, the type of people concern expressed is far different from the type of high concern for people shown when a high concern for production is also evident, 9.9.

(2) In addition to the five "pure" theories described, the authors have identified other "mixed" theories which are combinations of two or more of the "pure" theories used either simultaneously or consecutively. For example, in the paternalistic style, the work situation approaches 9.1 conditions in terms of direction and control, but this is coupled with the 1.9 style of concern for the well-being of people. The reward for subordinates complying with directions, controls and "push in work" is security, happiness and being taken care of in terms of economic and social security.

(3) Blake and Mouton claim that the Management Grid is not merely a theory or a formula, rather it "is a [practical] key for mobilising human effort and for getting the maximum performance results of which people in industrial life are capable. Through its application, a manager can unleash and utilise creative energy of the kind needed to become and remain competitive in this era of innovation and change". The Grid is usually introduced in a short seminar, with several follow-up stages aimed at incorporating the 9.9 management behaviour and style as an integral part of the organisation's management development activity. Prior to the seminar, managers participating are expected to familiarise themselves with the Grid and its concepts, to rate their own behaviour and style, and to examine the character of their organisation and their relationship to it. During the seminar, participants work in teams in simulated task situations. They establish superior/subordinate relationships. They are made aware of the influence of managerial style on performance and results. They are encouraged to criticise the relationships and performance of their team and to make consequent changes. The performance of each work team and of each individual manager is then orally assessed by each team member. Thus, each manager has the opportunity to critically examine his own ratings.

Whilst the management behaviour and style which Blake and Mouton call 9.9 is no more and no less than a synthesis of McGregor's Theory Y, with special emphasis upon his principle of integration, and Likert's Participative Group System, the Grid itself does classify management behaviour and styles, the criteria by which each is judged, and enables managers to self-critically rate themselves and their organisation. Their advance is in their practical tool which they have called the Management Grid. Yet they have neglected what Argyris, Herzberg and Myers have repeatedly emphasised, namely, that the subordinate's problem begins and perhaps ends with his task, and it is that which is management's biggest problem.

The aim of personnel management is – it was noted above page 38 – "to bring together and develop into an effective organisation the men and women who make up an enterprise and, having regard for the well-being of the individual and of working groups, to enable them to make their best contribution to its success". It is now possible to fully clarify this definition in the context of the preceding analysis:

1) The formal organisation is that kind of co-operation among men which is conscious, deliberative and purposeful.  

2) The survival and success of a formal organisation depends upon, on the one hand, its "effectiveness", by which is meant its ability to achieve its goals, purposes or ends, and, on the other hand, upon its "efficiency", by which is meant its ability to secure and maintain the personal contributions of energy of its members necessary to effect its goals, purposes or ends. From the point of view of the individual, management's action is deemed to be "efficient" if it satisfies his basic motivational needs broadly conceived. However, a satisfied need is not a motivator of behaviour. Thus, for management to rely, or to tend to rely, upon "hygiene" or "maintenance" factors once man's Physiological and Primary Safety Needs have been satisfied, is to thwart his higher-level needs and to cease to motivate him. In other words, when the Hygiene Needs are satisfied and the job environment is considered optimal, it is the job itself and the factors which relate directly to the self-actualisation of the individual on the job which are the "motivators". Also, if the behaviour of the individual suggests that he is lazy, is lacking in ambition, is resistant to change, is self-centred and indifferent to organisational needs, since he who is thwarted in any of his basic motivational needs may fairly be envisaged as a sick man, it would be a grave mistake to conclude that his behaviour is a consequence of his inherent nature.

3) Since we are assuming that Maslow's fundamental premise concerning the universality of man's basic motivational needs is a fact, it can be fairly said that there is a tendency, especially in industrial organisations, towards incongruency between the requirements of the formal organisation and the needs of the mature adult personality. Due to specialisation, there

---

are many jobs which, despite attempts to enrich them, probably never will satisfy the motivational needs of the individual broadly conceived. Argyris believes this incongruency to be part of the nature of things: McGregor, Herzberg, and Myers are more optimistic; Leavitt is perhaps more realistic:

The first approach was that of Taylor's: to routinise all work and, by routinising, to control it. The second, the participative approach, was to strive to eliminate routine – to make all jobs challenging and novel. I suggest that the third approach... is to do both: to routinise and control what we can; to loosen up and make challenging what we cannot. In so doing we may end up being efficient, and at once human and inhuman, depending upon where, in the large organisation, we choose to focus.81

Morse and Lorsch have reached a similar conclusion:

Enterprises with highly predictable tasks perform better with organisations characterised by the highly formalised procedures and management hierarchies of the classical approach. With highly uncertain tasks that require more extensive problem solving [the university organisation?], on the other hand, organisations that are less formalised and emphasise self-control and member participation in decision making are more effective. In essence... managers must design and develop organisations so that the organisational characteristics fit the task to be done.82

Now this seems to be a realistic point of view, but it means that McGregor's proposition, that the classical or Theory X approach merely satisfies the individual's lower-level motivational needs and thus ceases to motivate him, has been answered in one of two ways: first, that the proposition is correct and that where it is not possible to enrich or loosen up and make challenging his job, then the individual must learn to live with it and management must exercise the appropriate management behaviour and style. Secondly, it can be denied, as do Clare W. Graves, Morse and Lorsch, and Dubin, that Maslow is correct, that each and every man has the same basic hierarchy of motivational needs: "Human beings bring varying patterns of needs and motives into the work organisation..."83

(4) If the latter proposition is accepted, that is, that the basic motivational needs of mature adults are not universal, another proposition follows, namely, there is no one best method of supervision as, for example, McGregor, Likert, and Blake and Mouton would suggest. For example,
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it is Clare Graves’ thesis⁸⁴ that an employee is not something to be managed by a general set of managerial principles. He should be managed by principles which are appropriate to his “level of behaviour” since his acts, feelings, motivations, ethics and values, thoughts and preferences for management all are appropriate to that level. Thus, if management employs controls that are not appropriate to the employee’s behaviour level, the result is deteriorating work standards; if controls are appropriate, the result is satisfactory work. Therefore, when deteriorating work standards are present, we should look primarily for an incongruency between the psychological level of the producer and the managerial style of the manager. And, as we attempt to correct the situation, we should strive to restore congruency between worker level and supervisory style. Also, Morse and Lorsch tell us that:

there is not one best organisational approach; rather the best approach depends upon the nature of the work to be done. Enterprises with highly predictable tasks perform better with organisations characterised by the highly organised procedures and management hierarchies of the classical approach [associated with Theory X]. With highly uncertain tasks that require more extensive problem solving, on the other hand, organisations that are less formalised and emphasise self-control and member participation in decision making [associated with Theory Y] are more effective. In essence . . . managers must design and develop organisations so that the organisational characteristics fit the nature of the task to be done.⁸⁵

Thus, they suggest a new set of basic assumptions which move beyond Theory Y into what they call “Contingency [— by which is meant the accumulated feelings of satisfaction that come from successfully mastering one’s environment —]. Theory: the fit between task, organisation and people”⁸⁶:

[Although] human beings bring varying patterns of needs and motives into the work organisation, [there is] but one central need, [and that is] to achieve a sense of competence. This motive while it exists in all human beings, may be fulfilled in different ways by different people depending on how this need interacts with the strengths of the individual’s other needs – such as those for power, independence, structure, achievement and affiliation. Competence motivation is most likely to be fulfilled when there is a fit between task and organisation. Sense of competence continues to motivate even when a competence goal is achieved; once one goal is reached, a new, higher one is set.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Ibid.
And they conclude by stating that “the idea that different people have different needs is well understood by psychologists”\[88\] – although evidently not by Maslow, McGregor, Herzberg, Scott Myers . . .

(5) If it is assumed that there is one best method of supervision, namely that of Blake and Mouton’s 9.9 managerial behaviour and style, then if the requirements of the formal organisation are to attempt to meet the motivational needs of the mature adult personality broadly conceived, management must create the conditions such that the members of the organisation can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts towards the needs of the enterprise (McGregor’s principle of integration). This will be enhanced if management can build up an organisation of tightly-knit and highly effective work groups committed to achieving the objectives of the organisation (Likert). Such management behaviour reflects a high concern for production and a high concern for people. It is, therefore, apparent that the aim of personnel management, quoted above, is formed from propositions such as these – in other words, professional personnel managers have chosen to adopt a management behaviour and style which is a synthesis of McGregor’s Theory Y, his principle of integration, and Likert’s Participative Group System; it is similar to Blake and Mouton’s 9.9 style. However, we have also noted, and rightly, that these propositions are not self-evident truths, as perhaps their propagators might suggest.

It remains to seek to relate the IPM’S statement of aim to the university organisation. At this point, Millett’s assertion that “much of the thinking about organisation has been drawn from the organisational context of business and the public service”\[89\] will be recalled. This is certainly true of the propositions discussed and, more pertinently, much of the research findings upon which they are based. What, therefore, is the relevance of self-direction and self-control and participative group management to the university organisation?

The following propositions can be (fairly) stated:

(1) That the university is a formal organisation – that is, it is that kind of co-operation among men which is conscious, deliberative and purposeful.

(2) Its success and survival depend upon, on the one hand, its “effectiveness” and, on the other hand, its “efficiency”. Since we have assumed the “universality” of man’s basic motivational needs, it follows that these needs broadly conceived do not differ from one type of formal organisation to another; thus, “efficiency” in the university organisation must be understood in the context of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and his deductions as to their prepotency (see previous section).

(3) The university is an organisation uniquely designed to enable the faculty to pursue their goals. This is apparent in its authority structure for, as an organisation, it is monocratic only with regard to its “service”

\[88\] Ibid.,
activities. There is no clear "Line" in the major goal activities; to a large degree each faculty member is left to rely upon his own judgment, that is, he has final authority over the substance of his teaching and over his research. In other words, the authority structure of the major goal activities is, within the university organisation, highly dispersed. A direct consequence of the range and depth of specialisation among the faculty, as universities increased in size, is the fact that the loci of decision-making within the institution has moved downwards to departments. It would therefore appear that, in contrast with industrial organisations, the tendency towards incongruency between the requirements of the university as a formal organisation and the basic motivational needs of the mature faculty member tends to be low; for service staff, it probably tends to be higher, though, at lower levels, still less than in the industrial organisation. This is not, of course, to deny that co-ordination problems do not exist . . .

(4) "Can [the university]", Corson asks, "on the one hand develop a systematic organisation to co-ordinate all its members in achieving its purpose while, on the other hand stimulating and facilitating the enterprise of each of [them]?" The concern of a Vice-Chancellor is undoubtedly to create the conditions within the institution such that its members can achieve their own goals best by directing their efforts towards its needs. McGregor's principle of integration is, in the writer's view, vital to the university as an organisation, where faculty, by their very nature, prefer self-direction to direction from someone else, self-control to control from above. Since the powers of departmental boards are advisory and not executive, and departmental heads are appointed from above and not elected from below, the formal role of a head of department, although not autocratic in the strictly defined sense of that word, is strong indeed. It can (theoretically at least) be played in a Theory X style but, if it is, it will undoubtedly lead to conflict. In the language of Morse and Lorsch, "the fit between task, organisation and people," the university organisation being one "with highly uncertain tasks that require more extensive problem solving", suggests that academic "management" adopt a 9.9 Position, that Theory Y should be seen as the natural "managerial" behaviour and style for the academic environment and that attention should be paid to the department as a tightly-knit group.

Finally, it is the writer's conclusion that the philosophy enshrined in the IPM's definition of personnel management as to the management of human resources is relevant to the university as an organisation. It is, however, important that the reader weighs this acceptance carefully, since it has fundamental repercussions in its application to various aspects of the staffing function.


** Ibid.
SUMMARY

The goals of an organisation cannot be achieved without people – thus the Staffing function. Every supervisor or manager, up to the chief executive, is concerned with Staffing. If, for reasons of size of the organisation, the complexities of management-union relations, or other, an organisation has decided to set up a personnel department, its objectives will remain (a) the effective utilisation of human resources, (b) the maintenance of desirable working relationships among all members of the organisation, and (c) maximum individual development. The achievement of these objectives will, in principle, involve (a) obtaining suitable people, (b) utilising their efforts effectively, and (c) maintaining the willingness of each individual participant to work to achieve the organisation’s goals.

Personnel administration is a (specialist) Staff function but a Line responsibility, and this is especially so in a “professional” organisation such as a university. Since, at the core of any theory of the management of human resources in organisations there are assumptions about motivation, and although the views of Maslow are not without their critics, in the belief that they add to rather than detract from our understanding of the management of human resources in the university organisation, they are upheld here. On the basis, therefore, of this assumption of the universality of man’s basic motivational needs broadly conceived and of their hierarchal structure and prepotency, it has been concluded that Theory Y, involving McGregor’s principle of integration, is the “natural” behaviour and style for the “management” of experts and thus for the university organisation.