Chapter 2

Evolution of Management, Administrative, and Leadership Theories

Historical Perspective

As long as there have been human endeavors, there have been people willing to take charge—people willing to plan, organize, staff, and control the work. One might say that nature abhors a vacuum and thus someone will always step forward to fill a leadership void.

Probably the natural emergence of leadership grew out of our instinct for survival. In the hostile world of early humankind, food, shelter, and safety needs usually required cooperative efforts, and cooperative efforts required some form of leadership. Certainly leadership was vested in the heads of early families via the patriarchal system. The oldest member of the family was the most experienced and was presumed to be the wisest member of the family and thus was the natural leader.

As families grew into tribes and tribes evolved into nations, more complex forms of leadership were required and did evolve. Division of labor and supervision practices are recorded on the earliest written record, the clay tablets of the Sumerians. In Sumerian society, as in many others since, the wisest and best leaders were thought to be the priests and other religious leaders.

Likewise, the ancient Babylonian cities developed very strict codes, such as the code of Hammurabi. King Nebuchadnezzar used color codes to control production of the hanging gardens, and there were weekly and annual reports, norms for productivity, and rewards for piecework.

The Egyptians organized their people and their slaves to build their cities and pyramids. Construction of one pyramid, around 5000 BC., required the labor of 100,000 people working for approximately 20 years. Planning, organizing, and controlling were essential elements of that and other feats, many of them long term. The ancient Egyptian Pharaohs had long-term planners and advisors, as did their con-
temporaries in China. China perfected military organization based on line and staff principles and used these same principles in the early Chinese dynasties. Confucius wrote parables that offered practical suggestions for public administration.

In the Old Testament, Moses led a group of Jewish slaves out of Egypt and then organized them into a nation. Exodus, Chapter 18, describes how Moses “chose able men out of all Israel and made them heads over the people, and differentiated between rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties and rulers of tens.” A system of judges also evolved, with only the hard cases coming to Moses.

The city-states of Greece were commonwealths, with councils, courts, administrative officials, and boards of generals. Socrates talked about management as a skill separate from technical knowledge and experience. Plato wrote about specialization and proposed notions of a healthy republic.

The Roman Empire is thought by many to have been so successful because of the Romans’ great ability to organize the military and conquer new lands. Those sent to govern the far-flung parts of the empire were effective administrators and were able to maintain relationships with leaders from other provinces and across the empire as a whole.

There are numerous other ancient leaders who were skillful organizers, at least as indicated by their accomplishments, such as Hannibal, who shepherded an army across the Alps, and the first emperor of China, who built the Great Wall. Many of the practices employed today in leading, managing, and administering modern organizations have their origins in antiquity.

Many concepts of authority developed in a religious context. One example is the Roman Catholic Church with its efficient formal organization and management techniques. The chain of command or path of authority, including the concept of specialization, was a most important contribution to management theory.

Machiavelli also wrote about authority, stressing that it comes from the consent of the masses. However, the ideas Machiavelli expressed in The Prince are more often viewed as mainly concerned with leadership and communication.

Much management theory has military origins, probably because efficiency and effectiveness are essential for success in warfare. The concepts of unity of command, line of command, staff advisors, and division of work all can be traced back at least to Alexander the Great, or even earlier, to Lao Tzu.

**ACTION-BASED CONCEPT**

Specialization, division of work, path of authority, and chain of command are all important elements of management.
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The Industrial Revolution created a need for new thinking and the refinement of old thinking. Time and motion studies intensified the division of work, as did centralized production and research and development.

Modern management theory is discussed in the next section. The preceding historical review indicates that thinking about management and leadership is in large part situational and that practices evolved to deal with new situations that arose. It also indicates that yesterday’s principles and theories are surprisingly contemporary and surprisingly sophisticated. Some overlap occurs, of course, and some gaps. Today’s theorists have attempted to fill in the gaps and adapt the theories to current situations. Yet, like in other areas of thought, not much is of recent origin in the field of management theory.

CURRENT MANAGEMENT THOUGHT

There are numerous management theories, but they more or less fall into four groups: the scientific approach, the systems approach, the humanistic approach, and the contingency approach.

The Scientific Approach

Not surprisingly, the scientific approach uses the scientific method to achieve maximum output, minimum strain, elimination of waste, and reduction of inefficiency. Automation is encouraged. Where human involvement is required, rules, laws, and formulae replace individual judgment. Individual behavior is recorded and analyzed so that it can become the basis of rules. Scientific research is used to try to discover the best way to do a job. Workers are scientifically selected and trained to ensure that work is done as efficiently as possible. Work is studied so that managers are given the work for which they are best fitted, as are the employees they supervise.

ACTION-BASED CONCEPT

Maximizing output and efficiency and minimizing strain and waste are important elements of management.

An overriding concern is that competence govern the division of labor. This principle leads, of course, to standardization and specialization as well as hierarchy. Written rules determine the work each person performs as well as the promotion of employees into management ranks.
Naturally, the emphasis on written rules led to the formulation of what are now known as the classical principles of management, summarized as follows:

- Division of work and specialization should characterize any enterprise, and management should be a separate function. Departmentalization is by process or place.
- Authority should be equal to responsibility, with enough authority granted to ensure success.
- Discipline is required to ensure that the best interests of the organization are served.
- Unity of direction and unity of command are required so that people receive direction from only one supervisor.
- Subordination of individual interests must occur so that the general interest is best served.
- Centralization is desirable, especially centralization of decision making.
- Order is essential for everything, and an orderly process and orderly appearance are required.
- Employees should be adequately and fairly remunerated to reduce employee turnover and increase production.
- The emphasis is on production, and standards and incentive rewards are used to maximize production.

The scientific approach, not surprisingly, gave rise to the systems approach. The two approaches share many features but differ in format.

**The Systems Approach**

The first task of this approach is to break the whole into logical parts that are interconnected in an orderly fashion. The next task is to study the component parts and strive to understand how they perform in various circumstances. The application of systems analysis techniques to management resulted in identification of seven interconnected systems that could be studied separately or as parts of the whole of management:

1. Planning is the process of specifying goals, establishing priorities, and otherwise identifying and sequencing action steps to accomplish the goals.
2. Organizing is the establishing of a structure or set of relationships so that the plan can be accomplished.
3. Staffing is the assigning of personnel to specific roles or functions so that the organization works as designed.
4. Directing is the making of decisions and the communication of them to the staff who will implement them.
5. Coordinating is the task of directing the various components, and otherwise communicating between the units so that their interrelationships are smooth as is the function of the entire enterprise.
6. Reporting is the transfer of information through conferences, reports, and records to those to whom the manager is accountable.
7. Budgeting is fiscal planning, accounting, and control.

**ACTION-BASED CONCEPT**

Planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting are important elements of management.

Certainly modern-day managers plan, organize, staff, direct, coordinate, report, and budget. Other words are sometimes used to identify the functions, but their importance remains the same. Of course, not all managers will have the responsibility to perform all these functions. Yet from a systems theory perspective, they are the common subsystems of management.

The systems approach, however, is also concerned with how each enterprise fits into the larger social, cultural, economic, and political system. Although an organization is itself a social system with subsystems that can be analyzed and focused on production or service, it is still only one of many organizations that make up the larger social system. The importance of interconnectedness can not be underestimated in the world of the 21st century.

**The Humanistic Approach**

Management gets things done through machines and people, and some theorists speculated that treating people as machines was counterproductive. The work environment began to be studied, as did interpersonal relationships and the formal and informal groups in the workplace. Worker satisfaction and worker attitudes were also investigated. The result was a push toward more worker participation in the management process and better communication. Of course, labor unions played a big role in this trend.

**ACTION-BASED CONCEPT**

Management gets things done through people, and efforts to improve the working environment and worker satisfaction usually increase productivity.
The Contingency Approach

Each of the three management theories discussed above has many variations, and there are yet other theories that do not fit neatly into any of the major categories. Also, advocates of each of the three theories freely admit that their preferred theory has limitations and that other theories have elements that are useful. Indeed, many argue that the theories are not mutually exclusive and that it is possible to use elements of all three in the same situation. Moreover, most would admit that the best managers incorporate all of the theories in their management style.

The strategy of combining elements of different theories is known as the contingency approach. Theorists who favor this approach argue that the best policy is to go with what works given the particular problems, workers, managers, and setting. They claim that there is no best management theory and certainly none that works well all the time. The most reasonable management strategy is to continuously monitor and analyze the managerial environment and integrate strands of different management theories to arrive at the best combination.

The scientific, systems, humanistic, and contingency approaches all still have numerous advocates. Each one has strengths and weaknesses, and each one has its appropriate uses. Therefore, every manager should be familiar with these theories and be able to apply them effectively in the proper circumstances.

ACTION-BASED CONCEPT

No one theory will fit all situations. Managers must understand the particular circumstances and utilize appropriate elements of each major theory while maintaining flexibility.

MANAGERIAL ROLES

College students reading this book may not be especially interested in management theory; instead, they probably are more concerned to find out what managers do, because such knowledge will help them in their consideration of different career options. Managers, when writing about their major responsibilities, typically assert that they plan, organize, coordinate, and control. Yet how are these responsibilities translated into day-to-day activities? One recent research-based article on management by Henry Mintzberg punctured the idea that managers generally engage in systematic planning.
Folklore: The manager is a reflective, systematic planner.

Fact: Study after study has shown that managers work at an unrelenting pace, that their activities are characterized by brevity, variety, and discontinuity, and that they are strongly oriented to action, and dislike reflective activities.²

The work of managing involves a steady stream of meetings, callers, and mail from early morning until late night. Coffee breaks and lunches are often work related, and breakfast and dinner meetings are all too common. Workdays become longer over time, and the tasks expand to fill all available hours, regardless of the amount of delegation or additional staffing. There is the ever present “to do” list, the stack of “get to it later” things to shuffle through frequently, as well as the “must read” stack of journals, reports, and newsletters. Interruptions are the rule, and time to think and plan is the most needed, most precious, most missing ingredient. Is it any wonder that stress is a common problem among today’s managers?

ACTION-BASED CONCEPT

Management is action-oriented, and managers need lots of energy, the ability to be decisive, and the ability to cope with stress.

Folklore: The effective manager has no regular duties to perform.

Fact: Managerial work involves performing a number of regular duties, including ritual and ceremonial negotiations, and processing of soft information that links the organization with its environment.³

One the biggest problems is that a manager’s schedule becomes filled with numerous and often long meetings. Far too many appointments concern complaints or issues that should have been handled by others. Standing meetings with key employees and with key groups of employees take too much time. Preparing for meetings and following up on meetings often occupy more time than the meetings do or than the issues are worth.

The public relations functions become “old” after a while, as does the travel. Then there is the enormous task of sorting through the abundant and sometimes conflicting information and making sense of it—trying to see a path or discover which direction to take without adequate time to think reflectively about the issues that must be faced.
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Folklore: The manager needs aggregated information, which a formal management information system best provides.

Fact: Managers strongly favor verbal media telephone calls and meetings over documents.

Again, the authors’ experiences are consistent with this claim. Far more time is spent in oral communication or using faxes or e-mail than reading or preparing written reports. This is not to deny that reading widely can be enormously beneficial. Managers need to search for ideas and news items with potential to impact the organization, mentally or physically file them away, and occasionally forward them to others with the appropriate spans of control. Frequent consultation with other managers has been found to be essential as a way of finding out what they are thinking and feeling, because most of their thoughts do not get written down. It is from the mix of soft information, largely verbally transmitted, that decisions are made.

**ACTION-BASED CONCEPT**

*Extensive reading and informal communication are needed by managers, yet finding the time to read and communicate informally is often the most difficult task.*

The Mintzberg article belittled the idea that management is or is quickly becoming a science and a profession.

The managers’ programs—to schedule time, process information, make decisions, and so on—remain locked deep inside their brains. Thus, to describe these programs, we rely on words like judgement and intuition, seldom stopping to realize that they are merely labels for our ignorance.

Indeed, rarely does time permit full application of decision-making theory. Decisions are often made on the spot, in the midst of a meeting, on the phone, or while walking and talking. They have to be made quickly and intuitively because others need them to be made. To extend the decision-making period would be to slow others down and increase one’s own backlog of work. Yet some decisions must be postponed until the opinions of others are sought or the time to reflect is available.
The manager’s world is enormously complicated and difficult. Managers are overburdened with obligations yet cannot easily delegate their tasks. As a result they are driven to overwork and forced to do many tasks superficially. Brevity, fragmentation, and verbal communication characterize their work.\(^6\)

So why do people go into management if what they do is stress filled and ultra demanding? The reasons are many, including increased salary, perks and prestige, personality variables (“I like to be where the action is.”), the desire to make a difference, and the issue of “Who else will do it?” There will always be managers—and there will always be managerial turnover as individuals decide they lack the proper temperament or interest, or prove that they are missing the skills demanded by their superiors.

AN OVERVIEW OF LEADERSHIP

Many individuals manage at middle levels of an organization without having much leadership responsibility. They simply do specific management tasks. While admittedly an oversimplification, leadership implies change and influence whereas management can perhaps seem static (e.g., concentrated on controlling existing work processes). Of course, management, as discussed earlier, involves planning, organizing, staffing, directing, and controlling, and planning is future oriented. Long-term planning is a responsibility of top-level administrators, but for many managers, especially mid-level managers, the focus is on making decisions required to keep the organization functioning more or less as it is. Sometimes, lower-level managers simply do what they are authorized to do and must seek permission to do anything different. Planned change is a priority for only a few managers, and these are appropriately called leaders.

The distinction between leadership and management is blurry, yet it is worth noting, because leadership is the single most important ingredient in any organization or community. It is also the ingredient in shortest supply.

**ACTION-BASED CONCEPT**

Leadership implies change and involves management of planned change. High-level managers will also have leadership responsibilities, and leaders often have management responsibilities.
Little is accomplished without leaders, but followers are also required. Leaders would not be leaders if no one followed. And leaders must always recognize that fact and be grateful to their followers and share the credit whenever possible. The authors of this volume strongly believe that leaders receive too much credit for organizational accomplishments and too much criticism for organizational failure. Teamwork and shared credit are preferable, since both leaders and followers are needed.

What is it that makes one person a leader and another a follower? What characteristics distinguish leaders from followers? And what are the leadership skills that can be developed?

Warren Bennis, a widely respected management consultant and author of leadership books, has specified the characteristics of leaders and compared them with the characteristics of managers. Bennis points to innovation, trust, and a long-range perspective as distinguishing marks of leadership. He indicates that leaders challenge the status quo and often ask “why?” or “why not?” But perhaps the two most important distinctions between managers and leaders are these:

- The manager is the classic good soldier; the leader is his (or her) own person.
- The manager does things right; the leader does the right thing.7

**ACTION-BASED CONCEPT**

*Leaders innovate, inspire trust, make long-range plans, and motivate people to change.*

Much fruitful thinking can be devoted to Bennis’s characteristics of leadership. Certainly innovation and original thinking are key ingredients. Focusing on people and inspiring trust are also critical. Taking a long-range perspective, challenging traditional thinking and the status quo, and being willing to do the right thing and take risks are all part of the leadership process. It is easy to agree with Bennis’s thinking, and perhaps his analysis of leadership is sufficient for many.8 However, for the sake of clarification and emphasis, further discussion is in order.

It is useful to think of leadership in the context of planned change. On January 1, 2001 we began a new year, a new decade, a new century, and a new millennium. That all of these occurred simultaneously was a rare event, and thus, represented an unusually good opportunity to contemplate organizational change.

It is no secret that change occurs whether we want it to or not and that the rate of change is escalating. Some authors who write about trends believe that the
winds of change are now reaching hurricane proportion. As one author points out, “Americans experience more technological change in a single year than their parents witnessed in a lifetime.” In addition, 90 percent of all information created since the Ice Age was created in the last 30 years, and our entire body of knowledge is now doubling every five years. In fact, the human body replaces every single molecule it is comprised of every seven years. The ancient insight of Heraclitus, that “the only constant change,” is even more salient as reinforced by the work of modern scientists such as Albert Einstein.

Change is all around us. Organizations have to change in order to respond effectively to an ever-changing world. A vital question is, will people manage change or will change manage and shape people? Similarly, will people dare to simply react to change or will they take a proactive stance and aggressively plan change? One answer is that managers will simply react to change while leaders will proactively manage change. Peter Drucker hints at this role for leaders by stating that “every organization has to build the management of change into its very structure. Every organization has to prepare for the abandonment of everything it does.”

**ACTION-BASED CONCEPT**

Managers devote their time to solving personnel problems, financial problems, and legal problems, whereas leaders plan and manage change.

Managers deal with personnel issues, financial constraints, and legal problems. Although necessary functions, they are not sufficient for long-term organizational success. A past president of Yale University once stated that financial constraints and budgetary deficits can not justify a deficit in intellectual vision or a response to changes sweeping the world. Another author put the issue this way: reliance on yesterday’s successful response in the face of new challenges leads to decline. If managers keep on doing what they have been doing, they will keep on getting the same results, or worse. Managers may settle for more of the same, for continuity and stability, but leaders want better results—more growth and increased efficiency.

People are uncomfortable with change, and leaders have to provide the necessary impetus and guidance. To do this, they must deal with people’s fear, arrogance, complacency, and lack of imagination, beginning with their own. Self-analysis is a fruitful place to begin working on leadership skills.
Optimism about the future of society, self-confidence, confidence in the organization and staff, and optimism about the organization’s future are essential for effective leadership. Of course, optimism about the future of society and optimism about the organization’s future are largely determined by current circumstances, whereas self-confidence is partly a matter of personality and partly a matter of having a history of success at work. Mike Friesen and James Johnson have even gone so far as to say the “new paradigm” of success involves embracing change.\(^\text{12}\)

**CONCLUSION**

In any project or organization, someone has to be in charge in order to ensure that decisions are made in an orderly, timely, efficient manner. That person can be called a manager or a leader.

Management and leadership theories have roots in antiquity. Modern theories, however, have evolved in response to increases in the complexity of the work environment resulting from the Industrial Revolution, the growth in high technology, and the development of global transportation and communication systems. Modern managers tend to focus on short-range issues associated with keeping an organization running smoothly, whereas leaders tend to focus on planned change, both short-range and long-range. Yet most managers perform some leadership functions, and most leaders have some management responsibilities. Opportunities to pursue a career as a manager or a leader are increasing because of the population increase, and either type of career can be rewarding and ultimately satisfying. Management or leadership skills can be learned and enhanced through work experience.

**IN-BASKET ASSIGNMENT**

TO: Health Education and Health Promotion Specialists  
FROM: The Director  
RE: Time Management Techniques

I would like a reminder sheet for our department heads on time management techniques. They are all very busy and need to be as efficient as possible.
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Please review an article or two and prepare a list of six to a dozen strategies that are recommended.

If there is a book or article that is particularly good, list the reference so staff who wish to can do additional reading.

I would like this material sometime this month, if possible.

Thanks!

MANAGEMENT CASE STUDY

Setting

An AIDS-oriented agency in a midsized metropolitan area was being administered by an AIDS patient with only a modicum of managerial or leadership experience. However, because of the capabilities of its staff fund-raiser, the agency raised enough to cover its $250,000 annual budget.

Problem

The fund-raiser saw the manager as a person without an adequate vision of what the organization could become. The manager seemed content to maintain service to AIDS patients and their families as the primary focus. The fund-raiser saw opportunities for AIDS education and AIDS advocacy in the legislature but was rebuffed by the manager, who stated he did not want the organization to take on more than it could do well. The fund-raiser talked to the board chair about the opportunities and about the need for leadership rather than mere management.

Alternatives Considered

One alternative considered was to establish a board-initiated and -conducted planning task force. Another was to ask the manager to survey six similar agencies in other metropolitan areas as to their size, budget, program emphases, and so on. The third alternative was to replace the director with someone who had stronger leadership skills.
Actions Taken

The board decided to direct the manager to survey six similar agencies and to present a summary of the results to the board. The summary was to be presented at the next board meeting so it could be used by an organizational futures task force to be created by the board.

OUTCOME

The survey indicated that most of the six agencies were doing more and that their larger budgets were being covered. The organizational futures task force decided that the local community would support an increase in the budget and a wider range of activities. The board subsequently developed an expansion plan and directed the manager to implement it. The manager started the process but concurrently began looking for another position more suited to his skills, finding one in six months. The fund-raiser was promoted to manager.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Is a bigger organization better? Could other organizations have been formed to do the additional tasks? What advantage is there to having one large organization encompass AIDS patient services, education, and advocacy instead of having three separate organizations perform the necessary activities?

2. Can a manager evolve into a leader? How could such an evolution be achieved?

3. How likely is it that the fund-raiser was merely attempting to orchestrate a promotion? How might the manager have responded other than by changing jobs? In what other ways might the board have responded?

NOTES


