

TAYLORISM IN BUSINESS AND EDUCATION
A Cry for Reform

Prepared for
Power, Leadership, and Education
ED 268: George Washington University

Prepared by
Mark S. Barnett

July 4, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I: Educational Leaders	1
Introduction	1
A Scientific Philosophy of Leadership Management	2
Taylorism	2
Anti- Taylorism	3
Taylorism and Anti- Taylorism in Education	3
Directed Instruction	3
Constructivism	4
New Paradigm	5
Part II: Business Leaders	6
Tayloristic Policies Applied in a Major American Company	6
Job Insecurity	6
Case Study	6
Store Policy for Sales Counselors	7
Write-Down Policy	7
Low Price Guarantee Policy	8
3-Ring Binder Policy	8
Coercive Power	9
Insight of Sales Counselors	9
Summary	10
Part III: Interview June 23, 1999	11
Significant Backdrop to Interview	11
Technology	12
Leadership	12
Management	13
Correlations from Interview	16
Philosophy of Mangement-Leadership	16
Modes of Learning	16
Leadership Criteria	16
Leadership Types	17
Leadership Styles	17
Conclusion	18
References	19

PART I: EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

INTRODUCTION

What makes a good educational leader? What makes a poor educational leader? Years ago I heard a retired Supreme Court Justice state that in his 50-plus years in the U.S. judicial system, only 10-15% of the attorneys who came through his courtroom were competent.

A great many others have observed that this “10-15% job competency” applies to almost every professional vocation. What about teachers? Does the same observation prove true for them, with only 10-15 teachers out of a 100 competently excelling in their profession?

What about educational technology leaders? What is it that makes a few of them exceptional leaders, while the others are basically collecting a paycheck? Is it the difference in their *philosophy* of leadership, leadership *style*, leadership *traits*, or leadership *behavior* which makes one much more effective than another? Does *charisma* have anything to do with being a competent leader?

Peter Drucker, perhaps the most renowned speaker, teacher, and author on Leadership and Management in the last century asserts, “The one and only *personality trait* the effective [leaders] did have in common was something they did *not* have: they had little or no “charisma” and little use either for the term or what it signifies” (Hesselbein, 1996, p. xii).

In centuries past, before common citizens were given a democratic opportunity to utilize and apply their own knowledge and understanding, *authoritarian* and *elitists'* leadership was not only tolerated, it was sanctioned. Fortunately, there has been a major paradigm shift in leadership style over the last 10-20 years. *Participatory leadership* (Yukl, 1998, pp. 333-336) is rapidly becoming the most popular, by virtue of taking advantage of the greatest resource for any company—its people! This is readily observable in the phenomenal growth in a specialized business categorization across America—charismatic churches.

It should be perceived that leadership has the same characteristics and results cross-categorically in most all societies. This is to say, that the same comparable and effective leadership qualities will be found in a society's businesses, churches, schools, organizations, clubs, etc. at any given time historically. This should be expected since the same members of a common culture comprise membership in each of these groups.

Consequently, educational leaders should be constantly alert, observant, and applying leadership forms which are effective and are being readily received by not only learners, but participants in contemporary society. By adapting and applying the same leadership philosophies, styles, traits, and methods to the classroom which are working in

the public domain, teachers and administrators will find that they will play a much more effectual role in the students' learning process.

A SCIENTIFIC PHILOSOPHY OF LEADERSHIP-MANAGEMENT

Taylorism Early in this century mass-production helped catapult the United States into the most productive nation in the world. Though he didn't invent it, mass-production was perfected by the teachings of Frederick Winslow Taylor. His philosophy and style of management is best described by the following quote:

The worker's equal division of work was *to do what he was told to do by management* In [Taylor's] system the judgment of the individual workman was replaced by the laws, rules, principles, etc., of the science of the job which was developed by management The whole attitude of Taylor in this respect was described by a mechanic who worked with him Taylor would tell him that he was "not supposed to think, there are other people paid for thinking around here" (Callahan, 1962, p. 28).

Under Taylor's method of management (termed *Taylorism*) the elitists (engineers, technicians, managers) were the ones empowered to lay down the law for the workers to follow verbatim, with virtually no input. The workers were to do *as they were told*, and were expected to "leave their heads at the factory gate" (Marshall, 1992, p. 5). Neither their bosses nor their shop stewards allowed them to think for a living.

Even though *Taylorism* helped to make the front-line workers the largest and richest middle class the world has ever seen for over 60 years, it was also far more vulnerable than anyone imagined. There was one thread that ran through almost all its weaknesses—its *elitist* character. *Taylorism* had built a system surrounded by a managerial, technical, and support *elite* (Marshall, p. 10).

It rarely occurred to anyone to ask these workers—often three-quarters or more of the whole work force—how they thought the product or the process might be improved, let alone actually to involve them in the design process. Because the *elitists* were "out of touch" with the plant floor, product changes could not be made quickly at the point of service delivery because innovation was a time-consuming process (Marshall, p. 11).

Summary of Taylorism

- | |
|--|
| 1. Managers & Technicians: Hired to do ALL the thinking for the Company. |
| 2. Workers: Are not to think. Only do what they are told by management. |

Problem:

- ◆ Elitists out of touch with plant/production floor
- ◆ Potential of workers ignored and considered worthless

Anti-Taylorism (or DeTaylorism). Because America held on to its *Tayloristic* philosophy of leadership-management too long, they lost their *elitist* position as the world's top producing economy (Marshall, p. 43). Using the intelligence, imagination, thinking skills, quality control, and self-supervision of the front-line workers (termed *anti-Taylorism*), Germany and Japan became the dual colossi of the new world economic order.

The ascendancy to the top for these two nations is remarkably fascinating when one considers their minimal size (both in geography and population) and their limited natural resources—especially when compared to the United States. Because these two countries *anti-Taylorized*, placing their faith in the *worker* instead of the *elitists*, they invested heavily in the training of the employee, and steadily increased the worker's responsibilities regarding job production.

“Unused intelligence,” Japan would say, “is of little value. It is intelligence actually applied that makes the difference” (p. 52).

Yet, despite global competition and the need for speed, flexibility and quality, the principle of *Taylorism* still remains in the contemporary workplace (Pruijt, 1997).

Summary of Anti-Taylorism

- | |
|--|
| 1. Realization of tremendous potential of workers |
| 2. Shifting of production responsibilities from management to worker, with heavy emphasis on employee's life-long training |

Result

- ◆ Highest wages in the world for workers
- ◆ Highest standard of living in the world for workers

TAYLORISM AND ANTI-TAYLORISM IN EDUCATION

What does *Taylorism* and *anti-Taylorism* have to do with education? Much in every way. Traditionally teachers have used *Tayloristic* methods of instruction, viewing the student as someone to command and *do as told*, or face the consequences. In the conventional classroom, the teacher is empowered to lay down the law for the students to follow verbatim, with virtually no input. This must change!

If we relate teachers to *Tayloristic* managers, and students to workers, then a connection to the workplace becomes clear.

Directed Instruction. A central problem in education is the failure to adapt teaching to the way children think. From this perspective, many learning disabilities are

in fact created by schools. Children beginning school are especially vulnerable when teachers demand they learn what they cannot understand (DeVries, 1987, p. 18).

In regards to academia, this problem is magnified because less than half of the school population learn best from traditional teacher initiated, direct-dialogue, and textbook instruction (Gallagher). Currently, trends in school instruction seem to be leaning toward more motivating, interactive, and cooperative learning activities in which the teacher is more a facilitator and manager of resources than a means of delivering information to passive receivers (Roblyer, 1997, p. 73).

In *directed instruction (Taylorism)*, the teacher sets the goals and delivers most of the instruction. Accordingly, the teacher makes the decision on coursework, textbooks, lessons, assignments, homework, and tests. They even have the power to expel [fire] the student from their class, as well as giving them passing or failing grades.

Summary of Taylorism in the Classroom

1. Teachers and Administrators: Hired to do the global thinking and to set direction for the Students' learning process.
2. Students: Are not to question direction. Only do what they are told by teachers.
<i>Problem:</i>
◆ Teachers out of touch with potential of youth and business world ◆ Potential of students' brain power ignored and considered useless

Constructivism On the flipside, the job of the teacher in the *constructivist (anti-Taylorism)* model is to arrange required resources and act as a guide to students, while the students set their own goals and *teach themselves* (Roblyer, p. 70). The *constructivist* method emphasizes students' ability to solve real-life, practical problems. In this model, learners construct knowledge themselves, rather than simply receiving it from knowledgeable teachers. They tend to focus on projects that require solutions to problems rather on [dictated] instructional sequences that require learning of certain content skills.

Constructivism is not a theory about teaching. It is a theory about knowledge and learning (Brooks & Brooks, 1993, p. vii). To understand *constructivism*, educators must focus attention on the learner [worker] (Brooks & Brooks, p. 22).

When teachers recognize and honor the human impulse to construct new understandings, unlimited possibilities are created for students. Becoming a teacher who helps students to search rather than follow *is* challenging, and rewarding (Brooks & Brooks, p. 102).

Summary of Anti-Taylorism in the Classroom

- | |
|---|
| 1. Realization of tremendous potential of students |
| 2. Shifting of learning responsibilities from teacher to student, with heavy emphasis on student's life-long training |

Result

- ◆ Higher motivation to learn; questioning and thinking welcomed
- ◆ Potential for learning released; increased future job security

New Paradigm. A new set of images, reflective of new practices, is needed—images that portray the student as a thinker; a creator; and a constructor. Schools can become settings in which students are encouraged to develop hypotheses, to test out their own and others' ideas, to make connections among “content” areas, to explore issues and problems of personal relevance (either existing or emerging), to work cooperatively with peers and adults in the pursuit of understanding, and to form the disposition to be life-long learners (Brooks & Brooks, p. 127).

As the workplace must shift from *Taylorism* to *anti-Taylorism*, the classroom must shift from being teacher-directed to student-directed (*constructivism*). Emerging from this transition will be a thinking, autonomous, independent, and self-directed human being. As a result, the student's search for understanding and knowledge will continue throughout their life, and thus making for a happier and more productive camper in the workforce.

PART II: BUSINESS LEADERS

TAYLORISTIC POLICIES APPLIED IN A MAJOR AMERICAN COMPANY

Job Insecurity. Job insecurity abounds in America. This is self-evident because of technological advances replacing more and more workers everyday in addition to jobs which are lost due to fierce competition with other countries. This can be expected since technology is making the world smaller and smaller everyday.

Be that as it may, job insecurity in America is also directly precipitated by *Tayloristic* leadership. As before stated, under this type of management the employee is made to understand that they are “not to think” or make any intellectual or experiential contributions to their job—only do what they are told! After all, the managers are the intellectuals with the experience and training; thus they know what’s best regarding company policy. If an employee disagrees, then they should be out looking for other employment.

This type of leadership is unacceptable, since *elitists’* conduct is a controllable behavior for society. America’s strongest competition for jobs is with Japan and Germany. And yet, both of these countries have virtually 100% job security. So why does America put up with *Tayloristic* leadership, placing many families at risk of losing their jobs for disagreement and thoughtful deliberation? Is it because we tolerate *Taylorism* and look the other way when employees are fired for the wrong reasons?

Far-reaching insecurities develop for the unconventional employee when companies hire managers with a *Tayloristic* philosophy of leadership-management. This style of management creates an environment which guarantees huge conflicts will eventually develop between *elitist* supervisors and the experienced employees who are specialists in their field. Research indicates that conflict occurs when one or both parties express hostility and interfere with each other’s efforts to accomplish objectives (Yukl, p. 111).

Case Study. A case in hand has to do with the nation’s largest electronic consumer retailer with over 600 stores in the U.S. Reaching market saturation with their Superstores in the larger cities a few years back, the company has since been actively constructing *micro* stores in mid-size cities with floor space that is 60-75% smaller. This reduction in size and inventory (which is stocked at bare minimum) was enacted with several changes taking place—many of them being very unfavorable for the sales counselors in the *micro* stores.

For example, all of the major retailer’s sales counselors are compensated on a “commission-only” basis. This means that their entire income is wholly contingent upon the total sales they individually make. However, the sales counselors in the *micro* stores are discriminated against and limited in their income potential when compared to the sales counselors in the Superstores.

To increase profits for the company, corporate management made a decision to cut labor costs to a minimum in the *micro* stores. Consequently, sales counselors in these smaller stores are required to spend about 25% of their work week pulling inventory for customers, setting up and configuring floor products, pricing, tagging, customer service, and janitorial work—for which they receive *no* compensation. Whereas, in the Superstores, additional employees are hired to do these jobs. When compared to the *micro* stores, this amounts to about 10 more hours-per-week on the floor for sales counselors in the Superstores to do what they were hired to do—sell!

STORE POLICY FOR SALES COUNSELORS

This electronic retail giant has THREE principal policies in place which are required for all their sales counselors:

1. During every sale, execute a literal *write-down* on paper as the tool for selling the company's extended service contracts
2. Immediately greet every customer entering the store by passing out a hard copy of the store's *Low Price Guarantee (LPG)*, using a canned speech stipulated by management
3. Carry a 3-ring binder at all times

There is a rationale for these THREE company policies, and on the surface they appear harmless. But in actuality, they have a negating and demoralizing affect upon every store's sales counselors.

Write-Down Policy. Since the company makes an undisclosed profit on their self-funded extended service contracts, management wants to make sure every customer has been given the opportunity to purchase the store's insurance protection for their product.

Sales counselors are also nicely compensated for selling these extended protection contracts, increasing their paychecks as much as 30-50%! A large conflict with this store policy occurs, however, because most all sales counselors *quickly learn* to be much more effective at selling extended service contracts without spending the extra time it takes to *write everything down* on paper. For the professional sales person, they understand that the customer is a busy person, who only wants to hear a quick summary on two issues:

1. What does this do for me?
2. How much does it cost?

The professional sales counselor is not always opposed to doing *write-downs*, explaining in detail the extended service contracts. Some customers simply need to be convinced in writing. In these rare instances the sales counselors are more than happy to comply.

For the *anti-Taylorist* manager, he or she rarely enforces the *write-down* policy unless the sales counselor's numbers are low for the month in that category. But for the *Taylorist* manager, he or she constantly uses *coercive power* (Yukl, p. 178) and threaten termination if the sales counselor refuses to comply with the store policy in this regards.

Low Price Guarantee (LPG) Policy. The *LPG* store policy is in place because it promises peace of mind for the customer. If the consumer becomes aware of a legitimate lower price for their product from one of their competitors (within 30-60 days of purchase), they have the opportunity to come back into the store and receive compensation for the difference.

For over a decade now every major retailer in the U.S. has advertised this same *LPG* policy. Unless a consumer has been isolated for 10-years, they already know about universal *LPG*'s.

But store policy for the nation's largest electronic retailer *states* that the sales counselors must literally hand out a hard copy of the *LPG* guarantee to the customer when they first enter their department, using a predetermined verbal presentation. Again, this policy creates a conflict for most sales counselors because they have their own comfort zone on how to approach customers without making them feel threatened or angry.

Most consumers are intimidated by sales people because of some bad experience with them in the past. And many customers just want to be left alone when shopping, and explore the store on their own. They certainly don't want to tie their hands up by being forced to hold a piece of paper which is going into a waste basket (or the store's parking lot) ASAP.

Again, for the *anti-Taylorist* manager, total flexibility is given to the sales counselors regarding the *LPG* policy as long as the *LPG* message is clearly articulated to the customer before they leave the store. But for the *Taylorist* manager, unless they see a *LPG* piece of paper in every customer's hands, they get paranoid and angry at sales counselors for disregarding company policy. *Taylorist* managers view their principal duty as enforcing company policy without question or reason from the employee.

3-Ring Binder Policy. The 3-ring binder policy is given because the sales counselors need to have a place to stash the *write-down* sheets as well as the *LPG*'s. These binders can also be used to store technical specifications for products. Because sales counselors are always using their hands to demonstrate products, the binder is a constant nuisance. Since it has to be laid down somewhere in order to show how a product works, sales counselors seem to spend a lot of time hunting for their binders, since a lot of time usually elapses before they realize it is missing.

However, sales counselors are very creative and smart. It doesn't take them long to figure out that *write-down* and *LPG* sheets can be stacked neatly within arm's reach throughout the store, easily and quickly accessed when needed. Most technical

specifications are internally memorized by the sales counselors after some time on the floor. But if needed, a booklet detailing every product is always available at the nearest kiosk desk.

As before, *anti-Taylorist* managers rarely even mention enforcing the carting of 3-ring binders on the person. They would rather train their sales counselors to have knowledge of their product memorized internally, and professionally endowed with verbal sales skills—not relying on written material which is often bulky and confusing. But for the *Taylorist* managers, they seem only to be able to have faith and assurance in their sales counselors if they can visually see the 3-ring binder being carried around in their hands at all times.

Coercive Power. How do employees respond to a *Tayloristic* manager’s exercise of power? People are not by nature compliant. Therefore, it seems reasonable, if a given behavior is not something employees would voluntarily engage in, then efforts by *Tayloristic* managers to have them engage in that behavior would be met with resistance (Ratzburg, p. 2).

Tayloristic management is directly linked to the *Autocrat* style of leadership. The *Autocratic* leader dominates team-members, using unilateralism to achieve a singular objective. This approach to leadership generally results in passive resistance from team-members and requires continual pressure and direction from the leader in order to get things done (Leadership Styles).

Coercive power is the capacity *Tayloristic* managers use to dispense punishments to those who do not comply with their requests or demands (Leadership Styles, p. 9). To remain in power, a *Tayloristic* manager must use this type of power, which involves forcing employees to comply with their wishes. A prison best exemplifies an example of a *coercive* organization (Leadership Styles, p. 8).

Insight of Sales Counselors. For the *Taylorist* managers, sales counselors can immediately recognize their lack of people-skills, not to mention less than average sales abilities. Having difficulty adapting quickly to spontaneous situations, *Taylorist* managers require rigid structure to keep them on track. Out of fear of losing control, they demand their employees abide by laws, rules, and policies which were written by someone with similar philosophical personalities as themselves.

On the flip side, sales counselors can readily perceive that *anti-Taylorist* managers possess sensational sales and people skills. Over time these highly competent and respected leaders eventually convey earlier frustrations with these THREE company policies when they were sales counselors on the floor.

Karlan Witt, with *Intelliquest*, states, “It’s always cheaper to *keep a customer* than to *acquire* a new one” (PC Computing, July, 1999, p. 152). Analogously, a parallel motto for an *anti-Taylorist* manager would be, “It’s always cheaper to *retain* a good

employee than to *hire and train* a new one.” In opposition, the *Taylorist* manager would say without hesitation, “In order to *preserve* the letter of the law as written, it’s always better to *fire* a good employee than to *retain* them and corrupt the established policies of the company.”

Summary. Sales counselors are not robots, even though *Taylorist* managers treat them as if they were. Every successful sales person has their own unique gifts and forte in sales, either naturally endowed or acquired. If mandated to sell utilizing only one method (translated means “what works for someone else”), it has several negative affects upon a professional sales person. First, it decreases their sales, because a extrinsic method of selling takes them out of their element no matter how many times they use it. It doesn’t fit and throws them off balance in their sales presentation.

Shakespeare counseled, “To thine own self be true.” Ralph Waldo Emerson’s counterpart for that was his famous words, “Know thyself.” A professional sales person does indeed know himself or herself—including what their strengths and weaknesses are. When selling a new product, they quickly learn to adapt their strengths by acquiring new vocabulary and presentation techniques relating to the merchandise. Half of sales are made by knowing your product. The other half is in believing wholeheartedly in the value of your product, so that it convincingly flows out of you in a natural and smooth way.

Therefore, when a professional sales person is mandated to give a rote extrinsic sales presentation which they have to memorize, it disables their creativity, imagination, people-skills, believability, and motivation. It might even make some sales counselors sound impaired and insincere.

Wrapping-up, the three Binding Policies mentioned above for sales counselors employed by the nation’s largest electronic retail chain might be warranted—if all their sales counselors were teenagers without any sales experience, and their turnover rate was high. Otherwise, these *Tayloristic* policies should be viewed as discriminatory against original and natural professionalism for sales counselors.

PART III: INTERVIEW ON JUNE 23, 1999

Leadership Relating to Organizations, Change, and Technology

Significant Backdrop to Interview. This interview took place with my youngest brother, James Barnett, Division Director of *DaySpring Cards*, the largest Christian greeting card manufacturer in the world.

Mr. Barnett has been with the company for 18 years—thirteen-years as Sales & Marketing Manager, and the last five as Division Director. Much of the success for the active expansion of *DaySpring* has been the result of Mr. Barnett's marketing plan activated shortly after he was first hired. When Mr. Barnett was first hired by *DaySpring*, he was given a green light to initiate a concept which he developed in his MBA thesis paper—hiring an outside sales group to actively pursue business in all the Christian Bookstores throughout the United States.

Until five years ago, *DaySpring* was privately owned by its two founders, who then sold it to *David C. Cook Communications, Inc.*, a Christian non-profit corporation. Albeit, *DaySpring* remained a *for profit* company after the purchase, and was viewed as being a “partner in ministry” by their new owners.

Since then *DaySpring* has continued its rapid growth and today contributes over 40% of the entire parent company's sales volume. As a result, their upper management has become intimidated and frightened, and has begun to see *DaySpring* as a possible threat to their ownership relationship.

Consequently, for the last six months *DaySpring's* parent company has been taking bids for its sale, allowing the officers of *DaySpring* virtually no input in the selling process. This has caused great apprehension for Mr. Barnett and the 400 employees of *DaySpring*, due to their possibility of being moved or consolidated by a new owner.

In two weeks the bidding will end and a decision will be made regarding the company's future ownership. One of Mr. Barnett's main concerns about this buyout is whether he will be working for *Tayloristic* or *Anti-Tayloristic* managers in the new parent corporate organization.

The interview questions centered on three main issues:

- I. **Technology:** How it has affected his organization, his role in using technology, and the change it has produced.
- II. **Leadership:** His philosophy of leadership and leadership styles.
- III. **Management:** How he views *Tayloristic*-styled management in regards to himself, managers under him, and managers over him.

I. TECHNOLOGY

How has technology affected, or is affecting your organization?

Tremendously, in every area. Perhaps the greatest affect has been the way our company communicates. Instead of letters and long distance telephone calls, we now use e-mail. When we want to research companies, we use the Internet. When we want to gather information about virtually anything, we use the Internet.

Most of our company's products are now designed on the computer, without any hard copies. Inventory control systems are kept on the computer and the Internet. Planning and tracking of sales and inventory with vendors and suppliers are all done via the Internet.

But the biggest change agent is the consumer, who always votes with their pocketbooks. As a result of having instantaneous knowledge of sales, we can re-supply inventory immediately as needed.

How are you leading the changes to the organization that are produced by technology?

I made a decision three years ago that the *Information Technology* person was to report directly to me. At that time I began to implement technology into the company, i.e. international and intra-company communication, product design and development, product control and distribution, management responsibilities, etc.

Also, I formed a leadership team with the specific purpose of using newer technology to be in constant and immediate communication with customers, suppliers, and distributors. With our larger customers, we have set up POS (Point of Sale) systems which is linked directly to their store's database. By doing this, we have immediate access to sales information which lets us know which products are selling the best at which locations and in what markets.

With our *Wal-Mart* account, we can access the sales we make with them using their EDI (Electronic Data Interchange) system, which is very similar to POS systems.

II. LEADERSHIP

How would you describe your leadership style?

I would call my type of leadership as consensus or participatory style. As the obvious leader at the top, I set direction for the company, specifying what needs to be accomplished and what the goals are. However, I do not lay the roadmap out and say this is the route we are going. Instead, I involve everyone possible in

the company with leadership positions to participate in the decision-making process. It is my responsibility to see that we accomplish the goals of the company, not to dictate the itinerary and policy for arriving there.

In regards to your definition of *transforming* or *transformational* leadership styles (Yukl, pp. 324-327), I would have to say that I am more *transformational* than *transforming*. As a result of my leadership style, I believe that employees get reward value by being able to express their own ideas and exhibit their own leadership styles, without being forced to operate under the style I dictate for them.

I allow leaders to lead within certain freedoms, as long as they don't go out of bounds. Out of bounds would be dishonoring and showing disrespect of others, as well as dishonesty and loss of integrity. This is especially valid in regards to how they deal and relate with the people they lead.

How did you choose your leadership style? Is it something you created or is it a result from observing negative leadership styles of others which you have intellectually made a decision not to duplicate in yourself?

My leadership style has been formed based on how I like to be treated—sorta like the Golden Rule.

According to the five power types (Yukl, p. 178), which ones best describe you?

All of them except *coercion* power, which I detest. I use *reward* power by granting financial and promotional gain for good work. *Legitimate* power and *expert* power are self-understood in my position. Regarding *referent* power, I believe employees comply because they want admiration, respect, and approval of peers.

III. MANAGEMENT

What is your viewpoint concerning “Tayloristic” management, and how do you see yourself as well as those managers under you?

I see two extremes of *Tayloristic* management types, but in reality there are hundreds of in-betweens. I see myself very much as having a *anti-Tayloristic* style of management, perhaps a 3 on a 10-scale, where 10 is the pure *Tayloristic* manager.

In regards to being *Tayloristic*, I see a place for guidelines in systems. When ideas have been tested, and it is already known that X idea is better than Y idea, then it doesn't do much good in spending a lot of time discussing trying the Y idea. Also, there are some companies which have a bad track record. We don't

want to go down that road, because a company cannot live in chaos. Some paths are simply more successful than others.

So it is better to have some instruction with advance knowledge than no instruction or experience. With 15 people involved in a decision, I need something to start with in order to provide balance. It is not the *what*, but the *how*.

So, in my opinion, there should be at least some restrictions in allowing managers and employees to “use their brains” freely and without limitations and guidelines. But, I’m assuming all *anti-Tayloristic* managers would agree with this.

In regards to managers who report to me, my manufacturing managers would lean a little more toward the *Tayloristic* world, perhaps a rating of 5 or 6 on a 10-scale. This is probably normal, since production requires so much legalistic perfection. However, for all other managers in our organization, they are probably along the same lines as me, about a 3 or 4 on a 10-scale.

Where would the managers in your parent company fit on the elitist Tayloristic-management 10-scale chart?

They would probably rate pretty high, perhaps a 8 or 9. I don’t believe they really want my input, and desire to do things as they have always done them. That kind of philosophy of management just doesn’t fit well in the rapidly changing world of technology which we live.

They probably see their value threatened. They have maintained their conservative growth while we have continued swift expansion. I don’t believe the managers in our parent company feel superiority over us. They just don’t know how to handle conflict. Therefore they hold even tighter to hierarchical authority, even though it is not appealing to professional management in their subsidiary companies.

Do you have any other comments on leadership?

The best leadership is servant leadership. This style of leadership allows those around you to succeed and grow. Leaders should not be afraid if others around them become better at what they do. In this regards, the leader becomes an encourager, developer, and a coach toward helping their employees become the best they can be.

Which do you feel is easier, being a Tayloristic manager or a servant leader?

In the short term it is probably easier to be dictatorial, but the long term would favor the servant leader. In the long term, you will stand a much better chance of retaining your key employees who are skilled experts. This not only saves in re-

training expenses, it is more likely a healthier workplace environment would exist for the workers since it is more stable in the turnover ratio.

Even so, it is human nature to find it difficult to give up control of the decision-making process.

CORRELATIONS FROM INTERVIEW

To me, the characteristics of management and leadership are interchangeable, not detached. Either directly or indirectly, one cannot manage without leading, and one cannot lead without managing. Reflecting on the interview, Mr. Barnett seems to combine many positive management-leadership skills.

Philosophy of Management-Leadership. Mr. Barnett sees himself as a manager by consensus, allowing all sides to express their views, preferably directly to one another (Consensus-Building Principles). By allowing direct input, underlying conflicts can be avoided. However, he also realizes that not all modes of expressing conflict are constructive, especially when dishonor and disrespect for others are demonstrated.

Some organizations do much to assure that they don't have good leaders (Bennis, 1989, p. 187). But Mr. Barnett seems to have created an environment which makes it conducive for talented people in his company to become strong leaders. He would agree with Bennis that an organization's purpose should determine its structure—rather than the other way around—and that it should function as a community rather than a hierarchy . . . because ultimately an organization is merely the means, not the end. Just because the company has the gold, it doesn't have to function in an atmosphere where it makes all the rules (Ratzburg, p. 5).

People are prone to do what their minds and emotions tell them to do, not necessarily what the leader says to do. No leader can motivate others. They can only cause followers to motivate themselves (Farr). Mr. Barnett seems to understand this, and becomes a coach (versus a dictator) to encourage motivation among his leaders.

Modes of Learning. According to Gib Akin, there are several modes of learning (Bennis, p. 56), and two of them apply specifically to Mr. Barnett. The first is *validation* where one tests concepts by applying them and learning after the fact. The second is *anticipation*, in which one develops a concept and then applies it, learning before acting.

Even though both involve a certain amount of risk-taking, a greater loss can occur with the *validation* mode of learning, since learning comes “after” the application. Therefore greater caution needs to be exercised here, because it could literally break a company if the conception turns out to be defective.

In Mr. Barnett's early years with his company, he had no other choice but to use *validation* as his primary mode of learning. In contrast, today he is able to use the *anticipation* mode of learning, since he now has the budget, experience, and track record to draw upon. This allows him more time and resources to employ in testing ideas and concepts before applying them.

Leadership Criteria. *FedEx* uses “9 faces of leadership” as criteria to identify potential leaders (Row). While Mr. Barnett seems to share all of those personal attributes, there are three which seem to stand out in his interview:

1. *Individual Consideration*. Coaches, advises, and teaches people who need it. Actively listens and gives indications of listening.
2. *Judgment*. Reaches sound and objective evaluations of alternative courses of action through logic, analysis, and comparison. Puts facts together rationally and realistically. Uses past experience and information to bring perspective to present decisions.
3. *Respect for Others*. Honors and does not belittle the opinions of other people.

Leadership Types. Farr asserts that if leadership can be taught, it can also be managed (Farr, p. 2). To him the most progressive and successful companies manage leaders as a strategic weapon. In accomplishing this, Farr specifies three *leadership types* which are manifested in the best managers—all of which characterize the leadership skills of Mr. Barnett, who has been able to successfully integrate them in a way which best serves the employees as well as the organization:

1. *Directional leadership* is strategic leadership. It is all about determining where the organization should go.
2. *Implementational leadership* involves determining how the organization will make it to wherever it is headed.
3. *Interpersonal leadership* involves the process of getting human resources behind organizational goals and objectives.

Leadership Styles. The most succinct studies identify three primary styles of leadership: autocratic, laissez-faire, and democratic (Leadership Styles). The *autocratic* leader dominates, generally resulting in passive resistance from team-members, and requires continual pressure and direction from the leader in order to get things done. This definitely does not describe the *leadership style* of Mr. Barnett.

The *laissez-faire* manager exercises little control over his group, leaving them to sort out their roles and tackle their work without participating in this process himself. Again this does not describe Mr. Barnett.

However, the *democratic* style of leadership *does*. The *democratic* style of leadership makes decisions by consulting his team, whilst still maintaining control of the group. The *democratic* leader allows his team to decide how the task will be tackled and who will perform which task.

A good *democratic* leader encourages participation and delegates wisely, but never loses sight of the fact that he bears the crucial responsibility of leadership. He values group discussion and input from his team, and can be seen as drawing from a pool of his team member's strong points. He motivates his team by empowering them to direct themselves, and guides them with a loose reign (Leadership Styles).

I believe Mr. Barnett would agree with Gary Klein, the developer of the naturalistic decision-making approach (Klein, p. 2). Klein views people as intrinsically

skilled and experienced with inherent human strengths and capabilities that are usually downplayed or ignored. Having expressed *servanthood* as his core philosophy of leadership, Mr. Barnett would see his leadership role as doing his best to assist every employee in his company to excel to their highest potential possible. If that were accomplished, he would be the first to revel in their achievement.

Conclusion. Mr. Barnett can be aptly portrayed as an *anti-Taylorist* manager. Unlike *Taylorist* elitists, Mr. Barnett believes that workers should use their minds and intellect, and their expertise and skills should be concentrically involved in the decision-making process of the company. By comparison, since he has experienced *Tayloristic* suppression by the leadership in his parent company, he would view a *Tayloristic* style of management as being repressive and perhaps destructive for long-term relationships to exist between employer and employee.

Louis Boone reflects on *Tayloristic* management when he declares, “Some people work just hard enough to not get fired, and some companies pay just enough that they won’t quit” (Ray Jutkin's Power Quotations, 1997, p. 2).

Bennis sums up the one true mission of all *anti-Taylorist* organizations as releasing the full use of the individual’s potential, and finding ways of offering them opportunities for growth and development (Bennis, p. 187). Hopefully, *anti-Taylorist* managers like Mr. Barnett who provide this kind of growth and development for the employees of his company will become the predominate leadership style everywhere.

REFERENCES

- Bennis, Warren (1989). *On Becoming a Leader*. Massachusetts: Perseus Books.
- Brooks, Jacqueline G., Brooks, Martin G. (1993). *The Case for Constructivist Classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Callahan, Raymond E. (1962). *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Consensus-Building Principles*. RESOLVE: Center for Environmental and Public Policy Dispute Resolution. Available online at <http://www.resolv.org/consensus/principles.htm>
- DeVries, R., Kohlberg, L. (1987). *Programs of Early Education: The Constructivist View*. New York: Longman.
- Farr, James, N. *Leadership Vs. Management: Do You Know the Difference?* Business Leader. Available online at <http://www.leadership-trust.org/leadership.htm>
- Gallagher, Teresa. *The Exploratory Learner: Temperaments in the Classroom*. Connecticut, USA: Born to Explore! The Other Side of ADD. Available Online: <http://borntoexplore.org/addlearn.htm>
- Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., Beckhard, R., Ed. (1996). *The Leader of the Future*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Klein, Gary. *Sources of Power: How People Make Decisions*. Reviews: Amazon.com. Available online at <http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0262112272/002-5295788-2239467>
- Leadership Styles* (me96). Available online at <http://www.ee.ed.ac.uk/~gerard/MENG/ME96/Documents/Styles/styles.html>
- Marshal, R., Tucker, M. (1992). *Thinking for a Living: Education and the Wealth of Nations*. New York: Basic Books.
- PC Computing* (July, 1999). "Internet Business: I-Biz 100"
- Pruijt, H. (1997). *Job Design and Technology. Taylorism vs. Anti-Taylorism*. Routledge London and New York. ISBN 0-415-15890-9. Description available online at <http://www-old.eur.nl/fsw/soc/pruijt/jobtech.html>
- Ratzburg, Wilf H. *Power Defined*. Organizational Power: Y! GeoCities. Available online at <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Forum/1650/htmlpower.html>
- Roblyer, M.D., Edwards, Jack, & Havriluk, Mary Anne (1997). *Learning Theories and Integration Models. Integrating Educational Technology into Teaching*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Row, Heath. *The 9 Faces of Leadership*. Fast Company. Available online at <http://www.fastcompany.com/online/13/9faces.html>
- Ray's Jutkins' Power Quotations* (1997). Hanson Marketing Group, Inc., November 24, 1997 edition. Available online at <http://www.hansonmarketing.com/guest4-a.html>
- Yukl, Gary (1998). *Leadership in Organizations*, 4th Edition. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.