

CHAPTER 2

MANAGEMENT:

A PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

2.1 INTRODUCTION

As discussed in Chapter 1, the premise of this study is that communication is the binding element that keeps the various interdependent parts of the organisation together. The narrow working definition of “communication” and “communicating” namely, the association with whatever kind of speaking and writing is done or received in the course of a task does not apply here. This conduit perspective of communication is essentially an informal model of communication, or, what Axley (1996) refers to as an ‘in-the-head’ model.

For the purpose of this study, the definition as described by Redding (1972:25) applies:

Communication consists of those behaviours of human beings, or those artefacts created by human beings, which result in messages being received by one or more persons.

In Redding’s view, a person has communicated as soon as at least one other person derives some meaning from his words, his actions, his silences or his inaction. Similarly, communication takes place if at least one person derives meanings from inanimate objects, intangible event, or indefinable climates. The basic or requisite unit for communication is one person, someone who observes something and creates some personal sense of it. The communication is therefore not sequential or discrete and the roles of “sender” and “receiver” therefore become blurred.

Throughout this study the construct organisation are interchangeable used with company, business and corporation. Peters (1992:13) refers to the word organisation as “bad and naked”. He continues “... it is not an organisation as you and I and our grandfathers have known it. Tomorrow’s effective “organisation” will be conjured up anew each day”(p14). But for the want of a better description of a group of people with a common objective, drawn together in a network of alliances, this word, organisation, will be used.

In terms of the Mitroff and Kilmann (1978) model, which was used in Chapter 1 to describe the scope of the study, this chapter deals with activity 1, namely conceptualisation from a historical perspective, as well as the conceptual framework, circle II. It reviews the development of the organisation and management. Elements or variables necessary for defining the *background* to the nature and extent of the problem are described below.

2.2 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The historical overview of management is primarily based on the arguments of Peter Drucker (1986) which form the basis of the existing arguments on the historical development of Western management and to whom The Economist referred as the ‘*venerable management guru of them all*’ (Innovation in Industry Survey 1999).

A historical overview of management is provided to underline the fact that professional management has not been around that long. In earlier, pre-industrial societies, men and women paced their work according to the sun, the seasons and the demand for what they produced. Small communities encouraged personal, often familial relationships between employers and employees. The explosive growth of urban industry, the factory system in particular, changed the face of the workplace forever. Workers in cities were forced to adapt to the

factory's formal structure and rules and to labour long hours for employers they never saw. Many were poorly educated and needed considerable oral instruction and hands-on training in unfamiliar tasks.

Peter Drucker, who during the 1940's advanced the idea that management was a profession, and like medicine or law it possessed a proprietary core of wisdom, is one of the most respected leaders in Western management. Refer 2.3.1.3 for a discussion on Peter Drucker.

In a society of organisations, managing becomes a key social function and management the constitutive, determining, differential organ of society (Drucker 1986). Puth (1994:4) argues that prominent scholars, communication practitioners and corporate philosophers opine that management in organisations can *only* be achieved through communication.

2.2.1 THE FIRST SYSTEMATIC APPLICATIONS OF MANAGEMENT

The year 1886 marked several important turning points in business and management history (Hellriegel & Slocum 1996:38). The first labour unrest occurred, the first "shop accounting" and "shop management" forum was proposed at the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and the first aspiring mail-order business called Sears, Roebuck and Company was formed. For the first time affordable fine goods were available to both rural and urban consumers. Other organisations that began in 1886 and remain in operation today are Avon Products, Cosmopolitan magazine, Johnson & Johnson, Upjohn and Westinghouse (p39).

Drucker (1986) contends that the first systematic applications of management theory and management principles did not take place in

business enterprise. They occurred in the public sector. The first systematic and deliberate application of management principles in the United States (US) - undertaken with full consciousness of it being a management application - was the reorganisation of the US Army (early 1900) by Elihu Root, Roosevelt's secretary of war. Only a few years later, in 1908, came the first "city manager" (in Staunton, Virginia), the result of a conscious application of then-brand-new management principles such as the separation of "policy" from "management". The city manager was the first senior executive ever who was called a manager; in business, this title was still quite unknown. For instance Frederick W Taylor, in his famous 1911 testimony before the US Congress, never used the term but spoke of "the owners and their helpers". When Taylor was asked to name an organisation that truly practised "Scientific Management," he did not name a business but the Mayo Clinic (Drucker 1986).

Drucker (1986) states that, 30 years later the city manager Luther Gulick applied management and management principles to the organisation of a federal government that had grown out of control. It was not until 1950 and 1951, that similar management concepts and principles were systematically applied in a business enterprise to a similar task: the reorganisation of the General Electric Company after it had outgrown its earlier functional organisation structure.

Currently the most management-conscious institution is probably the military, followed closely by hospitals. Fifty years ago the then-new management consultants considered only business enterprises as potential clients. Today half of the clients of a typical management consulting firm are non-business: government agencies, the military, schools and universities, hospitals, museums, professional associations,

and community agencies such as the Boy Scouts and the Red Cross.

Increasingly, holders of the advanced degree in Business Administration, the MBA, are the preferred recruits for careers in city management, in art museums, and in the Federal Government's Office of Management and Budget in the US. (Although in recent years, the MBA has received considerably less support from business, which accuses it as being too structured, while not containing enough intuition - Fortune (Rethinking middle-management: 1995).

The business enterprise was not the first managed institutions. The modern university and the modern army each antedate the modern business enterprise by a half-century. They emerged during and shortly after the Napoleonic Wars.

The first Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a modern institution was the chief of staff of the post-Napoleonic Prussian army, an office developed between 1820 and 1840. In spirit as well as in structure, both the new university and the new army represented a sharp break with their predecessors. But both concealed this - deliberately - by using the old titles, many of the old rites and ceremonies and, especially, by maintaining the social position of the institution and of its leaders.

2.2.2 THE NEW BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

The new business enterprise, for example the long-distance railroad as it developed in the United States after the Civil War, the Universal Bank as it developed on the European Continent, were not run by the "owners". They had no owners, they had "shareholders" (Drucker 1986). Legally, the new university or the new army was the same institution it had been

earlier, however, much of its character and function had changed. To accommodate the new business enterprise, a new and different legal persona had to be invented, the “corporation”. A much more accurate term is the French *Socit Anonyme*, the anonymous collective owned by no one and open to investment by anyone. In the corporation, shares become a claim to profits rather than to property. Shared ownership is, of necessity, separate from control and management, and easily divorced from both. In the new corporations capital was provided by large, often very large numbers of outsiders, with each of them holding only a minute fraction and with none of them necessarily having an interest in, or - a total novelty - a liability for, the conducting of the business.

This new “corporation” could not be explained away as a reform, which is how the new army, the new university, and the new hospital presented themselves. It clearly was a genuine innovation. This innovation soon came to provide the new jobs - at first, for the rapidly growing urban workforce, but increasingly for educated people. It soon came to dominate the economy. What in the older institutions could be explained as different procedures, different rules, or different regulations, became in the new institution (very soon) a new function, a new management, and a new kind of work. This then invited study, attention and controversy.

But even more extraordinary and unprecedented was the position of this newcomer in society. It was the first new autonomous institution in hundreds of years, the first to create a power centre that was within society, yet independent of the central government of the national state.

Around 1860 one of the leading social scientists of the time, the Englishman Sir Henry Main, coined the phrase “from status to contract” in his book *Ancient Law*. This phrase refers to the progress of history.

At the time at which Main proclaimed that the law of history demands the elimination of all autonomous power centres within society, the business enterprise arose. And from the beginning it was a power centre within society, as well as being autonomous.

2.2.3 NEGATIVE PERCEPTIONS OF THE “CORPORATION”

To many contemporaries of the new corporation it was a totally unnatural development and one that bespoke a monstrous conspiracy. The first great social historian the US produced, Henry Adams, clearly saw it this way. His important novel, *Democracy*, portrays the new economic power as being itself corrupt and, in turn, as corrupting the political process, government and society. A few decades later, Henry's brother, Brooks Adams, further elaborated on this theme in one of the most popular political books ever published in the US, *The Degeneration of the Democratic Dogma*.

In Germany, Walter Rathenau - himself the successful chief executive of one of the very large new “corporations” - similarly felt that the business enterprise was something radically new, something quite incompatible with prevailing political and social theories, and indeed a severe social problem. In Japan, Shibusawa Eiichi, who had left a promising government career in the 1870's to construct a modern Japan through building business, also saw in the business enterprise something quite new and distinctly challenging. He tried to tame it by infusing it with the Confucian ethic; and Japanese big business as it developed after World War II is largely made in Eiichi's image.

In Europe the new business enterprise was equally seen as a radical and dangerous innovation. In Austria, Karl Lueger, the founder of the (Christian) parties that still dominate politics in Continental Europe, was elected lord

mayor of Vienna in 1897 on a platform that defended the honest and honourable small businessman - the shopkeeper and the craftsman - against the evil and illegitimate corporation. A few years later, an obscure Italian journalist, Benito Mussolini, rose to national prominence by denouncing "the soulless corporation".

Concern with management, whether hostile or friendly, concentrated on the business enterprise. No matter how much management was being applied to other institutions, it was the business enterprise that was visible, controversial, new, and therefore significant.

2.2.4 BUSINESS AS SOCIAL INSTITUTION

Almost a 100 years after management arose in the large business enterprises of 1870, it was clear that management pertained to every single social institution. In the past 100 years every major social function has become lodged in a large and managed organisation. The hospital of 1870 was still the place where the poor went to die. By 1950 the hospital had become one of the most complex organisations, requiring management of extraordinary competence. Today the labour unions in developed countries are run by a paid managerial staff, rather than by the politicians who are nominally at the head.

The identification of management with business can therefore no longer be maintained. Even though textbooks and studies still focus heavily on what goes on in a business - and typically, magazines with "management" in their title (for example, Britain's *Management Today* or Germany's *Management Magazine*) concern themselves primarily, if not exclusively, with what goes on in business enterprises - management has become the pervasive, universal organ of a modern society. Modern society has

become a “society of organisations”. The individual who conforms to what political and social theorists still consider the norm, has become a small minority. The overwhelming majority of people in developed societies are directly or indirectly linked to an organisation. They derive their livelihood from the collective income of an organisation, see their opportunity for career and success primarily linked to an organisation; and define their social status largely through their position within or affiliation to an organisation.

2.3 A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF MANAGEMENT THEORY: WESTERN MANAGEMENT

Pepper (1995) argues that formal organisation theory has been driven by five different, though not mutually exclusive, metaphorical conceptualisations of workers and workplace culture. These visions are:

The machine culture (classical period 1900 - 1930 - the present):

This was the initial vision of formal organisational design and theory. It was an attempt to construct a working environment around the capabilities of the machines of the industrial revolution. The workers and workplace became extensions of these machines, supervised by managers acting as machine operators.

The satisfaction culture (human relations period 1930 - 1960 - the present):

In response to a series of studies known as the Hawthorne Studies and a basic disillusionment with the precepts of the machine metaphor, a new guiding metaphor emerged - the worker as child. Children have needs that caregivers try to meet. In this vision managers are benevolent parents. They listen to the concerns of their children and try to satisfy their needs.

The teamwork culture (human resources period 1960 - the present):

The vision of children with needs was changed to a vision of workers who could derive satisfaction from workplace factors. These workers could contribute, and they were vital, creative forces within the organisation team. They were a source that could be tapped and relied upon. It was not that they needed less; rather, it was that organisational designers began to focus on what the organisation itself could supply.

What the organisation could offer the worker was a workplace, a specific working environment, rather than the personal relationship of the satisfaction culture.

The organismic culture (systems period 1960 - the present):

At some point, organisation researchers and practitioners came to realise the importance of the environment outside the company walls, as well as the interrelationships of workers and departments within those walls. This was a recognition of complexity and relatedness, of systemic thinking, of contingency theories. The organisation was increasingly seen as a living organism, growing and dying and subject to diseases, neuroses, growth and decline cycles, and so forth.

The organisation as culture (cultural period 1980 - the present):

This vision explicitly recognised culture as a definitional quality of organisations. Throughout the history of organisation theory, culture was a present but overlooked organisational factor. In the machine period, the culture of the organisation was understood as efficiency; in the satisfaction period, culture was understood as needs-based relationships; in the teamwork period, culture was understood as a participation/productivity mix; and in the organismic period, culture was systemic complexity. The unifying theme in all of these visions is that culture was imposed from the top down. Culture was what upper management thought it was or wanted it to be. A historical perspective on management theory indicates a strong link with organisational theory.

2.3.1 EUROPE IN RELATION TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (US)

Throughout the discussion on Western management, reference is made to America or the United States (US). But Western management includes Eurocentric management. In spite of significant cultural differences, Western management theory is taught throughout Europe. (This does not include European countries recently freed from economic dictatorship. Not enough research has been done to venture an opinion on the state of management in these countries). But the US is the undisputed leader on Western management theory and development. Its position as economic leader is still intact.

According to the 1994 World Competitiveness Report, the US had regained the title of the world's most competitive economy. The annual report, published by the International Institute for Management and Development in Lausanne, and the World Economic Forum, Geneva, ranks 41 countries according to their competitiveness.

The report stated that although some clouds remain, particularly on issues related to education and the attitude of the workforce, the US performs high in entrepreneurship, internationalisation and financial vitality.

Northern America's position as economic leader was also confirmed by an article in Industrial Engineering (January 1995) which stated that the US economy was the world's most competitive economy.

The conclusion is confirmed by another report, Critical Technologies Update, (1994) published by the Council on Competitiveness. The Council's report found that the US was making a major comeback in many areas, and continuing its strength in others. America's ranking in such

areas as total quality management, design for manufacturing and the integration of research, designs and manufacturing moved from weak to competitive. In the areas of biotechnology, environmental technology and information technology, the US was the undisputed leader.

One area of improvement may be of special importance. US companies continue to be strong in design and engineering tools, and have improved across the board in commercialisation and production systems. Efforts to break down barriers between research, design and manufacturing and to get products to market faster contributed to this success. Another factor is the growing recognition by the private and public sectors of the importance of creating a workforce skilled in high-performance manufacturing.

2.3.2 THE ADVENT OF THE EUROPEAN MANAGEMENT EXPERT

Max Weber, a German social-historian who is closely associated with bureaucratic management (so named because Weber based his work on studies of Germany's governmental bureaucracy), was one of the first theorists to deal with the problems of organisations. He was only recognised once his work was translated into English in 1947, 27 years after his death (Hellriegel & Slocum 1996:40).

In an article titled "The advent of the Euroguru" (March 1995) published in the Economist it was argued that 20 years before Europe could not muster many management experts, but the situation was changing. There was still only one European whom Americans would admit into the first division. He is Charles Handy, a visiting professor at the London Business School (LBS). But a lot of fresh management thinking was coming from less familiar people. The most impressive article in the January-February

Harvard Business Review (1994), on top management and globalisation, was co-written by Ghosal. A book *Product Juggernauts* which was co-written by Jean-Philippe Deschamps, a French consultant with Arthur Little, gets a top rating by the Harvard Business School Press. A quarter of the people on the editorial board of Strategic Management, a leading American journal, were European.

In the article in the Economist (March 1995) it is further argued that for better or for worse, European management thinkers were beginning to appear more guru-like. Handy's features were familiar to readers of American business magazines. Kay was well on the way to turning himself into a European Michael Porter, Harvard's top showman. Like Porter, he wants to turn management into a science; he also has a highly lucrative consultancy, London Economics. Manfred Kets de Vries, a professor at Insead, a European business school, who specialises in applying psychoanalytical insights to the study of management, had a column in a Dutch newspaper.

Public interest in business has grown in Europe in recent years, partly because politicians such as Margaret Thatcher tried to turn businessmen into figures of respect. Various top managers - Carlo De Benedetti of Olivetti, Alain Minc of Cerus, Wisse Dekker, formerly head of Philips - have taken to philosophising about management. In Britain Sir John Harvey-Jones, a former head of ICI, travelled around the country telling people how to run their companies in "Trouble-shooter", a television series. The recent backlash caused by pay rises (Britain) and corruption (everywhere) has only increased public interest.

At the same time, the quality of Europe's business schools has improved. Insead, LBS and Switzerland's International Institute for Management

Development (IMD) have existed for more than 30 years, yet Jean-Claude Larrch, a professor of marketing at Insead, recalls that in 1970 only one member of Insead's faculty had a business doctorate, a situation that looked entirely different these days. Germany was, in the mid-nineties, in the throes of a heated debate about whether to recognise the MBA qualification.

All this has encouraged American management theorists to take an interest in Europe. Tom Peters did not mention the place in *In Search of Excellence* (1982) but his *Liberation Management* (1992) devoted chapters to Asea Brown Boveri (ABB) and to Germany's medium-sized companies. Henry Mintzberg spends part of every year at Insead. Another first-division American, Gary Hamel, has a part-time position at LBS.

Europeans were rising in their careers by gaining doctorates from American universities and publishing in American journals. Ghoshal has turned down job offers in the US but spends 80 per cent of his spare time consulting there. In most areas of management theory, European thinkers still see themselves as catching up. But there are three areas where they have crept ahead of the US:

2.3.2.1 Global companies

Three Europeans - Yves Doz of Insead, Ghoshal and John Stopford of the LBS - were producing some of the most innovative work on managing multinationals. The lesser American business schools can be remarkably parochial. The dean of one such school in the midwest found that only a tenth of its professors had passports during the mid-nineties.

2.3.2.2 Cultural diversity

Geert Hofstede, of Holland's Institute of International Culture, more or less invented cultural diversity as a management subject, although it matters hugely to companies of mixed national parentage, such as Royal Dutch/Shell and ABB. European academics have been quicker than Americans to notice that attitudes towards pay, hierarchy and a firm's supposed social obligations differ vastly in different cultures.

2.3.2.3 Soft management

Europeans have always been less keen than Americans on scientific management, with its cult of the assembly line and its assumption that workers react best to simple monetary incentives. In the 1950's psychologists at London's Tavistock Institute, led by Elliot Jacques, argued that a better way to boost productivity was to concentrate on the "human side" of running an enterprise, encouraging workers to feel a valued part of the enterprise.

In a strange way, Europe benefits from the fact that management studies are less well established than in America. For one thing, this makes it easier for people to move from business careers into academic ones. Handy spent most of his career as an oil executive before moving to LBS. Arie de Geus pioneered "scenario planning" at Shell before moving there too. And European gurus are still compelled to write about large issues in a way that laymen can understand. Blair Sheppard of Duke University's Fuqua School of Business notes that American theorists tend to write on more esoteric subjects for narrow audiences of fellow-professionals.

By now, a picture of the European management expert of the future is

emerging. A fluent linguist, he is interested in multinationals and cultural differences. A competent technician, he is also interested in history, literature and the arts. He is keen on tackling big issues and general trends, and he is happier writing for general magazines than for technical journals. An example of such an individual is Peter Drucker, who was born in Vienna in 1909 and fled to America on the eve of World War II.

2.3 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: JAPANESE MANAGEMENT

If we are to develop a convincing blueprint for the Japanese economy of the 21st century, we must abandon existing economic policies, management styles, and ideas about living standards, and embark upon structural reforms of historical magnitude. (From a Japanese government report, Dec 1994).

For centuries Japan has been a stubborn nation intent on doing things its own way² but that does not mean it has not been willing to change when it had to. In the late 19th century, when it became clear that Japan would fall hopelessly behind the West, the country abolished feudalism and adopted a European education system, a Western-style military, and modern production methods. That period is known as the Meiji Restoration, and is still remembered with reverence as the time when modern Japan and many of its famous corporate giants were born. After World War II, Japan underwent dramatic changes in its economy, military, and government that persist to this day (Schlender 1994).

At the time many researchers seemed to be falling into the trap of explaining the cause for success (and the latter part of the nineties, failure) of Japanese management practices by examining only a small portion of the managerial environment and attributing causality exclusively to the examined part. Similarly, other

² At the Olympics and other international events, Japan is represented by emblems dating as far back as the 10th century (Business Week 1999:38)

inquirers were falling prey to the traps of functional myopia, imputing success or failure solely to their own functional speciality which they wished to see strengthened in the United States. The jungle of Japanese management theories was reminiscent of the mental entanglement that characterised American management theories in the 1950s.

From a review of the existing literature, Keys and Miller (1994) identified five streams of thought which were influential in depicting Japanese management practice. These themes included:

1. Excellence in manufacturing management;
2. quality circles as an innovative and motivating technique;
3. statistical quality control as the key to productive effectiveness;
4. a long planning horizon; and
5. consensus decision making, as a form of participative management.

Four additional streams of thought about Japanese management went beyond the single-factor approaches to develop broader, more comprehensive conceptualisations. Ouchi (1994:346) described Japanese organisations as ... *characterised by lifetime employment, slow evaluation and promotion, non-specialised career paths, implicit control mechanisms, collective decision making, collective responsibility, and holistic concern for employees*. In sharp contrast he described features of American organisations as including short term employment, rapid evaluation and promotion, specialised career paths, explicit control mechanisms, individuals decision making, individual responsibility, and segmented concern for workers (p. 346). Ouchi (1994) proposed an alternate Theory Z, a hybrid form of the American organisation, which presumably capitalised on the best of both the American organisation and the Japanese organisation. Pascale and Athos (1994) portrayed the Japanese as masters of the soft S's of management: staff, skill, and style, while American managers were thought to

be less effective because they managed largely by utilising the hard S's of strategy, structure, and systems. Caplen (1994:70) suggests the Japanese now study cases where their own techniques have been successfully altered to the Western environment so they can borrow them back.

Hatvany and Pucik (1981:470) suggested that the success of Japanese business was linked to a strategy that maximised its human resources through the development of an internal labour market, the creation of a corporate culture that promotes group values and co-operation, and the implementation of an intensive socialisation process for incorporating new employees into the organisation. Durlabhji (1994) made a notable attempt at holistic modelling of Japanese management by use of comparative interview data, but concluded with the same stereotyping typical of the other early studies.

Although empirical evidence was scarce, Keys and Miller (1994) hypothesised from a mental factor analysis that three underlying factors appeared to be highly influential to Japanese management success. They included the strong adherence of Japanese management to a long-run planning horizon, a commitment to lifetime employment and an unfailing preference for collective responsibility. Keys and Miller (1994) concluded that the development of better integrated, more comprehensive theories, which incorporated factors in the external environment, would be more appropriate in the future than studies of specific elements of Japanese management practice in narrow settings. Much has been learned in the last decade about Japanese management theory and practice. It has to be noted that almost all the literature on Japanese management is written by Western management experts. This leaves a serious gap in the literature available on the subject.

2.4 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW: AFRICAN MANAGEMENT

2.4.1 INTRODUCTION

Kiggundu (1989:69) pointed out that in Africa, as elsewhere in developing countries, society and environment pervade organisation and management. As elsewhere, there has been a tendency to focus heavily on internal organisational processes at the expense of developing a more complete understanding of the environments in which formal organisations operate. One serious effect of this, in Kiggundu's view, is that whereas African organisations may find they can apply Western management concepts and practices to their technical core with few major modifications, these imported ideas and practices are generally found to be inadequate and/or inappropriate for the organisations relationships with their environments.

It is unrealistic to suppose that anything can be said about the contexts of African organisations which will have equal validity across the whole vast continent. Nevertheless, African nations, most of which have been independent for less than 45 years, do have some similar experiences and characteristics amid great diversity. It is in the nature of this discussion that these similarities will be of primary concern.

Rotberg (1999) argues that in Africa, since the end of colonial rule, only Botswana and Mauritius were able to avoid the pitfalls of human greed. (Botswana averaging a GDP of eight percent annually from 1972 to 1992, and Mauritius six percent annually from 1975 to 1995).

The elements of a national environment are of course interrelated in a complex whole. In the brief explorations of some of those elements which are significant for organisational functioning, it is important to remember that these facets have

been isolated artificially for analytical purposes; in reality they are not isolated in their influences on formal organisations (Kiggundu 1989).

Third World public sector management is widely recognised as a problem area in the study of organisations. There is a broad consensus that public resources in poor countries are being mismanaged, and that an improvement in the effectiveness of public management is an important condition of sustained development (Howell 1978:53). Likewise, Moris (1987:25) comments that the transfer of Western management practice into Africa and Asia has had disappointing results and concludes that the problem is the system itself rather than the special conditions or people in the countries concerned. Reilly (1987:25) describes what in some of the less developed countries is nothing short of a crisis in organisation and management. Blunt (1983:4) refers to organisational malfunctioning ... on a fairly grand scale. Hyden (1983:9) speaks of the incapacitation of the institutions of national development in Africa and the need for drastic changes in the present structure of development management. Scudder (1995:17) speaks of the massive inefficiency. If such writers are to be believed, low management performance in the Third World (particularly in Africa) is not just a symptom of a problem but one of its major causes. There is also the tendency, common in Third World studies (though less common, one notes, in the West), to characterise the problem of ineffective management in terms of gross societal or pan-societal types. Thus, Hyden (1983:9) sees the fundamental problems of African management as lying in the economy of affection - that network of support, communications and interaction among structurally-defined groups connected by blood, kin, community or other affinities, for example religion. Its effect, he claims, is to impose social obligations on individuals that limit their interest and capacity to support public concerns outside the community. It is associated with a peasant mode that keeps alive opportunities for the rural producers to escape the demands of any given macro-economic system. Though generated in the peas-

ant economy, the economy of affection becomes by diffusion, an integral part of society at large.

Reilly (1987) and Clapham (1995), on the other hand, attribute poor managerial performance to The Hombe Theses - a conspiracy by the elite to manage the system in their own interest, and preserve the status quo, aided and abetted by aid organisations, donor governments and third parties with whom, for a variety of public and private reasons, they collude.

Approaches such as these two are clearly more concerned with hypothetical issues of gross societal dynamics than with organisational performance *per se*, and as such have little in common with most studies of Western management.

In accounting for the very limited contribution of organisation theory to the understanding of Third World management has been the underlying ideal-typical bias which such approaches tend to assume. If the growth of development administration as a discipline in the early 1960s was more concerned with the establishment of a new way of conducting administration in developing countries, than with what administration in them actually happened to be like at the time, then the same may be said of much of what is written on the theme of Third World management today.

There are, of course, notable exceptions to this rule, though such works are usually concerned with a fairly restricted field of influence. In general, however, the emphasis is more on normative issues than practical realities. Related to this is a tendency to relegate to a residual position the sorts of environmental influences (particularly those pertaining to the political environment) which are widely recognised to have a critical impact on the practice of management, but the consideration of which is held to be beyond the scope of a study of manage-

ment. There tends to follow a vague acknowledgement that more management training along present lines may not be a solution to the problem, given its location, in large measure, outside the structure and procedures of the organisation in question, but there the matter tends to be diplomatically laid to rest. The systems perspective in studies of Third World management tends, therefore, to be a rather qualified phenomenon (Clapham 1995).

Moris's (1981:65) contention is that non-Western management systems have rational causes subject to analysis and informed action and that a comprehensive understanding from the inside of how they work is an essential precondition for any attempts to improve their efficiency. What is advocated in short, is a behavioural rather than an idealist approach to Third World management.

2.5 SUMMARY

The classical period was developed around the potential of the industrial revolution and the machines that were driving the development of industry. The demands of theorists were to create a workforce out of people unaccustomed to factory life, develop an organisational structure that could facilitate efficiency, and develop a body of theory that was generalisable enough to be taught systematically.

The human relations' period was developed around the misgivings of the classical period. It is thought that the scientific principles of the machine metaphor had overlooked the human needs of the workforce. This period of design, then, focused its attention on the worker as a person, on the assumption that a "fulfilled" worker was a productive worker.

The human resources period was developed around the inability to fully articulate and implement the human relations' ideal. Managers as parents turned out

to be an unworkable vision, and worker needs were retranslated into workplace needs. The new vision was one of job enrichment rather than personal enrichment.

The systems period was developed around the recognition of internal and external complexity. The organisation was seen as complex and in need of integration, environments were viewed as ambitious, demanding adaptation by the organisation. The cultural period was developed around the recognition of the importance of symbols and the tendency of workers to develop their own interpretations of workplace reality. These interpretations determined how the workers acted and were largely out of the control of management. Organisations were now understood as communication events, rather than being understood as closed units within which communication happened.

From a review of the existing literature, single-factor approaches to comprehend Japanese management are not uncommon. The interpretation and integration of Western management principles into the Japanese organisation and culture are a reality.

African organisations may find that they can apply Western management concepts and practices to their technical core with few major modifications, but these imported ideas and concepts are generally found to be inadequate or inappropriate for the organisations' relationship with their environments.